We repeat: the CETIM has no “hidden agenda”, on the contrary, it has an open agenda visible to everybody, that of promoting and defending ESCR and all human rights, and of supporting the UN in its mission of bringing peace to international relations.

The CETIM and the Committee on NGOs

The procedure followed by the Committee on NGOs to recommend the suspension of our status, has been, according to us, expeditious. Whereas the United Nations promotes democracy, respect of opinions, freedom of expression, transparency, the right to a fair defense and a fair trial, among other things, we can only deplore the way our case has been handled out. We had a mere 33 hours to react and we haven’t been auditioned. Owing to this extremely tight deadline, we were unable to present a solid and detailed defense.

The expeditious procedure recurred to in the case against the CETIM leads us to ask the following questions. Should not the right to freedom of opinion and expression of NGOs within the United Nations be protected from political-diplomatic agendas such as are current between governments? Have we been judged on effective acts, and if yes, which ones, or on some vocabulary use? Have all the member States of the Committee on NGOs had the time to examine the accusations, serious but unjust, brought by Turkey?

Conclusion

As we have demonstrated, the complaint brought by Turkey is, according to us, without foundation. On 19 July 2010, the CETIM will do everything within its power, its means and the time allotted to it, to defend its rights and in order to the ECOSOC to pronounce for a reconsideration of this decision, that it considers unjust and totally disproportionate to any possible misstep committed, however one may be inclined to judge it. The CETIM is of the opinion that: 1. the recommendation of the Committee on NGOs regarding the CETIM was adopted within the framework of a procedure, in this particular case, that did not observe the principles of fair treatment. This “case” could undermine the UN credibility; 2. the right to freedom of opinion and of expression, one of the pillars of human rights, must be respected and promoted within the UN that has decreed it. The NGOs must be able to fully play their role in conformity with Articles 3 and 2 of General Assembly resolution 60/251, Articles 1.3 and 71 of the United Nations Charter and ECOSOC resolution 1996/31.

Thus, we request the ECOSOC to send the CETIM case back for reconsideration by the Committee on NGOs and ask the Committee for a hearing.

CETIM ADVISES YOU THE FOLLOWING READING

Efficace, neutre, désintéressée?

Points de vue critiques du Nord sur la coopération européenne

Joint publication

Ecological crisis, spread of viruses... in spite of its carefully established borders, the North now realizes that we all form one world. “Let us make a clean sweep of our responsibilities and unite ourselves to better experience the decades to come!” the defenders of a new Overseas Development Aid (ODA) appear to be suggesting.
A technical ODA, neutral, which could support an optimal functioning of the markets and protect the famous “global public commons”. Thus does the mainstream message come across.
But is this the purpose of development aid? Can development aid be apolitical? Should development aid remain an instrument of domination or become a tool of cooperation, with all that this implies, among all peoples, placed on equal footing? Isn’t it imperative to reflect upon what “other” Europe –Switzerland included– we want? What other North/South relationships we also wish?
Responding to an article by Jean-Michel Severino (the current Director General of the French Development Agency) that illustrates the mainstream thinking about ODA, the authors of this piece offer us avenues for envisioning another type of European international cooperation and solidarity policy.

Price: CHF 10.- / 6 €, 192 pages, ISBN: 978-2-88053-074-7, PubliCetim n°33, October 2009. It can be ordered from CETIM.

THIS BULLETIN IS ALSO AVAILABLE IN FRENCH AND IN SPANISH

Bulletin n° 38
August 2010 - Special ECOSOC

CETIM
Europe - Third World Centre
Centre Europe - Tiers Monde
Centro Europa - Tercer Mundo
6, rue Amat,
1202 Geneva/Switzerland
Tél.: +41(0)22 731 59 63
Fax: +41(0)22 731 91 52
www.cetim.ch
cetim@bluewin.ch
CCP: 12-19850-1
CCP: (Euro) 91-13687-6,
PofichBe, Postfinance, Berne

EDITORIAL

On July 19, 2010, the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which deals as last instance for the questions relating to NGO status, decided to suspend our status for two years, on recommendation of the Committee on NGOs and further to a complaint by Turkey. This complaint did not rely on any foundation and the procedure applied to our case was tainted with numerous procedural flaws, as we hope to demonstrate in this newletter and on our website at www.cetim.ch/en/cetim_ecosoc.php

The most diverse raison d’état took over justice and the most elementary standards for a fair trial. We are saddened by this unfair sanction, even though it does not come as a surprise.

