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Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2001 regular session
(New York, 7-25 May 2001)

Summary

At its 2001 regular session, held from 7 to 25 May 2001, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had before it 145 applications for consultative status, including applications deferred from its 1998, 1999 and 2000 sessions. Of those applications, the Committee recommended 44 applications for consultative status, deferred 101 organizations for further consideration at a later date and closed consideration of 1 application. The Committee reviewed four requests for reclassification of consultative status; and deferred consideration of the reclassification of three organizations to its 2001 resumed session.

The Committee heard 19 representatives of non-governmental organizations who were given the opportunity to respond to questions raised by Committee members. The additional information provided by the representatives facilitated the debate and the work of the Committee in taking its decisions.

The present report contains four draft decisions on matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council.

By draft decision I, the Council would:

(a) Grant consultative status to 44 non-governmental organizations;

(b) Take note that the Committee had decided to close consideration of the application of one organization;

(c) Take note that the case of one complaint submitted by a State had been closed;

* E/2001/100.
(d) Take note that the Committee had decided to close consideration of the request for reclassification of one organization.

By draft decision II, the Economic and Social Council would decide that those non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development should follow the rules and provisions outlined in Council resolution 1996/31 and that the Committee should deal with these applications as expeditiously as possible.

By draft decision III, the Economic and Social Council would authorize the Committee to hold a two-week resumed session from 14 to 25 January 2002 in order to complete the work of its 2001 session.

By draft decision IV, the Economic and Social Council would take note of the present report and approve the provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee.
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I. Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council

1. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations recommends to the Economic and Social Council the adoption of the following draft decisions:

Draft decision I
Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

The Economic and Social Council decides:
(a) To grant the following non-governmental organizations consultative status:

General consultative status
None

Special consultative status
Abdul Momen Khan Memorial Foundation
Association Culturelle d’Aide a la Promotion Educative et Sociale
Asociación de Antiguas Alumnas del Colegio de las Madres Irlandesas
Benevolent Community Education and Rural Development Society
Center for Practice-oriented Feminist Science
Centre africain de recherche industrielle
Concerned Women for America
Cooperation Ireland
Elizabeth Seton Federation
European Institute
European Roma Rights Center
Family Welfare in Brazil Civil Society
Feminist Majority Foundation
Femme-jeunesse-environnement-santé
Fondation pour la promotion de la santé et le développement de la recherche
Forum for Human Dignity

Fundación Intervida
Global Environmental Action
Girls’ Power Initiative
Hong Kong Women Professionals and Entrepreneurs Association
International Association of Prosecutors
International Council for Caring Communities
International Council of Management Consulting Institutes
International Shinto Foundation
Irish Penal Reform Trust
Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights
Jaime Guzman Errazuriz Foundation (ad referendum)
Migrants Rights International
Mouvement pour l’abolition de la prostitution et de la pornographie et de toutes formes de violences sexuelles et de discriminations sexistes
PARTAGE
Philippine Human Rights Information Centre
Scouts Musulmans Algériens
Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur
Tebtebba Foundation — Indigenous Peoples International Centre for Policy Research and Education
Trauma Foundation
WebForce International (ad referendum)
Wellesley Centers for Women (ad referendum)
Women’s Board Educational Cooperation Society

Roster
American Motorcyclist Association
Association internationale des traducteurs de conférences
Gun Control Australia
Union Internationale des Journalistes et de la Presse de Langue Française
We Care About Kids (Kid-Care)
World Animal Net

(b) To take note that the Committee has decided to close consideration of the application of the following organization, without prejudice to its right to reapply:

Consumer World Organization

(c) To take note that the complaint submitted against the following organization has been closed:

World Confederation of Labour

(d) To take note that the Committee has decided to close consideration of the request for reclassification of the International Peace Bureau.

Draft decision II
Implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302

The Economic and Social Council, recalling its decision 1996/302 of 26 July 1996, decides that the non-governmental organizations referred to in its decision 1993/220 of 26 May 1993 that wished to expand their participation in other fields of the Council would be considered by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations; and that the Committee would do so, as expeditiously as possible, under an item of its agenda, following the rules and provisions stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996.

Draft decision III
Resumed 2001 session of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The Economic and Social Council decides to authorize the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to hold a resumed session from 14 to 25 January 2002, in order to complete the work of its 2001 session.

Draft decision IV
Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee

The Economic and Social Council takes note of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, on its 2001 regular session and approves the provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee.

Provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
3. Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat.
4. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations:
   (a) Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the previous session of the Committee;
   (b) New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification.

Documentation
Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing deferred applications for consultative status
Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing deferred requests for reclassification
Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting new applications for consultative status
Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting new requests for reclassification
5. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304:

(a) Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations;

(b) Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31;

(c) Consideration of issues in the agenda of the informal Working Group;

(d) Other related matters.


7. Review of deferred quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

Documentation

Deferred quadrennial reports of non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Council resolution 1996/31

8. Consideration of special reports.

9. Provisional agenda and documentation for the 2003 session of the Committee.

10. Adoption of the report of the Committee.

II. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

2. The Committee considered item 3 of its agenda at its 2nd-8th and 17th-28th meetings, on 7-10, 17, 18 and 21-24 May 2001. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status received from non-governmental organizations (E/C.2/2001/R.2 and Add.1-5) and also a compilation of applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (E/C.2/2001/CRP.1).

A. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions

1. Applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions

   Human Rights International Alliance

3. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the application of the Human Rights International Alliance (HRIA) and decided to defer consideration thereof to its resumed session pending receipt of further information from the organization. At the 1999 resumed session, the Committee again deferred the request pending further clarification from the organization. At the 2000 session, the Committee deferred consideration of the application pending clarification on similarities existing between the organization and the Global Peace Foundation. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee reviewed the application. A delegate pointed out that in the list of member organizations of HRIA, at least one organization, Jeay Sind Mahaz, was politically affiliated to the Tamil Centre for Human Rights, while one other was associated with terrorist activities. Precisely for this reason, the Committee during its 2000 regular session in May had declined the request to the Tamil Centre for Human Rights for consultative status. Other delegations expressed their reservation on the organization and one delegation asked why the organization was seeking status since most of its members had consultative status. The representative of the organization, in addressing the questions posed by the Committee, stressed that his organization did not support terrorism and that it strongly opposed violence. He also added that the affiliated members of his organizations had their own objectives and did not abide by the programmes of HRIA. The Committee decided to defer the application for further consideration.

4. At its 3rd meeting, on 8 May 2001, the Committee decided to defer the review of the application of the organization owing to the fact that
one delegation needed more time for its further consideration.

5. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not review the following applications, which had been reviewed at the 2000 session and deferred further to its 2001 regular session (E/C.2/2001/CRP.1):

- Local Government International Bureau
- International Prostitutes Collective
- Kashmiri American Council
- Africa for Christ International
- African Community Resource Center
- Korea International Volunteer Organization
- Relief International
- Vishva Hindu Parishad
- Le Foyer Musulman — Association internationale pour les droits de l’homme
- National Center for Missing and Exploited Children

**International Federation of Inspection Agencies**

6. At its 2nd meeting, on 7 May, the Committee considered the application of the International Federation of Inspection Agencies. A number of delegations questioned the organization’s expenditures. They were also concerned with its limited sector of activities and wondered whether the organization could truly contribute to the work of the Economic and Social Council. The Committee deferred consideration of the application pending clarifications from the organization.

**E-Quality**

7. At the 2nd meeting, on 7 May, the members of the Committee noted that the organization had the statute of a foundation and was mostly composed of government officials. In addition, noting that the income of the organization was mostly coming from Governments, the delegations also questioned the organization’s independence in its policy-making process. The Committee deferred consideration of the application of the organization pending response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee.

**Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women**

8. At the 2nd meeting, on 7 May, the Committee considered the application of Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women. A number of Committee members requested that additional information on the organization’s income be obtained. The organization needed to clarify why most of its income came from contracts. The Committee deferred consideration of the application.

**International Lesbian and Gay Association**

9. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had considered the application of the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), an international organization previously in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (Roster). The organization consultative status had been suspended in 1994 pursuant to Council resolution 1994/50 of 16 September 1994 on concerns raised on member organizations or subsidiaries of ILGA that promoted or condoned paedophilia. At its 1998 session, the Committee received a letter from the organization requesting reinstatement of its status. The Committee deferred the matter to its resumed 1998 session. At that session, the Committee decided to ask the organization to submit a new application for consultative status, which the Committee would examine at a future session (E/1998/72). Having reviewed the application, a number of delegations raised questions on its registration status. Other delegations requested the organization to explain to the Committee how it could guarantee that its members did not promote paedophilia. A Committee member asked the organization how it screened its member organizations and subsidiaries to ensure that they did not promote paedophilia. Another delegation requested the organization to provide the list of member organizations expelled by ILGA, that had condoned paedophilia in the past. A delegation questioned the nature of the affiliation of government organizations to ILGA. One Committee member wanted to find out whether some of the member organizations of ILGA had already been granted consultative status with the Council.

10. At its 2nd meeting, on 7 May, the Committee reviewed the response of the organization and raised questions about the organization’s representation by a lawyer. A number of representatives also underlined that a non-governmental organization could not ratify
or sign an international covenant or treaty, as the organization had claimed it had done with respect to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. A representative noted that the issue of homosexuality was a divisive one in his country where examples of discrimination or violence had occurred because of an individual’s sexual orientation. Thus, ILGA could be considered a human rights non-governmental organization, committed to addressing the plight of others. The Committee deferred the application of the organization pending response to additional questions posed by the Committee.

Antioch Christian Centre

11. At its 3rd meeting, on 8 May, the Committee considered the application of Antioch Christian Centre. A number of Committee members questioned whether the organization was a church or an organization. A Committee member expressed his concern on whether the organization used its activities in order to evangelize the areas where the organization operated. Additional documentation on the work of the organization was requested by the Committee. The representative of the organization explained that the organization was both a church and a legally established non-governmental organization working with disadvantaged people together with other associations and churches. His organization could contribute to the work of the Council by bringing its expertise in counselling drug abusers, prisoners and disadvantaged people. The Committee deferred consideration of the application pending response of the organization to its questions.

Population Reference Bureau

12. At its 3rd meeting, on 8 May, the Committee considered the application of Population Reference Bureau. A number of Committee members questioned the finances of the organizations and particularly the high contributions it had received from Governments. One Committee member requested the organization to clarify how it could help population and health programmes in developing countries. The same delegation also asked additional details on the working relationship between the organization and the head of the Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat.

Mountain Women Development Organization

13. At its 3rd meeting, on 8 May, the Committee considered the application of Mountain Women Development Organization. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred the application of the organization, pending correction of names of territories incorrectly used by the organization. The organization had to use the recognized names used in United Nations terminology. As the Committee had not received a response on this specific issue, it deferred consideration of the application.

University of Missouri Kansas City Women’s Council

14. At its 4th meeting, on 8 May, the Committee considered the application of University of Missouri Kansas City Women’s Council. Members of the Committee sought clarification concerning the representation of the organization at the United Nations international conferences. The Committee deferred consideration of the application.

Swedish Organisation of Disabled Persons International Aid Association

15. At the 4th meeting, on 8th May, members of the Committee requested the organization to mention the name of the non-governmental organization that had accredited it to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the organization.

