



CONTENTS

Agenda item 62:

*International Year for Human Rights (con-  
tinued):*

(a) *Measures and activities undertaken in  
connexion with the International Year for  
Human Rights: report of the Secretary-  
General;*

(b) *International Conference on Human Rights  
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/  
L.1633/Rev.1 (concluded) . . . . .*

*Consideration of draft resolution A/C.3/  
L.1635/Rev.1 . . . . .*

Page

1

5

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

AGENDA ITEM 62

International Year for Human Rights (continued)  
(A/7194, A/7195, A/7195/Add.1 and Add.3-8, A/  
CONF.32/41, A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1635/  
Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1637/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1638-1641,  
A/C.3/L.1642/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1647, A/C.3/L.1649):

(a) Measures and activities undertaken in connexion  
with the International Year for Human Rights:  
report of the Secretary-General;

(b) International Conference on Human Rights

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.3/L.1633/REV.1 (concluded)

1. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, said that operative paragraph 1 contained a purely factual error: the resolution mentioned should be resolution XXVIII of the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross held at Vienna in 1965. With regard to the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.3/L.1647), calling for the deletion of the fourth sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1, he recalled that in 1965, when the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross had considered the question of the protection of civilian populations in time of war, it had had before it six draft resolutions, including some submitted by Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany calling for the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Since the Conference had been unable to reach agreement on the various draft resolutions in question, it had appointed a Drafting Committee, which had drawn up the text of resolution XXVIII. At the time of the adoption of that resolution, the Chairman of the Drafting Committee had made it quite clear that the reference to nuclear weapons in no way prejudged the question whether or not such weapons were permissible, because that was a question not within the competence of the Conference of

the Red Cross. All the delegations of Eastern countries had then voted for resolution XXVIII in its present form. Nevertheless, in a spirit of compromise, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1 had agreed to the deletion of the fourth sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1, it being understood, however, that there was nothing in the rest of the paragraph to prevent the principles mentioned therein from applying to all conflicts, whatever the weapons used.

2. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) unreservedly supported the aims of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1 because, in the context of the International Year for Human Rights, the Committee was in duty bound to reaffirm the need for protecting civilian populations in time of armed conflict. Wars had brought great suffering to millions of innocent people in the past and continued to do so. A case in point was the tragic fate of the Arab population in the territories occupied by Israel, with regard to whom the Committee had just been considering a draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1626 and Add.1) proposing the establishment of a fact-finding committee. He would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1. However, the term "enemy" used in the first sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1 must be defined; it was unacceptable to him that, for instance, the freedom fighters who were fighting for the liberation of their brothers in South Africa, Angola, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia should be described as "terrorists".

3. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) noted that the abolition of war, one of mankind's oldest and most cherished hopes, was as yet unfulfilled. Despite more than twenty years of striving by the United Nations to limit resort to force, there had been more than fifty armed conflicts during that relatively brief period, and even today, while efforts were being made to put an end to the tragic hostilities in South-East Asia, the Middle East and Africa, voices in many parts of the world were calling for the use of armed force and violence as an acceptable method of bringing about changes where peaceful means appeared too slow or ineffective.

4. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, referred to resolution XXIII of the Teheran Conference entitled "Human rights in armed conflicts". That might seem to be a contradiction in terms, because warfare was inevitably brutal and inhuman. However, until mankind was able to abolish war, it must make every effort to reduce as far as possible the suffering which accompanied it. That effort had begun in earnest with the founding of the Red Cross in 1863 and the adoption in 1864 of the first Geneva Convention. Since then, the Red Cross had promoted a whole series of Conventions, including those referred to in resolution XXIII of the Teheran Conference and in the draft resolution

