

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



THIRD COMMITTEE, 1582nd
MEETING

Wednesday, 23 October 1968,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Message to the President of the General Assembly</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on Social Development (continued)</i>	
<i>Title (concluded)</i>	1
<i>Preamble</i>	3

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

Message to the President of the General Assembly

1. The CHAIRMAN, speaking on behalf of the Committee, asked the representative of Guatemala to convey to the President of the General Assembly the Committee's sympathy on the occasion of his illness and its best wishes for a prompt recovery.
2. Mr. PONCE RAMIREZ (Guatemala) thanked the Committee for its good wishes.

AGENDA ITEM 50

Draft Declaration on Social Development (*continued*)
(A/7161, A/7203, chap. X, sect. A; A/7235 and Add.1, A/C.3/L.1575-1578)

TITLE (*concluded*)

3. Miss HART (New Zealand), commenting on the Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1576) to the title of the draft Declaration on Social Development (A/7161, annex I), said that, in her delegation's view, the concept of progress was covered by the term "development" and there was no point in using two words where one would suffice. That did not mean that the word "progress" should not appear in the body of the Declaration, but the text should be carefully edited to ensure that the terminology used was consistent. "Development" was the term currently used in the United Nations, as was illustrated by the decision of the Economic and Social Council to rename its Social Commission the Commission for Social Development. Moreover, the adjective "progressive" was sometimes used in a political sense. It would be preferable to use the more comprehensive term "development" and to state in the Committee's report to the General Assembly that the term was intended to cover the concept of "progress".
4. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that the Charter of the United Nations referred to "social progress" in the Preamble and to "social progress and development" in Article 55, and she rejected the suggestion that the term had any political implications. Nor did she agree that the two terms were synonymous. Her delegation

felt very strongly that the word "progress" should be included in the title of the Declaration.

5. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran), supported by Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), said that the decision to be taken on the title would affect the wording of the whole Declaration. As the text referred in several places to "social progress and development", it was only logical that the title should do likewise. If it was decided not to use the word "progress" in the title, there would presumably be no reason to use it in the text.

6. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that social development was a concept that was continually growing and taking shape, and one which the United Nations had been studying for many years past. The primary purpose of the draft Declaration was to affirm the interdependence of economic and social development and to provide guidelines for social development, and the concept should not be changed and broadened to include that of social progress.

7. Mr. TSAO (China) said that the ideas of progress, advancement and improvement were implicit in the term "development", and there was no need to refer explicitly to one of those ideas rather than another. The term "progress" was quite properly used in the Charter but was unnecessary in the title of the Declaration, which should be as short, forceful and elegant as possible.

8. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) expressed surprise at the opposition to the inclusion of the word "progress" in the title of the Declaration. There had been no objection when the idea had first been suggested by the representative of Canada; apparently, it was the fact that the socialist countries had expressed support for the suggestion which had aroused opposition. As the representative of a developing country, he thought that it would be useful to have both terms in the title.

9. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) said that the Iraqi amendment deserved the Committee's support, since the word "progress" conveyed the idea of forward movement. Many countries had embarked upon programmes of social development, but that did not mean that progress would actually be made. Development programmes should be regarded as a means of achieving progress.

10. Miss HLASS (Jordan) agreed that "development" was the more widely used term, but considered that "progress" was more positive; "development" could sometimes have a negative sense. Consequently, the needs of the developing countries would best be met by including both words in the title.

11. She moved the closure of the debate on the title of the draft Declaration and on the Iraqi amendment.

The motion was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 30 abstentions.

12. After an exchange of views concerning the French and Spanish translations of the Iraqi amendment, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the language services of the Secretariat should be asked to make any necessary modifications to the Spanish text. He understood that the wording of the French version was acceptable to the French-speaking delegations.

It was so agreed.

The Iraqi amendment (A/C.3/L.1576) was adopted by 52 votes to 17, with 28 abstentions.

The title of the draft Declaration (A/7161, annex I), as amended, was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

13. Dame Mabel MILLER (Australia) explained that her delegation had voted against the Iraqi amendment and abstained from voting on the title, as amended, because it considered the amendment totally irrelevant and redundant.

14. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that her delegation had voted against the amendment but in favour of the title, as amended, because, while it had not been in favour of the Iraqi proposal, it did not consider the wording of the title to be particularly important. She added that the word "progress" had no political undertones or revolutionary connotations in the English language.