Millennium Institute

16. At the same meeting, on 8 May, the Committee, while reviewing the application of the organization, questioned the nature of its activities, and its aims and finances. One Committee member wondered whether the projects implemented by the organization had been ordered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Another delegation noted that the organization had referred to Taiwan and requested that the reference be corrected to Taiwan, Province of China. Another delegation sought clarification on whether the programme of the organization entitled “Threshold 21” was a trademark registration. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the organization.
International Society of Doctors for the Environment

17. At its 5th meeting, on 9 May, the Committee deferred consideration of the application of the organization after asking clarification on the lack of the organization’s registration in Switzerland.¹

Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International

18. At its 5th meeting, on 9 May, the Committee posed additional questions and deferred consideration of the application of the organization. It requested clarification on the fact that the organization had been established in France, was based in Switzerland but was registered in Norway.

United Nations Watch

19. At its 5th meeting, on 9 May, the Committee considered the application of United Nations Watch, an organization consideration of whose application had been deferred at the 2000 session of the Committee. Members of the Committee asked additional questions of the organization, particularly on its finances and the high cost of its administration. Some members of the Committee also sought to identify the umbrella organization that allowed the organization to participate in United Nations meetings. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the organization.

Marmara Group Strategic and Social Research Foundation

20. At its 6th meeting, on 9 May, the Committee considered the application of Marmara Group Strategic and Social Research Foundation. A Committee member questioned the nature of the organization and also its finances, noting that the main part of its contributions came from the Government, intergovernmental organizations, donations and fund-raising. The Committee reviewed the reply of the organization at its 20th meeting, on 18 May, and further deferred the consideration of its application to its 2001 resumed session pending a response to questions posed by the Committee.

International Religious Liberty Association

21. At its 16th meeting, on 16 May, the Committee examined the application of the International Religious Liberty Association. Committee members requested the organization to provide additional and specific information on its aims, activities and finances. A Committee member requested the organization to explain in what capacity it was able to maintain a presence at United Nations Headquarters in New York and at the United Nations office at Geneva. The Committee deferred consideration of the application pending response of the organization to its questions.

Family Research Council

22. At its 6th meeting, on 9 May, the Committee considered the application of Family Research Council. Some members noted that the organization had participated in the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly entitled “Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century” in the year 2000. A delegation asked whether the organization was one of those that had harassed delegations during the special session. The Committee questioned the views of the organization on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and whether the organization was opposed to the ratification by the United States of America of the Convention. A Committee member questioned the organization’s position on the issue of abortion. The representative of the organization explained that his organization did have some concerns regarding some of the provisions of the Convention. He added that the organization strongly supported the relationship between family, faith, freedom and the rule of law. The Committee decided to defer the application pending the response of the organization detailing its activities for combating the illegal trafficking of women.

Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights

23. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred the application of the organization. Concern was expressed that the organization’s application referred to various activities with political implications. The representative of the organization had explained that his organization provided assistance to the poor and to refugees in Kyrgyzstan, assisting those suffering human rights violations, and stated that his organization did not pursue any political ends. At its 18th meeting, on 17 May, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application pending...
consultation with the Government of Kyrgyzstan on the organization.

Väestöliitto — Family Federation of Finland

24. At its 19th and 20th meetings, on 18th May, the Committee considered the application of Väestöliitto — Family Federation of Finland. Some members of the Committee underlined that the organization’s membership included several governmental officials and therefore wondered whether it was independent in its policy-making decisions. A delegation believed that the organization was a political party and wondered whether political parties could be considered non-governmental organizations. Another delegation, referring to paragraph 12 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, pointed out that any organization that was not established by a governmental entity or intergovernmental agreement should be considered a non-governmental organization, including organizations that accepted members designated by governmental authorities, provided that such membership did not interfere with the free expression of views of the organization. It was decided that this important issue should be placed in the agenda of the informal working group of the Committee on non-governmental organizations and the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application of the organization.

In Honor of Mandela Fund

25. At its 2000 session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application pending the outcome of a legal procedure undertaken by the organization to use the name “Mandela”. A representative from the delegation of South Africa, in his capacity of observer, had confirmed that a decision was still pending on the issue. At its 16th meeting, on 16 May, the representative of the organization informed the Committee that the organization had legally and officially changed its name to Education and Literacy Fund for Africa. She also added that the names of the schools the organization intended to build had been changed from Mandela Institutes to Umtata Scholar Schools.

26. The Committee decided that the organization had to submit a new application in the name of Education and Literacy Fund for Africa and refrain from any mention of its previous name.

International Commission on Distance Education

27. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred consideration of the application further to the concern expressed regarding the unauthorized use of the United Nations logo by the organization. Questions were also raised concerning the organization’s association with the Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation. At its 17th meeting, on 17 May, the Committee considered the application of the International Commission on Distance Education and asked detailed information concerning its activities in the sector of information technology and its contribution to the work of the Economic and Social Council. The representative of the organization explained that the organization worked with the Albert Schweitzer University in Geneva, a private, online university. The representative stated that his organization participated in the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). He pointed out that though students were coming mainly from Spain, the organization hoped to expand its activities to other Spanish-speaking Latin American countries. The organization had also envisaged expanding its activities to Africa and India. The Committee decided to defer its decision on the application of the organization pending further consideration.

28. The Committee deferred consideration of the following organizations pending clarifications from the organizations regarding their financial statements:

Africa Infrastructure Foundation
Network of East-West Women
Centre Féminin pour la promotion du développement

29. The Committee deferred consideration of the applications of the following organizations after one of its members raised questions on their possible contribution to the work of the Economic and Social Council:

European Association of Automotive Suppliers
Motorcycle Riders Foundation

30. The Committee deferred consideration of A Woman’s Voice International, which had not responded to questions posed by the Committee at its 2000 session.
31. At its 2nd meeting, on 7 May, the Committee decided to close the case of the application of Consumer World Organization, without prejudice to its right to reapply. It was recalled that there had been some confusion at previous sessions on the nature of the activities of this organization, which had not responded to questions raised by Committee members. The organization was encouraged to apply again in the future with redefined aims and goals of its activities if it still was interested in obtaining consultative status with the Council.

32. The Committee deferred consideration of the following applications pending the response of these organizations to the questions posed by the Committee:

- Non-Aligned Students and Youth Organization
- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
- A Centre for the World Religions
- Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers
- Pioneer People Trust
- World Council for Psychotherapy
- American Society of Safety Engineers

33. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not review the following organizations whose applications were deferred to the 2001 resumed session:

- Amitié sans frontières internationale
- Argentina Association of International Law
- Center for Policy Alternatives
- International Energy Foundation
- International Society for Human Rights
- Leadership for Environment and Development
- Community of Sant’Egidio
- Russian Public Movement “For Civil Rights”
- Alliance musulmane d’Angola
- Association mauritanienne pour le bien-être et le secours de l’enfant et de la mère
- Comite international pour le respect et l’application de la Charte africaine des droits de l’homme et des peoples

International Communities for the Renewal of the Earth
Federation of Ijaw Communities
Felege Guinhon International
Jubilee Campaign
United World Colleges
Wales Assembly of Women

2. Requests for reclassifications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (1998, 1999 and 2000)

34. At its 7th meeting, on 10 May, the Committee considered the requests for reclassifications deferred from previous sessions as contained in documents E/C.2/2001/CRP.2 and E/C.2/2000/R.3/Add.1 and R.3/Add.2.

International PEN

35. At its 1998 and 1999 sessions, the Committee considered a request for reclassification to special consultative status from International PEN, an organization on the Roster. At its 1999 resumed session, one delegation indicated that the organization was actively interfering in the internal affairs of her country and that it had relationships with individuals or groups engaged in illegal activities in her country. The Committee deferred consideration of the request of the organization because it was not yet in a position to make a decision on this application.

36. At its 2000 resumed session, a number of delegations noted that a number of respected intellectuals were represented on the organization’s board. However, there was no consensus on the application. The representative of Cuba found the response provided by the organization on its trip to Cuba unsatisfactory. She asked for further information on the organization’s activities in Cuba, particularly during the week the representatives of the organization had entered Cuba on tourist visas. She requested additional information on the “fact-finding” missions of the organization in Cuba and wanted to know which Cuban authorities had been contacted during these missions. A number of delegations underlined that the organization had already apologized for entering Cuba on a tourist visa and made clear that it would not happen again. Some delegations felt that this issue
should not be revisited year after year. Another Committee member noted that the organization has a particular area of specialization and was in consultative status with UNESCO (Roster). He felt that it was a case of reclassification and the Committee should wait for a consensus decision on this aspect. After a lengthy debate, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification pending additional information from the organization.

37. At its 7th meeting, on 10 May, members of the Committee noted that the organization had not responded to the questions posed by the delegation of Cuba at the 2000 resumed session of the Committee and decided to defer the review of the request of reclassification of the application pending response from the organization.

International Peace Bureau

38. At its 1999 session, the Committee decided to defer the request for reclassification of International Peace Bureau, an organization on the Roster, pending further clarification to questions posed by the Committee on its high administration expenditures and receipt of government funding. At its 2000 resumed session, a number of delegations raised questions on the umbrella nature of the organization and its relation with another organization, Hague Appeal for Peace, applying for consultative status at the same session. Pursuant to the fact that a non-governmental organization asking for consultative status should not be involved in political activities, several delegations questioned the affiliation of the organization with political organizations. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification pending further response by the organization to the question posed by the Committee.

39. At its 2001 session, the Committee was informed by the organization that it had decided to withdraw its request for reclassification. At its 7th meeting, on 10 May, the Committee decided to close consideration of the request by this organization for reclassification.

40. Also at its 7th meeting, the Committee considered requests for reclassification deferred from its 2000 session contained in documents E/C.2/2000/R.3/Add.1 and R.3/Add.2.

Armenian Relief Society

41. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification contained in the application of this organization pending response from the organization to questions raised by the Committee (E/C.2/2000/R.3/Add.2). During the 2001 session of the Committee, at its 7th meeting, on 10 May, one delegation circulated a number of documents among the members of the Committee with a view to underlining the political nature of the organization’s activities, and the hatred it promoted in its publications, and denouncing the education it provided in the education facilities it operated. The representative of Turkey stated that Armenian Relief Society (ARS) was a controversial non-governmental organization and not an innocent relief organization. He said that the organization had even been banned by the Armenian authorities in the mid-1990s and that it was deeply involved in political work and pursues pan-Armenian ideals. ARS had explicit links with a political party, which had been involved in terrorist activities in the recent past. It had close links with organizations like Armenian Youth Federation, which promoted terrorism.

42. The delegate underlined that the application had been rejected in 1985 on the grounds of its links to terrorist groups and its sole interest in a single ethnic group. ARS continued to question the territorial integrity of Turkey in its official publications and promoted hatred, violence, intolerance, culture of revenge and prejudice based on ethnicity. He further stressed that the organization infected young minds with a culture of hate and violence and contributed to a camp where terrorism was promoted and praised through re-enacting some terrorist attacks, including a raid on the Turkish Embassy in Lisbon in 1983 by Armenian terrorists during which the wife of the Turkish Ambassador had been killed.

43. Bearing in mind the hatred ARS tried to promote in its official publications, the representative of Turkey wondered what sort of education it provided in the education facilities it operated.

