

Confidential Filing

UN Human Rights Commission.

UNITED NATIONS

Appointment of Sir Anthony Williams
as the UK Delegate.

November 1983

Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date
17/11/83							
1.12.83							
2/12/83							
8/11/83							

PREM 19/3583

RESTRICTED

FROM: M G D Evans, UND
DATE: 2 June 1991

cc: PS/Mr Garel-Jones
PS/PUS
Sir John Coles
Mr Weston
Mr Beamish
Mr Goulden
Mr Murray, LAD
Mr Cooper, Planners
Legal Advisers
Mr Freeman, ODA
Mr Watt, UND

Mr Slater
PS/Mr Lennox Boyd

HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY

1. I visited Mexico, El Salvador, Ecuador, Peru and Chile between 10 and 23 May for talks on human rights and the UN (reported separately). The Embassies are well plugged in to human rights organisations and arranged excellent and intensive (not to say exhaustive/ing) programmes with calls on NGOs and lobbyists even more than official spokesman. I had the sense that the fact that a Permanent Member of the Security Council (who was not the US) was taking the time to do the rounds (and in Spanish) was welcome. The journey was revelatory. As an old Latin American hand, I was fascinated by the evolution in attitudes which allowed a "gringo" British official to talk to hosts - including the military - at a high level on so delicate an issue as human rights without provoking the cry of "no interference in our domestic affairs". I was taken aback by the non performing role of the judiciary the length of the continent - not a single court case leading to a conviction - and less so by the unreconstructed views of the military, even in Chile.

2. In general in calls on Government spokesmen, apart from trailing the general "Good Government" approach, I argued that the Latin Americans could now afford to be much more progressive on human rights in international fora. The majority are democracies: the principles of "Good government" (leaving aside the aid dimension) are now integral to many national policies. There are Governmental Commissions for Human Rights as well as national NGO counterparts. The time had passed for traditional Latin American circling of the wagons around the weaker brethren (eg Cuba). Recognition of problems and undertakings to examine any as and when they arose paid more dividends than a refusal to face facts. It was easier for Latin American Ministers to call on Amnesty International when in London

GEIAAG

RESTRICTED

(eg Andres Rozental) than to reject their reports. Given this growing identity of views between us, I hoped the Governments concerned would vote for our reelection to the UN Human Rights Commission - Peru, Mexico, Ecuador and Chile are all ECOSOC members. (Peru and Ecuador made positive noises; Mexico was more receptive than I expected and Chile embarrassed. In calls on NGOs, I listened.

3. Following are highlights country by country. Conclusions and recommendations for follow up are set out in para 9 below.

Mexico

4. The general approach was well received by the younger generation and the NGOs. (The UN Director - over 50 - represented a more traditional attitude). The young Director for Human Rights was fascinated to discover so much common ground and receptive even to an explanation of HMG's views on good government and our training programmes eg in-house and for MPs. (I promised details and invited Lic. Gonzalez to come in for talks when next in Europe). I argued that with the creation of a National Commission for Human Rights Mexico no longer needed to be defensive: they had a good tale to tell. In practice, the picture remains murky. The record is poor. The new National Commission for Human Rights is a hybrid; officially independent but located on Ministry of the Interior premises. The Executive Secretary is dynamic and hoped for full independence within 5 years, but there are too many elements of a PR operation. The Commission's key weapon is publicity in its biannual reviews for mal-administration, abuse etc. It has no investigative powers. Contacts with NGOs are well established but education eg in the police and military rudimentary. A weak judiciary. I suspect that echoes of the attack launched by a leading human rights activist on the inadequacies of some of the national Commission's work over dinner are still reverberating. Her evident passion and sincerity made the official spokeswoman look like cardboard.

