

# WCRP Report

Quotation from  
State Dept "religious intolerance"  
Fall 72, UN

WORLD CONFERENCE OF RELIGION FOR PEACE 777 United Nations Plaza New York, N. Y. 10017, U.S.A.

## NEW PROGRESS TOWARD

### A U.N. DECLARATION AGAINST RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

by Homer A. Jack\*

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

After the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. in 1948, there were hopes for the adoption of specific declarations and conventions spelling out in more detail many of these human rights. In the mid-1950s expectation arose for the drafting of instruments which would tie together the elimination of racial and religious intolerance. Yet by 1962 other efforts were successful to separate the international instruments against racial intolerance from those against religious intolerance. Since that time, much more progress has been made in the racial field, with the U.N. Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination proclaimed in 1963 and the U.N. Convention adopted in 1965.

Progress has been much slower in completing the two instruments against religious intolerance. The drafting of both got bogged down in U.N. politics by 1967. A number of factors were involved, including reflections of Middle East tensions and discriminations against religion in several parts of the world. At one point, greater progress was made in drafting a convention than the declaration. After devoting 29 meetings to drafting the preamble and Article I of the convention, the Third Committee of the 22nd General Assembly in 1967 ran out of time. It decided to accord priority during its next session to completing the drafts of both the declaration and the convention. Since that time, the agenda item--"Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance"--has been transmitted from one session of the General Assembly to another, largely without debate. The agenda item appeared dead, if not buried--a not uncommon situation at the U.N.

In the summer of 1972, a group of non-governmental organizations(NGOs) in New York decided to study the possibility of resurrecting these instruments. After consultations with a number of U.N. delegations, the agenda item took new life and was actually debated for four hours by the Third Committee of the 27th U.N. General Assembly in December, 1972. Indeed, a resolution was adopted which, if implemented by Member States, could result in the completion of a declaration in the near future and, eventually, of a convention.

\*Dr. Jack, a Unitarian Universalist clergyman, is Secretary-General of the World Conference of Religion for Peace.



This Memorandum discusses the NGO activity, the debate in the Third Committee, and what NGOs can do to continue this new progress. This Memorandum should be used in connection with two others in this series.

--H. A. J.

United Nations, N. Y.  
January 2, 1973.



## 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.	p. 1.
2. Table of Contents.	p. 2.
3. NGO Activity.	p. 2.
4. The Third Committee Debate.	p. 2.
5. Next Steps for NGOs.	p.10.
6. Literature Available.	p.10.
7. Appendix:	
A. Text of Adopted Resolution.	p.11.
B. Text of Soviet Amendments.	p.12.
C. The Voting Pattern of States.	p.13.
D. Text of Letter to President Trepczynski.	p.15.
E. Relevant U.N. Documents.	p.17.

## 3. NGO ACTIVITY

In the spring of 1973, several NGOs simultaneously felt that attention must be given to strategy to take this perennial item on the U.N. agenda off the shelf and again into Third Committee discussion. The issue was taken up by the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights (of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with ECOSOC) and, as a result, a subcommittee was appointed on the issue of the "elimination of all forms of religious intolerance." Dr. Louis Longarzo, representative of Caritas International, was appointed chairman and others who worked actively with him included Dr. Isaac Lewin of Agudas Israel World Organization, Dr. Sidney Liskofsky of the International League for the Rights of Man, and this writer representing the World Conference of Religion for Peace.

Several strategy meetings were held. First, a broad cross-section of NGOs were informed of the history of the issue and the impasse. Second, informal discussions were held with representatives from several permanent missions to the U.N., especially their representatives on the Third Committee. Third, a strategy was finally agreed upon: to give priority to the declaration (over the convention) and to get as much consideration of the item as possible in the Third Committee. Fourth, it was agreed to send a communication on the issue to the President of the 27th General Assembly, signed by as many NGOs as possible. A total of 35 NGOs signed the letter which was personally presented to President Stanislaw Trepczynski by members of the Sub-committee.

During the first half of the General Assembly, the NGO sub-committee continued consultations with delegations and representatives in the Third Committee. Several maintained close contact with co-sponsors of the resolution before and during the period when the Third Committee discussed the item.

## 4. THE THIRD COMMITTEE DEBATE

The item--"No. 59: Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance"--appeared in the provisional agenda of the 27th General Assembly, placed there by the 26th General Assembly. However, there was consternation when it was reported that, in an effort to streamline the agenda and eliminate obsolete items, this might be eliminated. However,



when the General Committee met in September to recommend items to be placed on the agenda of the plenary, and to assign items to committees, this was routinely retained and assigned to the Third Committee.

#### a. Initial Scheduling

A second crucial period in the life of this item in the 27th General Assembly was during the organization of work of the Third Committee. It was hoped for early and adequate consideration. During the organization of work on September 28th, representatives from Sweden, the Netherlands, Uruguay, Honduras, Costa Rica, and other States suggested that priority and time be given to item 59. Ambassador Diaz-Casanueva of Chile, however, said that item 59 in the past gave "rise to serious controversy, attributable mainly to the diversity of the world's political and religious systems." He added that "while controversy should not be feared, it was none the less necessary to avoid unproductive work" and thus "it might be better to give a higher priority to other items that were of more vital interest to world public opinion."