44. Aims and activities of ARS ran counter to Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, part I, paragraph 2, which stated that the aims and purposes of the organization should be in conformity with the
spirit, purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

45. The delegation of Turkey strongly believed that ARS did not deserve any status with the Economic and Social Council and that the Committee should reject the reclassification requested by the organization. The representative of Turkey also underlined that its delegation reserved its right to seek further action on the reconsideration of the current status of the non-governmental organization in accordance with the Council resolution 1996/31.

46. At the 7th meeting on 10 May, the delegation of Azerbaijan stated the following:

“I would like to bring to your attention a matter of high concern to my delegation to refer to the Armenian Relief Society (ARS), a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (Roster) and its request for reclassification to general consultative status, under agenda item 3 (a).

“As you will recall, at the session of the Committee in January, the members were informed that this non-governmental organization illegally enters and operates in the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan without permission and/or informing competent national authorities. Thus ARS disregards and violates the principle of sovereignty.

“As you will see, in its official application for reclassification, ARS refers to the Nagorno-Karabakh region of the Republic of Azerbaijan as the ‘Nagorno Karabakh Republic’, classifies it as an independent State and places it among other countries. Allow me to recall that the relevant resolutions by the General Assembly and the Security Council have unequivocally reconfirmed that the Nagorny-Karabakh region is an integral part of the Republic of Azerbaijan. The usage of deliberately distorted terminology and its wide circulation in the United Nations by ARS directly contradict the language adopted by the principal organs of the United Nations. Consequently, ARS disregards and violates the principle of territorial integrity.

“In its reply to our relevant questions, this non-governmental organization has not clarified its position; moreover, it has used the tricky wording, while during the personal meeting the representative of ARS promised to make due corrections pursuant to the language adopted in the United Nations. So, the fact that this has not happened indicates that there is a political motive behind ARS terminology. Such a form of propaganda chosen by the organization directly contradicts the requirement of paragraph 7 (a) of the questionnaire adopted by the Committee, which reads as follows: ‘All documents must adhere to the United Nations terminology with respect to territories and countries’.

“There are other instances that clearly indicate the fact that ARS is involved in politically motivated activity. This activity is carried out under the auspices of a political party, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation (ARF), and under the immediate leadership of ARF’s ‘political advocacy arm’, the Armenian National Committee of America (ANCA). The enclosed materials attests that ARS, despite its officially declared non-political status, is actively participating in a political campaign, supporting ANCA’s lobbyist activity in the United States Congress.

“Additionally, one of the members of the Executive Board of ARS, Mrs. A. Petrosyan, is a member of the Parliament of the Republic of Armenia representing the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. Moreover, it is not a coincidence that ARS and ANCA share one and the same headquarters at 80 Bigelow Avenue, Watertown, Massachusetts, 02472.

“Distinguished delegates!

“All these activities by the Armenian Relief Society stand as a clear violation of the rules governing its relationship with the Economic and Social Council, in particular paragraph 2 of resolution 1996/31. Apparently, should the ARS be granted general consultative status, the political party named ‘Armenian Revolutionary Federation’, standing behind this non-governmental organization will acquire ample opportunities for politically motivated activities within the United Nations.

“Given the foregoing facts, I should like to request the distinguished members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations
to refuse the Armenian Relief Society general consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, and, further, to reconsider its current status.

“Thank you!”

47. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification of the organization to its resumed 2001 session.

**International Association of Charities**

48. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee decided to defer consideration of this organization, placed in the Roster by virtue of its consultative status with UNESCO, pending the outcome of the debate of the Committee on the question of granting consultative status with the Economic and Social Council to non-governmental organizations placed in the Roster by virtue of their consultative status with other United Nations bodies such as the specialized agencies. At its 7th meeting, on 10 May, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the request pending the outcome of the discussion of the Informal Working Group of the Committee on this matter.

49. Owing to the lack of time, the Committee did not review the requests for reclassification of the Movement for a Better World and the World Safety Organization (E/C.2/2000/R.3/Add.2) and deferred consideration thereof to its 2001 resumed session.

**B. New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification**

1. New applications for consultative status

50. The Committee considered agenda item 3 (b), entitled “New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification”, contained in documents E/C.2/2001/R.2 and Add.1-5, and E/C.2/2001/R.3) at its 21st to 28th meetings, from 21 to 24 May 2001. At those meetings, the Committee decided to defer the applications of the following organizations to its 2001 resumed session, pending receipt of further clarification:

- Association of American Railroads
- Association of Expelled Persons
- Canada Family Action Coalition
- Confederation of European Forest Owners
- Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance
- Federation of Women Lawyers in Kenya
- Hope for Africa
- International Environmental Law Research Centre
- International Movement for Leisure Activities in Science and Technology
- International Planned Parenthood Federation-African Region
- International Planned Parenthood Federation-European Region
- International Possibilities Unlimited
- Japan Civil Liberties Union
- Medico International
- National Abortion Federation
- National Association of Non-Governmental Organizations
- National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty
- National Council of the Saemaul–Undong Movement
- Nonviolence International
- Rainforest Foundation
- World Forum on the Future of Sport Shooting Activities
- World Permanent Organization for the Jamahiriyan Youth

51. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not have time to review the following applications whose requests were deferred to the 2001 resumed session:

- Association marocaine de planification familiale
- Becket Fund for Religious Liberty
- Canadian Race Relations Foundation
- Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and action
- Citizens’ Rights Protection Society
Drug Watch International
Indonesian National Council on Social Welfare
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies
International Federation of Medical Students’ Associations
Network “Earth Village”
Population Concern
Refugees International

2. New requests for reclassification

52. Owing to the lack of time, the Committee did not consider the following two new requests for reclassification (E/C.2/2001/R.3):

- European Union of Women
- Union nationale de la femme tunisienne

III. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304

53. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations considered agenda item 4, entitled “Review of the methods of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations and Council decision 1995/304”, at its 8th, 20th and 30th meetings, on 10, 18 and 25 May 2001.

A. Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations

54. The Committee considered agenda item 4 (a) (Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations) at its 20th meeting, on 18 May 2001, and was briefed about the work of the Informal Working Group.

55. At its 2000 session, the Committee had decided to establish an informal working group to review its methods of work.

56. The Informal Working Group had met on 26 September, 20 November and 8 December 2000 at which times it considered the following issues on which it reported to the 2000 resumed session of the Committee: accreditation procedures, coordination with the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, non-governmental organizations training to be enhanced, security issues, the volume of applications received by the Secretariat and non-governmental organization invitations to the Committee’s meetings.

57. In 2001, it also met on 2 March and 30 April to continue its consideration of accreditation procedures, and proposals were put forward on additional mechanisms, that could facilitate a better coordination with the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights. It was stressed that further cooperation should be established with the non-governmental organization liaison officer at the United Nations Office at Geneva and with the security services in order to ensure proper progress of the meetings as well as order and respect of United Nations procedures inside the Commission conference room.

58. At its 20th meeting, on 18 May, the Committee had the opportunity to hold a first exchange of views on two complementary draft proposals submitted by the delegations of India and Germany in view of proposing to the Committee a new application questionnaire for consultative status which would better meet the information criteria sought for by Committee members when they reviewed new application requests submitted by non-governmental organizations. Those delegations reported to the Committee on progress made by the Working Group on this issue. The Committee agreed that the contents of the questionnaire should be carefully thought out in order to be better focused and bring more clarity to the review made by the Committee of the new applications. The Working Group had the responsibility of taking into account valid proposals made by other Member States, not members of the Working Group, and also of hearing the views of the Secretariat on this important issue.
B. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31

59. The Committee considered agenda item 4 (b) (Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31) at its 8th meeting, on 10 May 2001.

60. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the issue of non-governmental organizations whose defining characteristics were not in strict conformity with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, namely, commercial/industrial, professional, religious, research/educational, and Government-funded organizations. Several members of the Committee suggested that a precedent had already been set by granting status to these types of organizations in the past. Further, one member of the Committee suggested that the granting of consultative status to industry or commercial-based non-governmental organizations might cause a further imbalance between the number of non-governmental organizations granted consultative status from the North with respect to those granted consultative status from the South, as industry/commercial non-governmental organizations were not only well financed, but based primarily in the North.

61. At its 2000 resumed session, the Chairman of the Committee suggested that the Committee should take action on the applications that had been placed in that category for a considerable time. To assist the Committee in its decisions, he referred to paragraphs 1, 2 and 8 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, stipulating that the organization should be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, that it should undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities, in accordance with its own aims and purposes and the nature and scope of its competence and activities, and that organizations should be admitted provided that they could demonstrate that their programme of work was of direct relevance to the aims and purposes of the United Nations.

62. During its 8th meeting, on 10 May, the Committee considered this issue and deferred consideration of the applications of the organizations mentioned below, which remained in this category, pending further deliberation.

**German Advisory Council on Global Change**

63. The Committee had deferred consideration of the application of the German Advisory Council on Global Change at its 1998, 1999 and 2000 sessions on the basis of questions raised regarding its extensive funding from the Government. A Committee member expressed the view that an organization could be funded up to 100 per cent by the government, as long as that funding was disclosed, as had been the case with the organization. However, a number of delegations had reservations on the independence of the organization, given its membership, which was entirely composed of representatives appointed by the Government.

64. At its 8th meeting, on 10 May, the representative of Germany explained, as he had in previous sessions of the Committee, that, in his country, the Government could fund a non-governmental organization and ask for its expertise. He expressed the view that the organization was a commendable one, independent in its decision-making and could contribute to the Economic and Social Council in a supplementary way. The Committee decided to defer action on the organization.

**Confederation of German Forest Owners Associations**

65. The Committee had also deferred consideration of this application at its 1998, 1999 and 2000 sessions. Concerns were expressed by a number of Committee members regarding whether the organization represented the personal interests of private owners and whether it could make a concrete contribution to the work of the Economic and Social Council. The Committee deferred its decision on the application.

66. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not consider the following organizations deferred from its 1998 and 1999 sessions, which remained in the category:

- Syrian Orthodox Church in America
- Southern States Police Benevolent Association
Working Party “Brussels 1952”

67. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had decided to add the issue of organizations whose defining characteristics were not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 in the agenda of its Informal Working Group. However, this issue had not been reviewed by the Working Group yet.

C. Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat

68. The Committee considered agenda item 3 (c) (Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat) at its 30th meeting, on 25 May 2001.

69. On this issue, the Chief of the Section presented the statistics on the work accomplished and stressed that although the Section had achieved progress and improvement in its methods of work, a lot remained to be done. The ever increasing workload in the Section had reached a point where the number of incoming applications had outpaced the capacity of the office to deal with them.

70. The Section had worked on the development of a comprehensive database to keep track of the 2,050 organizations now in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. However, it needed to be improved and continually updated to expand the information gathered on non-governmental organization-related issues. On a positive note, the Non-Governmental Organization Section’s web page release 2.5 is now available at the address www.un.org/esa//ngo. In addition the section had presented over 30 workshops in 2000-2001, to non-governmental organizations, both at headquarters and in the field. The section had also launched a non-governmental organization informal regional network to strengthen non-governmental organizations in regions. The purpose of this network is to facilitate communication between non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council and the Non-Governmental Organizations Section/Department of Economic and Social Affairs to foster the collaborative relationship among non-governmental organizations and to enhance the involvement of all non-governmental organizations in the programmes and capability of the Council, particularly those of the high-level segment, and the United Nations at large. The Section’s workload would continue to grow and diversify in the future. It would have to call on all its resources to devise innovative ways to continue the mutually beneficial relationship between the Council and the community of non-governmental organizations.