El Salvador

5. The most fascinating and chilling. The presentations on human rights (official and NGOS alike) were the most sophisticated of all. I have never met so many brave people - opposition politicians, Churchmen, representatives of the ICRC and UNHCR and NGOS. Most live with threats to their lives and deaths of their colleagues as a matter of course. The only country where development issues come second and where the touristic highlights are places of notable assassinations (Archbishop Romero, the Jesuits etc). HM Charge said that some 50% of the contacts he made on first arrival are now dead. But the very presence and involvement in politics of opposition leader Ruben Zamora (whose brother

RESTRICTED

was assassinated when Attorney General) is a beacon and indication of change to many. An impressive and brave man: his survival will be a test of the Government's success in changing the environment. President Christiani was very polished and exposed little surface, though he chatted to me for over an hour. The main focus was ONUSAL (the proposed UN human rights verification programme for El Salvador) which I argued was a vital and unprecedented initiative both for El Salvador and for the UN. The President was sanguine as to its chances of success; others (eg the army) gave lip service. The UN Commander was cynical since most of the UN verifiers are to be drawn from those Latin countries who most identify with the army (as did the Spanish members of ONUCA). I told the army officer responsible for human rights that the success of ONUSAL was vitally important to the armed forces if they wished to redeem their image. An hour and half at military HQ in his company left me looking over my shoulder to see who was following. His "statistics" showed that only 174 of 400 allegations of abuse in 1990 were valid, for which the police were largely responsible. The army's share was negligible as shown in detailed graphs. When the army had identified its (small number of) culprits they would be tried and then handed over to the judiciary (sic). The FMLN's record of abuse was also depicted graphically, with a predictably rising curve. There was no attempt to distinguish between abuse (random killings, disappearances, torture etc and deaths/ wounds in conflict). The Government Commission was a smoother version of the military and about as credible. Pretty picture books of the basic "thou shalt not" (rape, torture etc) for illiterate army and police, which seemed to be expressly designed to show visiting human rights activists. Data on human rights courses given for police and army, how many soldiers attend etc. The Chairman of the non official Commission (CDHES) emerged from near hiding (both his predecessors have been murdered and he himself jailed and tortured - was low key and factual and very convincing. Nobody attempted to deny that so far there has not been a single case of a human rights violation successfully brought to trial and convicted in the courts. The case of the assassinated Jesuits languishes (now in the hands of two brave young lawyers whose life expectancy cannot be high). The judiciary are weak, corrupt and very frightened. US policy appears ambivalent (to be charitable). They have been arming and training the military to deal with "subversion", now more properly civil war. Now Congress refuses to vote money until the human rights record improves. But I did not detect any suggestion that the US armed forces would use their influence and access to change attitudes.

Ecuador

6. The Foreign Minister (an old UN hand) had to fly off to a meeting of Andean Pact ministers hours before I arrived and

RESTRICTED

GEIAAG

so reneged on the lunch invitation he had offered. I was not able to accept a pressing invitation to return to Quito to see him later in the trip. (His interest would have been in the UNSG stakes and UN reform). Human Rights discussions friendly but lacked depth. But one important nugget. In 1979, Andean Pact Foreign Ministers agreed that traditional doctrines of non interference were overridden in cases of gross human rights violations. This enabled Ecuador to vote for SCR 688.

Peru

7. My first visit for 22 years and a sad change. But a number of impressive people seeking to cope with one of the worst human rights records in Latin America, and the main protagonists - official and non official and NGO - are clearly in regular contact with each other. (Not always the case). The President of the UN Human Rights Commission (Senator Bernales) and the Head of the National Human Rights Commission (non official) are trying (and the recipients of death threats from right and left). But they are fighting with one hand tied behind their backs. Given the brutalities of Sendero Luminoso, preaching sweetness and light on the part of the security forces is not easy. I suspect that the person with greatest influence was the hugely impressive ICRC delegate (Dr Kobel). The ICRC have a team of 27 delegates (the largest outside the Gulf). They began in low key and pragmatic style by visiting political (Senderista) prisoners, moved to care for vulnerable groups and have extended their activities well beyond their mandate to the point that the delegates are able to operate without hindrance even in the Sendero controlled areas - the only organisation able to do so. Kobel told me of an exchange with the Commander of the Peruvian armed forces who had enquired testily what the ICRC thought it was doing in Peru : it was not an external conflict - the Geneva Conventions were irrelevant. Kobel had replied that the Peruvian armed forces had a mandate to protect Peru from external attack; it was not clear to him what they were doing there: both sides had to adjust. But I did talk to a highly intelligent and open minded Colonel on the general staff who did not flee from the theme of human rights and accepted there were international standards to be applied, and international concern.