15. Mrs. ROQUET (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the Iraqi amendment, in keeping with the fact that Canada had itself proposed in the Commission for Social Development that the Declaration should be entitled "Declaration on Social Progress". It was important to make it clear that the ultimate objective of social development was social progress, and not economic gains, which had been over-emphasized in the past. She hoped that the debate on the subject would not be reopened whenever the word "development" or the word "progress" was used in the text, and she suggested that a clear definition of the exact meaning of the two words should be established forthwith.

16. Mr. PAOLINI (France) explained that his delegation had voted against the amendment because it thought that it introduced a certain ambiguity. Moreover, it was inconsistent with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI), which called upon the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission for Social Development to prepare a draft declaration on social development which would, in general terms, define the objectives of social development and the methods and means of achieving them. Although the term "social progress" had a place in the draft Declaration, it should not be associated with, or used instead of, "social development".

17. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had also voted against the amendment because it felt that the wording used in General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI) should be retained. In that connexion, he reminded the Committee that proposals to change the title of the draft Declaration had met with opposition in the Commission for Social Development. Development was the means by which social progress could

be achieved and, as such, it surely implied a will to encourage progress.

18. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment, without, however, attaching any political connotations to it.

19. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that she had voted against the Iraqi amendment and had abstained from voting on the title, as amended, for the same reasons as had been stated by the representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom. In that connexion, she drew the Committee's attention to the comments of the Government of the Netherlands on the draft Declaration, and in particular to the views expressed in section I of the Netherlands note verbale (see A/7235/Add.1), which her delegation fully endorsed.

20. Mrs. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the title, not because it was opposed to progress, but because it considered that development was the means of achieving progress. She did not, in any case, think that the wording of the title was very important.

21. Mrs. AGBOTON (Dahomey) said that her delegation had voted against the Iraqi amendment because it felt that the concept of progress was included in the term "development". There was no reason why the word "progress" should not be used in the body of the text, even if it did not appear in the title. Her delegation had abstained from voting on the title, as amended, because it preferred the original wording.

22. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) observed that in United Nations usage the term "development" included the idea of progress. Nevertheless, he had voted in favour of the Iraqi amendment, as he thought it only logical that a word used throughout the text should appear in the title. Those opposed to the amendment should have submitted a counter-proposal to delete the word "progress" throughout the text.

23. Mr. GARZON VALDEZ (Argentina) said that he had voted against the amendment because he considered it irrelevant. Moreover, although he did not agree that the word "progress" was redundant, it was nevertheless inconsistent with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI).

24. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) said that she too had voted against the amendment and abstained from voting on the title, as she preferred the original wording, which was in accord with decisions previously taken by the General Assembly and the Commission for Social Development.

25. Mr. BONNY-EBOUMBOU (Cameroon) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the amendment, firstly because the proposed wording was inconsistent with that used in General Assembly resolution 2215 (XXI), and, secondly, because it had doubts about introducing the concept of progress into the title.

26. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the Iraqi amendment and the amended title, because it felt that a mention of the broader concept of progress in the title of the draft Declaration would be an encouragement to the developing countries.

27. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Iraqi amend-

ment because it had found itself in a very difficult position. On the one hand, a very definite title had been submitted to the Committee by the Commission for Social Development; on the other hand, it was clear that many States attached great importance to the inclusion of the word "progress". Another difficulty had been that many delegations had had to translate the amendment from one of the official languages of the United Nations into their mother tongue. His delegation had voted in favour of the title, as amended, because it felt that it was in accordance with the principles and purposes of the draft Declaration.

28. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) said that his delegation had voted in favour of both the amendment and the amended title because social progress was among the objectives of Uganda's second Five-Year Plan and it believed that the term should appear in the title of the draft Declaration.

29. Mrs. CONDE (Guinea) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the Iraqi amendment because it believed that it adequately expressed the ultimate objective of the draft Declaration, which was the steady improvement of the human condition.

PREAMBLE

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the preamble of the draft Declaration (A/7161, annex I) should be considered paragraph by paragraph and that amendments should be introduced as and when the paragraph to which they related was taken up.

It was so decided.

31. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland), introducing his delegation's amendment for the insertion of a new opening paragraph (A/C.3/L.1577), said that it was of a general nature and largely self-explanatory. Not only was it based on the fundamental principles of the Charter, but it gave added force and a more prominent place to the ideas expressed in the seventh preambular paragraph. While he welcomed the sentiment expressed in that paragraph, war should be condemned at the very beginning of the preamble, as it disrupted social progress, and, if wars continued, progress in disarmament would hardly be possible.

32. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that, if the fifth preambular paragraph were replaced by the Polish amendment, some of the repetition about which she had complained earlier would be avoided.

33. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) supported that suggestion.

