

compromise text. As for the amendments submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.2090), he said that out of a total of 10, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted four, which was quite a high number.

36. Miss CAO PINNA (Italy) said that her delegation wished to maintain the change it had proposed orally to the Polish subamendment (A/C.3/L.2095). It certainly had political connotations, but the concept of sovereignty embodied in the subamendment was political, and all States accepted it as such.

37. At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. LÜTEM (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090, explained that the first and fourth amendments, part of the sixth amendment—to replace the words “members of society” by “people”—and the ninth amendment had been accepted. The third and fifth amendments in that document had been rejected, as had the second part of the sixth amendment—to delete everything from “and form” onwards—and the seventh, eighth and tenth amendments.

38. The CHAIRMAN announced that a vote would be taken on the amendments and subamendments to the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2), in the order of the paragraphs they affected, on the parts of the text that had been changed as a result and, lastly, on the draft resolution as a whole.

The first of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2089, as orally revised, was adopted by 70 votes to 5, with 20 abstentions.

The second of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 41 votes to 28, with 25 abstentions.

The third of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 51 votes to 20, with 27 abstentions.

The fifth of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 41 votes to 28, with 28 abstentions.

The second part of the sixth of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 44 votes to 14, with 34 abstentions.

The seventh of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 38 votes to 23, with 34 abstentions.

The eighth of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was adopted by 35 votes to 26, with 34 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 (d), as amended, was adopted by 46 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.

The subamendment (A/C.3/L.2095) to the second of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2089 was adopted by 75 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

The new operative paragraph proposed in the second of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2089, as amended, was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The tenth of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2090 was rejected by 52 votes to 17, with 26 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

2045th meeting

Friday, 30 November 1973, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Yahya MAHMASSANI (Lebanon).

A/C.3/SR.2045

AGENDA ITEM 63

Human rights and scientific and technological developments: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)
(A/9075, A/9227, A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.2094, A/C.3/L.2095)

1. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights) said that the Secretary-General had prepared a note (A/9075) informing members of the Committee about the progress of work on the question of human rights and scientific and technological developments. The note reviewed the work done by the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2450 (XXIII), on which the study of the question was based. It also indicated the approaches applied to that study by the General Assembly and the Commission after considering the relevant reports of the Secretary-General.

2. He recalled the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3026 B (XXVII), and pointed out that

paragraph 9 of the note by the Secretary-General contained a list of the documents prepared to date on the matter. Paragraph 11 listed the documents that the Secretary-General hoped to be in a position to submit to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirtieth session, in 1974, since the Commission had decided to give the item high priority at that session. The report mentioned in paragraph 11 (a), on the uses of electronics which could affect the rights of the person and the limits which should be placed on such uses in a democratic society, was undergoing revision. It was being submitted in fascicles to a liaison group appointed by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, as well as to certain specialized agencies and several consultants, for their comments.

3. The third preliminary report on the impact of scientific and technological developments on economic, social and cultural rights, mentioned in paragraph 11 (c), referred to the right to rest and leisure and the right to social security. At its thirtieth session, the Commission

would also have before it a WHO document on the right to health in the light of scientific and technological progress. The Commission would likewise have before it a document containing information received from UNESCO regarding the impact of scientific and technological progress on the rights set forth in article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2, and article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which dealt with the right to education and culture and copyright.

4. Mr. LOSHCININ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) introduced the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1. He said that during the preceding week his delegation had held intensive and very fruitful consultations regarding the text, as could be seen from the fact that it was now also sponsored by the delegations of Cuba, Nigeria and Trinidad and Tobago.

5. The revised draft took account of the suggestions and proposals made by several delegations of non-aligned countries and reflected the position adopted at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973. The sponsors were particularly grateful to the delegations of Algeria, Brazil, the Philippines and Jamaica for the additions they had suggested; most of the proposals submitted had been accepted.

6. The purpose of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 was positive: to activate international co-operation so that scientific and technological developments might be used to promote the welfare of peoples and the realization of their right to self-determination and independence. It contained some very important points, such as the one in the seventh preambular paragraph. Operative paragraph 4, however, stressed the negative side of scientific and technological developments; the Secretary-General and the ILO, UNESCO, WHO and other specialized agencies were invited to pay particular attention to the problem of the protection of the population against social and material inequalities as well as other harmful effects which might arise from the use of scientific and technological developments, and the Secretary-General was requested to submit a report on the subject to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. The sponsors had held consultations with the Secretariat and had been assured that it would have no difficulty in preparing and submitting the report within the time-limit specified.

7. He was pleased to report that consultations had been held with the United Kingdom delegation, and, of the nine amendments originally submitted by that delegation in document A/C.3/L.2091, there remained only the three appearing in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1, which the sponsors had been unable to accept. In the first of those amendments, the United Kingdom proposed that in operative paragraph 3 the words "*Emphasizes that*" should be replaced by "*Recognizes that where it exists*". That would mean recognizing something that was currently taking place, but the scope of the draft resolution was much broader. Wars of aggression, interference in the domestic affairs of States, and the like, could take place not only at the present time but also in future; if they did, they would also constitute violations of the Charter. With regard to the second amendment, providing for the inclusion of a new operative paragraph 4, he

stressed that one of the purposes of the text was to emphasize the negative aspect of scientific and technological developments. The inclusion of the proposed new paragraph would undermine the entire structure of the draft, as it would destroy the balance between the reference in the preamble to the positive side of scientific and technological developments and the paragraph pointing out the negative side.

