

and that soldiers, particularly in periods of armed conflict, were subjected to indoctrination aimed at making them hate the enemy and conducive to brutal treatment of prisoners. The text of that article should likewise be displayed in all schools and widely disseminated throughout the world on every anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in order to remind Governments of their commitments and their obligations in that regard.

68. With reference to the question of women's rights, he said that while he subscribed to the principle of equality of rights he would warn women of the dangers that would be faced if they took an extremist position and sought absolute quantitative equality with men. In particular, it was essential to ensure that the upbringing of children was not entrusted to persons other than the mother, as had become the practice in Western and socialist societies. The family should continue to be the corner-stone of society.

69. Mr. IRARRAZAVAL (Chile), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation objected to the reference to the Chilean Government made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic. He found that reference all the more regrettable in that he had intended to congratulate the representative of the German Democratic Republic on the admission of his country to the United Nations, for which Chile had voted by way of paying a tribute to the whole German people, who had made a great contribution to the formation and development of the Chilean nation since it had attained its independence. It was not for the representative of the German Democratic Republic or anyone else to interfere in Chile's domestic affairs; such interference constituted a violation of the Charter and was contrary to the appeal made to representatives by the Chairman of the Committee at the beginning of the session not to depart from the agenda items under discussion.

70. Chile was experiencing an exceptional period in its history, which had been characterized for more than 160 years by independence and democracy. The Chilean armed forces had put an end to a situation which represented a continuous violation of human

rights, for one part of the population had been denied free access to employment and food supplies, had been deprived of freedom of expression and had been unable to lead a normal life because of the rate of inflation, which had exceeded 320 per cent. Those violations of fundamental rights had of course not been mentioned by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, whose statement had been motivated by considerations of political solidarity. Only the Chileans, who had experienced more than three years of what some called "the Chilean experience of socialism", were judges of the situation. The Chilean army had a tradition of never intervening in political affairs and if it had done so, it was only after the Congress and the highest judicial authorities in the country had declared the actions of the minority Marxist Government unlawful.

71. Chile reaffirmed its traditional respect for genuine rights, which was inherent in the very nature of the Chilean people, as indicated by Chile's active co-operation in the work of the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights ever since the establishment of the United Nations. Chile intended to continue working to ensure respect for those rights, without distracting the attention of representatives by referring to matters which had no connexion with the items under consideration. References of the sort which had been made bore witness to the desire of certain countries to intervene one last time in the domestic affairs of Chile, since they could no longer do so in Chile itself.

72. His delegation also objected to the observation of the representative of Poland concerning the Chilean Government. That observation simply reflected the concerted hostility of certain delegations towards Chile. It represented not only an injustice but a new intervention in Chile's domestic affairs on the part of a delegation which, along with several others, could not resign itself to the loss of the Marxist bastion in Chile. It was to be hoped that there would be no further observations of that kind so that the Committee would be able to continue its work in peace, undisturbed by political quarrels, which had no place in its deliberations.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

## 1999th meeting

Wednesday, 17 October 1973, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

A/C.3/SR.1999

### AGENDA ITEM 56

Observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (*continued*)  
(A/9133 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2010)

1. Mr. STAUFFENBERG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his country attached great importance to the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was an expression of the aspirations and hopes of mankind. The anniversary should be an occasion on which to take stock of the situation with regard to human

rights and to appeal to the international community to intensify its efforts to implement the basic rights of individuals and peoples.

2. The Federal Republic of Germany, for its part, was preparing to commemorate that anniversary with due solemnity. There would be a ceremony at Bonn on 7 December 1973 which would be attended by the President of the Republic and the Federal Minister of Justice and which would be given extensive coverage by the news media. The federal and regional authorities would be distributing numerous publications, and arranging discussions and exhibitions, on questions of

human rights. The special emblem issued by the United Nations to commemorate the anniversary would be distributed throughout the Federal Republic. Moreover, the Government hoped to be in a position, before 10 December, to make an announcement concerning the International Covenants on Human Rights, which the Parliament was currently considering.

3. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights had had a great influence on the development of the political and social situation in the Federal Republic of Germany. The authors of the Constitution, on whom the dreadful experience of the National Socialist régime had made a deep impression, had set themselves the task of preparing a constitution that would safeguard the freedom of the citizen and his individual and social rights in such a way as to ensure that past events would never be repeated. They had felt they owed that to the memory of all those who had died fighting for the cause of justice and respect for human dignity in Europe. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany drew extensively upon the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which had become a reality in the Federal Republic in the sense that the country's entire political and social system was based on the principle that the State and society must guarantee the freedom, dignity and social rights of every individual. To that end, there had been established a system of courts to which everyone could appeal in order to enforce his constitutional rights. The educational system aimed at educating young people in the spirit of the principles of the Constitution.

4. The Federal Republic of Germany had ratified a number of important international treaties, such as the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, which, unlike the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, had the force of law in the Federal Republic, the European Social Charter, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

5. Much remained to be done at the international level to implement and safeguard human rights. In that connexion, he wished to emphasize how much the Germans, in particular, suffered from the division of Europe. It was painful to note that, almost 30 years after the end of the Second World War, there were still restrictions on the freedom of movement of people and on the exchange of ideas and information. The Federal Republic of Germany was making considerable efforts to change a situation which was detrimental to *détente* in Europe.

6. For the German people, the concept of the universal character of human rights had a deep meaning. Respect for the dignity of man and the rights resulting therefrom both for individuals and peoples was indivisible and could not be modified on geographical or ideological grounds. The Federal Republic of Germany, which firmly rejected racial discrimination, also rejected all other violations of basic human rights—such as the right to life and to freedom of movement—whether they occurred in the centre of Europe or in some other continent. Nothing could be more harmful to the cause of human rights than their selective application on the basis of political interests or ideological concepts. The Federal Republic of Ger-

many was fully aware that, in the pluralistic community of the modern world, there were differing views regarding priorities, not least because of the different political and economic conditions existing in various countries. However, it believed that there would be no real progress for all mankind unless everyone took a universal view of human rights.