71. The Committee expressed concern on the record increase in new applications, which has been due to a surge in organizations seeking accreditation for events related to the new millennium. Various views were put forward stressing the need to address the workload issue seriously and urgently. Delegations expressed the views that the item should be discussed further at the resumed session of the Committee in order to identify a solution to an issue that had become increasingly complex over the last years and was anticipated to worsen in the future. The Committee requested that the item should also be placed in the agenda of its Informal Working Group in order to identify solutions, which could be presented at the resumed session of the Committee.

IV. Implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/302

72. The Committee considered agenda item 5 entitled “Implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/302”, at its 8th meeting, on 10 May 2001. It had before it a background paper prepared by the Secretariat and views expressed by the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat on the issue under consideration.

73. At its 2000 resumed session in January 2001, when the Committee began to review this item, it had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications from non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development to expand their participation in other fields of the Economic and Social Council (Conférence room paper No. 7), pursuant to Council decision 1996/302 of 26 July 1996. Pursuant to that decision, those organizations that wished to do so should so inform the Council’s Committee on Non-Governmental
Organizations which would take appropriate action as expeditiously as possible.

74. At the same session, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat listing the 539 non-governmental organizations accredited to the Commission on Sustainable Development of which 101 organizations had already been placed on the Economic and Social Council Roster pursuant to Council decision 1996/302. Committee members expressed the view that the non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission had in the past been granted consultative status without having had to submit to the Secretariat the requisite questionnaire and other documents submitted by organizations applying for Roster consultative status with the Council. Members felt that the existing procedure was discriminating against other organizations who had followed normal procedure as stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31.

75. The Committee expressed the view that the whole procedure should be reviewed and streamlined. Concern was also expressed by Committee members that the Secretariat did not have any file or documents proving the existence and activities of non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development, except for a simple form showing the name of these organizations and their contact numbers. Committee members agreed that there was an anomalous discrepancy between applications from these organizations and others.

76. It seemed that there was a need for procedures to be corrected and the Committee requested that the Secretariat contact the Office of Legal Affairs on this issue. It also requested that consultations be conducted with the Secretariat of the Commission on Sustainable Development to confirm whether the list containing the 539 non-governmental organizations accredited to the Commission was still an active list used by the Commission. It was also decided that the issue would be added to the agenda of the Informal Working Group of the Committee who would consider all aspects of the issue and make recommendations to the Committee.

77. At its 8th meeting, on 10 May, the Committee reviewed the background paper prepared by the Secretariat reflecting the discussion undertaken between the Division for ECOSOC Support and Coordination and the Division for Sustainable Development and the views expressed by the Office of Legal Affairs on the matter. The Committee members expressed the view that the non-governmental organizations on the Roster of the Commission on Sustainable Development should go through the same (process) channels of application for consultative status with the Council as any other organization, as outlined in resolution 1996/31. The clarification provided by the Office of the Legal Counsel stated that the Committee was not required to accord those organizations any special treatment, but rather should just treat their applications as it would any other applications. The Committee would consider these applications, in the agenda, as expeditiously as possible (see chap. I, draft decision II).

V. Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

78. The Committee considered item 6 of its agenda at its 11th to 16th, 19th and 24th meetings, on 14 to 16, 18 and 22 May 2001. The Committee had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations on their activities during the period 1996-1999 (E/C.2/2001/2 and Add.1-19) and pending quadrennial reports of non-governmental organizations on their activities during the period 1994-1997 and 1995-1998 (E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1). It also considered quadrennial reports from previous sessions (E/C.2/2000/CRP.2).

79. At its 11th to 16th, 19th and 24th meetings, the Committee took note of 172 quadrennial reports and deferred consideration of another 56, pending responses from the organization to questions posed by the Committee.

80. The Committee took note of the following quadrennial reports:  
   Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission  
   Academic Council on the United Nations system  
   Action Aid  
   Adventist Development and Relief Agency
Africa-America Institute  
Afro-Asian Peoples’ Solidarity Organization  
AFS Inter-Cultural Programs  
Airports Council International (formerly Airports Association Council International)  
All-China Women’s Federation  
Alliance for Arab Women  
American Council for Voluntary International Action  
American Jewish Committee  
Arab Network for Environment Development  
Asian Federation of Laryngectomees Association  
Asian Women’s Human Rights Council  
Association for the Advancement of Psychological Understanding of Human Nature  
Association François Xavier Bagnoud  
Association of the Bar of the City of New York  
Association tunisienne de Mères  
Bochasanwasi Shree Akshar Purushottam Sanstha  
Brothers of Charity  
CARE International  
Catholic Institute for International Relations  
Centre for Social Research  
Centre of Economic and Social Studies of the Third World  
Centro de Estudios Economicos y Sociales del Tercer Mundo A.C.  
Centro Nazionale di Prevenzione e Difesa Sociale  
Change  
Colombian Confederation of Non-Governmental Organizations  
Conference of European Churches  
Congregation of Our Lady of Charity and the Good Shepherd  
Congress of Black Women of Canada  
Counterpart Foundation  
Cousteau Society  
Cuban Movement for Peace and the People’s Sovereignty  
Data for Development  
Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era  
Development Innovations and Networks  
DEVNET Association  
Economists Allied for Arms Reduction  
Egyptian Red Crescent Society  
European Federation of Older Students at Universities  
European Network of Policewomen  
European Women’s Lobby  
Federal Union of European Nationalities  
Federation internationale de l’Automobile  
Federation of Cuban Women  
Felix Varela Center  
FEMNET — African Women’s Development and Communication Network  
Four Directions Council  
Franciscans International  
Fraternité Notre Dame  
General Arab Women Federation  
Global Education Associates  
Good Neighbours International  
Goodwill Industries, International  
Hope Worldwide  
Human Appeal International  
Humane Society of the United States  
Indian Council of Education  
Indigenous World Association  
Institut de cooperation Europe-Asie-Amérique latine (European-Asian-Latin American Institute for Cooperation)  
Institute for War and Peace Reporting
Institute of Social Studies Trust
Integrated Care Society
Inter-American Press Association
International Academy of Architecture
International Association against Torture
International Association for Impact Assessment
International Association for Volunteer Effort
International Association of Youth and Family Judges and Magistrates (formerly International Association of Juvenile and Family Court Magistrates)
International Black Sea Club
International Catholic Migration Commission
International Catholic Union of the Press
International Centre for Ethnic Studies
International Centre of Sociological, Penal and Penitentiary Research and Studies
International Chamber of Shipping
International Confederation of Christian Family Movements
International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity
International Cooperative Alliance
International Council for Adult Education
International Council of Prison Medical Services
International Council on Social Welfare
International Federation for Hydrocephalus and Spina Bifida
International Federation of Associations of the Elderly
International Federation of Industrial Energy Consumers
International Federation of Non-Governmental Organizations for the Prevention of Drug and Substance Abuse
International Federation of the Little Brothers of the Poor
International Federation on Ageing
International Federation Terre des Hommes
International Fellowship of Reconciliation
International Forum for Child Welfare
International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
International Institute of Humanitarian Law
International Islamic Charitable Organization
International Kolping Society
International Movement ATD Fourth World
International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
International Planned Parenthood Federation
International Prison Watch
International Real Estate Federation
International Road Transport Union
International Rural Housing Association
International Save the Children Alliance
International Service for Human Rights
International Social Security Association
International Tunnelling Association
International Union for the Scientific Study of Population
International Women’s Health Coalition
Inter-Press Service International Association (IPS)
Inuit Circumpolar Conference
ISIS International
Jigyansu Tribal Research Center
Junior Chamber International
Latin American Association of Finance Development Institutions
Latin American Committee for the Defence of Women’s Rights
Latin American Iron and Steel Institute
League of Women Voters of the United States
Learning for a Sustainable Future
Light and Hope Association for Blind Girls (Al Nour Wal Amal Association)
Madre
Medical Women’s International Association
Mediterranean Women’s Studies Centre
Mercy-USA for Aid and Development (formerly Mercy International — USA)
Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights
National Council of German Women’s Organizations — Federal Union of Women’s Organizations and Women’s Group of German Associations, E.V.
National Council of Negro Women
National Safety Council
National Union of Jurists of Cuba
Netherlands Organization for International Development Cooperation
New Humanity
Nippon International Cooperation for Community Development
Nord-Sud XXI
Organization for Industrial, Spiritual and Cultural Advancement International
Organization of African Trade Union Unity
Organization of Islamic Capitals and Cities
Pan Pacific and South East Asia Women’s Association
Pan-African Women’s Organization
Peace Education Foundation
Perhaps ... Kids Meeting Kids Can Make a Difference
Permanent Assembly for Human Rights
Planetary Society
Population Council
Prison Fellowship International
Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH)
Richmond Fellowship International
Service Peace and Justice in Latin America
Solar Cookers International
SOS Drugs International
SOS-Kinderdorf International
Special Olympics International
St. Joan’s International Alliance
Temple of Understanding
Trickle Up Program
Union of Arab Jurists
Union of Ibero American Capitals — Intermunicipal Financial and Economic Centre for Advice and Cooperation
Unitarian Universalist Committee
Water Environment Federation
Wittenberg Center for Alternative Resources
Woods Hole Research Center
Word of Life Christian Fellowship
World Association of Children’s Friends
World Conference of Mayors for Peace through Inter-City Solidarity
World Economic Forum
World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY)
World Federation of Methodist and Uniting Church Women
World Federation of Trade Unions
World Futures Studies Federation
World Muslim Congress
World Resources Institute
World Vision International
Worldwide Network — Women in Development and Environment
Youth for Unity and Voluntary Action
81. The delegation of India made the following statement on the World Muslim Congress:

“...My delegation had posed certain questions related to the quadrennial report of this organization. The responses were tardy, forcing us to repeat the questions to which even now we do not have complete answers.

“Mr. Chairman, you would note from the response dated 19 June 2000 in the section on answer to question 3, which says that after the Plenary Assembly of the organization from March to April 1988, its Constitution was amended regarding membership. The organization says that it tried to find the letter intimating these amendments to the Economic and Social Council, but could not find a copy. The copy of the Constitution which has been given to us yesterday is the one that was adopted in 1962 and is not the one with the said amendments.

“Mr. Chairman, in our debates we have recognized the need to utilize quadrennial reports to satisfy ourselves of the progress that non-governmental organizations make over the years. When this organization was granted consultative status by a vote in 1967, where most members abstained, this Committee stated in its report (E/C.2/L.27 of 1967) and I quote: ‘Note was taken of its failure to be representative of many groups of Muslims in the various regions of the world.’ It is also interesting to note that when consultative status was granted, it was an organization without individual membership and only organizations from individual countries were members. According to the response of the organization dated 19 June 2000, its basic structure was amended in 1988 by changing the membership rules. We say this because the structure of any organization depends on the nature of its membership. Clearly, this has undergone a sea change. Indeed, the focus of this organization’s activities also has witnessed a sea change over the years. While delivering statements in the United Nations, it subscribes to a number of agenda items but the contents of the statements are invariably directed against my country. Surely, the aims and objectives of this organization which was started in 1926 in the holy city of Mecca and later permanently moved to its current location are not being fulfilled by focusing on this narrow political agenda. Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me bring home the point that, what was noted in the 1967 report of the Committee about the failure of this organization to be representative of many groups of Muslims in the various regions of the world not only continues but its focus has become narrower.