before the Committee, to protect civilians, prisoners and combatants and to limit the use of some methods of war. The United States was a party to all fourteen international agreements except the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Although her Government had not formally ratified that instrument, it had voted for General Assembly resolution 2162 B (XXI), which called for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Protocol. It had at the time set forth its position on the Protocol, the principles and objectives of which it supported, together with its reasons for not having ratified it. The United States delegation had voted for resolution XXIII at Teheran and would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1. It supported the four principles of resolution XXVIII of the International Conference of the Red Cross, the reference to which in operative paragraph 1 constituted a reaffirmation of existing international law. It regretted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed, at the request of the Soviet Union, to delete the fourth principle, because it did not feel that that principle would in any way change existing international law with respect to nuclear weapons. It was true that the General Assembly at its sixteenth session had adopted a declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, but she did not think the Soviet Union really believed that that resolution (1653 (XVI)) constituted a legal prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; if it did, it would not have proposed the drafting of a new international convention on the subject. The XXth International Conference of the Red Cross, in adopting that fourth principle, had not intended to make any decision on the legitimacy of using such weapons; it had merely made it clear that nuclear weapons, like any others, were subject to the general principles of the law of war until such time as Governments came to an understanding on measures of disarmament and control with a view to their complete prohibition. The United States, which depended on nuclear weapons for its self-defence and the defence of its allies, was opposed to any proposal aimed solely at prohibiting the use of such weapons. The United States had been prepared to give up nuclear weapons when it had been the only Power possessing them. However, now that other countries had obtained them, a simple prohibition would only lead to a less secure world. The United States was dedicated to the pursuit of realistic disarmament steps, and had supported all agreements concluded for that purpose.

5. The United States had a deep interest in the better application of the Geneva Conventions. In Viet-Nam, as in all the other conflicts in which it had been involved, it had been its consistent policy to abide by the humanitarian principles enunciated in those Conventions, and it regretted that the North Viet-Name authorities had failed to apply the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, repeatedly refusing to allow the Red Cross and similar bodies to visit the prisoners at their place of detention. The United States hoped that the Red Cross, or another impartial intermediary, would be permitted to visit American detainees in North Korea.

6. In giving its support to the draft resolution, her delegation recognized that the task which the Secretary-General was asked to undertake was not an easy one; it was confident that he would make every effort

to produce, in consultation with such non-governmental organizations as the International Committee of the Red Cross, the thorough and objective study requested of him. The Secretary-General should, of course, take account of relevant studies already completed or contemplated by the United Nations, in particular the study of the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological means of warfare which had been recommended by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. The United States Government, for its part, would do everything it could to help the Secretary-General in carrying out his task.

7. Mr. PAOLINI (France) commended the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1) and recalled that the head of the French delegation at the Teheran Conference, Mr. René Cassin, had been one of the first to request that the Conference should take up the question of the protection of human rights in time of armed conflict. However, he regretted that the draft resolution did not pay a more explicit tribute to the work of the Red Cross. The text should also reaffirm the basic principle that representatives of the Red Cross should be respected and protected. The Red Cross had been the first purely humanitarian organization, and it was because of it that the first advances had been made in the field of human rights. Its work was of international value only because its activities were independent and non-political, in contrast to the humanitarian activities of the United Nations, which always had a somewhat political tinge. The existing Red Cross Conventions could be revised only with the consent of all the States parties to them. The International Committee of the Red Cross should therefore be mentioned as one of the international organizations to be consulted by the Secretary-General, and he proposed that the words "and in particular the International Committee of the Red Cross" should be inserted after the words "the appropriate international organizations" in operative paragraph 2.

8. With regard to the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.3/L.1647), which the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted, he agreed that the fourth principle enunciated in resolution XXVIII of the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross was of a theoretical nature, and he believed that the question of nuclear and similar weapons should be studied in the context of general disarmament. However, his delegation would have had no difficulty in voting in favour of the draft resolution in its original version.

9. Mr. VELA (Guatemala) commended the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, but said that he would have preferred the principles enunciated in operative paragraph 1 to be expressed more clearly. The Committee might limit itself to recalling resolution XXVIII of the International Conference of the Red Cross, simply stating that the principles enunciated therein should be observed by "all authorities", without specifying "governmental and other". He also proposed that the words "inter alia" in the introductory sentence of operative paragraph 1 should be deleted. He had reservations with regard to the wording of the first principle. The fourth principle was, in his view, a humanitarian aspiration which should be taken into account.

10. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would be able to

support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, in view of the fact that the sponsors had accepted the Soviet amendment (A/C.3/L.1647) and agreed to delete the fourth sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1.

11. It was regrettable that the United States representative's statement was so unconstructive. His own delegation's position was diametrically opposite, since the Soviet Union, like most countries, was in favour of the immediate prohibition of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the United States representative had slandered the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam by accusing it of violating human rights and of failing to respect the humanitarian principles of warfare. His delegation strongly objected to such allegations and affirmed that it was the United States, not the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, which by using napalm and bombing the civilian population was violating the principles enunciated by the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross.

12. With regard to the financial implications (A/C.3/L.1649) of the draft resolution under discussion, he said that the estimated costs were too high and did not cover what was really needed. His delegation did not agree with the methods of recruitment used by the Secretariat, which too often employed outside consultants. Another most regrettable fact, demonstrated by past experience, was that such consultants were recruited exclusively in Western countries. In the opinion of his delegation, whatever work was required should be done by the staff of the Secretariat; if, in the present instance, it was absolutely essential to employ outsiders, only one consultant, not two, should be recruited, for a short period and with due regard to the rules of geographical distribution.

13. Miss HART (New Zealand) said that her delegation would support the draft resolution under consideration. However, she felt that, despite the essentially humanitarian character of the study contemplated in operative paragraph 2 it would be desirable that the report called for in paragraph 3 should be considered not by the Third Committee, but by the First or the Sixth. Her delegation had reservations concerning the change that had been made in the draft resolution to take account of the Soviet amendment. It would be better not to mention any of the principles adopted by the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross and simply to refer to resolution XXVIII. If only the fourth principle was deleted, it might appear that nuclear weapons were not covered by the general principles of the law of war.

14. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) thought that it was desirable to consider ways of securing the better application of humanitarian international conventions and rules in armed conflicts. The tragedy of Viet-Nam proved—if proof was still required—the necessity of putting humanitarian principles into practice in the conduct of modern warfare, and it was for that reason that the United Nations was obliged to formulate rules concerning armed conflicts even though the Charter outlawed war.

15. He thanked the Soviet delegation for making it possible, through its amendment, to resolve the dilemma posed for a number of countries by the incompatibility between the fourth sub-paragraph of opera-

tive paragraph 1 and the efforts which were being made to ban nuclear weapons.

16. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) recalled that her delegation had voted in favour of resolution XXIII adopted at the Teheran Conference, on which the draft resolution under discussion was based. She agreed with the general intent of the latter, although she had reservations concerning operative paragraph 1, which contained something new. The principles set forth in that paragraph were of great importance in times of armed conflict; they were entirely commendable, but, as the United States representative had observed, they were expressed in too general terms. Her delegation therefore suggested that the word "Affirms" should be replaced by "Takes note of". In addition, the General Assembly would invite the Secretary-General to ask Member States for their views on the matter; that should not cause any particular difficulties, since under the terms of operative paragraphs 2 and 3 he would have to enter into consultation with Governments.

17. She agreed with the comments made by the representatives of the United States and France on the Soviet amendment and said that her delegation would have had no objection to retaining the fourth principle.

18. Miss FERRINGA (Netherlands) said that her delegation was in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1, which sought to reaffirm basic humanitarian principles. In her opinion, it would be preferable simply to refer to resolution XXVIII of the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross, for it seemed inappropriate to reaffirm that resolution while citing only three of its principles.

19. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said the Committee should realize that the studies contemplated in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1 were entirely new and would require a considerable degree of expertise in a field with which the Secretariat was not yet very familiar. He understood the concern for economy expressed by certain Member States, particularly those whose contributions to the United Nations budget were very large, but in most cases available staff could not be used to carry out such projects. In the draft resolution under consideration, the Secretary-General was invited to undertake a study and was requested to report to the General Assembly. The study in question would obviously take some time and could not be completed by the next session of the General Assembly even with slightly increased resources. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the First Committee was currently considering a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-9)<sup>1/</sup> on disarmament which referred to the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and in which the Assembly would ask the Secretary-General to draw up, if possible by 1 July 1969, a report on the possible effects of such weapons, based on the work of experts; thus, it would not be possible to see that report until the summer of 1969.

20. With regard to the international organizations referred to in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1,

<sup>1/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96, document A/7441 (Report of the First Committee on agenda item 27), para. 5 (b).

operative paragraph 2, he said that the Secretary-General intended to hold consultations with the International Committee of the Red Cross, and he noted in passing that in 1969 the Red Cross Committee would have an expert committee to consider questions somewhat similar to those mentioned in the draft resolution. The Secretariat expected to benefit from the work done on the subject both in the United Nations and elsewhere but, if it was to be able to submit a substantial report to the next session of the General Assembly, someone at United Nations Headquarters must be in a position to assemble the data with a proper awareness of the facts and to suggest what steps should be taken in furtherance of the task in question. Upon inquiry, it had been found that there was at present no one in the Secretariat with sufficient competence in that very specialized field. What was required was a study of international law by someone with a thorough knowledge of the military methods used today. The two persons who were wanted in order to reinforce the Secretariat's existing resources were indispensable to the execution of the project, whether they were engaged as consultants or as temporary staff members.

21. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) agreed with the comments of the representative of Sweden concerning the incorporation of the Soviet amendment. Unlike the delegations of France and the United States, his delegation was firmly convinced that the general principles of the law of war were applicable to, and should be applied to, nuclear weapons.

22. Mr. PAOLINI (France) paid a tribute to the Director of the Division of Human Rights for the very effective work performed by the Division, during the International Year for Human Rights. However, he had certain reservations with regard to the statement of financial implications submitted in document A/C.3/L.1649. The study entrusted to the Secretary-General should be carried out with the help of the International Committee of the Red Cross and should not, therefore, entail the recruitment of additional experts. His delegation fully reserved its position on that question until it was considered by the competent United Nations bodies. That applied also to the financial implications of the draft of which France had been a sponsor; the adoption of a draft resolution did not signify approval of its financial implications, which must be considered by the competent bodies.

23. He also pointed out that the new studies should be viewed as a whole, taking into account the organization of the Secretariat's work and the activities of the Commission on Human Rights. In the view of his delegation, the over-all question should be studied by the Commission on Human Rights at its next session.

24. Mr. KACHURENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the efforts they had made to ensure the implementation of resolutions XXII and XXIII of the Teheran Conference. The problem of peace was one of the key problems in the modern world, and the First Committee was considering a whole series of measures designed to eliminate the danger of nuclear weapons which was threatening millions of men. The draft resolution before the Committee was the result of a compromise, since the sponsors were anxious that it should be adopted unanimously. On the other hand, as some

delegations seemed to believe that the Soviet amendment was unnecessary, his delegation wished to state that it did not think that the principles expressed in resolution XXVIII of the XXth International Conference of the Red Cross, and quoted in the draft resolution, were entirely satisfactory. The first of those principles implied that there was a right to adopt means of injuring the enemy, and the fourth was incomplete since it contained no reference to chemical and bacteriological weapons. The dangers of those weapons had been stressed in several international documents, including the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925. The General Assembly in resolution 2162B (XXI) had invited all States to observe strictly the principles and objectives of that Protocol. However, certain Western States had not yet signed the Protocol. The deletion of the fourth sub-paragraph of operative paragraph 1 did not in any way affect the principle that all States should uphold human rights in periods of armed conflict.

25. The CHAIRMAN urgently requested delegations to keep their statements brief, as the Committee only had a short time left to complete its work.