The Chairman of the Third Committee, Ambassador Carlos Giambruno of Uruguay, on the basis of consultations suggested a package proposal and this item was allocated four meetings and came about midway in the agenda. This suggestion was approved. It was at least an improvement over recent years. However, as usual, the Committee fell behind in its work. In a revision of the schedule for the final weeks of the work of the Committee, the Chairman announced that the place of this item would be retained, but the number of meetings would be reduced to two. Later, when there were further delays, due to a lack of speakers on some items, it was agreed that this and two other items could be discussed simultaneously. Thus the Third Committee first reached this item, although two earlier ones were still pending, at its 1966th meeting on Thursday afternoon, November 30th.

In preparation for this item, consultations were held and Sweden took the lead in presenting a draft resolution. Several representatives in the Third Committee attended a drafting committee meeting on November 29th. Sweden, Netherlands, and Uruguay decided to become initial co-sponsors. The theory (earlier suggested by the NGOs) recommended itself to the drafting committee and thus the thrust of the draft resolution was 1-to give priority to the declaration, 2-to ask the Secretary-General to circulate drafts of the declaration for commentary by member States, and 3-to present these comments, with an analysis by the Secretary-General, to the 28th General Assembly so that action could be taken in the Third Committee toward the possible completion of the declaration on the 25th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights. This resolution was introduced on November 29th. (See Appendix A.)

#### b. November Thirtieth

Since the Third Committee was behind in its work, at its 1966th meeting on November 30th, it had three agenda items before it: war crimes, religious intolerance, and youth. The meeting began at 3:30 p.m. with a continuing discussion of war crimes. When no further representatives wanted to speak on this item, the chairman announced that debate on the item--"elimination of all forms of religious intolerance"--would begin.

Mr. Marc Schreiber, Director of the Division of Human Rights, introduced the item, giving a short history of its previous consideration.

Swedish Ambassador Olof Rydbeck delivered the opening address. He recalled that the item had been on the General Assembly agenda since the 15th session and the matter was not discussed during the past four sessions and, as a consequence, "the work done in the recent past and its results has fallen into oblivion." He felt that the General Assembly has "a duty to make a new effort to resume the active consideration of the item." He said that one of the main features of the procedural resolution, which his delegation had the honor to introduce along with the Netherlands and Uruguay, was "to give priority to



the item at the 28th General Assembly in order to create conditions for a more constructive treatment of the matter." He cited recent experiences in Sweden with immigrants of the Catholic, Orthodox, and Muslim faiths. He asserted that a declaration would serve as "an inspiring guideline for governments in their own handling of related problems." He also said that "considering the difficulties faced five years ago" with the draft convention, "we think that it would now be wise to concentrate our attention on the preparation of a declaration." He then explained the draft. His delegation regretted that it was not possible to allocate more time to the item during the present session, but the procedural draft resolution is "so straight-forward and non-controversial" that it might receive "a very broad support."

Mrs. Savitri Nigam of India warned that "the firmness with which we hold to our views is hardly a reliable guide to their correctness." She asserted that "a true follower of any religion cannot afford to nurse any ill-will or discrimination against any other human being who also is the son of the same God, even though he may be the follower of any religion or even may be an atheist." Freedom to practice any religion, or freedom of thought, comes, she said, "before or at par with other freedoms like speech, movement, or work." She recalled that Mahatma Gandhi was the "symbol of religious harmony and in his prayer meetings the Bible, Koran, and Gita used to get equal respect." She recalled the studies of Arcot Krishnaswami on religious intolerance and quoted his conclusion that legal sanctions are necessary since "individuals are inclined to consider wrong what the law prohibits and right what it enjoins them to do."

Dr. Marie Pintassilgo of Portugal recalled that the problem being dealt with is "totally different" from that which the U.N. started to tackle in 1953. The incompleted attempts, she felt, "were a sign that there was a feeling of uneasiness about the issue in the world community" and she believed that "the question was being approached from the wrong angle." Three new factors are evident today: the evolution of corporate forms of religion or belief, self-understanding on the part of States, and world public opinion. She indicated that "the great religious and philosophical movements of the world had in recent years become more receptive to other ideas, less dogmatic in their expression of truth, and more ready for exchange and encounter with others." Thus the tolerance today was "not. . . a condescending attitude toward other beliefs, but as an inner demand in the pursuit of truth." Likewise, States have "evolved a practical recognition of the presence of different forms of religion and belief in their midst and of the juridical consequences which that recognition entailed." In the early stages of U.N. consideration of the current item, "the main features of the problem had been mutual ignorance or competition between major forms of religion, the use of religion for political purposes within a State, and the crusading spirit which brought States into conflict." Today, she insisted, the item "was no longer a pretext for conducting a religious campaign against particular States but reflected the need for the joint affirmation of a well-recognized right and principle." The historical context had changed the nature of the problem, if not the title of the item.

Dr. Pintassilgo continued: "While it was unfortunate that the U.N. had not kept to its decision to give the present item high priority, the suspension of the discussion had perhaps enabled the General Assembly to approach it from a new angle." She hoped that the U.N. would "make a fresh start and produce an entirely new international document." She urged the creation of "a working party composed of experts of different religious beliefs from Member States and non-governmental organizations be appointed and given the task of making a comprehensive study" of all previous documents. After the Secretary-General consulted with Member States on the existing situation, she hoped that the 28th session would give the item high priority. She thus preferred a more far-reaching resolution than that pending, but would vote for it as "a reasonable compromise between the past and the radically new future."