Present in New York the week before the ECOSOC decision, our delegation sometimes had difficulties containing its anger, but its laughs as well. However, it was also met with lots of sympathy. “It’s a shame”, a state delegation confided when it heard about the final decision that had just been taken at noon on July 19. We have fought as best as we could and received in this battle lots of support from different origins. Our thanks go to them.

This sanction will not preclude us from pursuing our work. On the contrary, the progress of what we ironically nicknamed internally “the CETIM case” has taught us a lot and has strengthened our determination. Moreover, this sanction will not preclude us from continuing to support the UN principle as one of an international body above all others, and which remains essential, despite all its weaknesses and flaws. “ONU: droits pour tous ou loi du plus fort?” is the title of one of our publication. However, such events, of course insignificant in the context of the overall universe, to fuel its detractors arguments.

In addition, the sanction we are enduring could be just one more blow for all those who, in Turkey and in the rest of the world, seek to promote human rights in this country, in a democratic and pacific manner and, from there, a solution to the always central Kurdish question.

A "trial" led in blatant breach of resolution 1996/31!

The granting, the withdrawal or the suspension by the United Nations of a Non-Governemental Organizations (NGOs) consultative status follow a two-step procedure: first, one has to approach a subordinate body of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Committee on NGOs, made of 19 States elected according to a geographical distribution. After review, the Committee drafts "recommendations" that are submitted to the ECOSOC (54 States, elected according to the same principle) in the form of a "Report" divided into several items, each containing a specific recommendation for ratification or invalidation by the ECOSOC.

The whole procedure, as well as the rights, obligations and qualities of the NGOs soliciting, or benefiting from, a consultative status, are governed by an ECOSOC resolution adopted in 1996, Resolution 1996/31.

The Committee holds less than ten days sessions twice a year, both in New York. The one during which the CETIM case, amongst others, was handled took place from May 26 to June 4, 2010, a period interrupted by a long bank holiday in the US. The ECOSOC holds an annual four-week uninterrupted session, alternately in New York and Geneva. This year it took place in New York, from June 28 to July 23.

A recommendation drafted without any real investigation nor hearing of the defense

Officially, the Turkish complaint against us was filed by the Committee on NGOs Secretariat on May 14, 2010, for communication to the Committee members.[1]

The filing of this complaint was formally registered by the Committee on May 26, at the opening of the second annual session, both of which were chaired by Turkey. The Secretariat informed CETIM by an e-mail received in Geneva on the morning of the 27th. The text of the complaint was attached and CETIM was given a May 31 deadline to react to the allegations therein. In effect, given the upcoming long week end and the time needed for translation and distribution to the Committee before it resumed work, CETIM was left with only 33 hours to react. In such conditions, our reply could only be very general and succinct.[2] At the same time, we were asking to be heard by the Committee to present our defense. Then, when the Committee resumed work on June 2, and as it appeared that the Turkish charges could arise from a misunderstanding, we sent to the Committee a second letter in which we expressed our regrets that the unfortunate use of certain expressions[3] might have hurt Turkey, or have potentially been confusing; we also committed to avoid such awkwardness in the future. On the other hand, we reiterated that "we had never acted nor made any recommendation against the territorial integrity of Turkey and that we had never supported terrorism or expressed ourselves in its favour", as was alleged by the Turkish Mission in the extremely serious charges it was drawing from questions of wording.[4]

Therefore, the complaint needed to be investigated and scrutinized to assess whether or not CETIM had breached the famous article 57 of Resolution 1996/31 (see below).