26. Mr. JHA (India) said that the sponsors wished to make a minor formal amendment to the draft resolution. In the second preambular paragraph, the words "United Nations" should be deleted. Further, in the English text of operative paragraph 1, the words "inter alia" should be placed after and not before the words "laid down". The French representative's proposal was acceptable to the sponsors, although they believed that the words "appropriate international organizations" were sufficient. Accordingly, operative paragraph 2 would begin as follows: "Invites the Secretary-General, in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross and other appropriate international organizations, to study . . .". With regard to the New Zealand representative's proposal, he said that as the Swedish representative had already pointed out, the three principles quoted in operative paragraph 1 were not open to different interpretations and could therefore be confirmed by the General Assembly. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution, with those amendments, unanimously.

27. Mrs. AFNAN (Iran) hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by a very large majority, if not unanimously.

28. She understood that countries which contributed large sums to the United Nations budget were concerned about the financial implications of resolutions. On the other hand, the more modest contributions paid by poorer countries perhaps represented a larger proportion of their total resources and they were equally interested in the financial aspects of proposals. Ten years ago the Division of Human Rights had received 1.83 per cent of the United Nations budget. Now, in spite of the increase in the volume of work, it was only receiving 1.30 per cent. Delegations should bear that in mind when considering the financial implications.

29. Miss HLASS (Jordan) moved the closure of the debate.

30. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) observed that, under the terms of the draft resolution, the study of steps which could be taken to secure the better application of existing international conventions or other appropriate legal instruments, was to be entrusted to the Secretary-General. In that case, the Secretariat would have to have the necessary experts. On the other hand, if the General Assembly decided to entrust the study to the Red Cross, an indication to that effect should be included in the draft resolution, and the Secretary-General would merely be obliged to transmit the study to the General Assembly at its next session.

31. He was not clear whether the General Assembly was intending to authorize the Commission on Human Rights to decide whether certain studies, which the General Assembly had asked the Secretary-General to submit at a specific session, should be continued, suspended or cancelled. If it was intending to do so, such authorization should, in view of the constitutional aspects of the situation, be expressly stated in the draft resolution.

32. Mr. SOBOKE (Burundi) did not think that the debate should be closed.

*The motion for the closure of the debate was adopted by 53 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1633/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

33. Mr. ALO (Nigeria), explaining his vote, said he did not think that operative paragraph 2, which referred to international organizations in general, should mention one particular organization by name. However, in the interests of unanimity, his delegation had refrained from voting against the resolution.

#### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION

A/C.3/L.1635/REV.1

34. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/L.1635/Rev.1, said that since 1947 the United Nations and the specialized agencies, particularly UNESCO, had been working for the development of international understanding among youth. To that end, various resolutions and recommendations had been adopted, and various activities had been undertaken at the national and international levels. During International Year for Human Rights several resolutions, in particular resolution XX of the Teheran Conference, resolutions 1353 (XLV) and 1354 (XLV) of the Economic and Social Council and resolution 1,271 adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its fifteenth session, had drawn attention to the fact that education could play a major role in making children aware of the dignity and rights of man, encouraging the participation of youth in international co-operation and promoting international understanding. The draft resolution proposed by her delegation adopted a new approach. It did not merely recommend Member States to encourage teaching about human rights and international co-operation. It requested them to take appropriate steps to introduce or to encourage, according to the scholastic system of each State, in the training of teaching staff for primary and secondary schools, the regular study of the problems of international organization, with particular reference to the United

Nations and the specialized agencies and to the principles proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, it requested Member States to introduce or to encourage in the curricula of primary and secondary schools progressive instruction in the subject in question.