“In order not to expend the time and energy of this Committee and its members any further, we would go along with and agree to take note of the quadrennial report of this organization for the period under consideration but we state that our reservations on the nature and focus of its activities remain. We would request that this statement be reported verbatim in the records.”

82. The following is the list of deferred quadrennial reports:

- African Society of International and Comparative Law
- American Association of Jurists
- Arab Organization for Human Rights
- Association de volontaires pour le service international
- Association for the Prevention of Torture
- Association of Arab-American University Graduates
- Association of Third World Studies (ATWS)
- Baptist World Alliance
- Christian Democratic International
- Commission for the Defense of Human Rights in Central America
- Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund (formerly Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund)
- Equality Now
- Federation of European Motorcyclists Association
- France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
- Friends World Committee for Consultation
- Inter-American Federation of Touring and Automobile Clubs
- International Association for Religious Freedom
83. The Russian delegation made the following statement on the Transnational Radical Party:

“Mr. Chairman,

“We have before us the four-year report of the political organization called the ‘Transnational Radical Party’. Unfortunately, the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ has not learned anything from the discussions we had last year when we examined its file. As before, this political organization rejects the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, carries out politically motivated activities against Member States, and serves as a political spokesman for terrorists and separatists. Under paragraphs 55 and 61 (c) of resolution 1996/31, all of these factors must be borne in mind when we consider the report of the ‘Transnational Radical Party’. We must carefully determine to what extent the activity of the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ is in conformity with its consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and what contribution it makes to the work of the Council.”
“To begin with, we suggest that the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ answer the following questions.

“Mr. Chairman,

“Paragraph 13 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 clearly indicates that any financial support from a Government to a non-governmental organization must be declared to our Committee and fully recorded in the organization’s financial records.

“In its first submission requesting consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, which was reviewed in 1995, the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ indicated that it received no resources whatsoever from any Government. How can this be reconciled, however, with the fact that the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ as a political party represented both in a national parliament and in the European Parliament receives governmental funds. By the way, on 25 February of this year, the leadership of the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ sent a letter to the President of the European Commission, Mr. Romano Prodi, in which it drew his urgent attention to the following (and I quote): ‘the provisions with respect to the financing of European political parties should be applied on an equal basis to all political parties represented in the European Parliament’. I would remind you that the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ is in fact one of those parties.

“In 1998 the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ set up a political organization involved in propaganda and the distribution of narcotics under the name of ‘Radical Anti-Prohibitionist Committee’ (CoRA). However, in its initial submission and in the financial portion of that initial request, the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ made no mention of ‘CoRA’, nor did it do so in its four-year report. We wish to receive exhaustive information on the activities of ‘CoRA’, including its financial accounts, its statute, the composition of its executive bodies, and descriptions of the campaigns and projects it has carried out. We would also like to receive clarification as to whether ‘CoRA’ carries out its activities exclusively on Italian territory or whether they cover other States as well. It is important to note that ‘CoRA’ calls itself a ‘political organization’. We should like to know what is the political nature of its activities.

“Beginning in 1975, the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ became involved in the illegal distribution of narcotics. We would like to know what channels are used in obtaining or producing the narcotics that the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ has distributed, where they are kept, and the names of those persons who were involved in obtaining, producing and storing the narcotics.

“It is the view of the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ that the prohibition of all narcotics is a crime ‘against humanity’. Does this mean that the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ accuses Governments that prohibit narcotics of committing a crime against humanity? Does the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ feel that the ban on all narcotic drugs, as a crime against humanity, falls under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court?

“The ‘Transnational Radical Party’ is fighting against the anti-narcotic drug conventions of the United Nations. These conventions, as is well known, are based on the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The result is, then, that in fighting against the conventions on controlling narcotic drugs, the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ is fighting against the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. How can that fight be reconciled with the consultative status of the ‘Transnational Radical Party’ and the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, which clearly states that the aims of the organization must be in conformity with the spirit, purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

the ‘Transnational Radical Party’s’ stance on the
criminal punishment of the distribution of
paedophilia, child prostitution and pornography
on the Internet.

“We await detailed and prompt answers to
these questions.

“Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

VI. Consideration of special reports
and complaints by Member States

84. The Committee considered agenda item 7 at its
9th, 10th and 29th meetings, on 11 and 25 May 2001. It
had before it a note by the Secretary-General
containing the special report of Freedom House
requested by the Committee, as well as several
complaints by States.

A. Consideration of special reports

Freedom House

85. At the first part of its 2000 session, the
Committee had had before it a complaint by the
delegation of China against Freedom House on the
grounds that the organization had improperly obtained
interpretation services for a panel discussion held
during the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on
Human Rights. The organization had been requested to
present a special report on its activities at its June 2000
session.

86. At the second part of its 2000 session in June
2000, the Committee had had before it a special report
and a response from Freedom House explaining the
incident. The Committee had deferred consideration of
the complaint to its 2000 resumed session, pending the
receipt of a response to questions posed by the
Committee members regarding the work of the
organization. The Chairman of the Committee had also
been requested to address a letter to the secretariat of
the Commission on Human Rights, requesting a report
on the outcome of the inquiry carried out by the United
Nations Secretariat in Geneva on the interpretation
incident.

87. At its 2000 resumed session in January 2001, the
Committee had had before it a response from the
secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, a
response from the organization to the questions posed
by the Committee and a letter from the organization
concerning the incident. Several delegations stated that
they had not been convinced by the responses provided
by the organizations and asked additional questions.
The Committee decided to defer consideration of the
status of Freedom House, pending receipt of a special
report on the role and activities undertaken by the
organization in Cuba and clarification to questions
posed by Committee members.

88. At its 9th meeting, on 11 May 2001, the
Committee had before it a special report by the
organization. Several delegations stated that they
needed more time to consider the report, which had
been distributed in all official languages the day before
the meeting. Its format was discussed, as were the
responses provided by the organization to questions
raised by the Committee members. The Committee
considered the matter at its 9th and 10th meetings, on
11 May, and at its 29th meeting, on 25 May.

89. At the 9th meeting, the Ambassador of Cuba
made the following statement:

“At the Committee’s session in June 2000,
the Cuban delegation complained about the
violations of Economic and Social Council
resolution 1996/31 committed by represen-
tatives of Freedom House during the fifty-sixth session
of the Commission on Human Rights.

“The organization had accredited to the
Commission a representative of the so-called
Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad
Frederick Hayek, whose request for consultative
status had been rejected by this Committee when
proof was established of its ties to terrorist
organizations that regularly participate in
politically motivated acts of aggression against
Cuba with the declared objective of subverting
the constitutional order and overthrowing the
Government of my country.

“Mr. Chairman:

“The Cuban delegation, which particularly
welcomes the very important role of non-
governmental organizations and their significant
contribution to the work of the United Nations, as
well as their efforts to defend and promote the
purposes and principles of the Charter of the
United Nations, believes that such organizations
have a fundamental obligation to respect the norms and procedures governing their relations with the United Nations.

“It should be recalled that the Committee’s concerns, doubts and objections about this so-called non-governmental organization were clearly indicated from the very moment when it considered the request by Freedom House for consultative status in 1995, when the Committee took the reasoned and objective decision not to approve the request.

“Unfortunately, that decision was later rescinded by a vote of the Economic and Social Council following intense pressure that was publicly and blatantly exerted by the United States Government.

“The conduct of the United States Government, though unusual in relations between governments and civil society, came as no surprise, since we all know that Freedom House operates as yet another agency of that Government, pursues its political objectives, follows its orders and depends on it for financing.

“This so-called non-governmental organization also has close, well known and irrefutably demonstrated ties to the United States special services, in particular the Central Intelligence Agency, under whose direction it carries out missions to destabilize legitimately constituted governments, spread libellous propaganda against sovereign States and engage in subversion and clandestine activities in several countries.

“Behind the image of Freedom House as a promoter of ‘democratic values’ lurks a subversive organization that is more akin to an intelligence service than to a non-governmental organization. Its activities against Cuba provide ample proof of this, since such activities range from material support for groups operating illegally in my country in the service of a foreign Power to the organization and funding of espionage activities against Cuba.

“I wish to draw the attention of the distinguished members of the Committee to a document that has been circulated by my delegation, entitled ‘Freedom House: a non-governmental organization in the service of the CIA’, which contains abundant evidence in support of these assertions.

“Freedom House participates on equal terms with other official United States agencies in the recent Cuba Programme created by the United States Government under section 109 of the Helms-Burton Act to destabilize our country by fostering, organizing and financing purportedly internal subversive groups.

“The organization grew directly out of the ‘Transition project’, which received generous funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to the tune of $500 million; that was followed by a further $275 million in 1999, which was increased in 2000 to $550 million. This information is contained in the congressional records and in the Federal Budget of the United States.

“The initial programme gave rise to the emergence of an anti-Cuban centre called the ‘Centre for a Free Cuba’, which is directed by Frank Calzón, a CIA agent and former Director of the Cuba Democracy Project of Freedom House. The Centre has already received more than a million dollars from USAID to promote subversion. The basic areas of work of the current Freedom House programme include recruiting, training and sending to Cuba, in order to commit acts of destabilization and subversion, so-called politicians, journalists and activists, mainly from Eastern Europe.

“USAID publicly acknowledged in June 2000 that Freedom House had organized the visit to Cuba of four journalists, four parliamentarians, two economists and an academic from Eastern Europe, all of whom were financed and trained with funds from the United States Government.

“At the Committee’s session in January, we mentioned some of the most recent activities against Cuba that were organized and financed by Freedom House, as stated in the Committee’s report (E/2001/8).

“Mr. Chairman,

“I wish to draw the attention of the distinguished members of the Committee to the note sent by Carlos Amat Forés, our Ambassador
in Geneva, at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, denouncing the serious, politically motivated and repeated violations committed by the organization Freedom House.

“As indicated in the list of participants (E/CN.4/2001/INF/1), Freedom House accredited as its representatives members of terrorist organizations, such as Jesús Permuy, Miguel Loredo and Janisset Rivero, persons of Cuban origin, who engage in a wide range of activities under the orders of the National Cuban American Foundation, a terrorist organization based in Miami.

“This so-called non-governmental organization, in violation of the procedures and norms of the United Nations, also circulated in Geneva documents without attribution and material of a political nature and content that was libellous and disrespectful to Heads of State and Government of Member States.

“The representatives of this curious organization circulated documents produced by terrorist organizations of Cuban origin that do not have consultative status, such as the ‘Directorio Revolucionario Democrático Cubano’ and the Foundation for Human Rights in Cuba, both headquartered in Miami, and even by a well known terrorist, who participated in the bombing campaign against hotels in Havana in 1997. Additional information on this subject is contained in the report of the Special Rapporteur on Mercenaries (E/CN.4/2000/14).

“The organization was also guilty of serious violations in the accreditation of its representatives and in the use of its credentials.

“Freedom House accredited Anda Celma, Valdis Abols and Ivan Pilip, citizens of countries of Eastern Europe, who travelled to Cuba to foment disorder and to organize groups that engaged in activities against the Government. It also organized during the fifty-seventh session a panel discussion involving these persons and aimed at sowing disorder.