8. The purpose of the last United Kingdom amendment was to avoid setting a time-limit for the submission of the report requested of the Secretary-General in the draft resolution. He recalled that in the preceding four or five years the Third Committee had been unable to consider any of the Secretary-General's reports on the item, some of which had been submitted directly to the General Assembly and the Committee. If the amendment was adopted, another six or seven years might elapse before the General Assembly studied the question. He therefore insisted that a report should be prepared and submitted to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. It would, of course, be better if it could be submitted at the twenty-ninth session, but in view of the difficulties the Secretariat would have in preparing it, the sponsors had felt it was reasonable to set the thirtieth session as the time-limit. If the United Kingdom pressed its amendment, the sponsors of the draft resolution would be prepared to accept a compromise arrangement whereby the information would be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights at its thirty-first session and the report would be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session.

9. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) said that the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1) reflected a criterion different from the one adopted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1. The text submitted by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic stressed the negative aspects of scientific and technological developments, whereas the United Kingdom considered that there was reason to be optimistic about the subject, since scientific and technological developments had been generally beneficial for all mankind. Thanks to the co-operation of the sponsors, some of his amendments had been incorporated into the draft; however, others had not been accepted. The first two amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1, which should be considered together, would make the draft resolution more balanced. While it was true that scientific and technological developments could have negative consequences for mankind, the misuse of such developments was the exception rather than the rule. That was why the United Kingdom proposed the new operative paragraph 4, which stated that the effects of scientific and technological developments had been generally beneficial for all mankind and held out great potential for the future. That was, in effect, the message that the draft resolution should convey.

10. The third United Kingdom amendment was mainly concerned with the rationalization of work. Paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of the note by the Secretary-General (A/9075) showed that a large number of studies had already been prepared and that only a few of them had been thoroughly examined. The purpose of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2094, mentioned in the amendment, was to ensure that the Commission on Human Rights concentrated on the item at its next session. If

that draft resolution was adopted, the Commission should study all aspects of the problem, then refer it to the Economic and Social Council, and then to the General Assembly. The Assembly should not study any item piecemeal: it should examine it in depth and as a whole. The United Kingdom could not accept the compromise solution proposed by the Byelorussian delegation; the only purpose of the third United Kingdom amendment was to ensure the rationalization of work.

11. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) introduced, on behalf of the delegations of France and the Netherlands, the draft resolution in document A/C.3/L.2094, concerning the study undertaken by the Secretariat in compliance with resolution 2450 (XXIII), adopted five years earlier by the General Assembly. The note by the Secretary-General (A/9075) contained a list of documents prepared in the course of the study, most of which had not yet been considered by the Commission on Human Rights. At the Commission's twenty-ninth session introductory statements had been made concerning those documents, but in April 1973 the Commission had decided, for want of time, to postpone further consideration of them until its thirtieth session, and to give high priority to the item at that session. The purpose of the draft resolution was to indicate to the Commission on Human Rights that the General Assembly had taken note of the Commission's decision, thus showing the importance it attached to the study in question. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt the need to introduce it in order to emphasize that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2, of which France was a sponsor, did not cover the whole field of the item under consideration. The submission of a second draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1) by the Byelorussian delegation clearly showed that there was no end to the concepts that could be included under the heading "human rights and scientific and technological developments".

12. Mr. SCHREIBER (Director, Division of Human Rights), referring to the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative, said that in his introductory statement he had briefly reviewed the progress of work on the studies requested by the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights. When the studies on the uses of electronics which could affect the rights of the person in the fields of biology, medicine and chemistry were completed, the Division would deal with the question referred to in paragraph 1 (d) of General Assembly resolution 2450 (XXIII), namely the balance which should be established between scientific and technological progress and the spiritual, cultural and moral advancement of humanity. As in the case of the other studies, account would be taken in that overall study of the concerns expressed in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, and the study might be available in 1976. The Byelorussian representative had referred, in conversations with the Secretariat and the specialized agencies, to the possibility of preparing a special report on the questions referred to in operative paragraph 4. He had said that the sponsors of the draft resolution would be satisfied if that special report was based on the studies already completed and those that would be prepared for submission before the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, covering the various aspects of those questions, and synthesized the existing studies and those in preparation for 1975, particularly by the ILO and UNESCO. In the circumstances the Secretary-General

in collaboration with the ILO, UNESCO, WHO and other specialized agencies, would do everything possible to ensure that the report could be submitted at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

13. Mr. RIOS (Panama) regretted that, in view of the importance of the topic under consideration, it had not been discussed at greater length, and felt that it was important to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2094, which reflected concern over that fact. The declared aim of the Director-General of UNESCO and of the sponsors of the draft resolutions on the question was to try to reduce the possible adverse effects of scientific and technological developments on the distinctive character of cultures. The basic characteristic of the age, as far as cultural phenomena were concerned, was the trend towards uniformity, as endless examples could show. Another characteristic was the will to achieve justice and material welfare, and the advent of what might be termed a planetary civilization. The trend towards uniformity in material conditions, and in economic and social infrastructures, was the result of the twentieth-century ethos: everywhere there was a feeling for justice that reflected a universal type of culture, and, at all cultural levels, methods and techniques from other levels had to be applied in the solution of problems.