Chile

8. An oasis of prosperity and self confidence by comparison with the others (even compared to my last visit 2 years ago). The President's annual state of the nation address on the second day of my visit could have been written in Whitehall. Pragmatic in tone with a resounding passage on human rights, appointment of an ombudsman to deal with administrative abuse and a clear statement on the principles of "good government". (I was told the President himself and

his daughter wrote the speech). The National Commission for Human Rights (NGO) expressed the warmest gratitude to HMG for our support for human rights during the military years. Monsignor Venech at the Vicaria (Archbishopric) and the Columban fathers (who sheltered Sheila Cassidy) are now more concerned with social ills than human rights. The Government knows where it is going and so does its Ambassador for human rights (Garretyton - I invited him to call in on his forthcoming (private) visit to London). But, But. Not only the Armed forces, but also the Supreme Court rejected the conclusions of the Rettig Commission and felt no echo of conscience. Garretyton's own remarks at the Human Rights Committee that there had been torture practiced in Chile and this was being investigated provoked a storm in the Foreign Ministry. And I received a passionate exposition from a member of the Rettig Commission (Professor of Law at the Catholic University) on the failure to change attitudes at the roots. None of the major Law schools taught human rights. They had never done so. There had been no discussion or lectures in the Law schools on the report of the Rettig Commission. It was impossible to get key texts. There was no money or there were other priorities. There were scarcely copies available of the Geneva Conventions. (I asked the ICRC delegate to do what he could before they decamped to Brasilia). How could the judiciary play its proper role when operating on so fundamental a basis of ignorance? As for the army, they were a closed caste. He himself did teach a course to the Carabineros; but educating the army which had had no contact with the outside world for 18 years was a different matter. (The lack of elementary human rights training for lawyers was confirmed separately as was the army's exclusiveness. Only such right thinkers as the Spaniards and South Africans have good access to the Chilean army).

Conclusions and Recommendations for follow up

9. Marked progress but there remain common problems. First, the role of the judiciary, acknowledged as a black hole the length of the continent. Those responsible for justice are generally weak, corrupt and often live in fear. If Chile's law schools (with its relatively advanced educational system) and committed Government do not tackle human rights, then who is doing so? Second, when the armed forces are exposed to outside influences, these are generally American and geared to counter-terrorism. Where there has been sustained international pressure eg El Salvador, the reaction has been to develop an improved PR arm. Third, human rights education through the Church, NGOs, National Commissions (official and non official) is developing even in unpromising soil (Mexico) and the NGOs are generally a force for good. Outside attention and practical help (books etc) helps them domestically. We can help - my suggestions as follows:

i) we need to produce a piece of paper on good government, shorn of the aid element, for use in Latin America. The principles are now broadly accepted, but the linkage with aid (and misunderstandings about conditionality) confuse the message. We can now persuade a number of Latins that we are talking the same language. Any material we can pass across on our training courses and simulations will be of interest.

ii) We need to insert a good chunk on human rights into the Royal College of Defence Studies course (and any others offered eg by the police to third world army, police etc). These are future leaders of armed forces across the third world. Even the Chileans have for the first time sent a representative to the RCDS. There might be a case for doing a double act at the RCDS with the ICRC: first Geneva Conventions and how the International Red Cross fulfil (and extend) their mandate using Common Article 3 (internal conflicts) - and then human rights;

iii) We need to create an imaginative and targetted programme of lectures in selected Latin American capitals (to be funded from AUS budgets?). The British army and security services have particular experience in dealing with terrorism acting within the law. Can we not find either a serving general or eg a retired GOC Northern Ireland to talk at eg the War Studies Colleges on their experience. This could be a double act with eg an academic expert in international law and human rights.