7. Mrs. BONENFANT (Canada) said that her delegation welcomed the activities which had been initiated or planned within the framework of the United Nations and by States and non-governmental organizations to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Canada intended to celebrate that anniversary in a special way. To that end, the Canadian Government had prepared a draft programme which, because of its financial implications, had been submitted to the Treasury Board for approval. The Canadian Government felt that the Canadian people wished priority to be given to activities aimed at fostering human rights in Canada rather than to short-lived celebrations which, although valuable, did not necessarily stimulate the desired developments. In that connexion, the Federal Government intended to launch a programme of co-operation with provincial human rights agencies in educational, research and community action projects. Officials of the citizens' rights and freedoms section of the Office of the Secretary of State had met representatives of various organizations. A number of organizations, including the Quebec Human Rights League, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, the Human Rights Council of British Columbia, the Human Rights Commission of Nova Scotia, the Canadian Associations for the United Nations and the New Brunswick Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary had stated that they were organizing special activities to commemorate the anniversary. The Canadian Government also intended to give grants to voluntary organizations sponsoring projects connected with human rights or relating to the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration.

8. The Canadian authorities planned to issue, in the form of brochures, leaflets, books and so forth, information relating to human rights activities in Canada and abroad. In addition, a short film dealing with human rights was being prepared by the Canadian Film Board. Many information organs had declared their willingness to collaborate in the commemoration by publishing articles and commentaries on the theme of human rights and by arranging radio or television broadcasts. The Canadian Government also planned to organize, in co-operation with the Canadian association of official human rights organs, workshops in which representatives of the provincial human rights commissions and of several federal ministries would take part. The annual conference of the Canadian International Law Council, in which government and United Nations representatives had participated, had discussed the topic "the next 25 years of international law relating to human rights". Other activities were under consideration, and plans were being made for a concert to be given at the National Arts Centre at Ottawa on or about 10 December to commemorate the anniversary of the Declaration. In addition, the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State were expected to make statements.

9. Mr. BRUNO (Uruguay) said that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted 25 years earlier,

testified to the determination of the United Nations to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and reflected the concerns and hopes felt, at that time as they always would be, by the international community. His delegation wished to express its very special interest in the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of that historic document. The attention which the United Nations had, since its creation, given to the question of effective respect for human rights stemmed from the humanitarian tradition which lay at the origin of the San Francisco Charter and from the struggles waged by the peoples of the world to reaffirm their ideals of freedom and equality, with all the political and legal consequences they entailed.

10. He emphasized the incalculable scope of the Declaration: the dignity and value of the human person were not simply philosophical concepts but should constitute a principle for action by mankind. Recalling the provisions of the first and sixth preambular paragraphs of the Declaration, he observed that the Declaration should represent "a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations" in the field of human rights. The Declaration's scope went far beyond the civil and political rights traditionally embodied in national constitutions or laws up to the beginning of the twentieth century, since it also covered the entire gamut of economic, social and cultural rights, which had subsequently been codified in a covenant. Since the beginning of the century his country had been incorporating those rights in its legislation and had given them constitutional form in the Fundamental Charter of 1934.

11. Since its adoption the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had exerted considerable influence throughout the world, at the international and national levels. Its provisions had served as the basis for many international instruments and constitutions and for municipal law and jurisprudence in many States.

12. His Government intended to observe the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration by organizing a programme of activities, notably in the field of education, designed to illustrate the legal and political importance which it attributed to the instrument. The twenty-fifth anniversary offered all the nations of the international community an opportunity once again to reaffirm the principles enunciated in the Declaration.

13. Mr. FØNS BUHL (Denmark) recalled that in resolution 3027 (XXVII) the General Assembly had decided to adopt, if possible, a Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance as part of the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and he expressed the wish that priority should be given to the preparation of such a declaration.

14. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948, and the Proclamation of Teheran,<sup>1</sup> adopted 20 years later, were important steps towards defining the common ideals and principles essential to the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Those common ideals had been given effect in several legally binding instruments of universal or regional scope. The International Covenants on Human

Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination also marked important stages in the process of implementing the ideals proclaimed in the Charter and the Universal Declaration. His country was a party to those conventions and hoped that all Member States would soon ratify them.

15. The conventions adopted by the ILO, such as Convention No. 105, of 1957, concerning the abolition of forced labour<sup>2</sup> and Convention No. 118, of 1962, concerning equality of treatment,<sup>2</sup> were also universal in application, but limited to specific problems.

16. At the regional level, too, countries had cooperated to promote the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In that respect, the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms,<sup>3</sup> signed at Rome on 4 November 1950, was particularly important, not only because it was the first attempt to give legal substance to the principles of the Universal Declaration, but also because it established effective machinery for the supervision and enforcement of the provisions of the Convention. Thus, according to the European Convention, any contracting party might refer to the Commission any breach of the provisions of the Convention, and the Committee of Ministers or the European Court of Human Rights could take a binding decision on the question whether there had been a violation, if the contracting parties had recognized the competence of the Court. The right of the contracting parties to refer any breach of the provisions of the Convention to an international body whose decisions were binding on the contracting parties was extremely important, and his delegation hoped that future conventions concerning human rights would follow the procedure adopted in the case of the European Convention.

17. In the field of human rights the State-to-State complaints system, unsatisfactory as it was, remained the principal means of protecting individuals. But it was obvious that effective protection of individuals depended on the ability of the individual himself to seek a remedy when he had been the victim of any violation of human rights. Hence, the growing concern of the international community to promote the right of individual petition in matters relating to human rights. The European Convention set an example by giving any individual claiming to be the victim of a violation of the rights set forth in the Convention the right to submit a petition to the European Commission on Human Rights. Although that right could be exercised only when the contracting parties had declared that they recognized the competence of the Commission to receive petitions, it nevertheless represented an important step towards effective international protection of human rights. His Government found it encouraging that the right of individual petition had been included in several international instruments, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The importance of the right of individual petition had also been recognized by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1503 (XLVIII) of 27 May 1970,

<sup>1</sup> *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.XIV.2), chap. II.