14. Although it was inevitable that some forms of social life should suffer as that process evolved, in many cases the forms, customs and traditions thus affected were actually obstacles to progress. The disappearance of cultural forms, particularly in the social and economic field, could not be avoided if they created situations that needed to be remedied by technological progress, and if they were basically in conflict with the human rights upheld by the United Nations. History was made up of movement and change, and the way to advance into the twenty-first century without losing the values accumulated from earlier centuries was to incorporate into the new forms created by progress the positive and assimilable values handed down by tradition. In that dynamic process of creation and constructive evolution of values it was not necessary to try to perpetuate anachronistic forms or outworn idiosyncrasies, which were to be found not only in developing countries, but also in countries that were technically advanced.

15. He gave an account of the development of the notion of culture from the eighteenth century to the present day, and said that the tidal wave of modernity was threatening not only the smaller, but even the more widespread cultures. Those that survived technological progress were those that were responsive to the immediate problems of life, while those that were swept away were those that were incapable of renewal. Furthermore, as ideas spread and cultural exchanges broadened with development, the defence of idiosyncrasies became a more critical operation, and it became more difficult to select the values and works to be protected by the United Nations, on the basis of its ethical and universal outlook, reflected in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and its programmes for social progress and technological development.

16. He went on to analyse the various historical forms of culture, and stressed the importance of style as a determining factor in any cultural manifestation. To end on an optimistic note, he said that there was no

certainly that there was a "general decline in the importance attached to the spiritual aspects of life", to quote from the observations of the Director-General of UNESCO (see A/9227), since the attendance at cultural events was greater than ever before. Moreover, for the first time in history, the international community had come to the rescue of the cultural heritage of nations, as in the case of Abu Simbel, and the temples of Cambodia.

17. In conclusion, he explained that the statement he had just made represented the contribution to the debate of one of Panama's representatives to the General Assembly at the current session, Mr. Roque Javier Laurenza, who for many years had participated in the work of UNESCO.

18. Mrs. RUSS (Romania) recalled that it was on the initiative of Romania that the item entitled "the role of modern science and technology in the development of nations and the need to strengthen economic and technico-scientific co-operation among States" had been included in the agenda of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. She was pleased to see that there had been an increase both in concern with the problem and in efforts to deal with various aspects of it.

19. Science and technology now offered unprecedented means for solving the most difficult economic and social problems of the modern world. Her delegation did not share the more pessimistic view of the future of science, and believed that man was capable of using the achievements of modern science and technology for the development of mankind. That would have to be done within the economic, political and social framework of each country, and within the context of the promotion of international conditions that would ensure peaceful multilateral co-operation among States for the purpose of solving problems that affected all mankind. In stating that the contemporary technological and scientific revolution could and should have only beneficial consequences for man, she was well aware of the ambivalent nature of advances in modern science and technology, and of the danger that they might be used in a way that could threaten the existence of civilization, and of mankind itself. That demonstrated the importance of the political factor, at both the national and international levels, for the promotion of the use of science and technology for peaceful purposes. In view of those considerations, her delegation would support the revised draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian delegation (A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1).

20. Romania, as a sponsor of the revised draft resolution on the preservation and further development of cultural values (A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2), was gratified at the adoption of that text which, in its opinion, would promote international co-operation in a field that was so important for life in the present-day world. Her delegation was convinced that a more far-reaching approach to the many aspects of the development of science and technology, viewed from the social and humanitarian standpoint, would benefit international co-operation, and would promote the welfare of human beings the world over.

21. Mr. PETROPOULOS (Greece) said that the speed and lack of continuity with which the Committee had considered the item relating to human rights and scientific and technological developments during the current session had not done justice to the importance

of the item, and had perhaps betrayed a state of mind which, excessively concerned with the requirements of technology and technological progress, might represent an obstacle to positive action in that field.

22. His delegation had found the report of the Director-General of UNESCO (see A/9227) and his statement to the Committee (2024th meeting) of great interest, and had hoped that they would give rise to a fruitful exchange of views. However, since such an exchange of views was not possible, he wished to single out a number of very pertinent points in the report which the Committee had not had time to deal with at length. For example, the report stated that the use made of science and technology was a matter of culture, whereas in highly developed societies the requirements of technology were so overwhelming that they tended to create a set of values of their own, thus making culture subservient to technology. It was because industrial civilization was reducing the importance of spiritual values that it was now being challenged, particularly by young people.