“During those sessions, the accredited representatives of Freedom House, lent their identification passes to non-accredited individuals of Cuban origin for the express purpose of enabling them to gain entry into the meeting rooms of the Palais des Nations to engage in activities hostile to our delegation, provoke disorder and pursue political objectives. This not only constitutes a violation of resolution 1996/31, which stipulates the personal and non-transferable nature of identification passes, but is also an illegal and punishable act that put at risk the security of delegations, the normal functioning of diplomatic missions and the smooth organization of the events.

“Mr. Chairman,

“All of these actions together with the others mentioned in earlier meetings of the Committee prompted the request for a Special Report from this organization, which is due to be considered under this item.

“I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time which you so generously granted us during which I was able to quickly review the document just circulated to us. We note that it is not a Special Report on the activities of the Organization, as was requested, but merely an attempt to respond to the questions that had been asked earlier.

“Since the report requested is not yet available, I request you kindly, Mr. Chairman, to defer consideration of the item up to at least 24 May, which is also the date when it is scheduled to be taken up again, so that the members of the Committee would have the minimum time necessary to review it with all due care.

“I wish to reiterate our request for the Special Report to be submitted to the Committee, as provided for in the Committee’s procedures and practices. My delegation would also be grateful if the Secretariat could clarify whether it had explained to Freedom House in a detailed and timely manner the requirements of this Special Report and, consequently, explain why to date the Special Report has not been submitted.

“Given the present situation, it would be possible to have now, Mr. Chairman, only a preliminary discussion of the organization’s replies.

“Mr. Chairman,
“The Cuban delegation will continue to promote and defend the broadest possible access by the genuine representatives of civil society of all countries to the work of all organs of the United Nations, in all the broad diversity of subjects with which they deal.

“To this end, and in view of the very important and necessary contribution of legitimate non-governmental organizations to the United Nations, the Cuban delegation will not hesitate to denounce the use of so-called non-governmental organizations as vulgar instruments of aggressive and unscrupulous governments to pursue dirty political objectives, destabilize governments and violate the sovereignty of other States.

“I should be grateful, Mr. Chairman, if you would arrange for the text of this statement to be reproduced in full in the report.

“Thank you very much.”

90. The representative of China expressed concerns on the political objectives of Freedom House and said that he was still waiting for the replies from the organization to questions posed by his delegation. The representative of the Sudan raised the issue of the sources of information used by the organization and deplored that it had not contacted the Sudanese authorities to discuss a number of criticisms formulated towards her country. The delegate of the Russian Federation also stressed that Freedom House’s activities were increasingly politically motivated and irrespective of States boundaries, including on the question of the Chechen Republic of the Russian Federation, and that they had revealed “russo-phobia” on the part of the organization. The delegate of the United States of America reaffirmed the right of a non-governmental organization with consultative status, such as Freedom House, to criticize Member States at the Commission on Human Rights. He further stressed that the organization was independent from the Government of the United States, which it had criticized many times in the past.

91. At its 10th meeting, on 11 May, the Committee decided to request the organization Freedom House to submit a detailed special report at the 2001 resumed session of the Committee about its activities carried out in relation to Cuba, particularly its activities inside the country, including those of persons who had been sent by the organization to Cuba. The report should also include the criteria followed by the organization to designate and accredit its representatives to the meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council.

92. At its 29th meeting, on 25 May, the Committee resumed its consideration of the matter. The delegation of Cuba made the following statements:

Statement I

“Mr. Chairman,

“We once again have before us for consideration the agenda item on complaints and Special Reports, among them the case of the organization Freedom House. As you may recall, this case has been under consideration for several sessions in the Committee, following complaints by several members about the blatant and repeated violations of Council resolution 1996/31 by this so-called non-governmental organization.

“To be granted consultative status with the Economic and Social Council constitutes without doubt a recognition of the work of non-governmental organizations. At the same time, however, it involves a commitment and organizations have an obligation to honour this commitment by strictly observing the norms and regulations governing this consultative relationship.

“Mr. Chairman,

“We will not attempt to repeat here all the details of the politically motivated activities of Freedom House against Cuba and other States Members of the United Nations, in the service of the foreign policy objectives of the United States. My delegation has advanced sufficient arguments to prove the aggressive, interventionist and politically motivated action contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter that this organization has historically carried out against my country, with the aim of subverting the internal order and overthrowing the Government that has been legitimately and constitutionally established by the people of Cuba.

“The programme of activities to intervene in the internal affairs of Cuba and the organization’s ties to terrorist groups in Florida,
which seek to use every means possible to attempt to overthrow the Government of my country, are no secret.

“Nor is it a secret that this organization is an instrument in the service of the Government of the United States, which finances and directs its activities against a select group of countries that have been demonized by the United States.

“Also well known are the close and clearly proven links between Freedom House and the United States special services, in particular the CIA, under whose direction this organization engages in activities to destabilize legitimately elected governments, in libellous propaganda against sovereign States, and in subversive and clandestine activities in a number of countries.

“Freedom House seeks to project an image of a non-governmental organization that promotes democratic values, thereby attempting without success to conceal what it truly is, namely, a powerful machine for subversion in the image and likeness of the intelligence services of the Government that finances, directs and controls it. Its activities against Cuba prove this, since they range from material support for groups that act illegally in my country to the organization and financing of espionage activities against Cuba.

“Mr. Chairman,

“Cuba values, respects and strongly supports the serious and constructive work of non-governmental organizations. We cannot continue to allow the important and commendable work of non-governmental organizations, their invaluable contribution and constructive participation in and influence on the framework of the United Nations system to be tarnished by the repugnant actions of a tiny minority of organizations, like Freedom House, that are an embarrassment to the community of non-governmental organizations which genuinely respects established norms.

“My delegation has a number of questions to put to the organization and therefore requests its representative, who is present in the room, to proceed to the podium to reply to the Committee’s questions.

“Mr. Chairman,

“We deeply regret that the representative of Freedom House is not present in the room, even though the organization was perfectly aware that its case would be dealt with today and despite the fact that my delegation insisted through the secretariat that the organization be informed of this. We view this as a further mark of disrespect by the organization for the members of this Committee. My delegation has a number of questions to address to the organization and therefore requests the distinguished secretariat to transmit them to the organization with a view to obtaining adequate responses. In addition, on the tables of the conference room we have made available to the members of the Committee information on the irrefutable links between Freedom House and the Central Intelligence Agency.

“Mr. Chairman,

“I request that the text of my statement and the questions which I shall submit in writing be reproduced in full in the report of the Committee.

“Thank you very much.”

Statement II
“Questions to be addressed to Freedom House based on the replies submitted by the organization and contained in document E/C.2/2001/3

“1. In the first paragraph of the introduction, Freedom House claims that it ‘was founded as an organization committed to the expansion of human rights and the promotion of democratic ideals’. In view of this claim:

“— What opinion does the organization have about the definition agreed upon in Vienna and contained in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that democracy is based on the right of peoples to freely determine their own political, economic, social and cultural system and on their full participation in all aspects of life?

“— How are the activities of Freedom House aimed at promoting ‘democratic changes’ in a select group of countries consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, specifically with
respect to interference in the internal affairs of States?

“2. In the first paragraph on page 3 and the fourth of the introduction, the organization states that ‘in evaluating the condition of freedom, Freedom House rigorously applies the same standard to all countries, whatever their political system, ethnic or religious composition, or region might be’.

“– How is this criterion consistent with the definition contained in paragraph 5 of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which emphasizes the need to bear in mind the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious backgrounds?

“– Why does not a single country in the developing world appear in the list of ‘free’ countries in which allegedly no human rights violations take place? Is it that the organization considers that human rights and fundamental freedoms are violated only in a ‘select’ group of developing countries? Are no human rights violations committed in the countries of the North?

“3. Bearing in mind the priority that Freedom House claims it gives in assessing States’ compliance with international human rights norms, what is the organization’s position with respect to the massive, flagrant and systematic violations of human rights committed by Israel in the occupied Arab territories, including Palestine? The United Nations has made repeated appeals to the Government of Israel to put an end to such practices. In fact, a special session of the Commission on Human Rights was held in which a resolution on the matter was adopted. What is the organization’s position with respect to this resolution and to the question of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, given that the right of peoples to self-determination is a human right?

“4. In the second paragraph of section 1, which refers to the organization’s independence from the Government of the United States, it is claimed that ‘Freedom House simply acts to transmit grants from the United States Government to non-governmental organizations in foreign countries’.

“– How does this mechanism operate? Does the United States Government give money to Freedom House for the organization in turn to deliver it to non-governmental organizations in other countries? Who determines which parties are to receive the money delivered by Freedom House on behalf of the United States Government? In which foreign countries are the non-governmental organizations that receive these funds?

“5. In the third paragraph of section 1, Freedom House cites examples of criticism of United States policy as a way of demonstrating its independence of the United States Government. What are the organization’s views and what action has it taken with respect to the continuing and increasingly frequent violations of human rights in the United States, which have been denounced even by well known non-governmental organizations, thematic mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights and treaty bodies, such as:

“– The application of the death sentence in the United States to persons under the age of 18 and to the mentally retarded and the application of the maximum penalty on the basis of racist and xenophobic criteria?

“– Rampant police brutality?

“– The increasing numbers of immigrant deaths, especially on the southern border of the United States, where some 400 deaths are reported each year?

“6. What is the position of Freedom House with respect to the principle laid down in article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations that ‘all Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State’? In this connection, what is the organization’s position regarding the criminal economic, trade and financial blockade imposed on Cuba for more than 40 years by the United States Government and which constitutes a flagrant, massive and systematic violation of the
human rights of an entire people, which has been vigorously condemned by the international community in different forums of the United Nations system, including through the adoption each year by the General Assembly of a resolution in which the Assembly by an overwhelming majority calls for an end to that practice?

“7. In the first paragraph on page 3, the fourth of the introduction, the organization states that its ““Freedom in the World” survey ... assesses the degree to which sovereign States adhere to universally recognized civil standards of political rights and civil liberties”. Bearing in mind that the organization itself claims that one of its principal objectives is the defence of human rights, why does it assess in its main studies only achievements in the field of civil and political rights? Why does the organization not assess the degree of enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights? What are the organization’s views on the right to development as an important human right inherent in individuals and peoples? What is its opinion of the definition contained in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action on the universality, indivisibility, interrelationship and interdependence of all human rights?

“8. The first paragraph of section 4 refers to the efforts of Freedom House to promote ‘political transition from dictatorship to democracy’.

“My delegation notes Freedom House’s alleged concern for democracy and wishes to ask:

“– What did Freedom House do to help put an end to the bloody and merciless Latin American dictatorships that virtually ravaged a number of Latin American countries in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s? Give concrete examples of its actions.

“– What did Freedom House do to help put an end to the reprehensible regime of apartheid in South Africa, whose flagrant violation of the human rights of millions of South Africans was widely condemned by all relevant organs of the United Nations system? Give concrete examples of its actions.”

93. The Chairman announced that no representative of Freedom House was present in the room. Following the requests made by several delegations, a detailed summary of the debate held at that meeting was hereafter presented.