In fact, and although the minutes published thereafter displayed highly diverse, if not completely opposite, assessments of our case, the debate quickly focused on what would be an appropriate sanction. After some controversies and following a real bargaining (see text box on the "competing" case of a LGBT US association), it was agreed "by consensus" that our status should be suspended for two years.

Till then, nothing particularly abnormal in the procedure, it was said, except for the selectivity of the complaint – most of our statements were joined – and for the fact that, let us say by mere coincedence, Turkey was, in our case, both judge (president of the Committee on NGOs) and jury (plaintiff). All we could hope at this stage was that, by analogy with a criminal procedure, the complaint would be filed without further action, absent any sufficiently convincing element. From there, the procedural flaws of which we were victims became overt.

Normally, following the procedure prescribed by article 56 of Resolution 1996/31 (see text box) and as Turkey itself had underlined some ten years before in the Transnational Radical Party case,[5] the Committee should have: a) notified us precisely about the recommendation project retained towards us and b) granted us sufficient time to produce to it our defense. This has not at all been the case:

a) The exact text of the recommendation project was never notified to us, and that despite our repeated requests during the ongoing procedure. We had only vague indications through the "Press releases" published by the UN, of which it is always made clear that they are of no official value. The first time we were able to get to know its exact content, and the one of the accompanying report, was only when the latter, dated June 21, was officially transmitted to the ECOSOC members and observers, and published on its website, that is on July 14, five days (including weekend) before the item was handled by this body. And the motivated, six line long sanction, was officially notified to us only on July 20, after its approval with no voting by the ECOSOC. Yet, the communication to the defense, before the judgement, of the text

- trains leaders of social movements in Geneva and elsewhere;
- serves as an interface between certain UN bodies and organizations, individuals, etc. The latest example being the CETIM's close and longstanding work with the international social movement of small holder farmers, La Via Campesina, with a view to the drafting by the UN of an international convention on the rights of small holder farmers;
- consistently contributes to a better knowledge of the various contents and means of enforcement of human rights, and of issues as food sovereignty, cancellation of the Third World Debt, etc.;
- substantially contributes to the work of the UN human rights bodies in the drafting of norms such as the justiciability of ESCR, the creation of a legal framework at the international level for the activities of transnational corporations, etc.;
- conducts a public debate by organizing conferences about the UN, the necessity of promoting international law and the UN Charter.

Three questions and an answer that is patently obvious: How, with all the activities described above, and a team that currently comprises only three members, would the CETIM pursue this "hidden agenda"? If, however, such is the case, how could we be able to commit the errors and missteps we are accused of, in such an outrageous way, knowing full well the sanctions that threaten us? Would it not have been reasonable for us to act less obviously? Finally, if the CETIM supported the idea of the creation of "great Kurdistan", as Turkey seems to think, why would we have fought from 1991 against any idea of partition of Iraq of which the Kurds constitute nonetheless an important part of the population?

To ask these questions is to answer them.

Point by Point Examination of Turkey's allegations

Between 1998 and 2010 (a period that saw three reports to the Committee on NGOs regarding our status), the CETIM submitted (individually or jointly with renown organizations) 24 statements concerning the human rights situation in Turkey – a tiny part of its activities and interventions. A detailed analysis of these statements shows that they deal essentially with the denunciation of serious human rights violations of all Turkish citizens, denunciations based on reports of internationally acknowledged Turkish human rights organizations, and also on the reports of the special rapporteurs of the Human Rights Council (and the former Commission), the Treaty bodies, etc.

Turkey reproaches us for using the term "Turkish Kurdistan" and for thus attacking its territorial integrity. We do not deny having used this term, and if it offended Turkey, we regret this. However, we have used this term only to designate a geographic area where the kurdish speaking people live or as a historical allusion, but never to refer to any legal or administrative entity. As a proof, we submit our use of other, alternating and innocuous terms such as "Kurdish provinces" or "Kurdish region".

Moreover, if the use of the term "Turkish Kurdistan" had implicitly represented for us any sort of support for separatism, how can it be that we have never made known or even suggested such a point of view in the recommendations that are common places in such statements? Why would we, on the contrary, recommend that solutions be found within the institutional framework of Turkey?

