



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 7 August 1969

at 9.10 p.m.

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 20: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations ( <i>resumed from the 1627th meeting</i> ) .....	235

President: Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

## AGENDA ITEM 20

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (4668 and Add.1, E/4712; E/L.1276) (*resumed from the 1627th meeting*)**

1. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution E/L.1276. The draft resolution expressed the Council's gratitude to those specialized agencies and international institutions which had tried to comply with the recommendations of the relevant General Assembly resolutions on the subject of decolonization, and its regret that some agencies and institutions had not extended their full co-operation to the United Nations in that respect. It also endorsed the recommendations contained in the report of the President of the Council (E/4712) and made a number of practical suggestions regarding ways in which the specialized agencies and the international institutions might increase their efforts to assist the General Assembly in the implementation of the Declaration. Operative paragraph 7, in particular, suggested means whereby the Governments members of the governing bodies or deliberative organs of the specialized agencies and international institutions might assist the General Assembly and the Council in fulfilling their mandate.

2. The key provision of the draft resolution was operative paragraph 4, which contained the essence of the President's recommendations in his report to the Council, and which closely followed operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII). Since a number of the larger specialized agencies, in addition to UNESCO, had also established relationship agreements with OAU, the question might well be asked, why the sponsors had singled out UNESCO as an example to be followed. The answer was that UNESCO was the only specialized agency which had taken legislative action to give explicit directives concerning assistance to liberation movements.

3. There were, however, a number of elements which were as yet unclear. In that connexion, speaking on behalf of his delegation only, he wished to put certain questions to the representative of UNESCO. He would like to know how much money had been allocated by UNESCO for direct assistance to liberation movements for the two-year period 1971-1972. He would also like to know what UNESCO had done, in addition to publishing a booklet entitled *Apartheid*<sup>1</sup> in 1966, to publicize the question of *apartheid*, neo-colonialism and systems of racist regimes in southern Africa, both on its own initiative and in implementation of resolutions adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO and of operative paragraph 14 of resolution III adopted at the International Conference on Human Rights in Teheran in 1968.<sup>2</sup> In the autumn of 1968, UNESCO had offered to sell copies of the booklet entitled *Apartheid* at a reduced rate, and his country had bought a large number of copies to use in its school programmes. Since a number of other countries were anxious to take advantage of UNESCO's offer, he would like to know whether copies were still available and whether UNESCO had made any arrangements for republication. The UNESCO race programme, to which his delegation attached great importance, had recently been under attack, and he would appreciate further information on the activities being undertaken by UNESCO in respect of that programme. Lastly, it would be useful if the Council could have some amplification from the representative of UNDP of the reply from the Administrator of UNDP reproduced in the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (A/AC.109/333).

4. Draft resolution E/L.1276 fully reflected the views expressed by those members of the Council who had actually spoken in the debate on the item, and he urged its adoption by the Council. The resolution should certainly not be construed as an attack on the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations. On the contrary, the sponsors felt that by and large most agencies were doing their best to fulfil the relevant General Assembly recommendations, and the purpose of the draft resolution was to collaborate with the specialized agencies as far as possible in intensifying their activities in that field.

5. Mr. COLE (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, urged its adoption. With

<sup>1</sup> UNESCO document SHC-SS/67/D.30 A.

<sup>2</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.XIV.2), p. 6.

reference to operative paragraph 4, he said that the establishment of relationship agreements with OAU was intended as a means of providing practical assistance to liberation movements, and not as an end in itself. There was a great deal more that could be done. The draft resolution wished to place on record, however, that other agencies, particularly, IBRD and IMF, could follow UNESCO's lead in taking that first step.

6. Now that UNESCO had signed an agreement with OAU on 10 July 1968, his delegation would like to know how much money had been allocated by UNESCO for refugee relief, how many scholarships the funds could support and how the allocation compared with those of other UNESCO non-educational programmes. It would also like to know how many scholarships had already been awarded under the OAU programme, and what UNESCO had done on its own initiative in the African territories still under colonial domination. The IBRD/IDA report for 1968 referred to schemes which had been organized in Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania,<sup>3</sup> and his delegation would appreciate information on the actual amounts allocated to those schemes for the coming year.

