

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1443rd  
MEETING**

Monday, 13 December 1971,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Narciso G. REYES (Philippines).

**AGENDA ITEM 48**

**Question of the establishment of an international university: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)\***  
(A/8403/Add.1 (part VII); A/8510 and Add.1/Rev.1;  
A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1219)

1. Mr. OGISO (Japan) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2. The words "intergovernmental bodies" which now appeared in the third preambular paragraph did not of course exclude the Secretary-General's Panel of Experts, which was to continue to study the question, as was stated in operative paragraph 3. In operative paragraph 2 the sponsors had deleted the words "through the Executive Board of UNESCO" because in operative paragraph 4 that body was invited to submit its observations and recommendations to the Economic and Social Council and because it would be constitutionally incorrect to invite the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Economic and Social Council through the Executive Board of UNESCO. They had deleted the words "as proposed in operative paragraph 6 of UNESCO resolution", which had appeared at the end of operative paragraph 2 of the previous version, since the Panel of Experts also proposed to have a further study made on certain points. The sponsors, faced with the choice of adding a reference to the reports of the Panel of Experts or of deleting mention of the UNESCO resolution, had chosen the latter alternative. As in the previous year, the Secretary-General had also been requested to continue the studies and consultations. Certain delegations had suggested that such studies should be carried out under the guidelines laid down by the Economic and Social Council. However, the Council could formulate its recommendations only during its spring session, a procedure which would considerably delay the studies in question. On the other hand, the sponsors had felt that in the same paragraph the words "taking into account the views expressed in the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session" should be inserted after the words "and other interested bodies", in order to make it clear that the Panel of Experts should take into account the views of the Governments. They had added the words "and interested agencies and programmes" to the end of operative paragraph 3 although they had been deleted from the first revised text. In paragraph 4 the word "before" had been replaced by the word "at" before the words "its fifty-third session" because UNESCO would not have concluded its consideration of the question before the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council. The United States

delegation had proposed that operative paragraph 7 should be deleted but the sponsors had retained it because of the major role UNESCO was to play in the undertaking and also because, as the UNESCO representative had pointed out, the General Conference was to take up the question as a matter of priority. At its twenty-seventh session, the General Assembly would have ample time to consider the comments of the Executive Board and General Conference of UNESCO. During previous discussions it had already been decided to delete the word "further" from operative paragraph 8 in order to improve the English text. The representative of Upper Volta had urged that in the same paragraph it should be stipulated that the General Assembly would take a final decision on the subject at its twenty-seventh session. Although the sponsors felt that in fact the General Assembly should take such a decision at its twenty-seventh session, they had felt it inappropriate to instruct it formally to do so and had therefore preferred not to adopt the text proposed by the delegation of Upper Volta. But it was the sincere hope of the sponsors that a final decision would be made at the twenty-seventh session.

2. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Committee) assured the members of the Committee that, with regard to the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2, the Secretary-General, in consultation with UNESCO, would do everything necessary to submit the additional information required under operative paragraph 2 without requesting supplementary appropriations for consultant services and Secretariat staff. The additional expenditures to be incurred in that respect would be covered in 1972 by the total allocations to be approved by the General Assembly. However, if the Panel of Experts met in 1972 a sum of \$7,000 would be required in the 1972 budget.

3. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, as a co-sponsor, he wished to give some additional explanations about draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2. The text had been considerably revised in order to take into account all the viewpoints; moreover, the delegation of Cyprus had become a co-sponsor. The text did not endorse the Secretary-General's view of a United Nations university. The institution in question would not be of the traditional type but rather an international university centre as had been recommended by the delegations of France and Iran. However, representatives should have no illusions: the General Assembly could not take a final decision on the question at its twenty-seventh session; in other words, the last operative paragraph should not be interpreted as representing the final stage for the establishment of the university.

4. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) wondered whether the representatives of Greece and Japan had really been

\* Resumed from the 1441st meeting.

speaking about the same draft resolution. He thanked the sponsors who had tried to take into account the various viewpoints and he felt that the Secretary-General and all the parties concerned should spare no effort to implement the draft resolution. With regard to operative paragraph 8, one of the sponsors had said that the General Assembly should take the final decision at its twenty-seventh session. He himself felt, in view of General Assembly resolution 2691 (XXV) and considering that the matter had already been sufficiently studied, the General Assembly should take a final decision at its twenty-seventh session. That was why his delegation had put forward its amendment. Nevertheless, it had accepted the revised text and would vote in its favour in the light of the explanations given by the representative of Japan.

5. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) thanked the Consultant to the Secretary-General for the clarity with which he had introduced the question of the establishment of the international university. Argentina had always given its support and co-operation to that undertaking. It also approved of the recommendations of the Panel of Experts appearing in paragraphs 15 to 21 of annex IV to the report (A/8510). His delegation was particularly interested in the idea of a decentralized university which would have a small governing body. It would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2. It hoped that study of the question would continue and that it could be carefully discussed at the next session of the General Assembly.

6. Mr. ALULA (Ethiopia) felt that at the present stage the idea of establishing an international university was more idealistic than practical, in spite of the urgent needs of the world population in the field of education and culture. Nevertheless, it was a good idea and deserved study by the Second Committee; he would therefore vote for the draft resolution.

7. Mr. PRAGUE (France) pointed out that the expression "international university" occurred several times in the text under consideration. He did not wish to oppose such terminology at the present stage but felt that it should in no way prejudice the intrinsic nature of the future institution or its title.

8. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia) said that his delegation had always supported the plan to establish an international university. It would vote for the draft resolution although, like the delegation of Upper Volta, it would have preferred the provisions of the text to be more ambitious and that a real step forward should be made.

9. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union had already explained its position on the item at the fifty-first session of the Economic and Social Council and at the present session of the Committee. His delegation had reservations about draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2 and would abstain during the vote on it. It felt in particular that no additional studies should be undertaken before the Economic and Social Council and the Governments of Member States had considered the question in detail and in particular the documents already submitted by the Secretary-General. For that reason, the Soviet delegation could not support operative paragraphs 2 and 3 if they were voted on

separately. His delegation also took note of the statements made by the Secretary of the Committee on behalf of the Secretary-General to the effect that the implementation of operative paragraph 2 would involve no financial implications.

10. Mr. GUPTA (India) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2 for having taken into account India's views in the final revised text. India would now like to be included among the sponsors of the draft which it unreservedly supported.

11. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation had already pointed out that further studies were needed on the question, which was far from being elucidated. It would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2 and was grateful to the Secretariat for having given the Committee the assurance that all the expenses of implementing it could be covered within existing appropriations.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.2.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

13. Mr. RICHARDSON (Liberia) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution and said he had felt duty bound to vote for the establishment of the proposed university because of the advantages which it would bring to mankind as a whole.

14. Mr. HILL (Consultant to the Secretary-General) expressed the Secretary-General's satisfaction at the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted with such a majority and without opposition. The experts would now be able to continue their task and at the next session of the Assembly the Secretary-General would submit the results of his co-operation with UNESCO, UNITAR and the other organizations concerned, after which, it was to be hoped, the project could be successfully implemented.

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Ivan Bachev,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria*

15. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Bulgaria to transmit to his Government the sincere condolences of the Second Committee at the sad loss it had just suffered on the occasion of the sudden death of Mr. Ivan Bachev, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria.

16. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, said that they had learned with a great sense of grief of the sudden death of Mr. Ivan Bachev, the former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria. Mr. Bachev had had a long association with the United Nations, and had devoted his life to the ideals of humanity and social progress. The socialist delegations wished to express their condolences to the Government and people of Bulgaria.

17. Mr. GUELEV (Bulgaria) said his delegation was extremely grateful for the expressions of condolence it had heard in the Committee, and would communicate them to its Government.

