

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**THIRD COMMITTEE, 1844th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 21 October 1971,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mrs. Helvi SIPILÄ (Finland).

**AGENDA ITEM 53**

World social situation: report of the Secretary-General (concluded) (A/8380, A/8403, chap. XV, sect. A; A/C.3/XXVI/CRP.1, E/CN.5/456, E/CN.5/456/Add.1 and Corr.1, Add.2 to 4, Add.5 and Corr.1, Add.6 and 7, Add.8 and Corr.1, Add.9 to 16)

**EXPLANATIONS OF VOTE**

1. The CHAIRMAN gave the floor to delegations which wished to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1.

2. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) said that, apart from certain amendments, the French delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1, because in general it was in line with its own preoccupations and with the positions that it had occasion to adopt in international bodies. His delegation could not but associate itself with the appeal made to the developed countries to increase their assistance to the developing countries, since it had consistently urged for years that all the developed countries should devote at least 1 per cent of their annual income to such assistance.

3. In view of his delegation's attitude in that regard, no one would be surprised at its approval of the initiative taken by the delegation of Upper Volta in drawing attention to the disadvantages to the raw material market of the instability of prices resulting from threats to the international monetary system. For the same reasons, the French delegation had been in favour of the Guinean amendment, although it would have preferred that text to have been adopted in its original form and in the place which had first been proposed for it.

4. Nevertheless, the French delegation's support of the draft resolution did not mean that it had no reservations. Thus, it considered that certain political references were not indispensable in a text on social questions. As far as operative paragraph 8 (ii), was concerned, for example, his delegation would express its views during the discussion of agenda item 35, on the arms race, and item 38, on the sea-bed. He also wished to point out that his delegation's abstention on operative paragraph 4 was due to the introduction of the words "aggressive wars", which had not appeared in the original text. France was, of course, against all aggressive wars but it considered that a political element had been introduced which had no place in the draft resolution. Moreover, the competent United Nations bodies

had not yet succeeded in producing a clear definition of aggression.

5. He also felt that he should explain his interpretation of the economic problems dealt with in operative paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 8 (v). At the time of the preparation of the International Development Strategy, France had accepted the targets fixed for the Second United Nations Development Decade, and would do its best to ensure their attainment in all spheres. Nevertheless, in explaining its vote on General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV) at the twenty-fifth session (1871st plenary meeting), the French delegation had pointed out that, according to its understanding, Members were assuming no legal obligation, but were agreeing on the targets which they deemed it desirable to set for the international community. That was still how it understood the targets of the Decade, and it had been in the light of the interpretation of the term "obligation" which the Yugoslav representative had given that the French delegation had decided to accept that provision.

6. Nevertheless, the sponsors had accomplished a real task, and that was why the French delegation, despite certain substantive objections, had felt obliged to vote in favour of the draft resolution, which represented a generous attempt to improve the situation of the poorest peoples.

7. Mr. ROSENSTAND HANSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1. He wished to point out, however, that in view of the spirit of the International Development Strategy, his delegation would have preferred a different wording of operative paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 8 (v). That position had been reflected by its action in the separate vote.

8. Mr. PEACHEY (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite some reservations. For instance, it did not approve of the use of the word "oppression" in operative paragraph 4. Australia was responsible for certain Territories and could not agree that the paragraph was an accurate reflection of its administration.

9. With regard to the Second Development Decade, his delegation considered that General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV) should serve as a guide; that resolution referred to goals, objectives and aims to be achieved and to measures that might be taken, but not to "obligations". Since Australia was already carrying on a considerable amount of trade with the developing countries, his delegation considered that the inclusion of the word "more" before the word "favourable" in operative paragraph 5 was unnecessary, at least as far as Australia was concerned.

10. In operative paragraph 6, the Governments of developed countries were urged, "where possible to exceed" the targets embodied in the Strategy, which seemed to imply that those targets were inadequate; it was, however, the Strategy that should serve as a guide in that respect.

