

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE, 1584th
MEETING

Friday, 25 October 1968,
at 10.55 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>Draft Declaration on Social Development (con-</i> <i>tinued)</i>	
<i>Preamble (continued)</i>	1

Chairman: Mr. Erik NETTEL (Austria).

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/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1,
A/C.3/L.1578, A/C.3/L.1579, A/C.3/L.1581, A/
C.3/L.1582/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1583-1585)

PREAMBLE (continued)

Third preambular paragraph

1. Mr. BABAA (Libya) said that the word "of" should be inserted before the word "other" in his delegation's amendment (A/C.3/L.1578, para. 2) to the third preambular paragraph of the original text of the draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development (A/7161, annex I), in order to bring it into line with the amendment which Libya had submitted in the Economic and Social Council (see A/7161, annex II).

The Libyan amendment, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously.

The third preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

Proposed new paragraph

2. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the fourteen-Power proposal (A/C.3/L.1575/Rev.1, para. 2) for the insertion of a new paragraph after the third paragraph of the original text, said that the intention was to indicate that social development was not an end in itself—its aim was to create conditions in which man's aspirations could be fulfilled. That important point had been omitted from the preamble.

3. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that the subject of the proposed new paragraph was already covered by the fourth, fifth, seventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and by the revised Polish amendment (A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1). There were four original paragraphs and two amendments relating to the ideas of peace and peaceful coexistence, and she suggested that the Committee should consider them all together and try to condense them.

4. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) agreed with the representative of Italy. He did not feel that the proposed new paragraph added any new ideas to the preamble, and he wondered whether the sponsors would consider either withdrawing the amendment or combining it with another paragraph—for instance, the twelfth preambular paragraph. Moreover, the text as submitted was not very clear; he did not understand exactly what was meant by "a just social order", nor did he see why economic, and not social, development was mentioned.

5. Mr. PARDOS (Spain) said that, although he agreed in principle with the representative of the United Arab Republic, he thought that the General Assembly should make a declaration of faith on the cardinal importance of man in the process of social development.

6. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) agreed that the substance of the proposed new paragraph was already covered by other paragraphs. For instance, the importance of the individual in the process of social development was emphasized in the first paragraph of the amendment adopted at the preceding meeting, and the importance of peace and peaceful coexistence was brought out in the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs. Consequently, and taking into account the French delegation's proposal that the Committee should avoid repetition and redundancy, he asked whether the sponsors would be prepared to withdraw their amendment.

7. Mr. NAÑAGAS (Philippines) thought that the value of the amendment was that it focused the attention of the world on the importance of man as an individual, as opposed to collective programmes or social entities, and on his need for a just social order in which he could fulfil his aspirations. In his view, that was a most important point, which should be brought out clearly in the Declaration.

8. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) agreed with the representative of the Philippines, and said that he would vote in favour of the amendment if it was put to the vote.

9. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) also supported the amendment. The proposed new paragraph placed emphasis on man as an individual—a point which had so far been omitted in the preamble. Referring to the remarks of the representative of the United Arab Republic, he said that the words "a just social order" were quite clear; one of the most important conditions for man's fulfilment of his aspirations was a social order based on justice. Indeed, he suggested that the last phrase of the amendment should be deleted, in order to give added force to that important principle.

In any event, his delegation would vote in favour of the amendment if it was put to the vote.

10. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said that, although she agreed that repetition should be avoided, she would support the amendment, as it introduced two important new ideas. Firstly, it emphasized the importance of the individual, and secondly, it made it clear that man could only fulfil his aspirations within a just social order. She disagreed with the representative of Austria that the last phrase was unnecessary, since in her view, a just social order was impossible unless it was accompanied by economic development and peace. Even if peace was referred to elsewhere in the preamble, it was so fundamental a condition for social and economic development that it could not be mentioned too often. On the other hand, she thought that the word "complete" was redundant and could be deleted.

11. Mrs. STEVENSON (Liberia) said that, although the sentiments expressed in the amendment were undoubtedly commendable, they were already embodied in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs. Moreover, if the proposed text was inserted between the third and fourth preambular paragraphs, it would break the logical sequence of ideas, as the fourth paragraph referred to goals which were enumerated in the third.

12. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that he had no basic objection to the proposed new paragraph, but agreed that the ideas set forth in it were already expressed in the preamble. He recalled that, although his delegation had originally submitted an amendment for the insertion of a new opening preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1577), it had yielded to appeals to keep the text as short as possible and was prepared to have its amendment combined with the fifth preambular paragraph. He appealed to the sponsors of the amendment under discussion to follow the example of his delegation.

13. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said his delegation considered that the amendment (A/C.3/L.1575/Rev.1, para. 2) stated a principle of fundamental importance which should be placed as near the beginning of the preamble as possible. It would therefore vote in favour of it.

14. Mr. PAOLINI (France) said that, despite the Committee's desire to avoid repetition in the preamble, which was already lengthy, it now had before it several proposed paragraphs dealing with the relationship of man to development. The amendment under discussion was very similar to those submitted by Poland (A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1) and Canada (A/C.3/L.1581). He wondered whether the Canadian and Latin American delegations would consider amalgamating their texts. He also suggested that the Committee might consider whether, as a procedural matter, it should for the time being discuss only amendments to existing paragraphs of the draft Declaration and leave proposals for new paragraphs for discussion at a later stage.

15. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that she supported the idea of the amendment but found the same idea reflected in other amendments. She hoped that the

sponsors of the amendments in question would try to reach agreement on a single text.

16. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, while he had no objection to the content of the amendment, he objected to its placing. Its insertion after the third preambular paragraph would interrupt the sequence of ideas developed in the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs and would make the words "these goals" in the fourth paragraph meaningless. The amendment should be inserted later in the preamble.

17. Mrs. ROQUET (Canada) announced that her delegation had agreed with the sponsors of the amendment under discussion that the first Canadian amendment (A/C.3/L.1581, para. 1) should be treated as an amendment to the Latin American amendment (A/C.3/L.1575/Rev.1, para. 2) and be incorporated in it. The text of the new version would read as follows:

"Convinced that man can achieve complete fulfilment of his aspirations, only within a just social order and that it is consequently of cardinal importance to the well-being of humanity to accelerate in the world social and economic progress everywhere, thus contributing to peace among nations and to international solidarity".

18. Her delegation therefore withdrew its first amendment, but it would maintain the second (A/C.3/L.1581, para. 2).

19. Canada attached great importance to the idea of the Latin American amendment, which placed greater stress on man than on economic development. Since social progress was not complete even in the developed countries, in all of which inequalities existed and minorities suffered from poor social conditions, the Declaration should apply to disadvantaged groups in all countries, developed and developing alike. It should also stress the importance of accelerating social progress everywhere in the world, including the developed countries, and should draw attention to the reciprocal interaction of peace and international solidarity on the one hand and social development on the other. Although the new text was longer than the previous formulation, she felt it was also stronger.

20. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) said that the sponsors of the Latin American amendment accepted the Canadian amendment to their text, which they wished to have put to the vote. If the combined amendment was adopted, the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs could be deleted.

21. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) added, in reply to the Ukrainian representative, that it was precisely because the paragraph they proposed referred to the most important goal of social development that the sponsors could see no reason to change its position in the text.

22. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that since the second Canadian amendment calling for the deletion of the twelfth preambular paragraph still stood, he did not see how the combined amendment could be put to the vote until the Committee had dealt with the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs, which were closely interrelated with it.

23. Mr. TSAO (China) said that if the adoption of the combined amendment would entail the deletion of the twelfth preambular paragraph, which he considered to be of the utmost importance to the Declaration, his delegation would have to vote against it.

24. Mrs. ROQUET (Canada) replied that the text of the twelfth preambular paragraph was preserved virtually intact, in the combined amendment; only the words "as the ultimate aim of all development" had been deleted, and that was in accordance with the Indian and Iranian amendment (A/C.3/L.1579, para. 3) and, she believed, with the Committee's wishes. The idea expressed in the twelfth paragraph had even been strengthened in the new formulation. She could not see why the combined text could not replace the fifth and twelfth paragraphs.

25. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a proposal for the deletion of the fifth paragraph would be out of order because the time-limit for the submission of amendments had now expired.

26. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that, in his view, the Canadian and Polish amendments (A/C.3/L.1581, para. 1; A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1) had enough in common to be combined, but the same was not true of the Canadian and Latin American amendments, the amalgamation of which seemed only to confuse the basic ideas of each.

27. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) moved the suspension of the meeting.

The motion was adopted.