7. He wished to emphasize that, where draft resolution E/L.1276 referred to assistance to refugees from colonial territories, it should in all cases be interpreted as including assistance to the Governments acting as hosts to those refugees. He associated himself with the Tanzanian representative's statement that the draft resolution should not be construed as an attack on the specialized agencies.

8. Mr. KARASSIMEONOV (Bulgaria), speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution E/L.1276, said that the draft warranted the Council's serious attention for several reasons. First, it was based on the historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and on other resolutions on the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization. Secondly, it faithfully reflected the discussions in the Council during its current session, and the operative part in particular embodied suggestions made by various speakers. Lastly, the draft resolution was a praiseworthy attempt to induce the Council to stimulate, encourage and co-ordinate the efforts of the specialized agencies in the matter of decolonization, and contained several practical suggestions in response to the questions raised by those specialized agencies that were resolved to apply the General Assembly's resolutions on decolonization.

9. Stressing the importance of the penultimate paragraph of the preamble, which pointed to the urgent need of the peoples of several colonial territories for assistance, particularly in education and training, health and nutrition, he said the paragraph reflected the unhappy state of affairs prevailing in that part of Africa still dominated by colonialism. The dependent peoples in those territories

were in revolt because the Governments of two countries which were Member States, and one illegal regime, were still opposing decolonization and defying the United Nations. It was a noble task for the specialized agencies to participate actively in the assistance which those peoples should be given, and there could be no doubt what United Nations policy should be on the specialized agencies' role in decolonization. The statements of previous speakers clearly showed that the United Nations regarded the specialized agencies as an integral part of the United Nations system, and that UNESCO had pride of place in that design. UNESCO would, he hoped, make more rapid progress in implementing the policy of decolonization so as to continue to set an example to the other specialized agencies.

10. Welcoming the agreement between UNESCO and OAU, he expressed surprise that apparently nothing practical had yet emerged from the agreement. African Governments should urge the Secretary-General of OAU to reply to UNESCO requests for guidance as to how the purposes of the agreement might best be served. Nevertheless, UNESCO's attitude contrasted favourably with that of IBRD and IMF, whose actions were unfortunately not in keeping with United Nations policy on decolonization. IBRD was still lending money to Portugal and South Africa, and steps should be taken to end that scandalous state of affairs.

11. Operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was highly important, since it recommended direct aid to the national liberation movements through OAU. Operative paragraph 7 outlined several practical measures which met the specialized agencies' requests for guidance. Sub-paragraph v rightly stressed the need for machinery to review the implementation of the General Assembly's resolutions.

12. It was essential to keep the item on the Council's agenda, and he commended the draft resolution as a realistic, balanced and practical document.

13. Mr. de SILVA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) thanked the representatives of Tanzania and Sierra Leone for the interest they had shown in the activities of his organization, and particularly in the agreement signed on 10 July 1968 between UNESCO and OAU. It was a general agreement, under which both organizations had decided, with the approval of their respective governing bodies, to co-operate in activities such as the exchange of information and statistics. Pursuant to that agreement, UNESCO had received two requests for assistance from OAU, one for financial assistance in the preparation of a festival currently taking place in Algiers and featuring the cultures of Africa, and the other for assistance in organizing a training course for interpreters serving OAU.

14. Under paragraph 3 of resolution 9.12, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fifteenth session, the Director-General of the organization had been invited to

<sup>3</sup> World Bank/International Development Association, *Annual Report, 1968*, appendix 2.

initiate correspondence with the Secretary-General of OAU to determine the needs and requests for aid which might be made. Such consultations were bound to take some time, but he was convinced that the Secretary-General of OAU would reply as soon as he had the necessary information.

15. In reply to the question by the Tanzanian representative concerning the financial arrangements to give effect to the agreement, he stated that the resolution adopted by the General Conference did not contain any figures, as the financial implications of co-operation between the two bodies were not yet known, although \$10,000 had been set aside to finance the preparation of a joint programme.