<sup>2</sup> See *Convention and Recommendations, 1919-1966* (International Labour Office, Geneva, 1966).

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 213, No. 2889.

which provided the framework enabling the Commission on Human Rights to deal with individual communications concerning infringements of human rights. The Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had also done useful work in the supervision of the application of the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and his delegation was glad that the Commission had considered at its twenty-ninth session the four reports<sup>4</sup> submitted several years previously by the Special Rapporteurs appointed by the Sub-Commission.

18. With reference to the draft resolution on the abolition of the use of torture (A/C.3/L.2010), his delegation wished to draw the Committee's attention to the last paragraph of the information submitted by the Danish Government, which was contained in the Secretary-General's report on the item (see A/9133) which referred to the campaign launched by the Danish section of Amnesty International for the collection of signatures as a protest against the use of torture prevalent in many parts of the world. In his statement to the General Assembly (2128th plenary meeting) the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark had expressed alarm at the many reports of torture and other cruel or degrading treatment of human beings, and accordingly the Danish delegation fully supported the draft resolution before the Committee.

19. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) recalling the statements made by a number of delegations concerning the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, noted that some of those delegations, which had dwelt at length on the measures adopted by their countries to implement the noble goals of the Declaration, had tended to describe a situation almost utopian in its perfection, implying that those goals had been attained, while at the same time mentioning that flagrant violations of human rights were being committed in other countries and other parts of the world, which happened—curiously enough—to be precisely those with which they did not maintain good relations.

20. His Government had tried to further the aims of the Declaration, especially with regard to equality of opportunity, employment, education, health, social security and culture. Fundamental civil rights had been guaranteed in Brazil since it had first attained independence and had been embodied in the constitutions of the Republic since 1889. His Government was endeavouring to carry out the mandate it had received from the Brazilian people without wishing to impose its pattern of society on other countries; it could not approve of other countries trying to impose their systems and their ideologies on other parts of the world, including Latin America. His country believed in the exchange of ideas and experience, but only in order to benefit the whole of mankind and never to satisfy the imperialist aspirations of countries or of ideological systems. The right to life, liberty and security also had an application in international relations.

<sup>4</sup> *Study of Equality in the Administration of Justice; Study of Discrimination in the Matter of Political Rights; Study of Discrimination in Respect of the Right of Everyone to Leave any Country Including his Own, and to Return to his Country; Study of Discrimination against Persons Born out of Wedlock* (United Nations publications, Sales Nos. E.71.XIV.3; 63.XIV.2; 64.XIV.2, and E.68.XIV.3, respectively).

21. With a view to carrying out the suggestions concerning the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the question at the twenty-seventh session,<sup>5</sup> the federal, state and local authorities of his country, as well as private organizations, had made suitable arrangements emphasizing activities of interest to youth.

22. Looking at human rights from a historical point of view, it could be said with satisfaction that much had been achieved during the preceding 25 years, particularly with regard to equality of opportunity, social justice, decolonization, racial discrimination, religious intolerance, protection of children, the old and the aged, and women, and so forth. However, much remained to be done in order to eliminate the injustices which still existed.

23. It should not be forgotten that the modern world was one in which States could not remain isolated, in which contacts and exchanges were constantly growing and, with them, the international responsibilities of States. The excessive differences separating the developing from the developed countries could only lead to widespread chaos. In the circumstances, it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that the developed countries, were violating, among others, articles 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, and in particular article 3 of the Universal Declaration, since developing countries could not fully ensure their inhabitants the right to life, liberty and security of person, because they themselves did not fully enjoy the right to life, liberty and security. In particular, they could not grant their inhabitants the right to social security, the right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work and protection against unemployment, the right to rest and leisure, the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the worker and his family, the right to free and compulsory education, the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. The Governments of the developing countries certainly had the will to act to attain those ends but they did not have the necessary resources. The Third Committee should examine those fundamental issues in detail, taking into account the fact that the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were unattainable so long as all nations did not enjoy the benefits of science and technology, so long as the international community did not decide upon appropriate mechanisms for the transfer of capital and credit resources from the developed to the developing countries, so long as it did not put an end to the arms race and the rivalries among the great Powers, and so long as the concept of collective economic security was not attained.

24. The remarks he had just made should not be construed as a refusal on the part of Brazil to consider certain particular aspects of human rights. The highest priority was currently being given to racial discrimination, and Brazil fully supported all measures aimed at eliminating all forms of racism, and in particular the system of *apartheid*. In his delegation's opinion, other important elements of the Declaration, such as freedom of religion, expression, thought and conscience, and security of person, deserved careful scrutiny. His Government was actively supporting all constructive measures taken at the international level to safeguard

<sup>5</sup> A/8820 and Corr.1.

fundamental human rights, using the methods recommended by the Charter. He considered, however, that the different aspects of international protection of human rights could not be examined without taking into consideration the sovereignty of States. The State alone was capable of interpreting the interests, feelings and needs of its people, taking into consideration, as no international organization could, their customs, traditions, religion and social structure.

25. Mr. LÖFGREN (Sweden), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2010, announced that, after holding extensive consultations with several delegations, the sponsors had decided to revise the draft in the following way: in the second preambular paragraph, the words "about the fact" had been deleted; operative paragraph 1 of the initial text had become operative paragraph 2; in operative paragraph 2 of the initial text, the words "the report" had been replaced by the words "an introductory note" and the phrase following the words "on the question" had been deleted and replaced by the following text: "taking into account the consideration which may be given to this question in the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council, to be presented at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly". The word "report" had been replaced by the words "introductory note" in order to emphasize that that note should be impartial and concise, so as to constitute a starting-point for the discussion of the question of torture. The sponsors felt that the views of Governments should not appear in that note. However, Governments which wished to do so could communicate any relevant information to the Secretary-General. He hoped that the revised draft resolution<sup>6</sup> would be adopted unanimously by the Committee.

26. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) said that, since its inception, the United Nations had realized that there could not be international peace based on justice without respect for "fundamental human rights", for the "dignity and worth of the human person", for "the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small". The international community had thus resolutely undertaken to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations", had been a leading initiative in that regard. Since that time, the General Assembly had adopted several conventions and covenants, including the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which Egypt was a party; many resolutions had been adopted and organs set up to ensure the application of the principles set forth in the Charter and the Universal Declaration, including the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. Many international conferences had been held to reaffirm and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms; the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and

*Apartheid* in Southern Africa, which was held at Oslo in April 1973, was an example. The efforts of the specialized agencies, particularly UNESCO, the ILO, FAO and WHO, should also be recalled. The United Nations Secretariat had made efforts to follow up the resolutions and to publicize its activities through the Office of Public Information and the seminars organized in the field of human rights.

27. All those facts, positive though they were, were not enough. The international community was far from having achieved the objectives it had set itself, and there were many contradictions between theory and practice, ideals and reality.

28. Thus, in violation of the principle that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights", which was stated in article 1 of the Universal Declaration, the racist régimes of South Africa and Portugal and the Smith clique in Zimbabwe practised a policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid*; Portugal and the illegal régime in Zimbabwe oppressed the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe and denied them their right to self-determination; the population of the Arab territories occupied by Israel was subjected to torture, expulsion and genocide and the people of Palestine were still striving for the realization of their inalienable rights.

29. Instead of the "international order" which should prevail under the terms of article 28 of the Declaration, there was international disorder. States Members of the United Nations defied its authority and flouted its Charter, its resolutions and the entire international community, with the blessing of the Western super-Powers. Thus, small under-developed countries like Portugal persisted in their colonial and racist policy, the illegal minority régime in Zimbabwe continued to oppress the population of the territory, South Africa continued its illegal occupation of Namibia, and Israel, not content with having driven the people of Palestine from their lands, had continued to occupy Egyptian territory since its aggression of June 1967, refused to recognize the fundamental rights of the population of the occupied territories and, in its latest act of aggression, had bombed Egyptian civilians.

30. There was, however, every hope that the efforts by the international community to defend man's human rights would ultimately be victorious. There were a number of promising indications to that effect, such as the success of the liberation movements to shake off the yoke of colonialism and racism, the declaration of independence of Guinea-Bissau, the growing awareness that peace, freedom and dignity were indivisible, and the adoption of the programme of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

31. It must not be forgotten that colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism were perpetually planning to frustrate the efforts of the international community. Hence Members should be constantly on the alert to strengthen the United Nations and ensure the implementation of its resolutions; to isolate the racist and colonial régimes and withhold all assistance from them; to provide the liberation movements with every assistance, economic, moral and political; to strive for the implementation of the Second United Nations Development Decade and bring about a more effective system of international co-operation with a view to achieving equity for all individuals and all nations; and

<sup>6</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.2010/Rev.1.

to ensure that science and technology would be the servants of man and not his oppressors.

32. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that with the passage of time the original purpose or scope of a text could become distorted or restricted, and it might be instructive to look back over 25 years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration and read what the authors of that instrument thought about the work on which they were then engaged.

33. The United States representative at the time, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, had said that behind the Declaration lay man's desire for peace, and that it was a testimony to the common aspiration to lift men everywhere to a higher standard of life and greater enjoyment of freedom. She said that the Declaration made it possible to gauge how the Member States respected their undertaking under the Charter to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. The French representative, René Cassin, had said that the practical applications of basic human rights must be the *sine qua non* condition of true and lasting peace, and that the Declaration was a common meeting-ground for different ideologies—a concept expressed at the preceding meeting by the Swedish delegation. For Carlos Romulo of the Philippines, and for many others, the Declaration transcended time and its goals were desirable not only immediately but also in the future. Mr. Malik, the representative of Lebanon, who at the time presided over the work of the Third Committee, had pointed out that for the first time the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms had been spelled out authoritatively and in precise detail.

34. Today, in spite of the many changes that had taken place in the world, the importance of the Declaration had been confirmed by events. In the preceding 25 years, 77 countries had joined the United Nations and the newly independent States now had the responsibility for ensuring the enjoyment of human rights by their own peoples. In addition, many countries had adopted sections of the Declaration in their constitutions. The movement to greater freedom and equality had been the most characteristic social force in the preceding quarter of a century.

35. However, although the universality of the Declaration was recognized in principle, its provisions were not always applied; human rights were not everywhere protected by Governments; and violations remained all too prevalent, even in countries whose Governments paid lip-service to the ideals of the Declaration. One of the areas where those ideals had not been achieved was that of the elimination of racism and racial discrimination. It was therefore appropriate that it had been decided to launch the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination on the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and all Governments should take the opportunity to renew their undertaking to work for the achievement of all the goals of the Declaration.

36. Throughout its history, the United States had attached the greatest importance to the maintenance and expansion of civil and political rights, but at no time more than in the preceding 25 years. The Declaration had played an important part in creating the environment that made possible the substantial success of the civil rights struggle in the United States. His country attached equal importance to the achievement of the

economic and social rights contained in the Declaration.

37. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights had been the principal basis for building a better world. In spite of its brevity, the Declaration had very quickly begun to exert a considerable influence on the evolution of the world. It had been the starting-point for many conventions and declarations; it had inspired many constitutions; and it was a factor underlying achievements in the fields of decolonization and recognition of individual rights in the various countries. Mention might be made in that connexion of the role played by the specialized agencies, which had done a great deal, for example, to ensure recognition for the rights of workers, children and women; and he referred in that connexion to the ILO conventions and the activities of UNESCO.