## AGENDA ITEM 12

**Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to VII, VIII (sections A to E), IX to XIV, XXI and XXII] (continued) (A/8403; A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1208/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1210)**

18. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) said that in dealing with the item under discussion, it must be borne in mind that what was at issue was the very principle of enlarging the membership of the Council. Such an enlargement was obviously urgent in view of the recent increase in the membership of the United Nations itself. That was why the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1 had taken pains to make it clear that the enlargement of the membership was to be carried out without any change in the existing geographical distribution of seats in the Council. Nevertheless, the existing formula was not sacrosanct; it might be discussed by the Committee at a later date.

19. He had carefully studied the revised version of the amendment (A/C.2/L.1208/Rev.2). He had found the original text of the amendment, which would have increased the number of seats assigned to Africa, quite reasonable. The revised version, however, was far from clear: there was no indication of the reason for invoking the "principle of an equitable geographical distribution". Furthermore, that term was not appropriate because what was really at issue was not geographical distribution but a political distribution of the membership, even though the political distribution was determined by certain geographical considerations. The wording of the amendment therefore did not reflect its true meaning, and the idea of submitting it in the name of equity was questionable. If the principle of equitable geographical distribution was to be applied in the strictest sense of the term, Australia and the United States, which by themselves represented a major portion of two continents, would be permanent members of the Council. The principle, which was inapplicable in practice, could not be taken as the sole criterion for the allocation of the new seats in the Council. The original text of the amendment was much more realistic and more in keeping with United Nations practice.

20. The amendment submitted by several delegations (A/C.2/L.1210) was more subtle, since by emphasizing that the final allocation of the seats in the enlarged Council should be primarily in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution, it implicitly recognized that other factors should also be considered.

21. His delegation had decided to sponsor draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1 for essentially practical reasons—namely, the enlargement of the Council—on the understanding that the implementation of that provision could be taken up at a later date. It might be a good idea to request that the matter should be placed as a separate item, on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, which would then examine, in that context, the criteria to be applied in the allocation of the new seats in the enlarged Council. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1 was not intended to settle the question completely but it did represent a first step in the right direction. He expressed the hope that it would be adopted unanimously, or at least almost unanimously.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that Lesotho and Liberia should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1.

23. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), speaking as the representative of a State which was both on the Economic and Social Council and a permanent member of the Security Council, said that at two sessions of the Economic and Social Council he had already explained at length why his delegation was worried about the enlargement of the membership of the Council. It was true that the Economic and Social Council no longer enjoyed the confidence of all Member States, and his delegation realized that some of them felt the problem could be solved by enlarging the Council's membership.

24. His delegation was more seriously concerned about the wider question of amendment of the Charter, which such a measure would entail, than about the question itself. It had also had reservations about the number of members proposed for the Council and its bodies and therefore felt that it would be unwise to take a hasty decision.

25. He recalled that during the vote on Economic and Social Council resolution 1621 (LI), his delegation had voted against part A of the resolution because it could not endorse the enlargement of the membership of the Council, but it had voted in favour of parts B and C of the same resolution because it had not wished to stand in the way of the Council members that wanted to establish committees larger than the Council. Those agreed measures should be allowed time to prove themselves. His delegation had always been under the impression that the enlargement of the membership of the Council and of its committees would be carried out on the basis of the existing geographical distribution in the Council. He would therefore definitely vote against any proposal that would modify the existing formula for distribution of seats, not so much because he believed the formula to be a perfect one as because it had been proven in practice. It would be unfortunate if the question of the distribution of the seats was to block not only the proposed enlargement of the membership of the Council, which his delegation opposed, but also the enlargement of the membership of the Council's committees, which his delegation could accept.

26. Mr. JURASZ (Poland) said his delegation still was not convinced that the enlargement of the membership of the Council would lead to better co-ordination. His delegation was strongly opposed to the amendments contained in documents A/C.2/L.1208/Rev.2 and A/C.2/L.1210. In that regard, he wholeheartedly endorsed the statements made by the representatives of the USSR, Bulgaria and Hungary, and he agreed with the French representative that neither the draft resolution nor the two amendments to it were likely to promote a sincere dialogue between the parties concerned.