Mr. Valery Loshchinin of Byelorussian SSR said that, on the basis of the draft resolution, the Committee should not act "too hastily." He felt that it would "be logical to continue" drafting the convention, not the declaration. He urged that the draft resolution be modified to give equal attention to both the declaration and the convention.

Mr. Arnold Peter van Walsum of the Netherlands said that he would consult the other sponsors of the draft resolution on the changes proposed by Byelorussian SSR.

Mr. Costas Papademas of Cyprus indicated that Cyprus wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

While the chairman indicated that he would like to call a vote on the draft resolution--there was great pressure in the Committee to finish agenda items--he concluded that, as a result of a suggestion by Mr. Leonardo Arizaga of Ecuador, supported by Mr. van Walsum, and if he heard no objections, he would defer the vote to a later meeting. The Committee then began the consideration of another agenda item.

c. December First

The discussion on this item was opened by Mr. Arnold Peter van Walsum of the Netherlands, speaking in behalf of the three other co-sponsors of the resolution. He replied to the earlier speech of the Byelorussian representative by reiterating the considerations that led to the preparation of the draft resolution. The sponsors "asked themselves why no progress has been made on the matter" since the 22nd General Assembly. They concluded that "the task of drafting both a declaration and a convention was so voluminous that delegations tended to be discouraged by the fact that it obviously could not be accomplished during one or even two sessions of the General Assembly." Thus the Committee faced an "unrealistic proposition" and thus arose the tendency to consign the item "to the second half of the program of work, where items which never received serious consideration accumulated." In order to overcome those obstacles, the sponsors wanted "to reduce the task to manageable proportions." In order to ensure that something concrete would be done, "the Committee should not try to prepare both instruments at the same time but should concentrate instead on one and defer the other to a later stage." While the Byelorussian representative indicated that the sponsors had made the wrong choice, they opted to give priority to the declaration for several reasons: 1-the further preparation of the convention had bogged down and it might be advisable "to switch to an entirely different approach if there was to be progress," and 2-there were numerous examples of the adoption of a declaration and a convention precisely in that order. Mr. van Walsum admitted that the resolution did not sufficiently underline the equal importance of both instruments and the sponsors would be glad to insert the words, "equal importance of both" and also delete the word, "adopt," since "there was no wish to adopt either instrument hastily" and these modifications should "alleviate the fears of those who might think that the draft resolution cleared the way for an irresponsible railroading exercise."

Mr. V. M. Zenkyavichus of the U.S.S.R. said that the Soviet Union supported the principles of freedom of conscience and religion and the prohibition of discrimination against persons because of their religious belief. These formed "the basis of socialist society." He added that "unfortunately, there were some countries in which those principles were not applied and part of the population was discriminated against on religious grounds--a state of affairs that gave rise to tension." The drafting of these instruments were "a complex matter" and "the best course would be to postpone the study of the question until the Commission on Human Rights examined the draft convention" which "needed to be brought up to date." He then suggested one amendment to the preamble of the draft resolution and four amendments to the operative clauses. (See Appendix B.) He hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accord favorable reception to these proposals.



Mrs. Luz Bertrand de Bromley of Honduras felt that the adoption of these instruments was "highly desirable" and the time had come to adopt a declaration. Her delegation wanted to join the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Ambassador Jamil M. Baroodly of Saudi Arabia said that "religion in its various manifestations was the private concern of the individual heart and conscience." He added that "faith and religious emotions could not be tabulated, nor religions codified." He agreed that consideration of the question should be deferred until the 28th General Assembly and the co-sponsors should delete the word, "priority."

Mr. V. V. Loshchinin of Byelorussian SSR felt the approach of the co-sponsors was "a trifle illogical." The Commission on Human Rights had been unable to adopt any decision "because of the Western countries." Now they have changed their approach.

Mr. V. M. Zenkyavichus of the U.S.S.R. announced that he would like to hold informal consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mrs. Halima Warzazi of Morocco said that the draft resolution simply postponed the conclusion of a declaration and the vote should not be deferred to a later meeting. She asked for a 15-minute suspension to enable the U.S.S.R. to confer with the co-sponsors.

Mr. Folke Löfgren of Sweden supported Mrs. Warzazi.

The Chairman suggested that further consideration of the item should be postponed until the following meeting of the Committee, while a time-limit for submission of the revised draft resolution and any amendments would be 5:00 p.m. that day. This proposal was agreed upon, without further debate.

There was a short meeting of the co-sponsors with several representatives from the Soviet Union and Byelorussian SSR immediately after adjournment of the Committee at 1:10 p.m. The co-sponsors would not accept any substantial compromise, and they indicated that the Soviet amendments constituted exactly an opposite approach and thus a decision of the Committee was required. They asked the Soviet Union formally to submit its amendments so that such a vote could be taken. The U.S.S.R. did submit amendments before the 5:00 p.m. deadline, although the co-sponsors decided not to submit a revised draft resolution since the modifications were so minor.

The next meeting of the Third Committee, on December 4th, was very short (due to its early adjournment to hear an address by the President of Chile in the plenary) and thus this agenda item was not reached in the Committee and thus not discussed.