16. Replying to the question concerning UNESCO's "race programme", he said that from unspectacular beginnings in 1949 the programme had resulted in the publication of fifteen studies on the racial question, and that in 1955 those had led to protests from the Republic of South Africa, which had withdrawn from UNESCO. Nevertheless, he wished to reassure the Tanzanian representative that the programme was being continued. With regard to the booklet entitled *Apartheid*, published by UNESCO in 1966, a total of 9,600 copies had been printed, but it was the policy of the organization not to carry a big stock but to make reprints as and when required. Four hundred copies of the publication had been dispatched in November 1968 and a further 1,300 had been supplied to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania at half price in April 1969 for use in schools.

17. With reference to the implementation of resolution III of the International Conference on Human Rights, he gave the assurance that neither the secretariat nor the organization as a whole was neglecting the problem. One of the difficulties was to find ways of disseminating the findings of scientific papers on racialism.

18. Lastly, he said that ways of increasing the number of scholarships available to refugees were being considered, but to his knowledge no application on behalf of a refugee had ever been rejected.

19. Mr. DUMONTET (United Nations Development Programme), replying to the question raised by the Tanzanian representative, said that the reference in document A/AC.109/333 to UNDP activities under General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII) was inadequate, and that some amplification was required.

20. For instance, since the General Assembly's first resolution on the subject (resolution 1514 (XV)), UNDP had withdrawn all aid from territories under South African or Portuguese control and from Southern Rhodesia. UNDP had also acted in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII).

21. Since 1966, UNDP had established, on the initiative of the United Kingdom Government, a scholarship programme, which now amounted to \$75,000 annually, to assist Africans from Southern Rhodesia. There were several

examples of efforts made by UNDP, in conjunction with UNHCR, to assist African refugees and to integrate them in the economic and social life of the countries of asylum. UNDP was ready to examine any request for similar projects received from the Governments of the countries of asylum to assist refugees from the territories referred to in General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII).

22. UNDP was providing the Zambian Government with the services of an OPEX expert to help in co-ordinating refugee-assistance measures adopted at the national level.

23. UNDP had established resident representative posts in most of the developing countries either just before or immediately after their accession to independence. Ninety-three such offices, of which more than forty were in Africa, had already been set up to assist Governments, to identify their requirements and to ensure liaison with UNDP. The largest proportion of allocations under the UNDP funds went to African countries.

24. Mr. ALI (International Labour Organisation) said that the Director-General of the International Labour Office submitted a report every year to the International Labour Conference. That report was distributed throughout the world and was given maximum publicity.

25. Mr. PANGGABEAN (Indonesia) said that his delegation had not taken part in the general debate on agenda item 20 for the simple reason that Indonesia's views on colonialism were already sufficiently well known. Indonesia had always supported international action aimed at ending the domination of one country by another. It had been a co-sponsor of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and his delegation lent its full support to draft resolution E/L.1276, which stemmed logically from General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII).

26. Mrs. KAMATH (World Health Organization), replying to the questions raised by the representative of Sierra Leone, said that WHO operated through six regional offices. The regional office for Africa was at Brazzaville, and WHO had long had a liaison officer at ECA. Contacts had already been established with OAU before the co-operation agreement between WHO and OAU had been ratified by the twenty-second World Health Assembly on 23 July 1969,<sup>4</sup> and WHO had been represented in early July at the first meeting of the OAU Educational, Scientific, Cultural and Health Commission. Those contacts were expected to lead to fruitful relations, but no specific request for assistance had as yet been received from OAU.

27. The Director-General reported to each session of the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly any decisions of United Nations bodies or organizations in the United Nations system liable to affect WHO, and both WHO bodies had been apprised in full of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. The forty-third session of the Executive Board in February

<sup>4</sup> Resolution WHA 22.16.