23. His delegation did not believe that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2, adopted at the preceding meeting, had fully spelt out the real issue. The draft resolution emphasized two things: preservation of culture and the efforts of Governments to make cultural values an integral part of development efforts. However, if the problem was not properly approached, the preservation of culture would be of little value, and culture would become nothing more than a reflection of a set of values imposed by technology. In addition, if cultural values were formed on the basis of the dictates of technology, there was little hope that mankind could escape the threat which technology posed. It would seem that mankind had entered into a vicious circle which was being given majority endorsement. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 simply in order to keep the issue alive, in the hope that it would be given more meaningful consideration in the future.

24. Mr. GRAEFRATH (German Democratic Republic) welcomed the fact that the draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian SSR (A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1) stressed the responsibility of States to ensure that the results of scientific and technological developments were used in the interests of peace and social development, thus raising the issue which was central to the item before the Committee. That issue concerned the way in which scientific and technological development was to be integrated into social development so that it would not be detrimental to mankind and to the preservation of human rights: he had in mind both the rights of the individual and the rights of peoples and also peaceful coexistence among nations. Accordingly, his delegation supported operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and wished to point out that, although the misuse of science and technology in order to exploit and oppress peoples was a phenomenon which could not be separated from the violation of the right to personal freedom, it must be admitted that that misuse was potentially much more dangerous.

25. Scientific and technological developments did not occur in a vacuum: they were part and parcel of social development. The extent to which they were useful or detrimental to peoples depended less on science and technology than on the use to which States put them

and the policy they pursued—both at the national level and in international relations—in regard to their development. Human progress was closely connected with scientific and technological development, but by no means depended exclusively or directly on it. Before and during the Second World War, imperialist Germany had made use of scientific and technological developments in order to establish a highly efficient system of death camps equipped with gas chambers—one of the many examples of the misuse of science and technology. Scientific and technological development in order to promote the progress of mankind depended primarily on social conditions; as a result, that development was the responsibility of individual States, both in their national policies and in the sphere of international co-operation. That fact was clearly emphasized in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution, and should serve to guide future work on the subject. Furthermore, at the current stage of scientific and technological development, special importance should be attached to the right to work, and special consideration should be given to measures which each State could adopt in that regard. For all those reasons, his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1.

26. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 represented the minimum necessary basis for new studies on the need to ensure that scientific and technological developments were not detrimental to human rights, and that it had his delegation's enthusiastic support. He noted that the United Kingdom had withdrawn most of its amendments, but he pointed out that the three amendments which had been retained in the revised text (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1) were no more acceptable to his delegation than those which had been withdrawn. He was surprised at the prudence of the United Kingdom delegation with regard to the reference made in paragraph 3 of the draft to the Charter. It was obvious that in cases where the achievements of science and technology were not used to violate State sovereignty or human rights there would be no need to apply the provision relating to violations of the Charter; but it was also obvious that there were abuses of scientific and technological progress which had a detrimental effect on the welfare of mankind, and thus that progress was not, as the second United Kingdom amendment suggested, always beneficial. In the third amendment he detected an attempt to postpone consideration of the report which was requested. As a result, he could not accept the United Kingdom amendments.

27. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America) welcomed the remarks of the representative of Panama, who had pinpointed what was lacking in the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting (A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2).

28. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076 had seemed to reflect the philosophy, fashionable in the United Kingdom during the previous century, in accordance with which machines were attacked as the cause of the social problems of the time. Science and technology, like machines, were produced by man and were not in themselves responsible either for harm or for good. With the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.2091), and especially those which related to the third and fifth preambular paragraphs, the revised

version of the draft constituted an improvement over the initial text. He acknowledged that technology gave rise to problems and could accentuate differences in society, but he did not believe that the damage it caused was especially widespread or especially frequent.

29. The reference in the seventh preambular paragraph to the arms race could refer to only two countries, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Since the USSR was never described as colonialist and imperialist, the paragraph would seem to refer exclusively to the United States, which would thus be engaging in an arms race with itself, promoting colonialism, and so forth. Accordingly, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

30. Mr. LOSHCININ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he was not surprised that not all members of the Committee were happy with draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, despite the fact that the sponsors had arrived at a compromise text so that it would be acceptable to a majority of delegations and could be adopted unanimously, as was the traditional practice.

31. The idea of drawing attention to the unfavourable aspects of scientific and technological developments had not originated with his delegation, but had emerged at a conference held in the Netherlands at which it had been noted that scientific and technological development could endanger fundamental freedoms. Furthermore, it was stated in the report of the Director-General of the ILO to the fifty-seventh session of the International Labour Conference¹ that the possibilities of using technology for the benefit or detriment of mankind were infinite. It was obvious that if scientific progress did not serve the cause of peace, it could result in the extermination of mankind, and that notion was the basis of the draft resolution.

32. Turning to the last amendment contained in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1, whereby the report requested in the draft would be submitted to the Commission on Human Rights instead of the General Assembly, he re-emphasized that the result of that amendment would be that 5 or 10 years more would pass before the harmful effects of scientific and technological progress were discussed or measures adopted to remedy them. The sponsors could not accept that, and once again appealed to the United Kingdom delegation not to insist on the amendment. In addition, he had consulted with the Secretariat concerning the preparation of the report in question, and had been informed that it would not be available by the beginning of 1975, but that it could be prepared in time for consideration by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. Accordingly, his delegation urged the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 without any further changes.

