

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 221st
MEETING**

Friday, 9 December 1960,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 77:

*Appeal for maximum support to efforts of newly
emerging States for strengthening their in-
dependence (continued)* 211

Chairman: Mr. Carlet R. AUGUSTE (Haiti).

AGENDA ITEM 77

**Appeal for maximum support to efforts of newly emerging
States for strengthening their independence (A/4443, A/
SPC/49) (continued)**

1. Mr. ABOUBACRINE (Mali) said that his delegation would support any timely step in connexion with the item under discussion, and it particularly welcomed the statements made by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 219th meeting. What full national sovereignty meant to a people could never be sufficiently stressed. All Powers, great and small, were equally jealous of their freedom and independence, which were not free gifts but had to be won at the cost of great sacrifice. The heroic struggle being carried on at present by nations which were still colonial dependencies would inevitably triumph in the end. All Members of the United Nations should actively support that struggle without hesitation. Genuine independence for all peoples was no longer a matter of charity but of human solidarity.

2. It must be realized that the newly independent countries were to a certain extent handicapped when they arrived on the international scene. There was much talk of the large number of countries admitted to the United Nations in 1960, but it was not sufficiently emphasized that they were a large collection of debilitated countries, still convalescent and not yet restored to health after a long period of foreign domination. They had neither industries nor sound finances, and they lacked trained personnel. They were all still in the swaddling-clothes of the under-developed countries. To exploit the poverty of such nations and to impose on them prior political, economic or military conditions as they made the transition to independence was a cynical method of mortgaging the future national sovereignty of their peoples. The first concern of the newly independent countries was to rescue their peoples from malnutrition, illiteracy, in short, from economic, social and cultural under-development.

3. Moreover, since the newly independent States must never serve as pawns in the cold war, they had no use for military bases. Instead, the more well-to-do States should help their poor relations become prosperous by guaranteeing stable prices for raw materials at a level which would allow the peasant masses in the under-developed countries to pay their way.

Page

4. No great Power must count on its strength to transform the cloud-scapes of Africa and Asia into the mushroom clouds of atomic bombs. States which were still dependent or which had only just attained independence expected something different from the nuclear Powers than pollution of the atmosphere and exposure of peaceful and defenceless peoples to the terrible scourge of radioactive fall-out. The skies over those countries must be kept free from the danger which could be caused by a chance collision between aircraft carrying atomic bombs.

5. For all those reasons the Malian delegation asked the United Nations solemnly to declare, first, that no future negotiations concerning a country's attainment of independence should involve political, economic or military conditions that would limit the sovereign rights of that country and, secondly, that all negotiations with new States already conducted on that basis should be considered null and void.

6. The role of the newly independent States was not to perpetuate hatred, strife and war in the world, but, to promote the peaceful coexistence of all the peoples of the world. Hence, the Malian delegation fully endorsed the appeal for maximum support to efforts of newly emerging States for strengthening their independence.

7. Mr. BOHEMAN (Sweden), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that only a few delegations had taken part in the debate so far. That was no doubt because the present discussion overlapped to some extent with that taking place simultaneously in plenary on agenda item 87 and with the Second Committee's discussions on agenda item 31. Despite its decided interest in the question, the Swedish delegation felt that it might be better to close the debate now since there hardly seemed to be any need to adopt a draft resolution in view of the proposals which the Assembly would be voting on in the plenary meeting.

8. The CHAIRMAN thought that in view of the importance of the question it might be preferable to allow more time. The reason why there were few speakers on the list was probably that the Committee's meetings coincided with meetings of other important bodies. The Committee might therefore consider closing the list of speakers by 4 p.m. on 12 December so as to cut short the debate if there were not enough members wishing to take part in it.

9. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that while he fully understood the situation, he felt that the members of the Committee had perhaps not had sufficient time to prepare their statements. He personally would prefer the list to be closed on Tuesday, 13 December.

10. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUEZ (Brazil) said that in view of the circumstances and in order to make better use of the discussion time, the Committee might perhaps meet not on Monday 12 but on Tuesday 13 December, the list to be closed at noon on Tuesday.

11. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he objected strongly to any attempt to take advantage of the situation, as the representative of Sweden was attempting to do, while paying lip service to the importance of the question. It was not true to say that there was no need to discuss the question because of the discussions taking place in other bodies, and the slowness of the proceedings was only due to the use made of the time-table of the present heavy session. The list of speakers should therefore not be closed until noon on Tuesday, 13 December, if there were enough speakers on the list for a meeting to be held on Monday, or if not, on Tuesday evening.

12. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) supported the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union; however, he would like to see the list closed, whatever happened, by 6 p.m. on Tuesday, in the usual way.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that there was certainly no reason to suspect any lack of interest on the part of delegations. He agreed that it would be better to postpone consideration of the question until Tuesday, and proposed that the list should be considered closed by 6 p.m. on Tuesday.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 3.45 p.m.