1969 and the twenty-second World Health Assembly had each adopted resolutions approving the steps taken by the Director-General pursuant to the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

28. Furthermore, WHO was also collaborating with UNHCR in the provision of health services to refugees.

29. Mr. CONSOLO (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), replying to the question raised by the Sierra Leone representative, said that the operations of IBRD were a matter of public record. All loan and credit agreements were deposited with the United Nations. He did not at present have full details available, but would be glad to transmit them to the Council later through the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

30. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) wished to appeal to those representatives, particularly of the leading developed countries, who had not yet spoken in the debate. The great Powers were not usually so reticent on matters which touched their interests more nearly.

31. It was to be hoped that the directives received by the specialized agencies in the form of resolutions provided them with adequate guidance on the course of action to be followed.

32. He hoped that draft resolution E/L.1276, of which his delegation was a sponsor, would be unanimously adopted.

33. Mr. EKONDY-AKALA (Congo (Brazzaville)) said that the black population of European colonies in Africa had frequently been enlisted to fight in European wars, of the causes of which they had usually been completely ignorant. The war of 1939-1945 testified to the importance which Europeans attached to liberty. They might therefore have been expected to liberate their African subjects. Events since the end of the Second World War had, however, caused a number of people to lose their illusions on the subject. Those who mouthed the most liberal slogans in favour of freedom and against colonialism still continued to sell arms to Portugal and trade with South Africa.

34. The least which representatives could do was therefore to give some semblance of moral support to the African liberation movement by voting in favour of the present draft resolution. Representatives of the great Powers had spoken out much more vehemently on resolutions of much less fundamental importance.

35. Mr. HILL (Jamaica) said that it required little sacrifice to vote for draft resolution E/L.1276. In the struggle against colonialism, however, attention should not be focused on the assistance which might be afforded by the specialized agencies. There were other much more effective ways of combating colonialism.

36. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E/L.1276 to the vote.

*At the request of the representative of Upper Volta, the vote was taken by roll call.*

*Norway, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Sierra Leone, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libya, Mexico.

*Against:* None

*Abstaining:* Norway, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Belgium, France, Ireland, Japan.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

37. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom), explaining his vote, said that if a separate vote had been taken on each paragraph of the draft resolution, he would have voted in favour of some and against others. For example, he could not have supported paragraph 2. The freedom of action of IBRD and IMF was strictly limited by their terms of reference. Criticism of those institutions on political grounds was therefore unacceptable. He would also have had to vote against paragraphs 4 and 7, which likewise raised political difficulties.

38. Mr. HOOVER (United States of America) said that, although supporting some of the ideas contained in the draft resolution, his delegation had been unable to vote for it as a whole, since the activities of the United Nations in bringing about self-determination should not depart from the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter and should be such as to enlist the broad support of the Member States. The specialized agencies were effective institutions, and their effectiveness would be diminished by the obtrusion of political issues.

39. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation had abstained from voting in order that its position should be consistent with that adopted on similar issues on previous occasions. The Argentine delegation had also, for example, on constitutional grounds, abstained from voting on General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII). The specialized agencies should be allowed to carry out those activities which were properly within their competence. It was for the Member States to implement resolutions such as that on which they had just voted.

40. Mr. LÓPEZ HERRARTE (Guatemala) said he had reservations regarding some paragraphs of the draft resolution, but had voted in favour because it was a constructive measure in the struggle against colonialism.

41. Mr. PLEHN MEJIA (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution E/L.1276 because of its widely known traditional anti-colonialist policy; had a separate vote been requested on operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 7, he would have abstained for legal reasons. For the same reasons, Mexico had abstained in the vote on the sixth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of General Assembly resolution 2426 (XXIII) of 18 December 1968.

42. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting because some of the paragraphs contained recommendations to the specialized agencies which were liable to conflict with their terms of reference.

43. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) found the position of those representatives who

had raised objections on legal or constitutional grounds difficult to grasp. In his opinion, there were no legal factors which could have prevented the Council from adopting draft resolution E/L.1276 as it stood.

44. It was particularly regrettable that those States which were largely responsible for the present situation in Africa had not found it possible to support the draft resolution.

45. The fact had to be faced, however, that the problem of colonialism would not be resolved by action taken by the specialized agencies, but by the African freedom fighters themselves.

The meeting rose at 11.55 p.m.