27. Mr. DIAZ THOME (Mexico) said there was no reason for the Committee not to approve the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council, since the Council itself had already stated in a resolution that it considered such a measure to be necessary. Such an enlargement would enable the Council to work more effectively. Furthermore, the various countries would be

able to participate in its activities at shorter intervals and would not have to wait five or six years before being elected or re-elected to the Council.

28. He pointed out that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1 represented the outcome of lengthy negotiations and that the list of sponsors included countries from many different geographical, economic and political groups. It therefore reflected a very broad consensus and he was sorry that the system used for distributing the seats on the Council was not satisfactory to all delegations. Politics was the art of the possible, and the Committee owed it to itself to do what was possible; it should therefore adopt the draft resolution, particularly since the developing countries would then be better represented on the Council.

29. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) said the interest shown by all delegations in the question under consideration was proof of the increasingly important role the Council should play. The fact that its role touched on certain basic social and economic questions automatically compelled the developing countries to follow its activities closely and to try and discover to what extent it could help them in their development efforts. It was logical, therefore, that the distribution of seats by geographical groups should be an extremely important issue for those countries. Although the Council had already adopted a resolution on the matter, the question of the redistribution of the seats was still open. That was why his delegation had proposed that, at the current session, the questions of the enlargement of the membership and of the redistribution of seats should be treated as separate items. The Committee might very well take a decision on the former issue and defer the latter until its next session.

30. Some representatives, especially those from the most influential countries, had pointed out that under the Charter certain countries had the veto power on the question of enlargement. It was regrettable that certain delegations should use their privileged position to link the question of the enlargement of the Council's membership with that of the distribution of seats; they did so in order to perpetuate a flagrant injustice which primarily affected the Asian countries.

31. The countries of the Asian Group considered that the principle of equitable geographical distribution should be applied to the Economic and Social Council in the same way as it was applied in all the other organs of the United Nations. He pointed out in that connexion that in recent years six new Member States had been added to the Asian Group; however, according to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1, the distribution of seats in the Council would be made on the present basis. For the Asian Group, that injustice was the more flagrant in that one of the seats allocated to it was permanently occupied by a permanent member of the Security Council. For those reasons, his delegation had some difficulty in accepting the draft resolution, and it hoped that the Committee would bear in mind the reasons he had set forth; the Asian delegations were concerned that the question of the enlargement of the Council would be resolved in such a way that the Council would reflect the current political situation and be able to discharge its responsibilities in an effective and positive manner. Like the representative of Egypt, he expressed the

hope that the enlargement would be decided upon by an almost unanimous majority.

32. He pointed out further that the drafters of the Charter had been conscious of the importance of the Economic and Social Council and had for that reason stipulated that any amendment to the Charter—and consequently any amendment relating to the enlargement of the membership of the Council—would have to be adopted by a two-thirds majority and ratified by the five permanent members of the Security Council.

33. In view of the difficulty of reaching an agreement at the current session, and taking into account the fact that even his proposal to deal with the two questions separately raised difficulties, he thought that it would be better not to put the draft resolution and the two amendments to it to the vote at the present meeting. He therefore formally proposed that the vote should be postponed until the following meeting, so that the geographical groups and political groupings which had formed within the United Nations could consult together and arrive at a solution that would be satisfactory to all.

34. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) stressed once again the importance and urgency of the question of the enlargement of the membership of the Council, pointing out that it was becoming increasingly evident that many States had lost confidence in the Council because they were not adequately represented on it and that, in order to defend their interests, they were increasingly turning to other United Nations organs or bodies, where they felt they were more fairly represented. That being the case, the importance of the role conferred on the Council by the Charter was progressively diminishing, whereas the International Development Strategy gave that body the additional responsibility for the review and appraisal of progress in the Second Development Decade. If the council was to be able to discharge that responsibility, it must be worthy of the full confidence of all States Members of the Organization.