38. But there was still a good deal to be done. There were still countries under the colonial yoke; torture was still practised, and the policy of *apartheid* was still rampant—all of which indicated the direction in which the efforts of the international community should be steered.

39. Each country should first put its own house in order, and ensure proper treatment for its own nationals. There were spheres in which technological progress had actually become a threat to human rights, and there again, vigilance was called for. The United Nations should pursue its efforts without giving way to a sense of discouragement in the face of the tremendous task which still lay ahead.

40. Mrs. LYKOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation approved on the whole the programme prepared for the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration.

41. The United Nations had come into being at the time of the struggle against fascism, but the preamble to the Charter had not lost its topicality. It was a pledge given by the living to the tens of millions of victims of fascism. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights rounded out the provisions of the Charter concerning human rights and freedoms, and proclaimed the inadmissibility of all forms of discrimination.

42. Sixty per cent of the States participating by right in the work of the United Nations had not been represented at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris when the Declaration was adopted. Already at that time, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had been trying to draw up a declaration which would effectively serve the cause of progress and democracy, improve the living conditions of all men, and make an effective contribution to respect for human rights and the strengthening of international peace. Then as now, the Soviet delegation considered that the place of man in society was dependent on the social and economic structure of that society and that mankind could not be liberated unless there was an end to the exploitation of man by man and unless development was aimed at satisfying the needs of the working masses. It was not sufficient to proclaim human rights; the material conditions must be created which enabled them to become a reality. For that reason the Soviet delegation had pressed for the mention in the Universal Declaration of social and economic rights—the right to work, equal pay for equal work, education and social security,

among others—which had given that instrument the value of a political document which the forces of progress had been able to use to protect the rights of workers. However, in 1948, when many peoples were still under the colonial yoke, it was hardly to be expected that principles could be adopted covering the rights of entire peoples, and the historic changes which had occurred over the preceding 25 years had revealed gaps in the Universal Declaration in that respect. The proposal by the USSR and other socialist countries concerning the rights of peoples had been rejected, and the shortcoming had only been remedied 12 years later with the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Nor did the Universal Declaration make any mention of tasks such as the struggle against racism, *apartheid* and genocide or the education of youth to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was not until 25 years later that the General Assembly had adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

43. The main weakness of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was that it did not impose any obligation on Member States. Thus some States declined to accede to specific international instruments although they had acceded to the Universal Declaration. As far as the Soviet Union was concerned, the Universal Declaration occupied a fundamental place among the international instruments relating to human rights, since it had been used as the basis in framing those instruments, especially the declarations already mentioned, the Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples, the Declaration on Social Progress and Development, the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It was unfortunate that the last-named had not yet been ratified by a number of States, including Australia, Belgium, Italy, Israel, the Republic of South Africa and the United States of America. It would be helpful if the General Assembly were to urge all States to become parties to that convention.

44. Many provisions of the Declaration were explicitly embodied, in the form of obligations for States, in the International Covenants on Human Rights. In many cases they reflected achievements of the socialist countries and proclaimed rights which were embodied in their laws and their constitutions. It was the first time that social and economic rights had been proclaimed in international instruments of such importance, and the Covenants therefore represented a considerable advance over the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In ratifying the Covenants the Soviet Union had once again shown its determination to continue its struggle against colonialism, *apartheid* and racism. It was regrettable that certain countries still maintained a negative attitude towards those important instruments, whose entry into force would be an important step towards the implementation of human rights.

45. It could hardly be said, 25 years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that the objectives proclaimed in it had been attained. The racist policy of South Africa, the refusal to recognize the

elementary rights of 4 million inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia, Portugal's rejection of all the resolutions on decolonization, Israel's aggression against the Arab peoples and the treatment accorded to the Palestinian people showed that much remained to be done. If there were still peoples that had not been freed from the colonial yoke, the blame lay with those countries which assisted and supported the colonialists. The adoption of the draft Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* would have great significance, for it was precisely the struggle against the frequent and large-scale violations of human rights and the defence of fundamental political, social and economic rights that should be the main task of the international community.

46. Describing the measures taken for the implementation of human rights, and the guarantees provided for those rights, in the USSR, she said that the socialist State, which had from the outset done away with the exploitation of man by man, was unflagging in its efforts to extend the political, social, economic and cultural rights of its nationals. Even the most equitable laws would not suffice, however, if the *de facto* inequality between the different nations making up the Soviet Union was not ended. That had become one of the main tasks of the Soviet Government. The Constitution of the USSR guaranteed the fundamental freedoms, including inviolability of the person and the home, privacy of correspondence and the right to private property. Social and economic rights were guaranteed by law.

47. In recent years basic legislation had been adopted in the USSR and the Union republics with respect to land tenure and in the sphere of labour, public health, marriage and education, for example. The right to work was guaranteed by law and by economic measures, and there had been no unemployment in the USSR since the end of the 1920s. The law guaranteed pay commensurate with the quantity and quality of the work done and the absence of discrimination in hiring. The interests of the workers were defended by the trade unions. The Soviet State attached great importance to the protection of the health of individuals. Its policy in that sphere was based on the principle of free medical care for everyone. In 1972 there were 733,000 medical specialists in the USSR. The education system was truly democratic in the USSR. Seventy-two per cent of Soviet workers had received secondary or higher education. The Soviet Constitution guaranteed the right to social security. The Constitution guaranteed to women the same rights as men in all fields. It also protected the interests of mothers and children; women were entitled to maternity leave and there were many nurseries and kindergartens. Women currently constituted 51 per cent of the active population; 36 per cent of the engineers, 75 per cent of the doctors and 73 per cent of the teachers were women.

48. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be celebrated extensively in the USSR. At meetings, in the press and in scientific journals, attention would be drawn to the importance of the struggle of peoples for the total elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, *apartheid*, racism and racial discrimination. Faithful to the precepts of Lenin, the peoples of the Soviet Union would continue to support the peoples that were struggling for their

freedom and independence and for the attainment of their political, social, cultural and economic rights.

49. Mr. SHAFQAT (Pakistan) said that throughout its existence as an independent State, Pakistan, which was deeply attached to the ideals of the Charter, had tried to contribute to the strengthening of international order under the aegis of the United Nations. The role it had played in the United Nations, its participation in the work of the various bodies, such as the Commission on Human Rights, and the part it had played in the social and humanitarian activities of the Organization were known to all.

50. Despite its troubled history, Pakistan's efforts to establish a truly democratic and humanitarian society had borne fruit, and at the beginning of the year a fully democratic Constitution, forged by the freely elected representatives of the people of Pakistan, had been adopted. The new Constitution asserted that it was the will of the people of Pakistan to establish an order in which fundamental rights, including freedom of thought and expression and equality of status, would be guaranteed. Despite those efforts, the situation was, of course, not yet perfect and much remained to be done, for example, in the field of economic and social justice, which had begun to receive intensified attention.

51. Pakistan saw particular significance in the fact that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights coincided with the launching of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The time had come for all the Members of the United Nations to draw up a balance sheet and see what remained to be done. Deplorable situations still existed in various parts of the world and, in particular, in Africa, where colonialism, racism and racial discrimination persisted and human rights were trampled upon. It was to be hoped that those evils could be eliminated by peaceful means. The forthcoming celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary would perhaps be the moment for those who were still held in bondage to intensify their struggle to recover their rights and their dignity by all available means. It was not certain, however, that the means would be peaceful. War and violence had once again broken out in the Middle East, simply because millions of innocent people, expelled from their homes, wished to return to them.

52. It was time to recognize the existing and impending dangers that threatened the world; it was an urgent matter for the world community to work with greater ardour at securing full implementation of the Charter and of conventions which were intended to promote and guarantee human rights. A conscious effort must be made to achieve peacefully the goals cherished by all.

53. Document A/9133 contained an account of the activities planned by Pakistan in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration. Those activities showed the importance which Pakistan attached to the education of its youth concerning the ideals embodied in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

54. Turning to the draft resolution submitted by Sweden, he said that the initial text (A/C.3/L.2010) had left the Pakistani delegation somewhat perplexed; it had wondered why operative paragraph 1 referred only to torture, leaving aside the other kinds of treatment enumerated in article 5 of the Declaration. The revised

text which had been proposed seemed to be more complete; his delegation would study it and reserved the right to make further comment on it.

55. Mr. KARASSIMEONOV (Bulgaria) stressed the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as the foundation for the Organization's action for the cause of human rights. Bulgaria had supported all the specific manifestations and measures proposed for the appropriate celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration.

56. The Universal Declaration reflected one of the fundamental principles embodied in the Charter, namely that peace and security were essential for the implementation of human rights and that the respect of fundamental rights such as the right to freedom and independence was inseparable from co-operation between peoples. That fundamental idea of the Charter had inspired both the activity of United Nations bodies and that of the specialized agencies, which had sought to contribute to the implementation of fundamental rights and to strengthen peace by concerning themselves with questions whose importance as foundations for peace had been neglected. Thus, the Constitution of UNESCO spoke of peace founded upon "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind".

57. The activities of the United Nations during the preceding 25 years had been based on the belief that the members of the international community had the duty to guarantee the inalienable rights of the human family, as was recalled in the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2627 (XXV)), which stated that the international conventions and declarations concluded under the auspices of the United Nations "give expression to the moral conscience of mankind and represent humanitarian standards for all members of the international community". His delegation was happy to be in a position to state that the principles and provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were not only reflected in the Constitution and laws of Bulgaria but were also respected in practice. That confirmed that socialist society, which had eliminated the exploitation of one human being by another, was creating conditions which favoured the full development of the human personality, and that socialism guaranteed both civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights. The Constitution of Bulgaria, like those of all the other socialist countries, condemned all practices tainted with racial discrimination; freedom fighters were given the right of asylum in Bulgaria.

58. It was true that the basic ideas of the Universal Declaration covered a very wide field, but if there was one sphere in which the forces of nations and international organizations should be concentrated, it was the implementation of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, which was embodied in the first articles of the two International Covenants on Human Rights, which Bulgaria had ratified. Colonialism and discrimination still existed in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and the territories occupied by Israel, not to speak of the other parts of the world where the most fundamental rights were violated and crimes against humanity committed. His delegation therefore considered that the best way of celebrating the anniversary of the Declaration was to give effective help to the national liberation



movements; the programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the adoption of a convention on *apartheid* represented effective means of attaining that end.

59. Mr. MIKOLAJ (Czechoslovakia) said that the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were of capital importance for the millions of victims of wars, racism, colonialism and the abominable policy of *apartheid*. It was in the interest of all mankind to ensure that those principles, which reflected the humanitarian aspirations of the human race, did not remain a dead letter. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms not only determined the individual's place in society but also affected his private life and all his personal aspirations, whether material or spiritual. The progress of the world as a whole called for the preservation of the inestimable value of life and human dignity; the rigorous application of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was bound to further the development of the moral conscience of mankind.

60. All the people who suffered as a result of colonialism, racism or simply from the consequences of inadequate economic and social development placed all their hopes in that Declaration. The international community was still being shocked by acts of violence, assassinations and the suppression of national liberation movements. His Government strongly condemned such acts and denounced those Governments which continually referred to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights while they persisted in violating them.