34. Mr. VASS (Hungary) said that he fully supported the Polish amendment. However, it might be preferable to replace the word "the" by "a" before the words "basic condition", as there were other basic conditions for social and economic progress.

35. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) also supported the Polish amendment in principle, but thought that, while still appearing as the first paragraph of the preamble, it could be combined with the fifth paragraph. He wondered why the word "development" was not mentioned in the amendment.

36. Miss MARTINEZ (Jamaica) felt that the Polish amendment and the fifth preambular paragraph both of which were valid and which described a reciprocal

interrelationship, could well be combined. She had no preferences as to the positioning of the new paragraph.

37. Mr. SHERZOY (Afghanistan) said that he would be able to vote in favour of the Polish amendment if it contained the words "social progress and development", in conformity with the decision taken by the Committee on the title of the draft Declaration.

38. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) supported the Afghan position. He also felt that the Polish amendment should be combined with the fifth preambular paragraph.

39. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) supported the Polish amendment in principle, but wondered whether there was any real need for it. The discussion on the French representative's procedural motion at the 1580th meeting had shown that the Committee wished to shorten the draft Declaration and avoid repetition. The Polish amendment might therefore be combined with various other paragraphs of the preamble or with the amendment to the second preambular paragraph to be introduced by the Libyan delegation (A/C.3/L.1578, para. 1), which seemed to him to take account of the spirit of Poland's proposal.

40. Mrs. AGBOTON (Dahomey) said that, while she was not opposed to the Polish amendment, she felt that a declaration on social progress and development should concentrate on the social benefits that would accrue from the maintenance of international peace and security. In the spirit of the decision taken on the French motion, she endorsed the suggestion that the amendment should be combined with the fifth preambular paragraph.

41. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic), supported by Mr. BABAA (Libya), agreed with the representative of Hungary that the maintenance of international peace and security could hardly be considered the only basis for social and economic progress. Moreover, if peace was to have any real meaning, it must be based on justice, as the countries fighting for their independence or against colonialism well knew; justice was as basic a condition for social development as peace.

42. Mr. KALAGALI (Uganda) felt that the insertion of the Polish amendment as the opening paragraph of the preamble would give the misleading impression that the Declaration was concerned with ways of ensuring international peace and security—a matter which was outside the Committee's competence. He would be able to vote for the amendment if it was incorporated in the fifth preambular paragraph.

43. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica), supported by Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), observed that the Polish amendment, which seemed to stray from the sphere of social development into the political field, was very similar in intent to a Latin American amendment to be introduced later (A/C.3/L.1575, para. 2), which she thought was a better and more complete formulation of the same idea. She therefore hoped that the Committee would postpone its discussion of the preamble until it had before it all the amendments that were to be submitted.

44. Mr. GHAFI (Algeria) observed that the Polish amendment pertained more to the great Powers than to the developing countries.

45. Mr. JHA (India) pointed out that the benefits of the maintenance of international peace and security were not limited to the social field, but the Third Committee's terms of reference were. The Declaration should refer primarily to the social benefits to be derived from social development. The present text of the fifth preambular paragraph, which emphasized the contribution that social progress and development could make to peace and international solidarity, should remain intact and unchanged.

46. Mrs. PICKER (United States of America) considered that the Polish amendment repeated ideas expressed in the fifth, sixth, seventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs. Although the reference to the maintenance of international peace and security derived from Article 1 (1) of the Charter, the Polish amendment omitted the words "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law" contained therein. She therefore suggested that the Polish delegation might consider reformulating its amendment in such a way as to combine into a single paragraph the preambular paragraphs and the words of the Charter which she had mentioned.

47. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) said that, while she could not, of course, vote against the Polish amendment, she believed that the automatic insertion of the same words at the beginning of every United Nations document progressively deprived those words of their effectiveness.

48. Mr. MATHYS (Canada) said that his delegation intended to submit an amendment^{1/} which was very similar in thought to the Polish amendment.

49. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) felt that the final version of the paragraph proposed by the Polish delegation should also contain the ideas of international solidarity and of development. She suggested that delegations which intended to submit amendments to the preamble should meet and try to work out a joint text which would take account of the observations made at the current meeting.

50. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Polish amendment because he felt that the maintenance of international peace and security was the most important condition for economic and social progress. Since the fifth preambular paragraph reflected a different, but equally important and not incompatible, idea, the two paragraphs could well be combined.

51. Mrs. DANIELI (United Republic of Tanzania) suggested that the Committee should defer any further consideration of the preamble until all the amendments to it had been circulated.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.3/L.1581.