33. Mrs. MAIR (Jamaica) considered that the organization of work of the Committee, and the range of points of view represented in it, had made difficult the task of examining draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1. If the Committee had been able to discuss the matter in greater detail, it could have benefited by the experience and views of other delegations. In that respect, the representative of Saudi Arabia had pointed out (2037th meeting) other negative consequences of scientific and

¹ *Technology for Freedom—Man in His Environment—the ILO contribution* (International Labour Office, Geneva, 1972).

technological developments, such as the violation of privacy, which was currently only a secondary problem in developing countries, but which could become an important problem in the future. The world had also witnessed disasters brought about by the use of new scientific and technological advances for military purposes. In some cases, countries which had not reached a high stage of technological development had at their disposal modern weapons or sophisticated means of destruction.

34. Moreover, it was significant that the most important resolution adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-seventh session, resolution 10 (XXVII),² referred to the threat to human rights of scientific and technological progress.

35. Finally, she said that her delegation had reservations about the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1), especially the second amendment.

36. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) considered that while draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 was not perfect, it covered to a considerable extent the possible ways of avoiding the harmful effects of scientific and technological progress. He agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Jamaica, and pointed out to the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic that the last preambular paragraph of the draft spoke of the need "to respect human individuality and dignity in the light of scientific and technological developments"; since it was not possible to respect something abstract, perhaps the intention was to refer to respect for the dignity of the human person. With regard to operative paragraph 2, he requested a clarification concerning the word "spiritual", since he did not understand how an atheist State might interpret it. He wondered whether it would not be better to speak, for example, of "material needs and moral standards".

37. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by France and the Netherlands (A/C.3/L.2094) he did not understand why it was regretted that the Commission on Human Rights had been unable to consider the item at its twenty-ninth session, since, with all due respect to the Commission, its decisions were not sacrosanct and could be transmitted to the Economic and Social Council and then to the Third Committee to be ratified, rejected or amended. He therefore did not consider the third preambular paragraph of that text justifiable. The Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council were responsible to the Third Committee, since the latter had established them to provide it with assistance, but was not obliged to carry out their decisions.

38. Referring to the seventh of the United Kingdom amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091, he did not quite see how the effects of scientific development held out great potential for the future. Such a statement seemed to him incomplete, and he also did not understand why the United Kingdom wished to underline the beneficial effects of scientific and technological developments, which were taken for granted and did not need to be emphasized. To spell them out would mean providing them with a cover if they were directed to evil purposes. On the other hand, it was important to stress

the harmful effects of technological progress, and the delegation of the United Kingdom might have failed to mention them because of its fear that if they were stressed, technological progress might be held up, although that could not possibly happen. What should be stressed was the pursuit of happiness as a natural goal. In general, he considered that amendments should be submitted when they were necessary in order to clarify a meaning, but not in order to express fears. He therefore gave his unqualified support to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, and expressed the hope that in future years it would be possible to make positive statements on the subject.

39. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) regretted that the representative of Saudi Arabia had not been present when his delegation had explained the first and second amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1, which, taken together, struck a balance between the positive and negative aspects of scientific and technological developments. With reference to the judicious observation of the representative of Jamaica to the effect that the item had not been adequately discussed, his delegation fully shared that view, which was why it had proposed in its third amendment that the item should be the subject of a regular debate in the Commission on Human Rights before being examined by the General Assembly.

40. Comments had been made on the second amendment, but he felt that the general trend of the effects of scientific and technological developments was beneficial, and held out potential for the future. The purpose of the proposal, contained in the third amendment, to refer the matter to the Commission on Human Rights for consideration was not to postpone the debate for five or six years, as the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had said, but to work out reasonable recommendations, which he hoped would include a suggestion that the matter should be debated at an early date in the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. However, in the light of previous comments on the subject, his delegation withdrew the first part of the third amendment.

41. Mr. LOSHCININ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) accepted the suggestion of the representative of Saudi Arabia that the wording of the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 should be modified, and said that it had been reworded to read: "Reaffirming the right of peoples to self-determination and the need to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the value and dignity of the human person in the light of scientific and technological developments". Referring to the observations of the representative of Saudi Arabia on the expression "spiritual needs", he pointed out that it implied not only the idea of religious needs but also that of the needs of peoples with regard to leisure, relaxation, intellectual, cultural and educational activities, and so on.

42. He was pleased to note that the delegation of the United Kingdom had withdrawn the first part of its third amendment (see A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1), since he had been informed that the Secretariat could not have the information at its disposal before the second half of 1975, which meant that the Committee would not receive it until 1976. He urged the members of the Com-

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 4*, chap. XIX.

mittee to support the draft resolution in its existing form.

43. The CHAIRMAN gave the floor to delegations which wished to explain their votes before putting to the vote draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 and the relevant amendments.

44. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the second of the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1). There could clearly be no objection to the proposed new operative paragraph 4, and still less to the word "generally". If the word "generally" were omitted from the paragraph, his delegation would be unable to accept it, because while it was clear that in many cases scientific and technological developments might have been harmful, it was equally clear that they had "generally" been beneficial for mankind.