#### d. December Fifth

The Third Committee opened its meeting in the afternoon, beginning with the item on war crimes. It was just five o'clock when, after this item was voted upon and explanation of votes was made, that debate on religious intolerance was resumed. (It continued, until all votes were taken, to 7:00 p.m.)

Miss Graziella Dubra of Uruguay, speaking for the sponsors of the draft resolution, discussed the outcome of negotiations with the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and Byelorussia. The co-sponsors would incorporate the mention in the first preambulatory paragraph of a reference to General Assembly resolution 2295(XVII)--which decided to "accord priority during its 23rd session to the item entitled, 'elimination of all forms of religious intolerance.'" The co-sponsors made additional modifications as previously announced, but could not accept the five amendments of the Soviet Union since they were diametrically opposed to the draft resolution. She emphasized that "the draft resolution was procedural in character and it took no position with regard to the substance of the matter." While greater progress had been made in drafting the convention, no work had been done on the draft convention for five years "and the outlook was not very promising."



Mr. Peter van Walsum of the Netherlands said that nobody could be accused of inflexibility since "the sponsors of the draft resolution were suggesting that, of the two related problems, which might be termed A and B, A should be tackled first and B later, whereas the amendments were proposing the reverse." He said that "the only conceivable compromise between the two positions would be to tackle A and B at the same time--precisely the step which all had found to be impractical." In all comparable situations, "the U.N. traditionally followed the course of first adopting a declaration and then formulating a convention." A draft declaration already existed and "it constituted a better point of departure than did the draft convention." He said that those delegations who decide to support the Soviet amendments should be aware that the co-sponsors were willing to work with either side in this procedural dilemma. While he urged all delegations to vote against the Soviet amendments, because the declaration should be taken up first, those who voted for the Soviet amendments (i.e., for priority for the convention) would be invited to join the co-sponsors in informal consultations before the 28th session of the General Assembly in order to examine ways of giving this matter new momentum with the emphasis they have opted for, i.e., the convention. In order to facilitate the identification of those delegations who wish to work on the convention first, his delegation requested that a roll-call vote be taken on the second Soviet amendment. The co-sponsors had explained sufficiently "why they had changed their minds with regard to the position they had adopted five years earlier"--to escape "from the five-year deadlock and revive a dormant item on the Committee's agenda."

Mr. V. M. Zenkyavichus of the U.S.S.R. had hoped that "all differences could be resolved in the spirit of cooperation," but his delegation's proposal "had been rejected" and consequently he had been compelled to submit formally the amendments. A great deal of time had been spent on the draft convention and "it was logical to continue these endeavors."

Mr. V. V. Loshchinin of Beylorussian SSR did not entirely agree that the draft resolution was purely procedural. He felt that the Soviet amendments "represented a compromise approach." If the draft preamble of the convention contained provisions that were not acceptable to certain Western Powers, who could guarantee that, at the next session, similar provisions would not be inserted in the preamble to a declaration, leading to a similar expenditure of time and effort, and, most probably, failure to adopt either a declaration or a convention?" He was surprised that the sponsor of resolution 1(XXI) at the 21st session of the Commission on Human Rights was the Netherlands and this asked that absolute priority be given to completing the draft convention. Thus there would be "a complete reversal of previous decisions."

Mr. Ahmet Akyamac of Turkey suggested that it is up to the Third Committee itself of the 28th session to decide, in the light of its agenda, what priorities to set in discussing the whole question of the elimination of religious intolerance. It was noteworthy that the Soviet Union suggested that the Commission and the ECOSOC should consider the preliminary draft declaration. For this reason his delegation would endorse most of the Soviet amendments. However, because a "new element of controversy had emerged," he hoped both the draft resolution and the amendments would be withdrawn and both be simply referred to in the report of the Third Committee to the plenary.

Mr. Costas Papademas of Cyprus, as a co-sponsor, agreed that a draft convention, "a legally binding instrument, was more desirable than a draft declaration." However, the Committee had "to face the problem in a realistic fashion" and "it was a much easier task, and one involving far less controversy, to proceed by adopting a declaration first." The draft was a procedural one and "at the next session, it would be for the Committee itself to decide how priorities would be set."

Mrs. Anna-Lisa Nilsson of Sweden asserted that "a realistic assessment of the situation had led the sponsors. . . to believe that attention should now be focused on the draft declaration." Their aim "was to achieve results" and not to "engage in long discussions which had led to the adoption of nothing more than a preamble and one article." She felt that "referral of the matter to the Commission on Human Rights, which already had



an extremely heavy agenda, would merely lead to further delay." They wanted to reactivate an item "which had remained dormant for too long."

Mr. A. S. Mani of India asked whether the Commission had ever considered the report of the Work Group set up to prepare a draft declaration.

Mrs. Halima Warzazi of Morocco announced that her delegation would abstain during the vote on the Soviet amendments, but she would vote for the draft resolution if the sponsors would substitute the word, "elaboration," for "completion" (of a draft instrument) and would insert the phrase, "if possible," after the word, "adoption."