35. There was also the fact that the Council would be called upon to play a role in the implementation of the measures that were decided on regarding the environment.

36. If the Economic and Social Council was to be able to carry out all those tasks, it would have to be more representative of all geographical, political and economic interests. Failure to take a decision at the current session would be politically unwise.

37. With regard to the possibility of increasing the number of Council seats from 27 to 54, he was inclined to think that such a large increase was not fully justified and that the Council might thereby lose in effectiveness what it gained in numbers.

38. While it was necessary to apply the principle of equitable geographical distribution to the Council, that could only be done within the bounds of possibility.

39. The very concept of equitable geographical distribution was extremely difficult to define, and many criteria had to be borne in mind, such as the number of countries and the size of the population of each region, as well as the

economic and political importance of the various countries, not to mention the need to take into consideration the different political and economic systems. The situation was complicated by the fact that some groups counted among their number States which were permanent members of the Security Council; the Group of Western European and other States, for its part, included three members of the Security Council. Each of those aspects had to be taken into consideration, which further increased the difficulty of arriving at a consensus.

40. The Committee had before it three proposals, contained in the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1) and the two amendments under consideration (A/C.2/L.1208/Rev.2 and A/C.2/L.1210).

41. The aim of the draft resolution was to double the number of seats in the Economic and Social Council and to apportion them in accordance with the present geographical distribution of seats in the Council. That proposal had the merit of being immediately applicable.

42. The two amendments, proposed respectively by some of the Asian countries and by the Congo and Rwanda, advocated the postponement of a decision on the distribution of seats. In that connexion, he pointed out to the sponsors of the two amendments that a decision on the matter could not be postponed and that, at its organizational meetings for the fifty-second session, the Economic and Social Council would have to take a decision on what its membership was to be for its next session.

43. He therefore considered that those delegations which regarded the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council as an important question should accept the proposal of the sponsors of the draft resolution and decide to apportion the additional seats in the Economic and Social Council in accordance with the present geographical distribution. It was difficult to judge objectively the fairness of any system of distribution, but the Asian Group should not overlook the fact that one of its members had a permanent seat.

44. Like the Egyptian delegation, he considered that the Committee should decide immediately to apportion the additional seats in the Economic and Social Council in accordance with the present system of geographical distribution, as proposed by the sponsors of the draft resolution. He pointed out in that regard that such a decision could easily be modified later on. For the time being, the only means of achieving the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council was to adopt the draft resolution.

45. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that it was regrettable that operative paragraph 4 should be the subject of so much

controversy, especially since the sponsors of the draft resolution could not accept the amendments submitted, the one by a group of Asian countries and the other by the Congo and Rwanda.

46. Under rule 118 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he formally moved the closure of the debate on the item and requested that the draft resolution and the amendments to it should be immediately put to the vote.

47. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) said he felt that it would be in the interest of all members if, before proceeding to the vote, the Committee could hear those sponsors that wished to speak on the question of the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council. He therefore urged the Kenyan representative not to press his motion.

48. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that as the Committee had only begun its discussion of the item at the previous meeting it would be unwise to close the debate on the item, especially since consultations were being held. He therefore strongly opposed the motion proposed by the Kenyan representative and formally moved that the debate should be adjourned until the following day.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the second motion had precedence over the first; he therefore suggested that the debate on the item under discussion should be adjourned.

50. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) and Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) supported the motion for adjournment.

51. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) opposed the motion for adjournment on the grounds that the Committee had very little time left. Furthermore, those representatives who had not yet spoken should be given an opportunity to make known their views on the draft resolution.

52. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) felt that the item under consideration was so important that time must be found for an exchange of views. He formally moved the adjournment of the meeting.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 120 of the rules of procedure, the third motion had precedence over the first two. Accordingly, he suggested that the motion to adjourn the meeting should be put to the vote.

*The motion to adjourn the meeting was adopted by 65 votes to 6, with 25 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*