11. Finally, his delegation hoped that, in suggesting co-ordinated action among the developing countries in operative paragraph 7, the sponsors did not have in mind the conclusion of restrictive marketing arrangements.

12. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation supported all the provisions of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1, but had not been able to become a sponsor because of its objection of principle to chapter IV of the *1970 Report on the World Social Situation*, which concerned the Middle East. It hoped that that would be borne in mind when the next report was prepared.

13. Despite that fact, the draft resolution in general reflected the Syrian delegation's views regarding the real causes of under-development. Operative paragraph 10 clearly stated that the Secretary-General was requested, *inter alia*, that the next report should include the situation in colonial, dependent and occupied Territories. His delegation understood that a special report would be issued on the colonial, dependent and occupied Territories of Africa and the Middle East and that by the occupied Territories of the Middle East was meant the occupied Arab Territories. In preparing the next report on the world social situation, special attention should be paid to operative paragraph 8 (i), according to which the liberation of occupied Territories was "a prerequisite for the improvement of their social conditions". The use of statistical methods might lead to errors, especially in countries where colonial régimes were trying to eliminate all life and culture. The problems of refugees and displaced persons in Africa and the Middle East should therefore be analysed in depth and a study should be made of the conditions of their economic and social development in the context of their aspirations for freedom.

14. Mr. BENGTSOEN (Sweden) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, it nevertheless had some objections of detail.

15. Sweden had voted in favour of the amendments to operative paragraph 6, in particular the Italian amendment which reminded the developing countries that they, too, had undertaken to implement the Strategy.

16. His delegation did not regard the Strategy as a binding instrument, but rather as a moral and political commitment. It would therefore have preferred the wording proposed by the United States. Since that proposal had not been adopted, it had been able to support the existing text only on the basis of the interpretation of operative paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 8 (v) given by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

17. The amendment proposed by the USSR had been unacceptable to his delegation because it implied that there were wars which did not impede social development. Furthermore, after years of discussion at the international level, it had still not proved possible to arrive at a definition of aggression.

18. His delegation had not been able to vote in favour of the Brazilian amendments because it had felt that they weakened the text proposed by the sponsors.

19. It had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 8 (vii), because it felt that any specific instructions to the Economic and Social Council in that area should come from the Second Committee.

20. Mr. VALTASAARI (Finland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the paragraphs of the draft resolution. Regarding operative paragraph 6, it wished to state that the word "obligation" used in connexion with the Strategy for the Second Development Decade in no way affected Finland's position concerning the Strategy as stated at the previous session of the General Assembly.

21. Miss LAPOINTE (Canada) said that, like some other delegations, her delegation would have preferred the draft resolution to be simpler and shorter. Despite the sponsors' efforts, and although her delegation was able to accept a number of the revised paragraphs taken individually, it had nevertheless decided to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because it felt that it had departed from the point. The aim was to analyse the problems which were impeding social progress and to give the Secretary-General clear and precise guidelines regarding the 1974 report; that aim did not, however, seem to have been attained in the draft resolution. Several of the paragraphs contained in it should not have been included, because they dealt with questions which were the subject of serious and complex studies in organs which were more competent to propose solutions. She had in mind, in particular, the references to natural resources and the sea-bed and to the liberation of peoples under colonial or alien domination.

22. Similarly, her delegation objected to such sweeping statements as the reference, in operative paragraph 4, to "economic exploitation by foreign monopolies". That expression seemed to link together two phenomena of a different nature: racial discrimination, the roots of which were primarily political, and industrial and financial monopolies, which derived mainly from economic factors. Furthermore, her delegation had opposed the inclusion of the term "aggressive wars" in paragraph 4, because it seemed to imply that there were wars which did not impede social progress.

23. She would not elaborate further on her delegation's position concerning operative paragraph 6, since it had already expressed its reservations on many occasions.

24. For all those reasons she had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1, and, in particular, on operative paragraph 6 and subparagraphs (i), (v) and (vii) of operative paragraph 8.