We would emphasize that, since being informed (end of 2009) of Turkey's unhappiness with this term, we decided, immediately, to refrain from using it, as you can see in the two most recent joint statements to the 13th session of the Human Rights Council (March 2010).

We have thus respected Turkey's wishes, which attests to our good faith, to our concern to maintain good relationships with this country and to the absence of any "hidden agenda".

In the complaint Turkey accuses us also of being "a propaganda vehicle of terror organization PKK". The following are our defense and our arguments with regard to this. At the outset, we would like to emphasize that we have no relations with the PKK or any of its members.

In all the CETIM statements, we have used the term PKK in a neutral way to designate one of the parties to the conflict; using alternatively the terms "armed struggle", "guerilla" and "combatants" as is customary usage with other human rights NGOs.

We are of the opinion that it is not incumbent upon NGOs to characterize any group as being "terrorist". Furthermore, the international human rights organizations and a UN expert use neutral terminology. We should have spoken of "non-State armed groups", as do certain conventions.

Finally, the propositions presented in our statements, always written in a constructive spirit, deal with respect of freedoms and rights of all citizens of Turkey, or the search for a "peaceful/democratic solution to the Kurdish question" or "the recognition of Kurdish identity", and all this, again, with the purpose of constructing a peaceful democratic Turkish society.

Given the above, we deem that the CETIM has not violated ECOSOC resolution 1996/31 and has never attacked the territorial integrity of Turkey. The activities of the CETIM are based on the defense and the promotion of the United Nations Charter and international human rights norms as well as on the exercise of its right of freedom of expression, within the limits set by the spirit of these international instruments.

these lines we want to thank them again, as well as all the personalities, experts, Special Rapporteurs and social movements who provided their testimonies and support in the context of our defence file, as well as those who ensured its voluntary translation in English, Spanish or French.

During our own, intense, campaign, we had more in depth discussions with at least thirthy or so ECOSOC member state delegations. None of them[9] expressed, nor alluded to the fact that, in their views, we had violated Resolution 1996/31, as was alleged. To the contrary, several found that the procedure was hasty and unfair and many who knew our work in general, praised its contribution and quality. Yet, and this can be understood, the case was "delicate", it was "too late", all the more as the Committee's recommendation was a matter of "consensus" (see text box). They would be ready to support us "if" another State initiated a vote, for example.

Briefly, on the morning of July 19, at the opening of the discussion on item 12 concerning the NGOs it was a done deal. The session President, after solemnly insisting on the fact that it was unusual to open the discussion with recommendations emanating from secondary bodies and adopted by consensus, and having reminded us through its secretariat that by no means we would be authorized to speak up, led in less than two minutes both the ratification of the recommendation about CETIM and the one of all the other item 12 sub-chapters.

Not a single State spoke up, be it only to request for clarification on our case – the re-examination of which we repeatedly requested – or to challenge the followed procedure. So much so that the President himself made a joke about the speed of the debates! Apart from a couple of general remarks on the functioning of the Committee, the only question that was discussed at length and heavily during the three hours planned for item 12 was the one on the US LGBT NGO. For the United States, it was an absolute priority and they strongly urged its allies to remain silent on any other point to give it the best chance of success. They were heard...

It is worth mentioning here one more time that, except for our own information efforts, none of the States had officially any element allowing it to challenge the recommendation against us: the debates that had surrounded the recommendation at the Committee were summarized in a highly succinct, or even selective, manner, in view of the press releases on the subject; our position and denials were not even mentioned; and contrary to the draft of the very report which we were able to get two days before the publication of its official version on July 14, a copy of the Turkish complaint translated in six official languages had been attached as an appendix, in extenso...