94. The representative of the United States stated that the allegations of links between Freedom House and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) were simply not true. He continued by stating that as required, Freedom House disclosed that it had received funding from a Government. In this case, the United States Government, through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), provided funding to the organization. However, the delegate stressed that the CIA and USAID were two separate organizations. Further, the delegate noted that because of provisions of the Church Commission, the CIA was prohibited by law from providing funding to Freedom House, as the latter was an organization that, among many things, sought to change United States public policy. The delegate recalled that earlier in this session, the Committee requested that Freedom House submit a special report for consideration by the Committee at the resumed session in January. Past precedent told the Committee that the organization had been responsive to its previous requests, and the Committee should look to reading the special report at the next session.

95. The representative of Cuba stated that many facts and documents proved the involvement of United States special services in the subversive work and interventionist activities carried out by Freedom House. The delegation of Cuba had circulated a paper entitled “Freedom House: a governmental organization in service of the CIA” which documented the links between the two organizations in their activities related to Cuba, among them links between the non-governmental organization and Frank Calzon, former head of Cuba-related programmes at the CIA. The operational instructions given by Freedom House to the emissaries it sent to Cuba also revealed the secret and conspiratory nature of its activities in that country and the awareness by the organization of their illegal character. Two nationals from the Czech Republic, sent to Cuba by the organization and detained there in January 2001, had also recognized the use of such methods. As a result, Freedom House was clearly a facade for the United States special services. The delegate further stated that the legislation mentioned by the United States representative might well have
been violated. Previous examples of such violations existed, as several attempts against the life of the President of Cuba had occurred in spite of the American legislation prohibiting attempts against the life of international leaders.

96. For the representative of Germany, Freedom House was a valuable organization in the field of human rights. The organization had criticized the German Government for banning Nazi propaganda on the Internet. In spite of these different views, his delegation considered that the organization, in its assessment of human rights and democracy, was doing good and important work.

97. The representative of China made the following statement:

“Mr. Chairman,

“I should like to express the following views with regard to the ‘Freedom House’ special report and the question of the accusations of the countries involved:

“We have taken note of media reports quoting the persons in charge of that organization, including several completely groundless attacks on named members of this Committee. The materials distributed yesterday by the Secretariat will fully verify this. I do not wish to comment separately on each of these reports at the present time; rather, I will deal solely with the reported charge that China will ‘block any group that characterizes Tibet or Taiwan as independent of Beijing’. I should like to point out that China welcomes the participation of non-governmental organizations in the activities of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; however, non-governmental organizations participating in United Nations activities must be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, most important among which is the need to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all Member States, naturally including those of China. Any organization encouraging or supporting the breakup of a sovereign State, or any organization encouraging or supporting the independence of Tibet or Taiwan, violates the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, and is thus not qualified to receive consultative status.

“With regard to the issue of freedom of speech, we cannot agree with the view that a non-governmental organization’s criticism of a Government constitutes freedom of speech while a Government’s criticism of a non-governmental organization constitutes repression of the freedom of speech.”

98. The representative of Cuba commented on previous interventions made by delegations. A distinction needed to be made between criticisms formulated regarding Member States on the one hand, and actions taken against Governments on the other hand. Cuba had been strongly criticized by a number of organizations, but had never complained against those organizations at the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. However, in the case of Freedom House, the complaint was justified by the actions undertaken by the organization against the Cuban Government. The delegate further called the attention of Committee members to the report entitled “Freedom in the world”, published by the organization and available on its web site, which focused its findings on a limited number of countries of the South, without mentioning any human rights violations committed in countries of the North. It also appeared that those countries that had been demonized by Freedom House were also priority countries for United States foreign policy. The representative also asked why the organization did not make any reference to human rights violations committed in the United States. Such violations, including police brutality and deaths at the southern borders of the country, were regularly reported by numerous non-governmental organizations. Such a state of fact revealed the politicization of the organization as well as its arrogance, particularly in the light of its activities in favour of so-called democratic change in Cuba, using United States funding. The Committee should therefore carefully consider the special report to be presented by the organization in January. Meanwhile, the Cuban delegation was surprised that the organization, based in New York and fully informed of United Nations meetings, had not sent a representative to the current meeting of the Committee. However, this situation did not prevent this body from considering the issue.

99. The representative of the Sudan stated that, in view of the serious concerns raised by several
delegations, it was regrettable not to be in a position to discuss the matter with a representative of the organization. She further deplored that in spite of a recent discussion with a representative of Freedom House, during which the latter had stated its readiness to enter into a constructive dialogue with the Sudan, no further contacts had been taken by the organization with the Permanent Mission of her country. The representative also stressed that non-governmental organizations should strictly abide by relevant rules and regulations governing their consultative relationship with the United Nations and should be held accountable for all activities carried out by them and their representatives. In addition, non-governmental organizations when they criticized a State should seek credible information from reliable sources, including the Governments they criticized. Objectivity and seriousness were crucial. The United Nations considered the root causes of all human rights violations thanks to a constructive approach; a destructive one was unacceptable for her delegation. The Sudan had an additional question to pose to Freedom House in this regard, a question that it would transmit to the Secretariat shortly.

100. The representative of the United States of America stressed that the absence of a representative from the organization had not prevented the Committee from considering the matter. Freedom House had also provided answers to the questions raised by China. The delegate stated that the organization was one of many non-governmental organizations that spoke on behalf of people who did not seem to have a voice. Freedom House, like many other human rights organizations, had been critical of the policies of countries on human rights, and it was well documented that the United States was not immune to its criticism. While his delegation did not always agree with such criticism, the United States would support Freedom House and other non-governmental organizations that spoke out on important issues, such as human rights. Regarding the reference made by another delegation to an Amnesty International report about the deaths of individuals at the border of the United States, the delegate speculated that that report had dealt with the illegal smuggling of individuals into his country. While the United States had laws regulating immigration, a criminal element had exploited the situation in order to profit illegally. Sadly, a disregard for the health of those individuals seeking freedom and opportunity in the United States had led to their deaths. The United States deplored these deaths, but the blame remained in the hands of criminals.

101. The representative of the Russian Federation recalled his intervention at the 9th meeting of the Committee, on 11 May. He asked Freedom House to provide further explanations on its position regarding the creation of an International Criminal Court. As the representative of the organization was unfortunately not in the room, the delegate would submit its question in writing through the Secretariat.

102. The representative of Cuba stressed that several non-governmental organizations had criticized her Government while respecting the Cuban legislation and the Charter of the United Nations. For example, France Libertés, an organization led by Mrs. Danièle Mitterand, who had expressed criticism against Cuba, visited the country in 1995 with a delegation of other human rights organizations. Members of the organization could meet with whomever they wished, and the visit was held in due respect of national and international legal provisions. In addition, the representative referred to the comments made by the delegation of the United States concerning the Commission on Human Rights. In her view, this Commission had criticized only a selected number of countries of the South in the interest of the United States policy. When this country was a member of this Commission, it had pressured and blackmailed countries to condemn other States. In the framework of the Commission, Freedom House complemented the work of the United States and acted in violation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 on such matters as accreditation of participants, including of members of terrorist groups. Finally, the representative stressed that, although regrettable, the absence of a representative of Freedom House did not prevent the Committee from taking a decision.

103. The representative of China made the following statement:

“Mr. Chairman,

“We have just seen the replies of ‘Freedom House’ to the questions posed by this Committee on 21 May 2001. As a number of those questions involve important issues of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, we will need to report on them to our capital. In the meantime, we would like to present a preliminary response, and reserve the right to respond further at a later time.
“We are of the view that the replies of ‘Freedom House’ are not satisfactory. According to Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, non-governmental organizations must be in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, most important among which is the need for non-governmental organizations to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States Members of the United Nations. However, in its replies, this organization claims to have ‘no position’ on matters of disputed sovereignty or territory. Here I strongly wish to clarify that Taiwan is a province of China. It has been an inseparable part of China since ancient times, and is most certainly not some sort of ‘disputed territory’. This is a fact that has been universally acknowledged by the international community. I would like this point to be included in the written record of this meeting, in order to clarify matters for the public. Non-governmental organizations enjoying consultative status with the Economic and Social Council should have clear positions with regard to important questions of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States Members of the United Nations, and should respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States. In our view, having no position is in itself a position, one of non-respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States. We have good reason to request that the non-governmental organizations involved should clarify their positions and provide straightforward answers to our questions.

“Moreover, I should like to point out that we in the Committee are not debating whether or not non-governmental organizations may criticize Governments, but whether or not non-governmental organizations participating in the activities of the United Nations should accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, respect the relevant resolutions, and conform to the relevant rules of procedure. A non-governmental organization cannot simply say that it is criticizing a Government and therefore do whatever it pleases, ignoring the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the relevant resolutions and rules of procedure. I would again like to emphasize that we welcome non-governmental organizations to bring their positive and constructive roles into full play within the framework of the relevant resolutions and rules of procedure.”

104. The Chairman recalled that, at its 10th meeting, the Committee had requested Freedom House to submit a detailed special report at its 2001 resumed session. The Committee decided to further consider the matter at that session.

United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation

105. At its 2000 session, the Committee had requested the organization to submit a special report on its activities to the Committee at its 2000 resumed session. In particular, the Committee had requested information on the activities undertaken between the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the International Council of the Associations for Peace in the Continents (ASOPAZCO).

106. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had had before it a special report submitted by the organization, as well as a letter submitting additional information responding to the questions posed by the delegation of Cuba on the special report circulated among Committee members. The latter delegation also asked for more time to consider the report and requested that the organization respond in writing to questions raised on the relationship between the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and ASOPAZCO. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the special report of the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, pending receipt of a written response from the organization to the questions raised by the delegation of Cuba.

107. At the 10th meeting, the delegation of Cuba stated that in view of the reorientation of the organization’s leadership, more time was needed to consider its status. The Committee decided to defer the consideration of the matter to its 2002 regular session.
B. Complaints by Member States

108. At its 10th meeting, on 11 May 2001, the Committee had before it a letter by Mr. Leandro Despouy, Chairman of the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, addressed to Mr. Levent Bilman, Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, on concerns expressed by Governments regarding the participation of certain representatives of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Commission. The letter included in an annex two notes verbales from the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) and a letter from the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNOG. Mr. Bilman was asked to bring these letters to the attention of the Committee for consideration and possible actions.

1. World Confederation of Labour

109. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had before it a letter from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the Chair of the Commission on Human Rights regarding the circulation of documentation by a representative of the World Confederation of Labour at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission in Geneva. The Committee had also before it a response from the organization on the complaint. The representative of Mauritius asked the Committee to be given more time to review the response provided by the organization and to defer consideration of that issue to the next session of the Committee. The Committee deferred consideration of this matter to its next session.

110. At its 10th meeting, the Committee had before it a letter from the Secretary-General of the World Confederation of Labour in which the organization “expressed its regrets to the delegation of Mauritius and assured parties concerned that it would take necessary measures to prevent any incidents of this nature from recurring”. The Committee decided to close the case.