25. In conclusion, she noted with appreciation operative paragraph 10, which had been considerably improved by the sponsors and which seemed to prepare the way for a serious study and analysis of the 1974 report from a unified standpoint.

26. Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries which had sponsored the joint

statement of 21 September 1970 on the second development decade and social progress,<sup>1</sup> said that he wished to explain the vote of those countries on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1.

27. Those delegations had voted in favour of the draft resolution because they believed that as a whole it constituted an important contribution to the cause of social progress in the wider context of the political, economic and social development of the contemporary world.

28. However, as far as the reference to the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade was concerned, the positive vote of those delegations should be viewed in the light of the joint statement by the socialist countries.

29. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that the use of the term "obligation" in operative paragraph 6 did not seem improper to his delegation. However, the addition of the words "and where possible to exceed those targets," made it impossible to speak of any kind of obligation. Consequently, his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments proposed by the Italian delegation and the amendments proposed by the United States delegation, with the exception of that relating to operative paragraph 8 (v), which weakened the text.

30. Mr. ROUX (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the United States amendments, because they had appeared justified. The wording used in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution might give the impression that by adopting the International Development Strategy States Members of the United Nations had entered into a legal obligation. However, when introducing the draft resolution, the Yugoslav representative had himself stated that such was not the interpretation of the sponsors. Although the United States amendment had been rejected, his delegation had nevertheless voted in favour of operative paragraph 6, because it ardently desired the success of the International Development Strategy.

31. His delegation had voted against the first Brazilian amendment because the word proposed did not, in its opinion, take account of the facts. It had, however, voted in favour of the second Brazilian amendment, because, although overpopulation was a world-wide problem, it did not take the same form in all countries and it was, ultimately, for the Governments concerned to take such measures as they deemed necessary in that area, while respecting personal freedoms.

32. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the USSR amendment because a reference in operative paragraph 4 to "aggressive wars" would further increase the controversial nature of that paragraph, which was already over-political. Moreover, such matters were not within the purview of the Third Committee.

33. His delegation had voted in favour of the Hungarian amendment concerning disarmament and the United Kingdom subamendment thereto. It had also voted in favour of the Guinean amendment.

34. His delegation had felt that, despite its imperfections, draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1 had some very positive features, and it had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

35. Miss WILLIAMS (New Zealand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1853/Rev.1 because it was in sympathy with the general idea behind the text and with those of its main provisions relating to the world social situation. Her delegation, however, regretted the fact that some delegations should have seen fit to inject into the text considerations which were out of place in a draft resolution relating to the world social situation. Such a practice only weakened the original text. Another practice that was even more serious was to try to make the Third Committee adopt political decisions which were not within its competence. That applied particularly to operative paragraph 6. Such practice could only weaken the prestige of the Committee and, ultimately, of the United Nations.

36. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) expressed regret that despite the efforts which had been made it had not been possible to arrive at a consensus and that his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote.

37. His delegation had hoped that a draft resolution on the world social situation would encompass the social situation in all countries. Although it was only right that the developing countries should be accorded special attention, in view of the urgency of their needs, the draft resolution should not have been devoted solely to the problems of those countries and to the International Development Strategy.

38. In that connexion, the draft resolution did not accurately reflect the text of the Strategy. Operative paragraph 6 referred to the "obligation" of the developed countries. In fact, the nature of that obligation had not been the subject of any agreement, and, in the circumstances, his delegation could not subscribe to the interpretation placed on the strategy by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

39. His delegation believed that operative paragraph 4 did not properly belong in a draft resolution on the world social situation.

40. Operative paragraph 7 should have been made to conform with paragraph 74 of the International Development Strategy. He noted in that connexion that when the Strategy had been adopted at the twenty-fifth session, his Government had stated at the 1315th meeting of the Second Committee that it did not interpret paragraph 74 as prejudicing in any way the sanctity of freely concluded contractual arrangements or the obligations of States under international law.

41. Operative paragraph 8 (v) was defective for the same reasons as operative paragraph 6. Operative paragraph 8 (vii) set forth certain conclusions which were open to debate and which should be considered by the Second Committee.