"Consensus", a highly ambiguous term

At the UN, decisions are often taken by vote. States "for," "against," "abstentions," and "not participating" are then counted and listed.
However, because the organization presents the image of a united "international community", the adoption of resolutions "by consensus" is often preferred and, whenever there is a move in this direction, it is highly touchy for a State to distance itself, all the more when it is a small State with no significant diplomatic power.
Thus, the adoption of resolutions "by consensus" possibly spans across quite different realities, schematically situated between two extreme poles:
1) There is a real unanimity amongst all States on the substance and the "consensus" accounts for a strong reality;
2) The "consensus" is only a cover and, more than anything else, means that, for diverse reasons, the States did not want to display their divergences, or their opposition, either because, for example, the question was only minor in their view, and they did not want to express publicly their disagreement, or because some of them were frightened of distancing themselves from their regional groups, thereby taking the risk of loosing their support in other circumstances, or by fear of looking isolated,or yet for any other reason. Then, some States may distance themselves from the "consensus" by a declaration after the adoption of the text in question.
When it comes to subordinate bodies, as is the case with the Committee on NGOs and the ECOSOC, the "consensus" question gets even more complicated: 1) It is generally expected that the higher body adopts without discussion the recommendations of the subordinate body. It is a matter of efficiency. It would not be worth having subordinate bodies, generally smaller and the debates of which, as a consequence, are normally more agile, if that is to reproduce the same debates at the higher level... 2) However, if no exception is ever made to this practice, and if all the subordinate body recommendations are automatically ratified by the one heading it, then such a hierarchy is no more useful. Why then not grant to the subordinate body full decision-making autonomy?!
In our case, the Committee adoption "by consensus" of the recommendation about us, while we were trying to let the delegations with which we were in contact know that we would prefer a vote, put us towards the ECOSOC in a particularly difficult situation...

As we have just seen, the procedure concerning us followed by the Committee on NGOs is marred by procedural irregularities. What has saddened us most is not only that our organization is being sanctioned unjustly and that raison d'état takes precedence over justice, but that this is a signal sent to the NGOs working for the promotion of human rights, in Turkey and elsewhere, and furnishes a further argument to the the detractors of the United Nations.

We have stated and often repeated: the United Nations, in spite of its shortcomings and imperfections, as the world's highest multilateral instance, remains indispensable for dialogue and for the search for solutions to global problems. Obviously, this sanction will not prevent us from continuing to work with the United Nations, nor will it shake our confidence in this institution that has produced so many important international instruments for the universal recognition of human rights and the rights of peoples.

[1] From what we heard later, this formal deposition had been preceded, as of March 2010, by various informal communications of the Turkish mission by the UN in New York, to the attention of these same members, but the content of which we do not know.
[2] This answer with all documents mentionned in this newsletter are available on: www.cetim.ch/en/cetim_ecosoc.php
[3] Such as the use, usual after all, of the words "Turkish Kurdistan" to indicate the region of Turkey where mainly Turkish citizens of Kurdish origin are living, and referring to the history and the sequels of the fall of the Ottoman empire.
[4] Cf. Turkey complaint is available on the CETIM website, see note 2.
[5] Cf. our analysis, see note 2.
[6] The composition of the Committee on NGOs will be slightly renewed, but the presidency of which, it is said, will still be handled by Turkey.
[7] Cf. note 2.
[8] Cf. note 2.
[9] Except for Turkey, when we met some delegeates of the Geneva Turkish Permanent Mission. Note that the Turkish Ambassador in New York, never replied to our repeated requests for a meeting.

PLEASE TAKE NOTE

SYMPOSIUM 5 - 6 November 2010

The CETIM will organize a two-day series of conferences and debates on the subject
"To whom do natural resources belong to?"
with speakers coming from Ecuador, Bolivia, Western Africa and Europe.