The meeting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

28. Mr. ARTAZA (Chile) informed the Committee that the sponsors of the combined amendment wished to maintain their proposal that it should be inserted as a new paragraph after the third preambular paragraph of the original draft (A/7161, annex I). The Canadian delegation had withdrawn its amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1581, para. 1), and the text under discussion was still to be regarded as a new preambular paragraph and not as an amendment to the fifth paragraph.

29. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was a close relationship between the proposed new paragraph and the text of the revised Polish amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1). He therefore invited the representative of Poland to introduce that amendment.

30. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) recalled that his original amendment (A/C.3/L.1577) had been generally supported by members of the Committee, so far as its substance was concerned. He wished to point out to those delegations which had expressed doubts about the relevance of his text to social development that the maintenance of international peace and security, or the prevention and eventual elimination of war, would release resources for social development; thus there was a direct and important relationship between the two questions. Moreover, war itself, and those who waged it, were destroyers of social development. He could not agree that the repetition of such ideas deprived them of their meaning; on the contrary, he felt that the idea of

the maintenance of international peace and security was a most important and lofty principle, which should be included in the Declaration. In order to avoid adding a new preambular paragraph, his delegation had revised the original amendment and proposed that it should be combined with the fifth paragraph; he hoped that other delegations would follow that example. The revised Polish amendment introduced an idea that was basic to the whole Declaration, and he could not agree to the deletion of the fifth preambular paragraph, which, indeed, should appear in the text before the proposed new paragraph.

31. Mr. SHERIFIS (Cyprus) suggested that the words "and mutually influence each other" in the revised Polish amendment should be deleted, since that idea was already implied by the words "are closely interdependent".

32. Mr. EL SHEIKH (Sudan) asked whether the Indian and Iranian delegations maintained their amendment for the deletion of part of the twelfth preambular paragraph (A/C.3/L.1579, para. 3), or whether they would be prepared to agree to the deletion of the whole paragraph.

33. Miss NAIDU (India) said that her delegation would have no objection to the deletion of the twelfth paragraph.

34. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) said that he saw no point in inserting a new paragraph which merely expanded on what was already contained in the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs of the original draft. If the suggestion was that the twelfth preambular paragraph should become part of the fifth, there would be no difficulty, but he could not reach a decision on the proposed new paragraph until the position regarding the fifth and twelfth paragraphs had been made clear.

35. Mrs. ROQUET (Canada) explained that her delegation had become a co-sponsor of the Latin American amendment (A/C.3/L.1575/Rev.1, para. 2), as orally revised, and had withdrawn its amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph; however, the Canadian proposal that the twelfth preambular paragraph should be deleted had not been withdrawn. The proposal currently before the Committee was that a new paragraph should be inserted after the third preambular paragraph of the original draft, and the question of the fifth and twelfth preambular paragraphs should be considered later, even though some of the ideas they expressed were embodied in the proposed new paragraph. The revised Polish amendment, which she believed would have the effect of combining the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, should also be discussed later.

36. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said the fact that the time-limit for the submission of amendments to the preamble had expired should not mean that ideas which arose in the course of the discussion could not be incorporated, since the Committee had agreed that the text needed extensive reformulation.

37. Mrs. CONDÉ (Guinea) felt that the important question was not whether new paragraphs should be inserted into the text, but whether they were true to the spirit of the Declaration. In her view, the proposed new paragraph would represent a positive contribution to the text, and she urged its adoption.

38. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that the Committee should take into account the logical order of the preambular paragraphs. In his view, the fifth paragraph, in the version proposed by Poland (A/C.3/L.1577/Rev.1), should precede the new text proposed by Canada and certain of the Latin American countries, and the fourth paragraph of the original text (A/7161, annex I) should follow the new paragraph. He hoped the the sponsors of the new text would agree to that order and that the Committee would decide accordingly.

39. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) said that he had welcomed the original idea of the fourteen-

Power amendment (A/C.3/L.1575/Rev.1, para. 2) because it had introduced an important new element into the draft. In its present form, however, it had lost its impact by being incorporated into a long paragraph which recapitulated the ideas of several other preambular paragraphs. The status of the fifth, sixth and twelfth paragraphs and of the Polish amendment was a vital question; if it was the intention of the sponsors of the new paragraph that they should be deleted, his delegation would have to vote against the amendment.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.