Mr. V. V. Loshchinin of Byelorussian SSR asserted that the Netherlands and other Western delegations "had changed their attitude" to the draft convention since the General Assembly decided in resolution 2295 (XXII) to modify the title to "Draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief." He added that he "personally did not believe in God," but he respected "the beliefs of others who did." He asked: "Why should there not be tolerance for negative as well as positive religious beliefs?" That, he insisted, "was the stumbling-block."

Mr. Marc Schreiber, Director of the U.N. Division of Human Rights, answered the question of Mr. Mani and also said that the Commission had not taken up the question of a draft declaration since its 20th session.

Miss Graziella Dubra of Uruguay, speaking for the co-sponsors, accepted the two oral amendments of Morocco. Responding to the representative from Byelorussia, she said that the Commission had done nothing on a declaration for years and "it would therefore be a retrograde step to refer the draft declaration back to the Commission."

Mr. Peter van Walsum of the Netherlands admitted that, in the past, there had been "procedural reasons for supporting a draft convention, because more progress had been made in its preparation than in the case of a draft declaration." Now it was "more logical to proceed with the draft declaration."

Mr. A. S. Mani of India felt that "the draft resolution would produce only a half-baked declaration, without experts on the Commission on Human Rights being given an opportunity to study it." He would vote for the Soviet amendments, "which were consistent with proper procedure," but would also support the draft resolution "without any commitment as to its substance."

Mrs. Eugenia Stevenson of Liberia thanked Mrs. Warzazi of Morocco for suggesting the amendments and she thanked the co-sponsors for incorporating them, since they made it easier for her to vote for the resolution.

Mrs. Halima Warzazi of Morocco emphasized that the draft resolution was merely procedural, and paragraph three made it clear that "no commitment was involved." Accordingly, she proposed that the debate be closed.

#### e. The Votes

Previously Costa Rica and Iceland joined as co-sponsors of the resolution. The Chairman then invited the Committee to vote first on the five Soviet amendments, with Mr. Akyamac of Turkey asking for a separate vote on three words in the second Soviet amendment, "of the advisability." All votes were show-of-hands votes, except on the second Soviet amendment, for which the Netherlands asked a roll-call vote.

After all five Soviet amendments were rejected, the Chairman asked for votes on the unamended draft resolution. Mr. Zenkyavichus of the Soviet Union asked for separate votes



on paragraphs 1, 2, and 5. Thus five votes were taken, one on the preamble as orally revised, three on the three paragraphs, and finally one on the draft as a whole.

The draft resolution, as orally revised but not amended, was adopted by 73 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.

In the plenary, the resolution was adopted without further debate 101 to none, with 22 abstentions.

The tally of the eleven votes taken in the First Committee is given in Table 1 below: (See Appendix A and B for actual wording of draft resolution and amendments.)

Table 1. The Votes in the Third Committee on Item 59.

	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstention</u>
1. First Soviet amendment.	32	43	33
2. Second Soviet amendment (separate vote on three words.)	23	2	68
3. Second Soviet amendment. (roll call.)	29	37	41
4. Third Soviet amendment.	29	38	32
5. Fourth Soviet amendment.	29	38	33
6. Fifth Soviet amendment.	28	37	34
7. Revised preamble.	73	0	28
8. Paragraph One.	63	19	19
9. Paragraph Two.	69	9	24
10. Paragraph Five, as revised.	64	13	26
11. Draft resolution as a whole.	73	0	31

The Soviet amendments were rejected by relatively close votes. The second amendment lost by a vote of 29 to 37. If only nine Member States switched a half-vote each, the result would have been acceptance of the Soviet amendment. For example, if four States which voted against would have switched to abstention and if five States which abstained would have voted in favor, the result would have been 34 to 33! However, once all five Soviet amendments were rejected, the unamended draft resolution had easy passage: 73 to none, with 31 abstentions. The vote of States on the second Soviet amendment is given in Table 2 in the Appendix. The vote of States for the total resolution was not recorded in the Third Committee. It is known, however, that among the affirmative votes were the following States which did not vote affirmatively in the recorded vote on the amendment: Barbados, Burma, Cameroon, Columbia, Ghana, India, Morocco, Tanzania, and Venezuela. No attempt was made further to reconstruct the show-of-hands vote, for it was known that a recorded vote would be requested in the plenary.

Of the 29 States which voted for the Soviet amendment, 18 abstained on the whole resolution in the plenary. These were 10 socialist States and eight Arab States. Eleven States in effect changed their position between the vote in the Third Committee and in the plenary, and thus voted for the Soviet amendment, switched, and voted for the resolution in the plenary. These States were Chile, Dahomey, Egypt, Guinea, India, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and United Arab Emirates. Four States maintained an abstention position both on the Soviet amendment and on the total resolution in the plenary: Pakistan, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, and Zaire.

Of the 18 Arab States members of the U.N., 14 voted in favor of the Soviet amendment, none voted against, three abstained, and one was absent. In the vote in the plenary, nine Arab States voted for the resolution, eight abstained, and one did not vote.

From the Third Committee tally to that in the plenary, the 73 affirmative votes increased 28 to 101, while the 31 abstentions were diminished by nine to 22. The changes are interesting. The following 18 States which were not voting or absent during the

recorded vote in the Third Committee were present and voted affirmatively in the plenary: Bolivia, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Haiti, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Niger, Paraguay, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and Uganda. The following 35 States which abstained during the roll call vote in the Third Committee voted affirmatively in the plenary: Afghanistan, Barbados, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Columbia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Laos, Liberia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Sierre Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad, Tunisia, Venezuela, and Zambia.