42. Miss SANO (Japan) explained that her delegation had abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 42, document A/8074.

for the following reasons: the text contained several statements that Japan found it difficult to accept; it regretted that the sponsors should have seen fit to refer only to part B of Economic and Social Council resolution 1581 (L); the phraseology of operative paragraph 6 had not been modified along the lines suggested by several delegations, including her own; operative paragraphs 4 and 7 contained a number of ambiguous statements: finally, there were certain duplications between the texts of operative paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 8 (i). Moreover, her delegation would have been willing to vote for the original amendment proposed by Brazil, but the second version made the sentence awkward and it had, therefore, reluctantly decided to abstain.

43. Mr. TSENG (China) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on the Soviet amendment to paragraph 4 because the international community had not yet agreed upon a definition of aggression. It had, however, voted in favour of the resolution as a whole, despite some reservations, because it had felt that attention should be focused on the world social situation, particularly in the developing countries. His delegation stressed that a concerted and co-ordinated approach to the social and economic aspects of development was essential. Operative paragraph 8 (v) rightly emphasized that responsibility for the implementation of the International Development Strategy should be shared by the developing and the developed countries. It was to be hoped that concerted efforts would be made along those lines to improve the social situation, and particularly that exchanges of experiences in all fields of social development would take place.

44. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole had been dictated by her country's interest in the world social situation and the urgent need for measures to remedy it. However, it was regrettable that the text did not fully reflect the conclusions of the *1970 Report on the World Social Situation* and that it departed from the International Development Strategy, which had been adopted unanimously.

45. Her delegation had abstained in the voting on the United States amendments to operative paragraphs 6 and 8 (v) after hearing the sponsors' interpretation of the word "obligation". It hoped that that interpretation would be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly. Furthermore, it had abstained in the voting on the Soviet amendment because the United Nations had not yet agreed upon a definition of aggression.

46. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, despite reservations concerning the International Development Strategy expressed by it and by the delegations of the other socialist countries in their joint statement. The draft resolution as a whole was, however, a very useful text which reflected world social trends and it was to be hoped that it would facilitate progress in the field of social development.

47. Her delegation thanked all those delegations that had supported its amendment, because wars of aggression constituted one of the most serious obstacles to social development.

48. The oral amendment of Poland, underlining the importance of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development, was particularly welcome, and it was to be hoped that the sponsors of the next report on the world social situation would give more consideration to the Declaration.

49. Mr. KUSSBACH (Austria) explained that, in voting in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation had based its decision upon the sponsors' interpretation of operative paragraphs 6 and 8 (v).

50. Mrs. ESHEL-SHOHAM (Israel) said that her delegation would have been willing to support the original Guinean amendment, because the fact that monetary and financial questions fell within the competence of the Second Committee did not exclude the Third Committee from bearing in mind the interdependence of the social and economic aspects of development.

51. Her delegation had voted in favour of the two Brazilian amendments, which had improved the text, for every country should take whatever decisions it considered appropriate with regard to population. However, her delegation had had to vote against the two United States amendments, which would have had the effect of weakening the text by reducing the obligations of the developed countries to implement the International Development Strategy.

52. Although it might perhaps have been better if the text of the draft resolution had been more concise, it was a document that would be extremely useful in connexion with the preparation of the next report on the world social situation.

53. Mr. ZLENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in the belief that it could play a useful part in improving the social situation. He had also voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 of the draft, which contained important elements and made provision for the reforms that countries should carry out within the framework of social development. He thanked the sponsors for bearing in mind at least in part the amendments to operative paragraph 4 proposed by his delegation. The Soviet amendment to that paragraph was particularly well founded; it was indeed essential to refer to wars of aggression among the obstacles to social development. His delegation had voted for operative paragraph 4, the text of which corresponded to article 12 of the Declaration on Social Progress and Development. It had also voted in favour of operative paragraph 6, on the basis of the reservations made by the socialist countries in their joint statement. Finally, his delegation had voted in favour of operative paragraph 8 as a whole and wished to stress in that connexion that the next report on the world social situation should contain not only a description of the elements that hindered social development but also an analysis of the factors which would make it possible to improve the situation.