45. Mr. VALTASAARI (Finland) pointed out that while at the beginning his delegation had had difficulty with regard to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, after hearing the explanations of the Director of the Division of Human Rights, it was prepared to accept the paragraph on the understanding that it referred to a summary of the work which had been carried out or was being carried out within the United Nations system. Since Finland had always strongly supported the principle of co-ordination within the United Nations, it would also vote in favour of the third United Kingdom amendment. In addition, he would support the first of those amendments, because he considered it to constitute an improvement on the text.

46. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil) said that his delegation would abstain on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, because, in his opinion that text did not give a clear view of the objectives envisaged. It took note of the efforts of the sponsors to improve the draft, and thanked the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic for the kind and constructive way in which he had received its informal suggestions, but thought that the text nevertheless continued to be incomplete and unbalanced.

47. However, he recognized and commended the positive aspects of some of its paragraphs, such as operative paragraph 2, but could not agree with the one-sided and elitist approach of others. That was the case of the fifth preambular paragraph, which referred only to the negative aspects of scientific and technological development, and side-tracked its undeniable benefits. Even more unacceptable was operative paragraph 4, which also concentrated on the harmful effects which might arise from the use of scientific and technological developments, and completely ignored the fact that such progress gave developed countries the enviable capacity to provide their peoples with levels of well-being never previously enjoyed. He wondered whether the purpose of the sponsor of the draft resolution was "to save" the developing countries from the so-called "evils" of development, and whether they were suggesting that the developing countries should not fall into the same "mistake" of progress based on material benefits, should keep their development at the level of the good old times, and should spare themselves the anguish of free and sovereign choice. Such paternalistic intentions were astonishingly old-fashion-

ed and contrary to the position adopted by the Members of the United Nations.

48. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco), referring to the second of the United Kingdom amendments (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1), asked for a separate vote on two subamendments providing for the deletion of "on the other hand" and "for all mankind" respectively. If those subamendments were adopted they would make for a more balanced text.

49. Mrs. MARICO (Mali) said that the fact that her delegation had not spoken in the debate until that point was certainly not to be attributed to any lack of interest in the protection of human rights against the effects of sweeping advances in science and technology. While it was obvious that scientific and technological progress had, to some extent, been beneficial, especially in the third world countries, it had also been detrimental to ecology. For that reason, the United Nations, out of a concern to stop the havoc caused in that field by technological progress, had established the United Nations Environment Programme, with a secretariat in Africa. Her delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 and had serious reservations concerning the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1.

50. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) said that although, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, it was inappropriate for him to explain his vote, he wished to comment on the remarks made by the representative of Brazil.

51. Mr. COSTA COUTO (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Cuba was not explaining his vote but exercising his right of reply and he accordingly asked the Chairman for a ruling on the basis of rule 115 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

52. The CHAIRMAN read out rules 115 and 130 of the rules of procedure and said that, since the voting and explanations of votes had already begun, he had to apply the provisions of rule 130 and he asked the representative of Cuba not to continue his statement.

53. It would be the normal procedure to vote first on the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1) and on the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1 and subamendments thereto, but since one of those amendments related to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2094 he wished to invite the members of the Committee to vote on that draft resolution first.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2094 was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The first of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1 was adopted by 41 votes to 37, with 25 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3, as amended, of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The words "on the other hand" in the second of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1 were deleted by 49 votes to 22, with 30 abstentions.

The words "for all mankind" in the second of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1 were deleted by 51 votes to 21, with 28 abstentions.

54. Mr. LOSHCHININ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on a point of order, said that his delegation had always tried to facilitate the Committee's proceedings. Thus, since two phrases in the paragraph proposed by the United Kingdom in its second amendment had been deleted, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 would be willing to accept that second amendment if the United Kingdom delegation agreed not to press its third amendment.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, according to rule 130 of the rules of procedure, no changes could be made during the voting.

At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a vote was taken by roll-call on the second amendment, as amended, in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1.

Mauritania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Nepal, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Botswana.

The amendment, as amended, was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

In the case of the third of the amendments in document A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1 there were 32 votes in favour, 32 against, and 39 abstentions.

The amendment was not adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 as a whole, as revised and amended, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

56. The CHAIRMAN recalled that several representatives had expressed regret that the item had not been given adequate consideration. In view of the importance of all the items on the agenda, only a limited amount of time could be allocated to each. However, he wished to point out that, at the current session, four of the Committee's meetings had been devoted to the item, whereas only one eighth of a meeting had been

devoted to it at the twenty-fifth session, a quarter of a meeting at the twenty-sixth session, and half a meeting at the twenty-seventh session. Thanks to the efforts made by the members of the Committee, it had now been possible to consider the item at greater length.

Mrs. Bertrand de Bromley (Honduras), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

57. Mr. MOREIRA (Portugal), speaking on a point of order, said that in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, his delegation had intended to abstain but had voted for the draft by mistake, and would like to place that correction on record.