More information:
www.cetim.ch/en/conference_symposium2010.php

Art. 56 and 57 of the Resolution 1996/31

We are accused of having violated Article 57 of Resolution 1996/31, reproduced below:
"The consultative status of non-governmental organizations with the Economic and Social Council and the listing of those on the Roster shall be suspended up to three years or withdrawn in the following cases:
(a) If an organization, either directly or through its affiliates or representatives acting on its behalf, clearly abuses its status by engaging in a pattern of acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations including unsubstantiated or politically motivated acts against Member States of the United Nations incompatible with those purposes and principles;
(b) If there exists substantiated evidence of influence from proceeds resulting from internationally recognized criminal activities such as the illicit drugs trade, money-laundering or the illegal arms trade;
(c) If, within the preceding three years, an organization did not make any positive or effective contribution to the work of the United Nations and, in particular, of the Council or its commissions or other subsidiary organs."
There is no truth to the claim, as demonstarted by the pages of the text reproduced below and by the refutations of Mr Pierre-Marie Dupuy, professor of public international law, and of the president of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, Ms Jeanne Mirer (documents available on our website). On the other hand, the trial to which we have been subjected is, as we explain in the following declaration, marred by flagrant procedural irregularities contradicting Article 56 of the same resolution, also reproduced below.
"In cases where the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations has decided to recommend that the general or special consultative status of a non-governmental organization or its listing on the Roster be suspended or withdrawn, the non-governmental organization concerned shall be given written reasons for that decision and shall have an opportunity to present its response for appropriate consideration by the Committee as expeditiously as possible."

CETIM STATEMENT TO STATE MEMBERS OF THE ECOSOC

Above, the statement we sent to the ECOSOC Secretariat, the 25th June 2010, which has never been published nor distributed to the Member States by this latter.

Surprised by the recommendation of the Committee on NGOs to suspend its statute for two years, the CETIM requests an immediate review of its case

Turkey filed a complaint with the Committee on NGOs against CETIM making extremely serious accusations: CETIM would have "a hidden agenda" aiming to attack "its territorial and political integrity".

As the Committee on NGOs has recommended that ECOSOC suspend our (general category) consultative status for two years, we are obliged to defend ourselves because:

- These accusations are of course serious but unfounded. We can certify this.
- Confronted with an expeditious procedure, with no investigation to speak of, we have, until now, had no real way to defend ourselves, with any chance of proving our good faith, against these accusations.
- Finally, and especially, the accusation claiming that the CETIM has a "hidden agenda" that is contrary to the United Nations Charter projects an image that is the opposite of what has always constituted its practice and motivation; it cruelly injures all the persons who have worked with us. Moreover, by the enormity of the sanction requested, it risks becoming indirectly prejudicial to all the peoples and social movements that, placing their hope and trust in the United Nations, have sought the help and support of NGOs such as the CETIM to this purpose.

The CETIM and the United Nations

The CETIM does not recognize itself in these accusations. Indeed:

- Confronted with a profoundly bad developed world and with international relations often regulated by force, the CETIM has consistently presented the United Nations as the only international organization capable of realizing a democratic and egalitarian representation (imperfect but perfectible) in concert with all peoples and nations. The CETIM has always been convinced the most adequate way to a harmonious world and peaceful and democratic coexistence of peoples and States is through multilateralism..
- Further, in so far as its has had the ability and means, the CETIM has always worked to defend the UN against various campaigns aiming to discredit it.

Defense of national sovereignty, of the sovereign equality of States and promotion of human rights

The CETIM has always considered essential the principles of peace, of sovereign equality of States (including the principle of territorial integrity). It if turns out that the construction of the States-Nations has occasionally been carried out to the detriment of some of its constituent populations, we promote a peaceful and democratic settlement of disputes, within the framework of the States concerned.

However, supporting national sovereignty does not mean giving a blank check to States. The protection of all human rights, including cultural rights and the minorities rights, is one of the goals of the UN, enshrined in the UN Charter. Consultation with NGOs is part of this process.

Aware of the tensions within countries, the CETIM, in particular through its Human Rights Program and owing to its consultative status, has firmly committed itself to the defense and the promotion of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR) and to the right to development.

Thus, the CETIM has devoted its energies to:

- asserting the irreplaceable role of the UN in the elaboration of human rights norms;
- supporting the indivisibility, the inseparability, and the interdependence of all human rights.

The CETIM has also always urged the social movements of the entire world not avoid turning away from it and to include the rights it has elaborated in their daily struggles.