2. International Association for Democratic Lawyers

International Federation of Human Rights Leagues

New Human Rights

Women’s Human Rights International Association

Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples

111. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement in which he expressed the grave concern of his delegation on the accreditation by a number of non-governmental organizations with consultative status of members of the Modjahedin Khalgh Organization/National Council of Resistance (MKO/NCR), a movement deemed notoriously terrorist. The Committee had not recommended granting consultative status to two organizations affiliated to this movement last year, and a non-governmental organization had decided to freeze the movement’s activity in this organization following the complaints made by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the session of the Committee. In spite of that, representatives of this movement had been represented at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights and intensified their activities against the Government. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran further stated that in view of these recurring violations of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, the Commission should be informed of the decisions taken by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

112. In addition, the delegation lodged formal complaints against (a) the International Association for Democratic Lawyers (IADL), (b) the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues, (c) New Human Rights, (d) Women’s Human Rights International Association, and (e) the Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples, on the grounds that “they had provided the opportunity to the individuals referred to in the letter of the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Geneva to the chairman of the Commission on Human Rights as well as other persons who are well known and long-standing members of MKO/NCR, a notorious terrorist group based in a neighbouring country, through written and oral statements, to arrange a film show and distribute different publications during the fifty-seventh session of the Commission and even before”. The representative also stated that these continued acts constituted clear violations of the letter and the spirit of the rules set forth in Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, in particular
paragraph 57 (a), and asked for a special report on this abuse by these non-governmental organizations. The Committee decided that these five organizations should be asked to present special reports on the abuses brought to the attention of the Committee by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

3. Other complaints

113. Several delegations stated that cases of incidents involving non-governmental organizations had multiplied in the course of the recent sessions of the Commission on Human Rights. It was stressed that organizations should be held responsible for the conduct of all those accredited by them and that, when they failed to comply with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, the Committee should seriously consider the matter and take appropriate measures.

114. The Committee heard a declaration from the Ambassador of Sri Lanka who deplored that at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, members of the Tamil Center for Human Rights (TCHR) had obtained accreditation from another organization and distributed abusive material regarding Sri Lanka. He also recalled that at its 2000 regular session, the Committee had decided not to recommend granting consultative status to TCHR because of its links with terrorist groups operating in this country. In view of the repetition of similar situations at the Commission, the delegation was of the view that the Committee should request the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat to provide advice on what the Secretariat could do to investigate the identity and background of non-governmental organization representatives at Commission sessions and to prevent, in appropriate cases, their participation.

115. One delegation stated that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations could not solve the issue of accreditation of non-governmental organization representatives at the Commission on Human Rights and that it was incumbent upon the Secretariat and the Bureau of the Commission itself to address the matter. Other delegations stressed that all means should be explored to deal with the issue, namely, seeking for solutions in the framework of a working group of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations and requesting legal advice.

116. The delegation of China mentioned abuses in violation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 by the Society for Threatened Peoples and the Transnational Radical Party at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights. Such misconduct included distribution of materials in violation of the rules, making statements disregarding the topic under discussion, and vile behaviour of representatives. China would closely follow the words and deeds of the non-governmental organizations concerned. The delegate of the Russian Federation also referred to misconduct by the Transnational Radical Party at the same session of the Commission.

117. The Chairman recalled that initiatives had been taken to increase coordination between the Commission on Human Rights and the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, at both the intergovernmental and the Secretariat level, to help deal with such problems. The Committee decided that the matter would be further discussed under all of its aspects in the Informal Working Group of the Committee, including the issue whether a legal opinion, as proposed by the Ambassador of Sri Lanka, was to be sought or not.

VII. Provisional agenda for the session of the Committee in the year 2002

118. The Committee considered agenda item 8 at its 30th meeting on 25 May 2001. It had before it the draft provisional agenda for its 2002 session (E/C.2/2001/L.1).

119. At the same meeting, following statements by the representatives of the Sudan, India, Algeria and Cuba, the Committee approved the provisional agenda and documentation for its 2002 session, as orally amended, for submission to the Economic and Social Council (see chap. I, draft decision IV).

VIII. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its 2001 regular session

120. At the 30th meeting, on 25 May 2001, the Rapporteur introduced the draft report as contained in document E/C.2/2001/L.2, as well as an informal paper.
121. At the same meeting, the Committee adopted the draft report, and authorized the Rapporteur to finalize it in consultation with the members of the Committee, as appropriate.

IX. Organization of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

122. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations held its 2001 session from 7 to 25 May 2001. The Committee held 30 meetings (1st to 30th).

B. Attendance

123. The session was attended by the 19 members of the Committee. Observers for other States Members of the United Nations, representatives of organizations of the United Nations system and observers for non-governmental organizations also attended. One organization, having received a standing invitation to participate as an observer in the session and the work of the General Assembly, was represented by an observer. The list of participants is contained in annex I.

C. Election of officers

124. At its 1st meeting, on 7 May, the Committee re-elected the following officers by acclamation:

Chairman:
Levent Bilman (Turkey)

Vice-Chairpersons:
Mercedes de Armas Garcia (Cuba)
Mihaela Blajan (Romania)
Ilham Ibrahim Mohamed Ahmed (Sudan)

125. At the same meeting, the Committee also elected, by acclamation Ishtiaq Hussain Andrabi (Pakistan) to serve as Vice-Chairperson, and Mihaela Blajan (Romania), in addition to serving as Vice-Chairperson, to serve as Rapporteur.

D. Agenda

126. At its 1st meeting, on 7 May, the Committee adopted the provisional agenda for its 2001 session as contained in document E/C.2/2001/1. The agenda was as follows:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
3. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations:
   (a) Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the previous session of the Committee;
   (b) New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification.
4. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304:
   (a) Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations;
   (b) Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31;
   (c) Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat;
   (d) Other related matters.
6. Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.
7. Consideration of special reports.

8. Provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee.

9. Adoption of the report of the Committee.

127. At the same meeting, the Committee approved its organization of work as contained in an informal paper.

E. Documentation

128. The list of documents that were before the Committee at its 2001 session is contained in annex II.

X. Other matters

Requests from non-governmental organizations to be heard by the Economic and Social Council

129. At its 15th meeting, on 15 May 2001, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations resumed consideration of item 2 (Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters) and approved, in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, paragraphs 31 and 32, and rule 84 of the rules of procedure of the Council, the request of the following three organizations to be heard by the Council at the high-level segment of its substantive session of 2001 (see E/2001/100):

Organization for Industrial, Spiritual and Cultural Advancement International (OISCA)

130. The Committee had before it a document dated 18 April 2001, which summarized the recommendations made by 14 Asian non-governmental organizations on assistance provided to African countries. These non-governmental organizations, some of which were not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, had been included by OISCA in a consultative process of preparations for the high-level segment. The Committee advised the organization that its oral statement to the Council should take the form of a synthetic presentation, in the name of OISCA, of ideas expressed and recommendations made by the non-governmental organizations involved.

CONGO, Geneva

131. The Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations (CONGO) does not have consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. The Committee recalled that, in accordance with Council resolution 1996/31, paragraph 32 (a), non-governmental organizations with general and special consultative status could make oral presentations only at the Council's meetings. As the relevance of CONGO's contribution to the high-level segment was fully recognized and welcome, several Committee members expressed the wish that CONGO apply for consultative status in order to be granted such status and to avoid any misunderstanding in future. The Secretariat would contact CONGO to consider the best way to proceed in this matter, encouraging it to apply in order to avoid any debate on its special relationship with the United Nations.

Centro de Ricerca e Documentazione Febbraio 74 (CERFE)

132. CERFE, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, organized a panel at the United Nations on 29 March 2001 on poverty alleviation and development. In accordance with article 84 of the rules of procedure of the Council and paragraph 32 (a) of Council resolution 1996/31, the Committee decided that a summary of this panel focusing on the situation in Africa, including recommendations, would be presented to the Council in the form of an oral statement by the organization.

133. In addition, the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with Council resolution 1996/31, paragraph 31 (d), approved the request of the Asia Crime Prevention Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status with the Council, to submit a written statement of more than 2,000 words to the general segment of the Council, under agenda item 14 (c) (Social and human rights questions: crime prevention and criminal justice). The document is a declaration adopted by the non-governmental organization at an international conference recently held in Beijing.
Notes

1 The Permanent Observer Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations was consulted on the registration procedure of non-governmental organizations in Switzerland. The Committee was informed that the status of “non-governmental organization” did not exist as such under Swiss law. It had three equivalents (“association”, “fondation” and “société simple”). Only organizations whose primary purpose was to make profit had the obligation to be entered in the “registre de commerce”. Non-profit organizations would therefore not be found in that catalogue, unless they asked to be registered on a voluntary basis. In Switzerland, the only obligation in order for a non-profit organization to be recognized was to write its by-laws. Swiss law did not request this document to be certified before a notary public. It should also be noted that non-profit organizations created under Swiss law could develop commercial activities, however not to their own benefit.

2 Having noted various discrepancies in the applications reviewed, Committee members emphasized the importance for the non-governmental organizations of being more careful in filling out their questionnaire. In addition, organizations applying for consultative status should inform the Committee about all their activities and not only on United Nations-related activities.

3 Members of the Committee underlined that “taking note of the reports” did not mean that they endorsed the contents of the reports submitted for their review. In addition, they also underlined that non-governmental organizations, when submitting their quadrennial reports, should report on all their activities and not only on United Nations-related activities.
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List of participants

Members

Algeria: Abdallah Baali, Dalila Samah, Abdelouahab Osmane
Bolivia: Viviana Limpias
Chile: Ignacio Concha, Loreto Leyton
China: Yu Wenzhe, Mei Yuncai, Zhao Xing
Colombia: Alfonso Valdivieso, Sofia Salgado de Gómez, Alma Viviana Pérez
Cuba: Bruno Rodriguez Parrilla, Rafael Dausá Céspedes, Mercedes de Armas Garcia, Maria del Carmen Herrera Caseiro, Felipe Mario Medina González
Ethiopia: Birhanemeskel Abebe
France: Hugues Moret, Didier Le Bret
Germany: Philipp Ackermann, Dierter Lamlé, Oliver Hinte
India: Asith Bhattacharjee
Lebanon: Houssam Diab, Ibrahim Assaf
Pakistan: shtiag H. Andrabi
Romania: Mihaela Blajan, Alexandru Niculescu
Russian Federation: Alexey A. Rogov, Kirill Barsky
Senegal: Abdoul Demba Tall, Mankeur Ndiaye
Sudan: Elfatih Erwa, Ilham Ibrahim Mohamed Ahmed, Tarig ali Bakhit
Tunisia: Ali Cherif
Turkey: Hakan Tekin, Altay Cengizer, Levent Bilman, Mehmet Samsar
United States: Betty King, John W. Davison, Michael F. Williams, Ruth Wagoner, Peggy Kerry

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Georgia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic, Yugoslavia
Entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly and maintaining permanent observer missions at Headquarters

Palestine

Specialized agencies and related organizations

World Health Organization
## Annex II

### List of documents before the Committee at its 2001 session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document symbol</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Title or description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annotated provisional agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/2 and Add.1-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Note by the Secretary-General containing quadrennial reports, 1996-1999, submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Note by the Secretary-General containing quadrennial reports, 1994-1997/1995-1998 submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/R.2 and Add.1-5</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2000/R.3 and Add.1-2</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing requests for reclassification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Note by the Secretary-General containing a special report by Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2000/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Note by the Secretary-General containing special reports by United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and World Confederation of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/CRP.1</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Applications received from non-governmental organizations for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council deferred from previous session of the Committee held in 1998, 1999 and 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/CRP.2</td>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/CRP.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/CRP.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council requesting to be heard by the Council at its 2001 regular session: note by the Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/1999/CRP.5</td>
<td>4 (b)</td>
<td>Compilation of non-governmental organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2000/CRP.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing a compilation of deferred quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/L.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provisional agenda and documentation for the 2002 session of the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/C.2/2001/L.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>