



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 50:

**Draft Declaration on Social Development
(continued)**

Part I. Principles (continued) 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 and 2, A/C.3/L.1584 and Corr.1, A/C.3/
L.1586/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1587, A/C.3/L.1590, A/
C.3/L.1594-1605)

PART I. PRINCIPLES (continued)

Articles 2, 3, 7 and 12 (continued)

1. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said he appreciated that his proposal to combine a number of articles into one had somewhat complicated the Committee's work, but felt that the text would gain in clarity and precision as a result. He was gratified that most speakers had welcomed his approach.

2. After carefully considering the suggestions and proposals made by other countries with regard to his amendment, he was submitting a revised version (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) incorporating all the sub-amendments he had been able to accept. For the introductory sentence of the new article, he was proposing the following compromise wording in order to take account of the suggestions made by Algeria (1591st meeting), Iraq (1590th meeting) and Yugoslavia (1591st meeting): "The following are considered primary conditions of social progress and development". Regarding sub-paragraph (a), he had accepted the Libyan amendment (A/C.3/L.1602, para. 4) in order to bring the text into line with the seventh preambular paragraph. He had also decided to replace sub-paragraph (b) by the text in document A/C.3/L.1590. On the other hand, he could not accept the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 1), because the term "permanent sovereignty" employed in the French amendment was the one customarily used by the United Nations. He was also unable to accept the Ceylonese amendment (A/C.3/L.1586/Rev.1), because he felt that an article of that nature fitted more appropriately in the part relating to means and methods. He had retained sub-paragraph (d) as it stood because it was the original text of article 7, which represented a consensus reached after arduous discussions; he could not,

therefore, accept the Austrian amendment (A/C.3/L.1598).

3. He had no objection to designating the sub-paragraphs simply by dashes, instead of letters, since that would remove any suggestion of an order of priority. The Committee could decide on the order of the sub-paragraphs later, after it had adopted the substance of article 2.

4. In replying to comments made by the representatives of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, he explained that the object of his amendment had been to group together each and all of the ideas in the original text for the sole purpose of giving them greater cohesion, unity and force.

5. With regard to the sub-amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, he understood the sponsors' desire to give human rights pride of place in part I, but he could not incorporate that idea in his new article because it related to a different principle. In his view, that principle would better be set forth in a separate article.

6. Mrs. RAOELINA (Madagascar) commended the French delegation for having made the Committee's task easier by accepting most of the sub-amendments that had been submitted. The revised amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) greatly improved the substantive form and structure of the original draft and gave a precise enunciation of the primary conditions of social development. Her delegation would whole-heartedly support it; it could not, however, accept the Greek and Austrian sub-amendments.

7. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that she fully supported amendment A/C.3/L.1590, which France had accepted; in her view, that amendment incorporated elements which were fundamental to the peoples of the Americas.

8. The representative of Yugoslavia had referred to the utilization of as yet unexploited natural resources, especially for the benefit of the developing countries. Venezuela agreed with that idea and hoped that a reference to it would be made in some part of the text.

9. Article 7 of the original text (A/7161, annex I), now the fourth paragraph of the proposed article 2, which referred to the right and responsibility of each State, nation and people to determine freely its own objectives of social development, created no difficulties for her delegation. If the word "people" referred specifically to colonial peoples, her country believed the text must state that they possessed that right, even though they could not exercise it.

10. Miss HLASS (Jordan) said that the amalgamation of articles proposed by France deserved the full sup-

port of all delegations. She commended the spirit of co-operation which the representative of France had shown in accepting almost all the sub-amendments that had been proposed. Jordan would vote in favour of that amendment and also of the Ceylonese amendment, when it was taken up separately. Lastly, she wondered whether, in the English text of the revised amendment, the word "prerequisite" could be used in the introductory sentence instead of the word "primary".

11. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) pointed out that his objections to the French amendment had been based on purely practical and procedural grounds. Although he would have preferred the original text (A/7161, annex I), he did acknowledge that the French amendment had great merits. It was logical and it grouped together ideas which were closely inter-related. His delegation would support it if the majority favoured it. However, the Committee should not make the mistake of grouping together ideas which had nothing to do with each other. In saying that, he was referring to the sub-amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2; for, although he warmly supported the idea in question, he did not believe that it should be included in the article 2 proposed by France. He therefore requested the sponsors to withdraw the sub-amendment in order to facilitate the Committee's work.

12. With respect to the first paragraph of article 2, he asked the French delegation whether it had decided to delete the word "peace" which appeared in the original amendment.

13. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) replied that he had deleted the word because a number of delegations had requested that the text of the first paragraph of article 2 should be the same as that of the seventh pre-ambular paragraph; however, if the majority wished to retain it, he would have no objection.

14. Mr. GARZON VALDEZ (Argentina) found the French representative's comments on the sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 2), of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, perfectly acceptable. However, he was disappointed that he had not agreed to the inclusion of the new paragraph on human rights. He pointed out that the only article of part I to speak of something on which social development was founded was article 4, which referred to human rights. Thus, that principle was a foundation or an essential condition, and he saw no reason why it should not be included in the text of article 2 proposed by France. It had also been said that the new article 2 related exclusively to conditions of a political nature. He was surprised at that argument, because many of the political activities carried on by peoples were aimed precisely at bringing about respect for human rights. Moreover, part I would be more in harmony with the preamble if it began with a reference to human rights. He would therefore press the sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 2) and hoped that the French delegation would give it consideration.

15. Mr. TSAO (China) expressed his gratification that the representative of France had agreed to use dashes instead of letters to identify the paragraphs of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1). However, that did not fully dispel his doubts about the order of

the paragraphs; for national independence was a much more important condition for social development than peaceful coexistence, since without national independence peaceful coexistence could only be subjugation and bondage. He was therefore pressing his proposal that the first paragraph should be placed fourth. Since his delegation's position on the French amendment depended precisely on the order in which the ideas would be arranged, and since the representative of France had shown flexibility in that regard, he would like the order to be decided before the vote.

16. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) felt it would be better for the Committee to decide first on the content of the amendment proposed by his delegation (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) and then to decide on the best arrangement of its various parts.

17. Mr. SAINT-REMY (Belgium) supported the revised French amendment.

18. His delegation had no objection to the inclusion of the amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, either as an amendment to the French amendment or elsewhere in the draft Declaration, and in that respect he agreed with the comments of the representative of the United Arab Republic. However, he would like the representative of France to state whether he agreed with the idea contained in that amendment, why he declined to include it in his own amendment, and what he thought the best place for it would be.

19. Mr. NKONGO (Democratic Republic of the Congo), speaking as a sponsor of amendment A/C.3/L.1590, accepted the changes which the representative of France had made in it when incorporating it into his own amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1).

20. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) supported the idea contained in the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, but said that she could not vote in favour of its inclusion as an amendment to the French amendment, since she felt that respect for human rights was the very essence of social development, and not one of its preconditions. The best place to consider that amendment (A/C.3/L.1603, para. 2) would perhaps be article 3. She also agreed with the representative of France that the Ceylonese amendment (A/C.3/L.1586/Rev.1) should not be included as an amendment to the French amendment, since its nature was such that it should appear at a different place in the Declaration.

21. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) said that the Russian version of the French delegation's amendment would be logical or illogical, according to how the introductory sentence was translated—in other words, according as it stated that the various elements appearing in the amendment were "some" basic conditions for social progress or "the" basic conditions for such progress. His delegation could not agree to any wording which belittled the importance of the remaining articles of the draft.

22. The Russian version of article 2 of part I of the draft Declaration, which corresponded to the third paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1), spoke, not of the permanent sovereignty of each nation over its natural wealth and resources,

but of the exercise of that sovereignty; in his view, that distinction should be preserved.

23. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that the new version of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) summarized in an elegant and comprehensive manner concepts which had previously been scattered over four different articles. He would therefore vote in favour of it. However, he was surprised that the representative of France had agreed to introduce into the first paragraph the words "friendly relations", because that was both repetitious and confused in a context which already referred to peaceful coexistence. He also had some difficulty with the replacement of the word "fundamental" by "primary" in the introductory sentence, which strengthened the Argentine representative's arguments in favour of incorporating the amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, as an amendment, in the French amendment, since respect for human rights was indisputably a primary condition of social development. However, he agreed with the representative of Iraq that the most appropriate place for the amendment would be, not article 2 of part I of the draft Declaration, but article 3.

24. He shared the doubts expressed by the previous speakers about the desirability of inserting the Ceylonese amendment (A/C.3/L.1586/Rev.1) in article 2 of part I, and he considered that the most appropriate place for it would be part III.

25. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, after a careful study of the different items of the French amendment, he had arrived at the conclusion that it considerably weakened the original text of the draft Declaration, as submitted by the Commission for Social Development, by, for example, deleting article 11 and omitting the reference in article 13 to the responsibility of States with regard to the expansion of national income and its equitable distribution. He could not support changes of that kind, and the only point on which he agreed with the representative of France was that their ideas of what weakened or strengthened the text were diametrically opposed.

26. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) stated that his delegation had had serious difficulties in agreeing to the original version of the French amendment, but it was quite able to support the text as improved by the incorporation of various amendments submitted by countries of the third world, on the understanding that it would prefer the English translation to use the term "prerequisites", rather than "primary conditions".

27. Mr. KALANGALI (Uganda) suggested to the representative of France that he should use a different formulation in the introductory sentence of his amendment, so as not to suggest that other conditions of social development had no significance.

28. Raising a procedural question, he asked whether those amendments which were not expressed as amendments to the French amendment but applied to substantive articles of the draft should be adopted by the Committee or be accepted by the representative of France, since the latter's amendment related to several articles.

29. Mr. NASINOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not find the French amend-

ment satisfactory, either in its original form (A/C.3/L.1584, para. 2) or in its revised version (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1), in which, so far as the Russian text was concerned, the changes introduced were barely perceptible. The French amendment grouped together a number of concepts which were treated separately in the original document, but it did not propose any change which actually improved the text. Rather, on the contrary, it impaired the original formulation, as concerned both its structure and its content. Because of the amalgamation of different elements in a single article, several of the original ideas lost their force and character. As other speakers had pointed out, the proposed formulation restricted the primary conditions which were considered fundamental to social progress to a specific number, thus belittling the importance of other factors which were equally indispensable.

30. The idea expressed in the original article 12, namely, that peace and social progress were inseparably linked, had been considerably weakened in the first paragraph. The idea, which was of the utmost importance, must be given clear expression in the draft Declaration. With regard to the same paragraph, his delegation supported the remarks made by the representative of Iran concerning the use of the terms "peaceful coexistence" and "friendly relations", and he wondered what reasons could have prompted the deletion of the word "peace". Where the third paragraph was concerned, he felt that it was not enough to establish the principle of sovereignty over natural resources; it was extremely important to emphasize that the exercise of that sovereignty was a prerequisite for national development.

31. Similarly, many concepts contained in the original text had been emasculated or had disappeared completely, and for that reason his delegation was categorically opposed to the French amendment. On the other hand, it was prepared to support the Ceylonese amendment (A/C.3/L.1587) proposing the inclusion in the Declaration of a reference to international cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space and the sea-bed and ocean floor.

32. Mr. BABAA (Libya) welcomed the fact that his delegation's amendment to article 6 (A/C.3/L.1602, para. 2) had been incorporated in the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1).

33. Mr. ABSHIR (Somalia) observed that in both the original article 3 and the second paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) there was a clash between principles which applied to different situations. In his view, the concepts of national independence and self-determination related to colonial territories, while the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States affected countries which were already independent. Colonial peoples actually lived under foreign intervention and deserved the support of the whole world to rid themselves of it—support which the colonial Powers might in turn describe as interference in their internal affairs. He believed, therefore, that those ideas should be given separate treatment, and wished to submit a sub-amendment to that effect.

34. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) said he regretted that he was unable to accept the sub-amendment in

document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, since he felt that the idea which it expressed, and with which he fully agreed, would be out of place in article 2 as proposed in the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1). The principle of respect for human rights and social justice was clearly established in the new article 3 proposed in amendment A/C.3/L.1584, and his delegation was prepared at the appropriate time to consider the possibility of strengthening that concept in accordance with the wishes of the Latin American countries. The replacement of the word "fundamental" by the word "primary" in the introductory sentence of the revised amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) was intended solely to strengthen the text, and adjectives which would produce the same effect must therefore be used in the translated versions. In conclusion, he said that his delegation agreed to the insertion of the word "peace" after the term "peaceful coexistence" in the first paragraph of its amendment, with the result that all the concepts contained in the preamble and in the original articles which it was proposed should be replaced would be incorporated in the new formulation.

35. Mr. GARZON VALDEZ (Argentina), on behalf of the sponsors, withdrew the sub-amendment in document A/C.3/L.1603, paragraph 2, in view of the explanations given by the French delegation and on the understanding that, when article 3 was considered, an attempt would be made to arrive at a formulation which would place more emphasis on the principle of respect for human rights. He moved the closure of the debate and proposed that the Committee should proceed to vote.

36. Mr. ABUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) opposed the motion, as his delegation intended to submit an amendment to the French amendment.

37. Mrs. AFNAN (Iraq) said she thought that the United Arab Republic delegation should be given the opportunity to submit its sub-amendment; consequently, she too opposed the motion.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the motion for closure of the debate on the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1).

The motion was rejected by 35 votes to 22, with 33 abstentions.

39. Mr. VASS (Hungary) said that any enumeration of the primary political conditions of social progress should include a reference to the elimination of inequality, exploitation, colonialism, racism, neo-nazism and apartheid, and suggested that the French delegation should modify its amendment accordingly.

40. Mr. VALDIVIESO (Peru) urged the Somali delegation not to submit a sub-amendment proposing the separation of the concepts of national independence, self-determination, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and respect for sovereignty, which were interdependent.

41. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) said that the French delegation, in an admirable spirit of compromise, had incorporated in its proposed new article 2 (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) those points in the amendment to article 3 submitted by her country and others (A/C.3/L.1590) to which her delegation attached the greatest

importance. Nevertheless, she preferred the term "non-intervention" to "non-interference", since it was more precise and was used in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty. The term "interference" was open to misinterpretations, such as that placed on it by South Africa in resisting the condemnation of apartheid by the United Nations, whereas the use of "non-intervention" would safeguard the right and duty of the United Nations to concern itself with questions relating to human rights for which it was given competence by the Charter.

42. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) thought that the word "peace", which the French delegation had agreed to insert in the first paragraph of its amendment should be placed at the beginning of that paragraph. She urged the Greek delegation to withdraw its amendment to article 2 (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 1) since the expression "permanent sovereignty" was part of the accepted United Nations terminology and appeared in many United Nations documents.

43. Mr. ABUL-NASR (United Arab Republic) submitted an oral amendment to the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) whereby in the second paragraph of the new article 2 the word "on" would be deleted before the words "the principle of non-interference", and before the words "respect for the sovereignty". He believed that that might meet the objections raised by the Somali delegation.

44. Mr. SANON (Upper Volta) said that he agreed with the principles contained in the French amendment, although he considered the original text to be far more complete. He was, however, surprised at the use in that amendment of the expression "non-interference", since General Assembly resolution 2225 (XXI) referred to "the Inadmissibility of Intervention". With regard to the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 1), it seemed more appropriate to use the wording which had already become accepted in the United Nations. He agreed with the points raised by the Somali delegation and with the sub-amendment of the United Arab Republic, as they would make the text more precise and prevent possible ambiguity.

45. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) withdrew his amendment to article 2 (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 1) and said he wished his amendment to article 7 (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 4) to be regarded as an amendment to the French amendment.

46. Mr. ZORRILLA (Mexico) said he agreed with the French amendment and was prepared to vote in its favour. Referring to the criticism voiced by some delegations that article 2 did not include all of the primary conditions of social development, he said that France had grouped together only those principles specifically described as "fundamental" or "essential" conditions in the original text.

47. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) said that a moment previously she had voted against the closure of the debate, but, since the hour was late, she formally moved that the French delegation should give its final opinion on the comments which had been made and that

the debate should then be closed immediately so that a vote might be taken.

48. Mr. BAHNEV (Bulgaria) requested a slight drafting change in the Russian text of the revised French amendment; it would not affect the original text, but in the Russian text it would prevent some conditions from being considered of more fundamental importance than others.

49. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he fully supported the Bulgarian suggestion; he also proposed that the words "National development and the exercise of" should be inserted at the beginning of the third paragraph.

50. Mr. ABSHIR (Somalia) submitted an oral amendment to the second paragraph of the revised article 2 (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) whereby the paragraph would be divided into three separate paragraphs: the first would deal with national independence based on the right of peoples to self-determination; the second would be on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States; and the third on respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

51. Mr. LE DIRAISON (France) pointed out to the representative of Costa Rica that the expression "non-interference", as used in the second paragraph of the French amendment, seemed to him to be preferable to the expression "non-intervention".

52. Replying to the representative of the United Arab Republic, he said he had no objection to the deletion in the second paragraph of the two prepositions "on" before the words "the principle of non-interference", and "respect for the sovereignty".

53. With regard to the comments made by the Moroccan representative, he felt that the most appropriate place for the word "peace" in the first paragraph was after the words "peaceful coexistence".

54. Finally, he could not accept the suggestion by the Ukrainian representative concerning the third paragraph, since what had to be stressed as a primary condition of social progress and development was the permanent sovereignty of each nation over its natural wealth and resources, and not the exercise of that sovereignty.

55. Mr. HERNDL (Austria) withdrew his delegation's sub-amendment (A/C.3/L.1598) and said he would abstain in the vote on the fourth paragraph of article 2.

56. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), referring to the Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 4), suggested that the words "in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations" should be inserted between the word "decide" and the word "the" instead of between "methods" and "of" in the fourth paragraph of the French amendment.

57. Mr. PAPADATORS (Greece) accepted the suggestion.

58. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the debate should be considered closed in accordance with the motion by the Moroccan delegation.

It was so decided.

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the French proposal to combine articles 2, 3, 7 and 12 into a single article (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1).

The proposal was adopted by 80 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.

60. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the new article 2 contained in the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1) and the amendments thereto. He recalled that the sponsor had accepted to insert the word "peace" after the words "peaceful coexistence" in the first paragraph of the French amendment.

The introductory sentence of the French amendment was adopted by 89 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The first paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The oral amendment by the representative of Somalia to divide the second paragraph of the French amendment into three separate paragraphs was adopted by 27 votes to 25, with 38 abstentions.

The second paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The oral amendment by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR to begin the third paragraph of the French amendment with the words "National development and the exercise of" was rejected by 32 votes to 22, with 38 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the representatives of Guatemala and Peru had requested that a separate vote be taken on the words "and, as far as they are concerned, each nation and people" in the fourth paragraph of the French amendment (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1). He therefore invited the Committee to vote on those words.

The words were adopted by 54 votes to 9, with 30 abstentions.

The Greek amendment (A/C.3/L.1599, para. 4), as orally revised by the sponsor, to the fourth paragraph of the French amendment was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 36 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

62. Mr. TSAO (China) proposed that the first paragraph should become the last.

The proposal was adopted by 35 votes to 11, with 38 abstentions.

Article 2 as a whole (A/C.3/L.1584/Corr.1), as amended, was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.