iv) Apart from the armed forces, we (and our EC partners) could help Latin American law schools develop adequate courses on human rights to train the judges of the future. We might consult posts on whether they could identify suitable young law lecturers for scholarships under the FCOSAS in the UK (even flagship awards - Magna Carta scholarships?). In addition, we could use the inward visits scheme to bring in future judges and deans of law schools to expose them to the reality of an independent judiciary.

v) We should draw up a list of the basic publications on human rights (not just the Universal Declaration etc) but decent commentaries and good independent books on human rights and their history in certain countries in Latin America. We should circulate the list to posts to consult activists, universities etc to see if we can help with book purchase. We might make this the basis of an EC initiative.

vi) Could we prevail on the Civil Service college to run a special course for key figures from Latin America (we persuaded them to organise special courses on how to be a good Eurocrat/bureacrat for the Spaniards and Portuguese at the time of their EC accession. Very successful).

RESTRICTED

vii) We should repeat the experiment. The AUS (UN) Head of UND or Head of Delegation to the Human Rights Commission should regularly visit a selection of Latin American posts both to show a continuing interest and to help convince these countries that we do care, despite our reduced resources. It helps win us friends in the UN. Next time Guatemala (the Ambassador was reluctant this time), El Salvador (again), Brazil and Argentina?

viii) Not my parish. But could there be a case for a Military Attache in El Salvador? From my viewpoint, it would be useful.

M G D Evans

M G D Evans

RESTRICTED

GEIAAG

Thursday 8 December 1983

*As sent out
JH*

(Answered by the Prime Minister on Thursday 8 December 1983)

UNSTARRED Mr Harry Greenway:

NO. 229 To ask the Prime Minister, if she will make a statement to mark the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which falls on 10 December 1983.

This Government attaches the highest importance to human rights. Respect for the rights and freedoms of the individual lies at the heart of the concept of democracy. The Universal Declaration, and the International Covenants on Human Rights set high but attainable standards for the realisation of human rights. Thirty-five years after the adoption of the Declaration, however, there remain many countries in which the standards laid down in the Declaration are ignored. What is needed now is vigilance to defend these essential freedoms where they exist and practical effort to extend them elsewhere. We shall continue to play a vigorous part in this work.

mt

file with
TP

file

507



10 DOWNING STREET

PRIME MINISTER

You agreed in general terms to an arranged Question to mark the 35th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A revised edition is attached. Agree?

T. BUSHNER

2 December 1983

(Answered by the Prime Minister on

UNSTARRED

NO.

To ask the Prime Minister, if she will make a statement on the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which falls on 10 December 1983.

This Government attaches the highest importance to human rights. Respect for the rights and freedoms of the individual lies at the heart of the concept of democracy. The Universal Declaration, and the International Covenants on Human Rights set high but attainable standards for the realisation of human rights. Thirty-five years after the adoption of the Declaration, however, there remain many countries in which the standards laid down in the Declaration are ignored. What is needed now is vigilance to defend these essential freedoms where they exist and practical effort to extend them elsewhere. We shall continue to play a vigorous part in this work.

Written Question

To ask the Prime Minister if she will make a statement on the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which falls on 10 December 1983.

Answer

This Government attaches the highest importance to human rights. Respect for the rights and freedoms of the individual lies at the heart of the concept of democracy. The Universal Declaration, and the International Covenants on Human Rights set high but attainable standards for the realisation of human rights. Thirty-five years after the adoption of the Declaration, however, there remain many countries in which the standards laid down in the Declaration are ^{ignored.} ~~not met.~~ What is needed now is vigilance to defend these essential freedoms where they exist and practical effort to extend them elsewhere. We shall continue to play a vigorous part in this work.

N. Filula.

One amendment. We do not
need than all answers.