35. The experience of twenty years had shown that the world's knowledge of the increasing role of the United Nations system in peaceful co-operation and in the improvement of levels of living was inadequate, and that that lack of knowledge was inevitably affecting the political, economic and social life of nations, as well as relations between peoples of different countries. Experience had also shown that the older generations were more resistant to changes in ideas and customs and to the elimination of prejudices. Accordingly, her delegation thought that one should look to the younger generation. The draft resolution was concerned with the truly young generation of children at primary and secondary schools. The 1967 Report on the World Social Situation<sup>2/</sup> showed that the developing countries were making formidable efforts to develop secondary education. The draft resolution was therefore addressed not to a minority but to the totality of young people between six and eighteen years. It was at that stage of education that teaching about human rights and international organizations should begin. However, in translating that principle into reality, another difficulty arose. In many countries of the world, the teachers who should provide education of that kind were themselves ill-informed. The draft resolution submitted by her delegation was designed to break that vicious circle.

36. The revised text took into account the observations and suggestions which had been made privately by several delegations. The preamble defined the problem which the draft resolution was aimed at solving and in its revised form, differed little from the previous text. The main change was the deletion of the fourth preambular paragraph, which was redundant. The operative part had been substantially revised in order to take into account the differences in the scholastic systems of the various countries. They concerned, firstly, the role of the State in establishing the curricula of primary and secondary schools, universities and teacher-training institutes and, secondly, the role of private initiative. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the Member States were requested to introduce or to encourage, according to the scholastic system of each State, the regular study of international organizations, both in the institutions training teaching staff for primary and secondary schools and in the schools themselves. In operative paragraph 3, the authorities of private institutions were invited to make all the necessary efforts to achieve the aims envisaged in the preceding paragraphs. Operative paragraph 4 invited UNESCO to continue and to encourage the study of appropriate ways and means of promoting the achievement of the aims envisaged in the draft resolution.

37. Her delegation had endeavoured to make the revised text acceptable to all delegations and hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

<sup>2/</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.IV.9.

38. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Italy caused some difficulties and he hoped that the Italian delegation would take his suggestions into account.
39. In the third preambular paragraph, the term "everywhere" did not seem to be sufficiently clear. In addition, it would be better not to specify "in primary and secondary schools" but to leave it to each country to decide which was the most appropriate educational stage, by adopting a formula such as "at early stages of education" or "at appropriate stages of education". That comment was also applicable to the fourth preambular paragraph.
40. He could not see the point of the fifth preambular paragraph. The fact that educators had not received special instruction on those matters was not the only reason which prevented young people from receiving the required training. He did not know what meaning to give to "special instruction in international organization" and did not think that the expression "international organization" should be retained.
41. In operative paragraph 1, the word "regular" did not seem appropriate. Moreover, it would be better if the expression "problems of international organization" were replaced by "principles and purposes of the Charter".
42. In operative paragraph 2, the words "primary and secondary schools" should be replaced by a formula of the type he had suggested for the third preambular paragraph. The meaning of "progressive instruction" was not clear and the expression "to seize every opportunity" was somewhat inflated. It would also be better to delete the word "peaceful", since all co-operation was necessarily peaceful. He was not happy with the expression "a higher level of well-being" and hoped that the Italian delegation could propose a more satisfactory wording.
43. Operative paragraph 3 was addressed to universities and other scholastic institutions. He wondered whether it was advisable for the General Assembly to address itself to educational establishments rather than to Governments.
44. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) observed that it was very important to publicize the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights throughout the world. Those principles should not be disseminated solely during the International Year for Human Rights. He hoped that the authorities at Pretoria and Lisbon would take them into account and teach them to children who, later, would dissociate themselves from the retrograde policies of their Governments.
45. He supported the general principles underlying the draft resolution and hoped that the Italian delegation would find a wording acceptable to all delegations. He would like the Italian delegation to incorporate into the draft resolution a new operative paragraph 3 reading:
- "Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the other specialized agencies concerned, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, to provide assistance to Member States, particularly those which are developing countries, with a view to enabling them to achieve the aims envisaged in operative paragraphs 1 and 2;"
46. That amendment placed the problem in true perspective, since a number of developing countries were not in a position to undertake the programmes mentioned in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 because of financial considerations. It would be fitting for them to receive the assistance they needed for that purpose.

*The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.*