Eight States which did not participate in the roll call vote in the Third Committee also did not vote in the plenary: Albania, Bhutan, China, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Kuwait, and South Africa. In the Third Committee, both China and the Congo announced their non-participation. No such non-participation was announced in the plenary. However, during the 2114th meeting of the plenary, of the nine States which did not vote, the following six States which did not vote on this item did cast a vote on at least one other item and thus were physically present in the General Assembly hall: Albania, Bhutan, Botswana, China, Congo, and Kuwait. Thus these States probably intentionally did not participate in the vote on this item.

#### 5. NEXT STEPS FOR NGOS

It is expected that the Secretary-General will send a communication on this subject to Member-States, including the two draft declarations, sometime in January.

If the Secretary-General's analysis (by the Division of Human Rights) is to be made (and translated into five languages) before the opening of the 28th General Assembly in mid-September, 1973, this means that replies of States must probably reach the U.N. before July.

## Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

Of the 132 member States, usually only 25 or 50 respond to such inquiries by the Secretary-General. Sometimes only six or a dozen responses come in. The test of the interest and urgency of an item is often the number of responses from Member States. Consequently NGOs can help stimulate responses from Governments. Fifty would be a respectable number; seventy-five responses would show distinct interest in this item, especially if they come from States fairly equally distributed by continents (if not by political blocs.)

Governments thus must be encouraged to give to the Secretary-General 1-their response to the two draft declarations and 2-their hope that a final draft can be finished and approved during the 28th U.N. General Assembly (on the 25th anniversary of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.)

International NGOs must ask their international headquarters to request their national affiliates to influence governments to take the actions as indicated above.

International NGOs can themselves communicate informally to the Secretary-General their views about the draft declarations and the necessity of finishing and approving a declaration during the 28th General Assembly. Copies of these communications should be sent to the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights so they might be circulated to Member States.

#### 6. LITERATURE

##### A. Brief Bibliography

1. Study of Discrimination in the Matter of Religious Rights and Practices, by Arcot Krishnaswami. New York: United Nations. 1960. 79pp. (Out of print.)





2. "Eliminating Intolerance and Discrimination based on Religion or Belief: The UN Role," by Sidney Liskofsky. In Reports on the Foreign Scene, Institute of Human Relations, 165 E. 56th Street, New York, N. Y. 10022. February, 1968. 12pp. (single copies 20¢ each.)
3. Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, note by the Secretary-General, July 27, 1970. 9pp. plus annexes. A/8330.
4. Ten Years of Hope, by Dr. Isaac Lewin. New York: Shengold. 1971. Contains proposed text of an abbreviated draft of declaration, pp. 33-36.
5. "Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance," by Homer A. Jack. The Christian Century. August 30, 1972. pp. 856-57.

B. Literature Available

1. Eliminating All Forms of Religious Intolerance: What the United Nations Has Done and Can Do, by Homer A. Jack. 6pp. Revised Edition. September, 1972. 25¢\*
2. Annotated Unabridged Draft: Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance, edited by Homer A. Jack. 8pp. September, 1972. 25¢\*
3. "Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance," by Homer A. Jack. Reprint from The Christian Century, August 30, 1972. 2pp. 10¢\*
4. New Progress Toward a U.N. Declaration Against Religious Intolerance, by Homer A. Jack. 17pp. December, 1972. 50¢\*

APPENDIX

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

A. TEXT OF ADOPTED RESOLUTION(3027(XXVII))

ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 1781(XVII) of 7 December 1962, 2020(XX) of 1 November 1965, and 2295(XXII) of 11 December 1967,

Affirming the equal importance of both a Declaration and an International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance,

Convinced of the need to give new momentum to this work by initially concentrating on the completion of one of these instruments,

Noting that the consideration of this item has been deferred at each session without proper discussion since its twenty-second session,

1. Decides to accord priority to the completion of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance before resuming the consideration of the International Convention on this subject;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies (a) the preliminary draft of a United Nations Declaration

\*Available individually(or in a packet) from the World Conference of Religion for Peace.

on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance prepared by the Sub-commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities(A/8330, annex I); and (b) the report of the Working Group set up by the Commission on Human Rights at its twentieth session to prepare a draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance(A/8330, annex II);

3. Invites Governments to transmit to the Secretary-General their observations on the above-mentioned documents;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit the observations received, together with an analytical presentation, to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session;

5. Decides to give priority at its twenty-eighth session to the elaboration of a Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance with a view to the adoption, if possible, of such a Declaration as part of the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

#### B. TEXT OF SOVIET AMENDMENTS

1. Amend the second preambular paragraph to read:

"Affirming the importance of preparing an International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance and a Declaration on that subject,"

2. Amend operative paragraph 1 to read:

"1. Decides to continue work on the preparation of an International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance and to consider the question of the advisability of preparing a Declaration on that subject;"

3. Amend operative paragraph 2 to read:

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to transmit to States Members of the United Nations the draft International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance and the preliminary draft of a Declaration on that subject, for their observations and comments;"

4. Replace operative paragraph 4 by the following text:

"4. Requests the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council to consider the preliminary draft Declaration in the light of the observations received from Governments and to submit proposals on that question to the General Assembly;"

5. Amend operative paragraph 5 to read:

"5. Decides to continue at its twenty-eighth session work on the preparation of an International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance and to consider the question of the advisability of preparing a Declaration on that subject."