54. Mrs. KRACHT (Chile) said that her delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, had opposed any modification of operative paragraph 6. It had also opposed the Iraqi amendment, because it might have

given rise to confusion or useless polemics. Like the other sponsors, her country, which was dedicated to peace and supported total and general disarmament, had nevertheless voted against the Hungarian amendments because in its view they went beyond the framework of the resolution and distorted its perspective.

55. Mr. YAÑEZ-BARNUEVO (Spain), observing that it was not possible to satisfy 131 delegations completely, said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution even though it included certain assertions that seemed to him somewhat subjective. For all its imperfections, the text adopted was useful and appropriate in the present circumstances: the world social situation was sufficiently serious to warrant the most careful attention during the Second Development Decade on the basis of an integrated approach to economic and social planning in the context of national development. Like the Italian delegation, his delegation had abstained during the voting on the United States amendments to operative paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 8 (v) on the basis of the interpretation of the word "obligation" given by the sponsors. That explanation did not reduce in any way the commitments that States had assumed in adopting the International Development Strategy. He hoped, therefore, that the interpretation given by the sponsors would appear in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

56. Mr. ARNAUD (Argentina) thanked the sponsors for their spirit of co-operation, which had enabled his delegation to vote in favour of the draft as a whole. However, confirming his previous statements, he wished to place on record his delegation's view that operative paragraph 8 in particular set forth conclusions, many of them reflections on political philosophy, which fell solely within the competence of each State. Each country had the inalienable right to formulate its own conclusions in accordance with its stage of development, its historical circumstances, its ideology, its political organization, its religion, its geographic position, and so on. His delegation nevertheless agreed with the general objectives of the draft resolution and hoped that the principles which it embodied would provide guidelines which would be instrumental in improving the world social situation.

57. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) said that he too had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. Although his delegation strongly supported the proposal that an integrated and unified approach to development should be adopted, it had abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 8 (vii), as amended by Guinea, because it felt that matters of trade, prices of primary commodities, financial and monetary systems should be left to the Second Committee. That did not mean that his delegation lacked interest in these matters, but it felt that matters falling within the competence of other organs should not be introduced into a resolution of the Third Committee. Until the proposal to

create a single body to promote a cross-sectoral analysis of and a unified approach to economic and social development policy and planning had been set up, it was the view of the Philippines that resolutions on that item should not go beyond the purview of the world social situation.

58. His delegation was unable to support the Soviet amendment to operative paragraph 4 since it felt that not only aggressive wars but wars of all kinds were obstacles to social progress and development.

59. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia) said that in withdrawing its amendment to operative paragraph 10 her delegation had been moved by a spirit of co-operation. The sponsors had, however, accepted the inclusion of the word "experiences" in the same paragraph. Her delegation had been assured that the Secretary-General would reflect in his next report the experiences of countries with different social and economic systems and situated in different parts of the world, including Asia, particularly with regard to economic and social changes.

60. Mrs. MATTHEWS (Botswana) said that her delegation had found the Brazilian amendment to operative paragraph 8 (iii) very much to the point, for Botswana's difficulties were largely due to the fact that, unlike many developing countries, it was under-populated. Her delegation had, therefore, voted for the Brazilian amendment.

#### AGENDA ITEM 54

**Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (A/8367, A/8403, chap. XVII, sects. B and F; A/8418, A/8439):**

- (a) **International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) **Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;**
- (c) **Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General**

61. The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the report of the Secretary-General on the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (A/8367), the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/8418), the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination (A/8439), and chapter XVII, sections B and F of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/8403). Chapter XVII, section B, covered two resolutions: 1587 (L) and 1588 (L) of the Economic and Social Council; while section F of the same chapter covered resolution 1589 (L). It would be useful for members of the Committee to familiarize themselves with those three resolutions.

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*