

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

RESUMED FIFTY-NINTH SESSION

Summary records of the 1980th and 1981st plenary meetings, held at
Headquarters, New York, on 29 August and 10 November 1975

1980th meeting

Friday, 29 August 1975, at 4.35 p.m.

President: Mr. Iqbal A. AKHUND (Pakistan).

E/SR.1980

In the absence of the President, Mr. Longerstaey (Belgium), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation (E/5748, E/L.1676, E/AC.62/L.5, conference room paper)

1. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had before it the draft report of the Preparatory Committee on its third session (E/AC.62/L.5), the note by the Secretariat (E/5748) on the decisions taken by the Trade and Development Board at the first part of its fifteenth session and the note by the Secretariat (E/L.1676) on a decision taken by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme at its twentieth session. He drew attention to the conference room paper which contained chapter II of the draft report of the Preparatory Committee, as amended during the meeting of the Committee held that morning. The complete report of the Committee, comprising document E/AC.62/L.5 with the exception of chapter II of that document which was to be replaced by the conference room paper, would be circulated as document E/5749.

2. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Council) said that the Rapporteur of the Preparatory Committee had asked him to provide certain clarifications concerning the text in the conference room paper. Paragraphs 11, 12, 13 and 14 should follow paragraph 7 and should be renumbered accordingly. The first line of the new paragraph 13 should read "Another delegation expressed its disagreement and categorically rejected those false assertions and stated that no one should make use of . . .". The reference in the new paragraph 14 should be to the new paragraph 13, which had originally been paragraph 9.

3. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco), Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, said that he had the honour to present the Preparatory Committee's draft report on its third session (E/AC.62/L.5 and conference room paper). The Committee had decided to extend its third session so as to continue its work in informal consultations and fulfil the task which had been entrusted to it by the Council and which was so important to the success of the seventh special session. He drew attention to the decisions taken by the Committee that morning, which were reflected in paragraphs 2 and 3 of document E/AC.62/L.5. He stressed that throughout the year the Committee had carried out its work in a constructive and co-operative spirit, and he was sure that the same spirit would be maintained in the work of the special session, so that its aims could be achieved and appropriate decisions taken.

4. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that his delegation considered that paragraphs 11 and 12 of chapter II of the report, contained in the conference room paper, contained formulations which did not reflect the actual discussions that had taken place that morning at the Preparatory Committee's meeting. Paragraph 14 stated that other delegations had supported the views expressed in paragraph 13, but the actual situation was that only a handful of individual delegations had expressed support for those views. Paragraph 8 referred to the representative of the German Democratic Republic, speaking on behalf of socialist countries, and that did not correspond to the facts. He hoped that appropriate changes would be made in the text.

5. Mr. QADRUD DIN (Pakistan), Rapporteur of the Preparatory Committee, explained that the original text of paragraph 8 had contained the wording "speaking on behalf of the socialist countries", and that the word "the" had been deleted at the request of certain delegations and in consultation with the representative of the German Democratic Republic. The delegations concerned had considered that it was thus clear that

he had been speaking on behalf of some of the socialist countries. Furthermore the point made in paragraph 8 was dealt with in paragraph 9, which reflected views expressed by the Albanian delegation. The statements made at the Preparatory Committee's meeting had been recorded faithfully in the conference room paper.

6. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the draft report had been adopted that morning by the Preparatory Committee and that it was not for the Council to modify it; it could only take note of it. All the comments which were made would, of course, be reflected in the summary record.

7. Mr. ŠMÍD (Czechoslovakia), speaking both as the representative of Czechoslovakia and as the chairman of the group of Eastern European States for the month of August, said that he disagreed with the entire contents of paragraph 9. It contained slander against a whole group of countries and was expressed in very pejorative language which was unusual in United Nations documents. It was not clear what was meant by the "so-called socialist countries". He wondered whether the statement had really been made at the meeting of the Preparatory Committee that morning or whether it had been added later. The deplorable approach of the delegation in question could only be aimed at diverting the attention of all delegations from the main issues of the seventh special session. He therefore considered that the whole of paragraph 9 should be omitted.

8. Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic) recalled that the President had already pointed out that the report had been adopted at the final meeting of the Preparatory Committee. Paragraphs 8 and 14 had been read out by the Rapporteur and agreed on by the Committee. He therefore saw no reason to reopen the discussion in another forum.

9. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that an extremely abnormal situation had prevailed at the final meeting of the Preparatory Committee that morning. One super-Power, for its own ulterior motives, had insisted on inserting deceptive propaganda into the conference documents and had once again revealed the ugly essence and nature of its hegemonism. At the morning meeting the representative of Albania had spoken as the representative of a sovereign country which, as a matter of course, was fully entitled to express its views. The Chairman of the Preparatory Committee had agreed that those views should be recorded in the draft report. In order to reflect the actual situation, paragraphs 12 and 13 should indicate at which meetings the delegations concerned had expressed their views. The paragraphs should be re-numbered in accordance with the actual sequence of events, and paragraph 14 should state clearly that two delegations had supported the views referred to in the preceding paragraph.

10. The PRESIDENT said that all delegations had listened to the representative who had spoken, and that their statements would be viewed as comments on the report and as such would be reflected in the summary record.

11. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that every time he heard statements made by the previous speaker he was amazed at his impudence and obstinate refusal to take account of the real state of affairs in the contemporary world; at the same time he experienced a feeling of satisfaction because every statement made by that delegation was an act

of self-revelation. The delegation in question condemned hegemonism and super-Power politics but its statement at the final meeting of the Preparatory Committee had clearly reflected the hegemonism, great-Power chauvinism and narrow nationalistic machinations which motivated it, both in the United Nations and outside the Organization. Its attitude towards the genuine wish of the socialist countries to see their positions reflected in the Committee's report was evidence of its own hegemonism. Its statement that morning had been aimed at silencing a whole group of sovereign States Members of the United Nations. It did not like the fact that, as stated in paragraph 14, other delegations had supported the views expressed in paragraph 13. But that was the situation, and its own ideas had not been supported by the Committee, as could be seen from the statements of various representatives of developing countries. For some reason, the delegation in question disliked the existence of the socialist community, and at the sixth special session the head of that delegation had asserted that the socialist community did not exist; but nevertheless it did exist, and was moreover successfully developing in the political field and in the field of economic relations between member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

12. The delegation concerned claimed to support the developing countries on all questions, but although it supported the position of the developing countries in principle, it opposed it in practice. If it sincerely supported the legitimate aspirations of the developing countries and the principles and positions set forth in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (General Assembly Resolution 3201 (S-VI) and in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (General Assembly Resolution 3281 (XXIX)), it should make an appropriate analysis of the contemporary world economy and of international economic relations and should determine the real reasons for the disadvantaged economic position of the developing countries and identify the political and non-political obstacles which continued to impede their progress towards independent economic development. Instead of drawing information from the well-known documents of the non-aligned and developing countries, prepared at their meetings at Algiers, and at Havana and Lima, the delegation continued to view the world as it had been in mediaeval times. Nothing it said had any connexion with a scientific approach to world economics and international economic relations or with the obstacles which really stood in the path of developing countries seeking to achieve economic development. The delegation's sole aim was to use every opportunity, including the limited time available for preparations for the special session, when developing countries were in real need of assistance, to pursue its egoistic and narrow nationalistic great-Power and hegemonistic aspirations. The delegation affirmed that concepts such as peace; détente, the need to make détente irreversible and to extend it to all regions of the world, security, and disarmament were all calculated to deceive world opinion, and particularly the developing countries. Yet that delegation had not yet done anything constructive in the United Nations and had made no concrete proposals; there was nothing constructive and there never would be anything constructive in its position. It was not concerned with the interests of developing countries, with establishing a new international economic order or developing equal and mutually advantageous economic co-operation between all countries, irrespective of their levels of development or their

social and economic systems. It was quite clear that it did not want peace and détente, that it opposed disarmament because it was actively arming itself, and that it was against security because that did not fit in with its current and long-term plans. If it was really in favour of developing equal and mutually advantageous economic co-operation, it should support the General Assembly's decision contained in resolution 3254 (XXIX). If it had not opposed the implementation of the decision adopted by the majority of the General Assembly, the developing countries would already have received a considerable sum, in the order of \$2 billion. The delegation made slanderous remarks about the positions of other countries in order to hide its nationalistic position and its aspirations to rule over other countries, not only on its borders, but also in other continents.