MR. COLES

A-d C. $\frac{L}{R}$

Attached are papers from the Foreign
Office suggesting an arranged PQ to mark
Human Rights Day 1983. The Prime Minister
agreed in principle to such a Question, but
asked for the Answer to be redrafted.

I have provided an alternative version.

Is it ~~alright?~~ all right?

~~Questions~~

1 December, 1983.

pse type

Q + A as
amended

Written Answer:

To ask the Prime Minister if she will make a statement on the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which falls on 10 December 1983.

Answer:

This Government attaches the highest importance to ~~questions of~~ human rights. Respect for the rights and freedoms of the individual is the ~~hallmark of democracy and the best basis for international co-operation.~~ ^{lies at the heart of the concept of democracy.} The Universal Declaration, and the International Covenants on Human Rights, ~~in the preparation of which this country played its full part,~~ set high but attainable standards for the realisation of human rights. ~~It is a matter for great concern that~~ ^{however, there remain many countries in which} thirty five years after the adoption of the Declaration, there should be so many places in the world where the standards laid down in the Declaration are ~~ignored.~~ ^{not met} What is needed now is vigilance to defend these ~~basic~~ ^{essential} freedoms where they exist and practical effort to extend ~~the area of the world in which they are respected.~~ ^{them elsewhere} We shall continue to play a vigorous part in this work.

*GM
PCC
rely on
forward*



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

Prime Minister;

28 November, 1983

Agree this

Question and Answer?

X looks like race card material.

Dear John,

*Can the answer be translated into better language.
mit*

Human Rights Day 1983

*JA
28/11*

The 35th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights falls on 10 December 1983 - the day that has been observed at the UN and by member states since 1950 as Human Rights Day. There will be a special meeting of the General Assembly on Friday, 9 December, and the anniversary is likely to be marked in different ways by many countries.

I enclose a copy of the Universal Declaration. It remains valid as a canon of Human Rights and individual freedoms which the Western Democracies can support unequivocally and which, incidentally, is a chronic embarrassment to communist and other totalitarian regimes.

British Governments have marked such anniversaries every five years in various ways, for example by special post-marks and publications, by practical help to various non-governmental organisations active in the Human Rights field and by Ministerial speeches.

Sir Geoffrey Howe suggests that the best way to mark this year's anniversary would be for the Prime Minister to issue a statement. Such a statement would stand us in good stead, both at the United Nations and in our dealings with the public in this country.

The statement could be in the form of an answer to an arranged Parliamentary Question. A draft question and draft answer are attached. If it could be made on 8 December, the statement could be publicised in time for the General Assembly Commemorative Meeting on 9 December (10 December is a Saturday).

The Prime Minister might in addition wish to refer orally to the anniversary along these lines at her Question Time on Thursday 8 Decmeber, if arrangements can be made to have the appropriate Question or Supplementary put.

Yours ever,

Peter Ricketts

(P F Ricketts)
Private Secretary

A J Coles Esq
10 Downing Street

includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21. (1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22. Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23. (1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24. Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25. (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26. (1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all

nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27. (1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28. Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29. (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION of HUMAN RIGHTS



ON DECEMBER 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the full text of which appears in the following pages. Following this historic act the Assembly called upon all Member countries to publicize the text of the Declaration and "to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories."

Final Authorized Text

UNITED NATIONS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION
OF HUMAN RIGHTS

PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, Therefore,

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

proclaims

THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7. All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8. Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10. Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11. (1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his hon-

our and reputation. Everyone has the right to protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14. (1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15. (1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16. (1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17. (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right

SUBJECT

CONFIDENTIAL
STAFF IN CONFIDENCE



File^{ve}
see master

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

17 November 1983

Dear Sir,

UN Human Rights Commission

The Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary discussed with the Prime Minister this morning possible candidates for the task of United Kingdom delegate to the United Nations Human Rights Commission. It was agreed that Sir Anthony Williams would be the best choice.

Yours ever

John G. Cole

Brian Fall, Esq.,
Foreign and Commonwealth Office,

hr

Grey Scale #13



A

1

2

3

4

5

6

M

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

B

17

18

19