C. THE VOTING PATTERN OF STATES

Table 2. The Soviet Amendment Two.#

FOR (29)

<u>Western &amp; Other(1)</u>	<u>Latin-American(2)</u>	<u>African(6)</u>	<u>Asian(12)</u>	<u>Eastern European(8)</u>
Turkey	Chile Cuba	Algeria Dahomey Egypt Guinea Libya Sudan	Behrain Dem. Yemen India Iraq Lebanon Mongolia Oman Qatar S. Arabia Syria Unit. Arab Em. Yemen	Bulgaria Byelo. SSR Czech. Hungary Poland Romania Ukraine U.S.S.R.

AGAINST (37)

<u>Western &amp; Other(19)</u>	<u>Latin-American(10)</u>	<u>African(2)</u>	<u>Asian(6)</u>
Australia Austria Belgium Canada Denmark Finland France Greece Iceland Ireland	Italy Netherlands New Zealand Norway Portugal Spain Sweden U.K. U.S.	Argentina Brazil Costa Rica El Salvador Guatemala Honduras Jamaica Nicaragua Panama Uruguay	Lesotho Madagascar Cyprus Fiji Israel Japan Malaysia Maldives

ABSTENTION (41)

<u>Latin-American(8)</u>	<u>African(20)</u>	<u>Asian(12)</u>	<u>Eastern European(1)</u>
Barbados Columbia Ecuador Guyana Mexico Peru Trinidad Venezuela	Botswana Burundi Cameroon Chad Ethiopia Ghana Ivory Coast Kenya Liberia Mali	Morocco Nigeria Sierra Leone Swaziland Togo Tunisia Tanzania Upper Volta Zaire Zambia	Afghanistan Burma Indonesia Iran Khmer Rep. Kuwait Laos Nepal Pakistan Philippines Singapore Thailand Yugoslavia



#The groupings of States are geographical, not political, except for "Western and Other."



NOT VOTING (ABSENT) (23)

<u>Western &amp; Other</u> (2)	<u>Latin-American</u> (4)	<u>African</u> (13)	<u>Asian</u> (3)	<u>Eastern European</u> (1)
Luxemburg	Bolivia	Cent. Afr. Rep.	Bhutan	Albania
Malta	Dominican Rep.	Eq. Guinea	Jordan	
	Haiti	Gabon	Sri Lanka	
	Paraguay	Gambia		
		Malawi		
		Mauritania		
		Mauritius		
		Niger		
		Rwanda		
		Senegal		
		Somalia		
		Uganda		
		S. Africa		

NOT PARTICIPATING (2)

<u>African</u> (1)	<u>Asian</u> (1)
Congo	China

Table 3. The Resolution in the Plenary.#

FOR (101)

<u>Western &amp; Other</u> (22)	<u>Latin-American</u> (23)	<u>African</u> (32)	<u>Asian</u> (24)
Australia	Argentina	Burundi	Mali
Austria	Barbados	Cameroon	Mauritania
Belgium	Bolivia	C. A. Rep.	Mauritius
Canada	Brazil	Chad	Morocco
Denmark	Chile	Dahomey	Niger
Finland	Columbia	Egypt	Nigeria
France	Costa Rica	Ethiopia	Rwanda
Greece	Dominican Rep.	Gabon	Senegal
Iceland	Ecuador	Ghana	Sierra L.
Ireland	El Salvador	Guinea	Somalia
Italy	Guatemala	Ivory C.	Sudan
Luxembourg	Guyana	Kenya	Swaziland
Malta	Haiti	Lesotho	Togo
Netherlands	Honduras	Liberia	Tunisia
New Zealand	Jamaica	Madagascar	Uganda
Norway	Mexico	Malawi	Tanzania
Portugal	Nicaragua		
Spain	Panama		
Sweden	Paraguay		
Turkey	Peru		
U.K.	Trinidad		
U.S.	Uruguay		
	Venezuela		
			Afghanistan
			Burma
			Cyprus
			Fiji
			India
			Indonesia
			Iran
			Israel
			Japan
			Jordan
			Khmer R.
			Laos
			Malaysia
			Maldives
			Nepal
			Oman
			Philippines
			Qatar
			Saudia Arab.
			Singapore
			Sri Lanka
			Thailand
			U.A. Emer.
			Zambia

#The groupings of States are geographical, not political, except for "Western and Other."



AGAINST (0)

ABSTENTION (22)

Latin-American(1)

Cuba

African(4)

Algeria  
Libya  
Upper Volta  
Zaire

Asian(8)

Bahrain  
Dem. Yemen  
Iraq  
Lebanon  
Mongolia  
Pakistan  
Syria  
Yemen

Eastern European(9)

Bulgaria  
Byelorussia  
Czecho.  
Hungary  
Poland  
Romania  
Ukraine  
U.S.S.R.  
Yugoslavia

NOT VOTING (9)

Albania  
Bhutan  
Botswana

China  
Congo  
Equat. Guinea

Gambia  
Kuwait  
South Africa

D. TEXT OF LETTER TO PRESIDENT TREPCZYNSKI

777 United Nations Plaza  
New York, New York 10017  
September 21, 1972

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

H.E. Mr. Stanislaw Trepczynski  
President, 27th U. N. General Assembly

RE: Provisional Agenda Item 61(a): Draft Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance.