13. He pointed out that it was not his delegation which had entered into polemics and created an abnormal situation. A draft report containing factual information on the most important aspects of the Preparatory Committee's work had been adopted and all the positions expressed were reflected in it. The Council was now witnessing an attempt to write into the report all kinds of nonsense and slander, so that instead of concentrating on the substantive aspects of preparing for the special session, the Council was becoming involved in polemics between delegations. So far his delegation had held back when the country in question had made false assertions but if further slanderous statements were made, it would answer them fully. Such assertions would not help to enhance the effectiveness of the work of either the Council or the seventh special session of the Assembly, and would be harmful to the cause of establishing a new international economic order. That was not what was desired by the countries of the third world whose interests were so convincingly supported by the delegation in question.

14. Measures should be taken to prevent any delegation from obstructing the achievement of the lofty aims and the implementation of the noble principles laid down at the sixth special session. The delegation in question should know that it was acting against all the principles embodied in United Nations decisions supported by the majority of the developing countries. It was hard to understand how any delegation could oppose disarmament in a situation where the world was entering a new spiral of the arms race, and when, according to the introduction to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization,¹ world expenditure on arms was approaching \$300 billion a year. It was that delegation's position which was encouraging the arms race. The delegation in question did not want to take into account the legitimate aspirations of all peoples, and especially of the developing countries and, instead of complying with the wishes reflected in General Assembly decisions it did all it could to hinder the implementation of such decisions and to impose its utterly false concepts and thus prevent progress in establishing equal and mutually advantageous international economic co-operation. It was time for that delegation seriously to assess its position, and to realize that it was not supported either by the socialist countries or by the developing countries, and that it was interfering with the work of the United Nations.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

15. Mr. NAÇO (Observer for Albania), speaking at the invitation of the President, said that his delegation's statement at that morning's meeting of the Preparatory Committee had been prompted by the last-minute proposal made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic on behalf of the so-called socialist countries of Europe, i.e. revisionist countries. In that connexion, it should be recalled that the representative of Algeria had made several appeals in the Preparatory Committee to delegations, asking them not to create difficulties by putting forward proposals when the time came to adopt the report. The representatives of the revisionist States, however, had been unwilling to abandon their well-known tactics.

16. As a sovereign State, Albania had the right to speak before the Economic and Social Council and to have its views reflected in the latter's report. Because it disagreed with the proposal made by the German Democratic Republic, his delegation had requested that its own views should be incorporated into the report immediately after the proposal in question, and that was what had been done.

17. Referring to the harangue delivered by the representative of the Soviet revisionists, he said that the paragraph reflecting the views of the Albanian delegation set forth the plain truth, and although the truth was bitter to liars and slanderers, it would always triumph over lies and slander. His delegation would persevere in its resolute defence of the truth.

18. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that the representative of one of the super-Powers, flaunting the banner of socialism, had launched a lengthy and vehement attack on his country, making slanderous accusations to the effect that China was guilty of great-Power hegemonism, chauvinism and narrow nationalism. Such allegations were utterly unsubstantiated and inappropriate.

19. It was well known to all that that super-Power was currently pursuing its policies of aggression, interference, subversion, plunder and domination of countries all over the world. It insinuated itself everywhere, spreading its net far and wide. It used military forces to subjugate its so-called allies and had instigated the dismemberment of a sovereign State. It had established military bases in the territory of other countries. It used its so-called economic assistance to exploit and plunder other nations, while it took advantage of the difficulties experienced by other countries to press for the repayment of debts. In short, it was the greatest latter-day exploiter.