With this in mind, the CETIM:

of the recommendation, which, in a way, constituted the charge and indictment, is a matter of the most elementary standards for a fair trial.

The "competing" case of a US LGBT association

In the report drafted in June, which can be downloaded on our website, we were referring to a "negotiated consensus". We could not have said better. During the ECOSOC session, which will be discussed later, our case turned out to be in constant "competition" with the one of a so-called "LGBT" NGO (for Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgender) based in the US, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission. Their case would deserve an analysis of its own. We leave that to those who are better informed on this file. Briefly, according to the indications available to us, this NGO, having requested the consultative status, was hanging around since three years in the waiting room of the Committee on NGOs, which was continually asking new questions. At the last session, the US delegation tried to present an ultimatum so that the case be settled and presented to the summer ECOSOC session. A "no action motion" was put forward, that postponed the review to a later session of the Committee. The US then put into action the full power of their diplomatic system and, with the concerted support of all the occidental delegations plus a few others, they presented directly to the ECOSOC a draft resolution proposing to grant the coveted status to the NGO in question. And they won, with 23 yes, 13 no, 13 abstentions and 5 non-participating. That despite the vehement protests of several delegations which considered that this was tantamount to short cutting the Committee: A first in the history of ECOSOC that, in their view, could set a dangerous precedent, whatever one may think of the relevance of granting a consultative status to this NGO – something about which, in other respects, we can legitimately be delighted. However, we heard from several matching sources that, in parallel to the discussions at the Committee about our sanction, the US would have proposed the following deal to Turkey: contrary to their initial move, they would not ask for a vote on our case and would agree with a recommendation adopted by consensus. In exchange, Turkey would abstain during the vote on the US draft resolution at the ECOSOC. Indeed, along with Ivory Coast and Mozambique (abstentions), Cameroun and Irak (absent), Turkey (abstention) was one of the only member State of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference that did not vote against this resolution. Almost all of them voted against it.

b) In addition, despite our insistence, we were never heard by the Committee, as is set forth by article 56. Evidently, this would have implied that the recommendation project, the drafting of which was discussed on June 3, the day before the closing of the second 2010 Committee session, be concluded only at one of the following sessions, in 2011, and would not be transmitted meanwhile to the ECOSOC. Indeed, considering the budgetary restrictions and the increasing workload – about which it rightfully complains – the Committee would not have had any other resort than this postponement to the new 2011 Committee.[6] There was no urgency – unless CETIM's alleged power of nuisance are overestimated! – and we had clearly stated that we would abstain without reservation from making any statement about Turkey until the question has been settled.

Once we had understood, through press releases, that our case would be transmitted without further ado to the ECOSOC, we started, on one hand, to put together a file for our defense (which took us more than a month). On the other hand, according to the standards of our status, we sent for distribution to the ECOSOC secretariat a two thousand word text (in English and French, reproduced in the following pages) as well as a request for an oral intervention at item 12 of the agenda, the one dealing with NGO, scheduled on July 19.

Absent any reply, right after the arrival of our delegation in New York, we rushed to that Secretariat to hear that our text and request arrived outside the time limit of May 1... that is 26 days before we were "informed" of the Turkish complaint.

We were only left with campaigning by our own means, either by sending our file by e-mail to the delegations and other concerned NGOs or bodies, either by distributing it from hand to hand, or through meetings with the State delegations, which we attempted to make as numerous as possible, notably with the ECOSOC members.

Of note, the NGOs that took our defense had to follow the same ways. Led by Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, 31 NGOs sent a mail to ECOSOC members highlighting the procedural issues linked with the Committee's work and which were raised by our case and two others, the one of Interfaith International, the two year suspension of which was ratified by ECOSOC at the same meeting, and the one of the General Federation of Iraqi Women (GFIW), the status of which it took away. 15 additional NGOs[7] sent a mail to various delegations pleading in our favour and, through the voice of its President, Jeanne Mirer, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)[8], still on July 16, sent to the ECOSOC office and to several of its members, a mail pointing out, amongst others, the problems related to the procedure followed with our case. In