Your Excellency:

With the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, additional instruments were soon thought necessary to implement its various articles. At the 17th U.N. General Assembly in 1962 there was a proposal to draft two instruments, a declaration against racial and religious intolerance and an accompanying convention. However, the 17th General Assembly decided to deal separately with the subjects of race and religion and to draft separate instruments. As a result, the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted in 1963 and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination entered into force in 1969.

There has not, however, been equal progress in drafting instruments against religious discrimination, even though religious discrimination and intolerance continue on many continents. In 1965 the 20th U.N. General Assembly asked the ECOSOC to request the Commission on Human Rights to complete the draft declaration against religious intolerance, but the latter so far has been unable to give further consideration to this project. In 1967 the Third Committee of the 22nd U.N. General Assembly devoted many meetings to the draft convention, but was unable to complete the text. It then voted to give priority to both the draft declaration and draft convention at the 23rd U.N. General Assembly. Both items have, however, been postponed year after year and now these items appear once again on the provisional agenda(item 61) of the 27th U.N. General Assembly.

As international and national non-governmental organizations, we express gratitude that the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination has been proclaimed and that the International Convention is in force. Indeed, some of our organizations are working to induce additional nations to ratify this convention. However, only one-half of the total task as originally contemplated has been completed.

Therefore our organizations continue to be distressed that so little progress has been made during this same decade in drafting both a Declaration and a Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance. We feel that priority should now be given to finishing the draft of the declaration. This need not be a formidable or time-consuming task. We suggest that the Third Committee of the 27th U.N. General Assembly allocate sufficient priority and thus time to deal with this matter, perhaps with the help of a Working Group. Once the Declaration is drafted and adopted, then a Convention can again be considered.

(Signed)

Agudas Israel World Organization (Dr. Isaac Lewin)  
Amnesty International  
American Jewish Committee (Bert Gold)  
Baha'i International Community (Mary Sawicki)  
E'nai B'rith International Council (Dr. William Korey)  
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (Richard M. Fagley)  
International Association for Religious Freedom (Rev. Dana E. Klotzle)  
International Catholic Child Bureau (Margaret M. Bedard)  
International Catholic Education Bureau  
International Catholic Union of the Press (Rev. Hugh Morley)  
International Commission of Jurists (Riail MacDermot)  
International Conference of Catholic Charities (Dr. Louis Longarzo)  
International Council of Jewish Women (Mrs. Harold Rosenfeld)  
International Council of Women  
International Council on Jewish Social and Welfare Services  
International Federation of Women Lawyers (Dora Aberlin)  
International Federation for the Rights of Man (Robertta Cohen)  
International Humanist and Ethical Union (Mary H. Weis)  
International League for the Rights of Man (Sidney Liskofsky)  
International Movement for Fraternal Union Among Races and Peoples (Eileen M. Schaeffler)  
Pan-Pacific and South-East Asia Women's Association (Jetta Gordon)  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Mary Hornaday)  
Women's International Zionist Organization (Evelyn Sommer)  
Women's Overseas Service League (Catherine Reigart, Georgia H. Tapley)  
World Association of World Federalists (Donald Keys)  
World Conference of Religion for Peace (Dr. Homer A. Jack)  
World Federation of Catholic Youth (Rosemary Higgins Cass)  
World Federation of United Nations Associations (Mrs. Robert A. Wiener)  
World Jewish Congress (Max Melamet)  
World Muslim Congress (M. H. Rauf)  
World Peace Law Centre (Leo Nevas)  
World Zionist Organization of America  
Zonta International, New York



E. RELEVANT U.N. DOCUMENTS

Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance: Note by the Secretary-General for Item 56 of the Provisional Agenda of the 25th General Assembly. A/7930. (July 27, 1970)

Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance: Note by the Secretary-General for Item 63 of the Provisional Agenda of the 26th General Assembly. A/8330. (July 6, 1971)

Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance: Note by the Secretary-General for Item 60 of the Provisional Agenda of the 27th General Assembly. A/8649. (June 30, 1972)

Membership of the Third Committee. A/C.3/628.

Annotated Draft Agenda of the 27th Regular Session of the General Assembly. A/8750/Rev.1.

Provisional Summary Record of Organization of Work of Third Committee. A/C. 3/SR. 1908.

Communications Received Relating to General Assembly Matters: A/INF/145.

Draft Resolution. A/C.3/L. 1980.

Soviet Amendments. A/C.3/L. 1985.

Provisional Summary Record of first day of debate. A/C.3/SR. 1966.

Press Release GA/SHC/1806 (for 1966)

Provisional Record of second day of debate. A/C.3/SR. 1967.

Press Release GA/SHC/1807 (for 1967)

Provisional Summary Record of final day of debate. A/C.3/SR. 1969.

Press Release GA/SHC/1809 (for 1969)

Report on the Item to the Plenary of General Assembly. A/8945.

Verbatim Record of vote in plenary. A/PV. 2114.

Number of Adopted Resolution. 3027(XXVII).