61. Twenty-five years previously, Czechoslovakia had decided to start building a new, progressive and democratic social system. The Constitution guaranteed all citizens the same rights and freedoms in all fields. Czechoslovakia had always fulfilled its obligations under the international human rights instruments to which it had acceded; its internal laws often went beyond the provisions of those instruments, for they guaranteed all citizens complete social security, special attention being paid to children and students.

62. With regard to international relations, Czechoslovakia was a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and strongly condemned the racist minority régimes. It had also played an active part in the work relating to the adoption of the draft Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*. In the interest of all mankind and of justice, it supported the formulation of international norms with a view to the punishment of individuals guilty of crimes against humanity.

63. In the spirit of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Czechoslovakia had consistently advocated the maintenance of international peace and security, the expansion of international co-operation and respect for human rights. It was in that spirit that Czechoslovakia would celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration and would embark upon the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

64. Mrs. WATANABE (Japan) recalled that the activities planned by her Government for the observance of Human Rights Week from 4 to 10 December 1973

were summarized in the report of the Secretary-General (A/9133). Her delegation therefore wished merely to comment on one of the problems mentioned at the preceding meeting by the Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, namely discrimination against women with regard to employment.

65. In Japan, women constituted almost 50 per cent of the labour force in 1972. Article 4 of the Japanese Constitution, promulgated in 1946, proclaimed the equality of all before law, while the 1947 Labour Standards Law prohibited all discrimination against women in the sphere of employment. Japan had recently ratified ILO Convention No. 100, of 1951, concerning Equal Remuneration,<sup>2</sup> and a new law, which had entered into force the previous year, was designed to promote the vocational guidance and training of women at all levels and to ensure greater harmony between family and working life, in accordance with the guidelines set out in ILO Recommendation No. 123, of 1965.<sup>2</sup> That law also contained provisions relating to health in general, especially during pregnancy and after childbirth. A five-year plan for the implementation of all the provisions of that law had just been launched. Those efforts would form part of Japan's programme of international co-operation and would be combined with the activities to be undertaken by workers and employers in other countries in order to promote human rights.

66. Mr. AZIZ (International Labour Organisation), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that the programme of action which the ILO intended to pursue in connexion with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was summarized in the report of the Secretary-General (see A/9133). He drew particular attention to the publications to be issued on that occasion and to the special design which would be used on appropriate ILO publications and documents.

67. The ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations had considered in detail in 1973 and would continue to consider in the following years the position throughout the world with regard to certain basic human rights standards. In 1973, the Committee of Experts had undertaken a general survey of the situation of law and practice relating to the implementation of the ILO conventions on freedom of association, the right to organize and collective bargaining. That survey would be submitted to the International Labour Conference, as would the surveys to be made in the period 1974-1976 on Recommendation No. 119, of 1963, on termination of employment,<sup>2</sup> Convention No. 100, of 1951, on equal remuneration<sup>2</sup> and Recommendation No. 113, of 1960, on consultation at the industrial and national levels.<sup>2</sup>

68. The ILO's work in the realm of human rights was based on international standards elaborated by the Governments, employers and workers of the world and embodied in the ILO conventions and recommendations. All the activities of the ILO were concerned in some way with human rights, but there were certain basic freedoms which were of particular concern to the ILO because they came more directly within its sphere of work: those freedoms had been embodied in the ILO conventions on freedom of association, the right to organize and collective bargaining, which had been ratified by 80 or more States. Other conventions, relat-

ing to forced labour and its abolition, discrimination in employment, equal remuneration and employment policy had been ratified by from 49 to 106 States.

69. The ILO did not confine itself to drawing up and supervising the implementation of conventions and recommendations. It appreciated the necessity of practical action in connexion with those instruments. It had accordingly undertaken a number of programmes relating, *inter alia*, to discrimination in employment, *apartheid* in South Africa, women workers, freedom of association, migrant workers and the world employment programme. All those programmes related directly to the promotion of human rights, which remained the basis of the ILO's concerns and activities.

70. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that her delegation wished to set the record straight with regard to the question raised by the representatives of Egypt and the Soviet Union. It was not Israel which had begun the hostilities in the Middle East, but the Syrian Arab Republic and Egypt, which had massed their soldiers equipped with Soviet weapons along the southern and northern cease-fire lines. The territories which they claimed they were seeking to liberate had been occupied by Israel only as a result of the policy of aggression against Israel followed by those countries since 1948. Those same countries refused to solve the problem by having recourse to the only means compatible with the Charter of the United Nations, namely, peaceful negotiation. Those who unleashed wars knew well that they were exposing their people, including the civilian population, to danger. It was the Syrians who, in the current tragic war, had first attacked civilians when they had bombed a number of towns and villages, not on the cease-fire line but deep in Israeli territory. Moreover, the Egyptian President himself had said he was ready to sacrifice a million human lives in that war. Israel did not aim at civilian populations but at military targets which were important for the conduct of the war that had been forced on it. She regretted the loss of innocent lives, on whichever side of the firing line they might be, but the responsibility for that loss rested on those countries, the Syrian Arab Republic and Egypt, which had deliberately chosen war instead of peace.

71. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had just admitted that, as a result of the resumption of hostilities, the civilian populations of Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic were being exposed to Israeli attacks. Although the Committee was not currently examining the question of the Middle East, he wished to point out that it was not Egypt which had opened hostilities in 1967; it was Israel which had been responsible for that aggression, following which it had occupied territories belonging to three Arab States. That fact had been recognized by the Israeli military and diplomatic leaders themselves. Since that aggression and, even more since the cease-fire of 1970, Israel had been pursuing a systematic policy under which it was violating the Charter, the resolutions of the United Nations and world public opinion. At the same time, it was continuing to occupy the Arab territories and to oppose all efforts aimed at the implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971 submitted by the

Secretary-General's representative, Mr. Jarring.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, Egypt, in repelling the new Israeli aggression on 6 October 1973 and thereby seeking to recover its own territory, was celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in an appropriate manner, inasmuch as the prerequisite for the exercise of human rights was to be free and not to be subject to foreign occupation.