58. Mrs. RAKOTOFIRINGA (Madagascar) said that, in voting for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 and the amendments to that draft resolution at the preceding meeting, her delegation had had three principles in mind: first, the return to the fountainhead, mentioned by the Director-General of UNESCO in his report (see A/9227) when referring to countries like her own, to which foreign cultures had been imported to the detriment of indigenous culture—operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution gave Governments an opportunity to make that return to the fountainhead a reality; secondly, national sovereignty over cultural and artistic resources, which was guaranteed in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, as interpreted by her delegation; and thirdly, the enrichment of national culture through the interplay of different cultures, subject to respect for the sovereignty of the parties concerned.

59. By means of General Assembly resolution 3026 A (XXVII) and the Committee's draft resolution, a new and important aspect to the question of human rights and scientific and technological developments had been dealt with, and her delegation hoped that the Committee would be able to give the next report by the Director-General of UNESCO a degree of priority and amount of time commensurate with its importance and devote to that question the attention it deserved.

60. Mr. VAN WALSUM (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 partly in order to give expression to its dissatisfaction with the manner in which a number of amendments had been rejected, first by the sponsors and subsequently, in the vote, by the Committee itself. Those amendments (see A/C.3/L.2089 and A/C.3/L.2090) had been supported by his delegation because they had been aimed at adjusting the nationalistic and protective angle of the draft resolution and would not have drastically altered the text. In such matters, which touched on some basic concepts such as the true nature of culture and man's right to determine of his own free will how he would develop his natural talents, his delegation preferred to abstain on a draft resolution whose general tenor it felt it could not fully endorse. In that connexion it could be considered significant that in the voting on the proposal to add the word "free" before the word "creative", 26 delegations had cast negative votes and 34 had abstained.

61. As to draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1, his delegation had had even greater difficulties with the general tenor, which seemed to reflect a frightened, unimaginative and conservative approach to the eternal problem of the use and misuse of science and technology. Despite the improvements introduced as a result of

consultations between the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR and the United Kingdom, his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the voting.

62. Mrs. SELLAMI (Algeria) said that her delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 as a whole for three main reasons. First, that draft resolution was entitled "Preservation and further development of cultural values", and for Algeria the question was above all one of bringing about a renaissance of its culture, which had been denied over a long period of time, to such a point that a whole people had become depersonalized. It had a twofold task, for it must acquire the scientific and technological knowledge which would enable it to share in progress without its participation being in any way curtailed by the forces which had contributed and were still contributing in certain parts of the world to the nullification of the authentic cultural values of peoples.

63. Secondly, it seemed to her that the excellent ideas of the Director-General of UNESCO had in part been distorted by the interpretation given them in draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2. The Director-General of UNESCO had stressed in particular the universality of culture and the importance of ensuring that all categories of individuals in a society have access to it.

64. Thirdly, for Algeria the problem of science and technology was one of communication and the transfer of knowledge. Her delegation was somewhat sceptical about the good intentions of those who emphasized the negative consequences and the mistakes of scientific and technological progress, thus denying to developing peoples the possibility of mastering the forces which would enable those who assumed that negative approach to consolidate their own supremacy. While her delegation appreciated the goodwill which had been demonstrated, it was somewhat weary of cultural paternalism and wished to make it known that Algeria was prepared to accept the consequences of scientific and technological progress. The Heads of State of the non-aligned countries recognized that where technology was concerned the developing peoples needed to close the gap which separated them from the industrialized world and strengthen their own research efforts, sharing each other's experiences. In addition, they were determined to continue their struggle in international organizations to gain the easiest and least onerous access that they could to modern technology and to promote the adoption of an international code of conduct which would reorganize the transfer of technology from the developed to the developing countries on the basis of respect for their independence.

65. Mr. ABSOLUM (New Zealand), explaining his vote on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2, said that because the New Zealand culture represented a blend of Polynesian and European influences, his Government was particularly concerned to preserve and enhance the evidence of that unique heritage. Accordingly, his delegation had voted in favour of that draft resolution as a whole. His delegation had also supported the amendments in documents A/C.3/L.2089 and A/C.3/L.2090 because in its opinion they added balance to the text, stressing the importance of creating conditions conducive to the free interplay of individual intellectual and artistic styles which was the lifeblood of a dynamic culture.

66. His delegation shared the concern of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 with respect to the dangers to mankind which could result from the utilization of scientific and technological progress, especially in the case of the various substances which polluted the air, oceans and cities. However, there too it had deemed it essential to establish a balance, ensuring that it would be pointed out clearly that science and technology had contributed to the improvement of standards of living in many parts of the world and that they continued to be essential tools for improving the quality of life for all. For that reason his delegation had supported the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom (A/C.3/L.2091/Rev.1).

67. In conclusion, he said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2094 because it considered that the subject of human rights and scientific and technological developments should occupy a central position in the spectrum of social and humanitarian issues for which the United Nations assumed responsibility. It hoped that future consideration of that topic would focus on specific problems.

68. Mr. KHMIL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 and A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 because they were a valuable contribution to the work of establishing the foundation for a new orientation of the work of the United Nations with respect to technology and human rights. As the Secretary-General was invited in draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 to submit a report on the question to the General Assembly, he wished to make some comments concerning the future activities of the United Nations in that sphere.