20. Like the other super-Power, it was a hotbed of a new world war, despite its propaganda in favour of the so-called relaxation of international tension, the strengthening of international security, the national liberation movements and other causes which it used as a façade. The Chinese delegation, therefore, deemed it necessary to expose the real personality of that super-Power within the United Nations.

21. China was a socialist developing country which belonged to the third world. It was well known that not one Chinese soldier was stationed abroad. China occupied no foreign territory, nor did it seek hegemony. In order to defend itself against aggression and social-imperialism, China was digging tunnels deep in its territory, but such was not the act of an aggressive nation.

22. China had expressed its positions on international peace, disarmament and détente in various United Nations forums and would continue to do so. China was

always in favour of genuine disarmament, but it opposed the use of disarmament as a camouflage for arms expansion and war preparations.

23. China had always given its active support to the just struggles of other third world countries and had supported all their just and reasonable proposals, including all the legitimate demands made by the Group of 77 in connexion with the seventh special session of the General Assembly. China's verbal support had always been backed up with deeds.

24. The representative of the super-Power had boasted of his country's active contributions to the United Nations and the international community. The Chinese delegation had already pointed out, however, that if that super-Power truly wished to make a genuine contribution to the establishment of a new economic order, it should suspend or cancel the debts of developing countries which were experiencing economic difficulties, for such a gesture would be proof of genuine support for the third world countries. Failure to do so would prove that the deceptive propaganda of that super-Power was not even worth refuting. Therefore, China would not enter into polemics at the present stage; it would have ample opportunity to expound its views in the future.

25. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that everyone had grown weary of listening to a long flow of impudent lies and slander. The debate should be closed under rule 52 (d) of the rules of procedure and the Council should proceed to take a decision on the report.

26. The statement made by the representative of China had been totally unrelated to the item under discussion and was filled with nothing but slander against the Soviet Union. The Chinese representative thus reminded him of the man in the Chinese proverb who climbed a tree to catch a fish.

27. The PRESIDENT said he did not believe it would be necessary to invoke rule 52 (d) of the rules of procedure, since the debate seemed to be exhausted.

28. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the report of the

Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Development and International Economic Co-operation on its third session (future document E/5749), and to adopt the draft decisions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 2 of its report.

It was so decided (decision 130 (LIX), subparagraphs (a) and (b)).

29. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that the Council wished to transmit to the General Assembly at its seventh special session the documents which the Trade and Development Board wished to bring to the attention of the Assembly (see E/5748), namely the consensus of the Board on a list of selected broad policy areas, with an indication of the specific issues to be taken up in each policy area at the fourth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, together with the relevant chapter of the Board's report, and the report of the Secretary-General of the Conference on the role of UNCTAD in a new United Nations structure for global economic co-operation² and the relevant chapter of the Board's report.

It was so decided (decision 130 (LIX), subparagraph (c)).

30. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his delegation's position, said that the USSR continued to entertain the reservations mentioned in paragraphs 51-53 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Governmental Experts on the Debt Problems of Developing Countries on its third session.³

31. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would also take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decisions recommended by the Preparatory Committee in paragraph 3 of its report.

It was so decided (decision 131 (LIX)).

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

² TD/B/573.

³ TD/B/545.

1981st meeting

Monday, 10 November 1975, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. Iqbal A. AKHUND (Pakistan).

E/SR.1981

AGENDA ITEM 24

Trade and development (A/10015)

1. Mr. COREA (Secretary-General, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) said that the past year had been one of heightened activity in UNCTAD. The Trade and Development Board, at its sixth special session (10-21 March 1975), had considered its contribution to the mid-term review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade; at the second part of its

fourteenth session, on 29 April 1975, it had considered the UNCTAD programme for the biennial period 1976-1977; and at its fifteenth session, it had considered the activities of the various intergovernmental bodies of UNCTAD and its contribution to the seventh special session of the General Assembly. At the forthcoming seventh special session of the Board (8-19 March 1976), the provisional agenda of the fourth session of the Conference, to be held at Nairobi from 3 to 28 May 1976, would be finalized. Similarly, the intergovernmental bodies of UNCTAD had been very active. The Committee on Commodities had held three sessions during the year to consider trade in commodities and