72. War was raging in the Middle East and, just as there was legislation applicable in time of peace, so there was other legislation applicable in time of war. If a State claimed to respect the spirit of the Charter, it must also abide by the international instruments applicable in the case of war. Israel should therefore respect the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949,<sup>8</sup> but it was systematically refusing to do so and was attacking the Egyptian civilian population with particularly deadly weapons: American-made GAB multiple bombs. He drew attention in that connexion to the letter of 14 October 1973 addressed by Egypt to the President of the Security Council.<sup>9</sup> He also mentioned the letter of the same date addressed by his country to the President of the Security Council<sup>10</sup> to inform him that, the International Committee of the Red Cross having addressed an appeal to the parties to the conflict to abide by the Geneva Conventions, the Arab Republic of Egypt had informed that Committee orally and by note that it had always been and still was keenly respectful of those Conventions. He drew attention to the fact that Israel, in its reply to the same appeal, as read out by its representative at the 1746th meeting of the Security Council, on 12 October 1973, had failed to respond to the appeal of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

73. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had not intended to participate in that discussion but that he could not ignore the abusive statements made by the representative of Israel. While he would not reply to every one of the points to which objections could be raised, he noted, by way of example, that the Israeli representative had invoked the spirit of the Charter. The Israeli aggression of 1967 was justified by Israel on the basis of the theory of preventive self-defence, by virtue of which Israel had occupied the Arab territories. When the Arab countries undertook to liberate those territories, Israel spoke of "territories which they claimed" they were seeking to liberate. Thus the notion of self-defence, as referred to in the Charter, was distorted by Israel for the purposes of a policy of occupation which was totally contrary to the spirit of the Charter.

74. Mrs. ESHEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it had not been her intention to involve the Committee in a discussion of the situation in the Middle East and that it was not her delegation which had first brought up that question. However, she was obliged to protest the interpretation of her remarks which had just been given. She would not take up all the

<sup>7</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10403, annex I.

<sup>8</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1973*, document S/11025.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/11024.

points with respect to which objections could be raised, because it was in other forums that the substance of the matter should be discussed, but she wished to make it clear that she had never said that Israel had set out to bomb civilian populations; she had explained that if there had been innocent victims among the civilian population, the responsibility rested with those who had opened hostilities.

75. With regard to the 1967 war, she recalled the cynicism of the statements and acts of the Arab countries, which had made no secret of their intention to wage total war against Israel. All of that was well known. It was the Arab States which had taken the initiative and had then sought to place the blame on Israel. Without going further into that question, she wished to stress that for her country the most important point was the following: were the Arab countries prepared to follow the path of peace and solve existing problems by negotiation, in the spirit of the Charter? The statements which had just been made all indicated that such was not their intention and that they had chosen the path of war.

76. Mrs. LYKOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that she would not reply in detail to the representative of Israel, for all the progressive countries were well aware who was the aggressor and who were the victims. Since 1967 the Arab peoples had been the victims of continuing aggression by Israel; the Palestinian people had been driven from their homes and their most elementary rights were constantly being violated. The problem was a well-known one and Israeli aggression

was among the most abominable violations of human rights.

77. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) said that the representative of Israel was not addressing herself to the substance of the problem. However, the Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to consider the question of the Middle East. At the same time, it would be easy to demonstrate what had been Israel's attitude towards the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations, as well as towards Mr. Jarring's aide-mémoire of 8 February 1971. It should suffice to say that Egypt had replied positively to that aide-mémoire, whereas Israel's response had been negative. Peace could be achieved only on the basis of respect for human rights and the Charter of the United Nations, not on the basis of force, superiority or injustice.

78. He then read out articles 50 and 56 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, and observed that the methods and policies adopted by Israel were incompatible with the provisions of those articles. The reaction of world public opinion to Israeli aggression had recently been expressed by the non-aligned countries in the declaration concerning recent developments in the Middle East, which was transmitted in the letter of 10 October 1973 from the representative of Algeria to the Secretary-General.<sup>1</sup>

*The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.*

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, document S/11019.

## 2000th meeting

Thursday, 18 October 1973, at 10.45 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

A/C.3/SR.2000

### AGENDA ITEM 56

**Observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (*continued*)**  
(A/9133 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/L.2010/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.2011)

1. Mr. BOURGOIN (France) said that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, while it was an appropriate occasion for assessing what had been accomplished, should also be an occasion for reflection. Twenty-five years earlier, when the Commission on Human Rights had been established as an indispensable means of giving effect to the principles of the Charter, the international community had still been profoundly traumatized by the assaults of nazism and fascism against individual dignity and fundamental freedoms. The conquests of democracy were expected to constitute the essential foundation of an international society capable of meeting the aspirations of that generation. However, the solemn reaffirmation of rights and freedoms in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration had not sufficed to give them the strength and the reality which the founders of the United Nations had considered necessary. On the con-

trary, ensuring the observance of those rights was a task which was becoming more and more difficult and which required of legislators action that was both vigilant and flexible, urgent and patient, multiform and consistent.

2. Modern international co-operation with respect to human rights should take the form of a peaceful and constructive comparison of the various courses followed, in a spirit of good faith and courage, by the Governments of all Member States, not only in order to identify deficiencies but also to increase by joint effort the effectiveness of the measures applied through discussion, co-operation and mutual understanding. In Europe progress had already been made in that direction thanks to institutions set up after the Second World War and his delegation felt that that path should be followed with greater perseverance. Respect for human rights and the strengthening of freedoms must, in the period which was now beginning, be protected against a multitude of dangers which every nation and every community was having to combat by means compatible with its history and its own political, social and economic conditions. Consideration of those means and the joint evaluation of the progress made and the obstacles encountered and overcome constituted the