69. The reality of the current world showed that there were two different basic social and economic systems. Capitalism, which was based on private property, gave rise to the exploitation of man by man and to social inequalities; socialism was based on the principle of social property and established fraternal co-operation which guaranteed and equitable sharing of goods. The contrast between those two systems could be clearly seen in the differences between the effect of scientific and technological developments on human rights under capitalism and their effect on human rights under socialism.

70. In introducing scientific and technological advances into production, private enterprise was motivated by profit and not by the interests of mankind in general. In the capitalist world, scientific and technological progress did not lead to the redistribution and equalization of income, a fact not mentioned by the apologists of "free enterprise". Production was increased, but the workers continued to be exploited; increases in their wages were small in comparison with the growth of corporate profits and were dissipated by rising prices and inflation. Under capitalism, mechanization and automation of industry and rationalization of its organization and management were synonymous with unemployment. The scientific and technological revolution required more advanced education and training, but in the developed capitalist countries growing concern was being expressed about a crisis in education. On the international scene, imperialistic corporations transferred enterprises from one country to another on the basis of the advantages they derived

from the scientific and technological revolution, in order to obtain cheap labour and reap still higher profits. Another phenomenon directly related to the question discussed by the Committee was the "brain drain" from less developed and developing countries, which was cultivated by the capitalist monopolies.

71. Those tendencies reflecting the effects of the scientific and technological revolution on human rights under capitalism were all alien to socialism. In the Ukrainian SSR, scientific and technological progress had become an objective law of socialist construction. Scientific and technological advances belonged to all the people and were used for the planned and proportional development of the economy and of science and culture, for the harmonious development of human individuality and for improving the well-being of the entire people. The use of scientific and technological achievements in industry made work easier, increased personal and social consumption for all workers and gave them expanded opportunities for improving their work skills, education and cultural level. The Ukrainian experience made it clear that safeguarding human rights in the context of the scientific and technological revolution meant making the socio-economic and political structure of society keep pace with the demands of that revolution and ensuring that scientific and technological progress formed a unified whole with social progress. The socialist system was the embodiment of that unity.

72. The Ukrainian SSR felt that the United Nations had not considered the principal aspect of the question and that in general the discussion had centred around matters of slight importance because some States were afraid to go to the root of the problem, and the Secretariat was responsible because it was the Secretariat whose reports served as a direct basis for discussions by United Nations bodies. The reports the Secretary-General submitted by request to United Nations organs constituted the direct basis for the consideration of any question, but in the case of scientific and technological developments and in other cases the reports had not reflected the replies of all Governments. Until now, as could be seen from various United Nations documents—such as the report submitted to the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-sixth session,³ another submitted to the Commission at its twenty-eighth session,⁴ the report of the Secretary-General to the Assembly at the current session on the question of the elderly and the aged (A/9126) and the note by the Secretary-General on crime prevention and control also submitted at the current session (A/9032)—the tendency had been to mention "developed" and "developing" countries, but the socialist countries had been mentioned only occasionally, and then less prominently than their importance warranted. Frequently the socialist countries had drawn attention to the fact that the relevant documents should not be based solely

on information from the capitalist countries, but those comments had elicited no response and had not always been taken into account in the preparation of later reports. He asked, in that connexion, what methodological principles and political considerations were applied by the Division of Human Rights and the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs in preparing reports on social and humanitarian questions and why that Division did not take into account the reality that there were two different social systems in the world. That tendency was a vestige of the cold war and should be eliminated immediately, thus affording a better guarantee of the human rights of the peoples of the world.

73. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he had been aware that under rule 130 of the rules of procedure the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment could not explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment, but when he had asked for the floor he had been counting on the courtesy of the officers of the Committee and the representative of Brazil, for what he had wanted to do was to offer a clarification to the latter. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 had warranted the general support of all developing countries and of those countries which had a progressive political position, and he had wished to clarify the content of the text for the benefit of the representative of Brazil. Cuba had worked intensively on some paragraphs of that draft and it was to be presumed that the delegation of Brazil could tell which ones they were. What Cuba had wished to avoid was that the impression should be created that there was no common interest among the countries.

74. Mr. LÖFGREN (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2076/Rev.1 because there were elements and wordings in that text which could, in his delegation's preliminary view, seem questionable. With regard to the operative part, it had reservations in particular concerning operative paragraphs 3 and 4 in the initial text. However, there were certain provisions in the text with which Sweden agreed whole-heartedly. Among others, he could mention the last operative paragraph; he noted in that connexion that Sweden had recently adopted legislation of that type, concerning which it had transmitted extensive documentation to the Secretariat.

75. Mr. CABRERA MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) said that Mexico had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2050/Rev.2 but that in the separate vote on operative paragraph 1 (d) it had been obliged to abstain because it had been unable to support the word "official" in subparagraph (ii), which read "*dar a conocer al público la trascendencia oficial y estética del medio cultural*". Perhaps it was a typographical error in the Spanish version; in that case, he requested that it should be rectified.

³ E/CN.4/1028 and Add. 1-6.

⁴ E/CN.4/1084.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.