



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

AGENDA ITEM 48

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

1. Mr. MARSH (Jamaica) said it was natural that some representatives were somewhat unresponsive even to the idea of an international university, since it was entirely new and almost rash; imagination and a great deal of determination would be needed to overcome the many difficulties that would certainly arise.
2. In his delegation's view, the university could meet the needs of many small countries unable to afford the cost, exorbitant for them, of training highly specialized personnel. The traditional type of university, both public and private, had become over-bureaucratic and often bound by age-old traditions which no one dared to break. The idea of establishing an international university was especially appropriate because of the present scientific and technological explosion.
3. He congratulated the Panel of Experts on its report, and supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1, but he thought it would be useful to obtain details of the possible costs according to the site chosen for the campus. That was an extremely important question for the developing countries, which were anxious to derive all the benefit they could from the proposed university, even though cost was a limiting factor for them. Local social factors should also be taken into account in choosing the location.
4. He regretted that the representative of Greece had induced the sponsors to delete the last five words of operative paragraph 3, since certain programmes and agencies had already done a great deal of work on the question and could, in the present instance, play a very useful role.
5. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta), recalling that he had already presented his delegation's views in the Economic and Social Council, said it was unfortunate that the UNESCO study on the justification for an international university had not been more widely circulated, since its authors confirmed that the international university was a real goal toward which the General Assembly could now work.
6. He did not share the view that the mere presence of students from many countries sufficed to make a university international in character. On the contrary, such a university remained essentially a national institution, serving primarily the interests of the country in which it was located.
7. The student demonstrations that had occurred in various universities during the past two or three years had not only challenged the values which those universities were trying to preserve, but had also caused difficulties for many foreign students, including students from Upper Volta, who had had to transfer to other universities where they could express themselves freely. Those difficulties had led his country to decide to establish a national university.
8. What was original about the international university was the idea of studying subjects and topics that had previously been studied only from a national viewpoint. Even so, care should be taken to locate it in an area where it would be protected from any national influence.
9. The advantage of the international university would be that it would encourage co-operation among individuals, research institutions and universities, and thus help to increase the well-being of the peoples of the world and promote the principles of peace and progress embodied in the Charter.
10. He felt that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1 was inadequate and that the General Assembly should do more than the draft resolution proposed. When the members of the Economic and Social Council had decided to propose to the General Assembly that consideration of the question of establishing an international university should be postponed until the twenty-seventh session, his delegation had demurred, since that did not seem to it the best solution. It felt that the Second Committee could have accepted at the present session the principle of establishing an international university and entrusted a group of experts with the task of working out certain details concerning the structure, financing and curriculum of the university and its relations with national institutions concerned with more or less the same questions as those that would be in its curriculum. The representative of Sierra Leone had said that he thought it desirable for the Committee to make headway towards establishing the university. In the same spirit, his delegation thought that the draft resolution under discussion could be improved, so as at least to state that the General Assembly would adopt a definite position on the question at its twenty-seventh session.
11. He would like to see the phrase "through the Executive Board of UNESCO" deleted from operative paragraph 2, and the words "additional information" in the same paragraph replaced by "the conclusions of the consultations and additional studies provided for in para-

graph 6 of the UNESCO resolution". Similarly, operative paragraph 8 should be changed so as to indicate that the General Assembly expected to take a decision on the question at its twenty-seventh session.

12. He requested the members of the Committee to consider the best procedure for resolving the highly important question under discussion in a satisfactory manner. A preparatory committee could, for example, be established, or the Panel of Experts could be asked to continue the very commendable work it had already done.

13. Mr. NDUNGÚ (Kenya) said that his delegation had followed with keen interest the progress of the plan to establish an international university and the discussions on the question in various United Nations bodies. It attached particular importance to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1), under which the Assembly requested the Economic and Social Council to take account of the views expressed in the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session. In view of that provision, his delegation fully supported the draft resolution and hoped that its own recommendations would be taken into account.

14. As the Secretary-General had indicated in a 1970 report,¹ because of the rapid changes in the world, the increasingly numerous and complex problems with which mankind was faced could not be studied in depth, let alone solved, except at the international level. Examples were development planning, the economic and social evolution of recently decolonized countries, the financial aspects of aid to developing nations, human ecology, world energy resources, education reform, etc. It was incontestable that the present training of staff to work in the international field was based on essentially national traditions and ideas, and that there was no permanent machinery by which persons being groomed to occupy responsible posts in government departments could learn how to approach the world problems of concern to them from a truly international point of view. The plan to establish an international university had thus been originally intended to solve problems of a practical nature.

15. His delegation was not happy with some of the recommendations in the report of the Secretary-General (A/8510), especially the concept of the future university outlined in paragraph 6, which was not in keeping with the original principles and aims of the project. At a time when great stress was being laid on the transfer of technology from developed to developing countries, the expansion of trade, the stabilization of the international monetary situation and other scientific, economic and social problems affecting more than two thirds of the world community, the Committee was being asked to endorse the establishment of multi-campus institutions for co-operation among scholars and institutions engaged in higher learning, without taking into account the needs of the greater part of the world's population. Such institutions would clearly not be of much assistance to the developing countries, which had little high-level manpower to spare. What they needed was

an institution or institutions to act as a centre for post-graduate learning and research, catering for the most urgent needs of developed and developing countries in the scientific, technical, economic, political and social fields. Students could concentrate on issues such as peace and security in the world with a view to finding solutions to a number of problems that handicapped the United Nations in the implementation of the principles of the Charter.

16. The institution should grant degrees, diplomas or other qualifications so as to provide an incentive for the students. His delegation supported the awarding of degrees as being a necessary incentive to persuade high-level staff already occupying important posts in developing countries to leave their jobs for the sake of acquiring a better understanding of certain concepts of an international nature.

17. In the absence of an alternative draft for which to vote, he would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1, even though it did not tackle certain substantive issues. However, he wished his delegation's views to be taken into account in accordance with operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. SCHRAM (Iceland) congratulated the Secretary-General on having brought to the attention of Member States the idea of setting up an international university and for having seen the project through its initial stages. His Government fully supported the idea of an international university under United Nations auspices and urged the General Assembly to take a rapid decision concerning its establishment.

19. With regard to the basic question whether such a university was necessary, the Panel of Experts had concluded that the world today had fresh needs which the United Nations university could perfectly meet, all the more since higher education, the foundation of progress in human affairs, was inadequate or lacking in many regions of the world. The aim of the university would be to concentrate on problems of vital importance to the existence and survival of mankind. It should therefore be a living institution, protected from national or regional influences and capable of a just and objective analysis of the basic contemporary problems. It might, for instance, deal with the problem of development and the environment from the viewpoint of the common interest instead of from a national angle, draw the attention of the scientific community to those new problems, and train national jurists and international civil servants in the very important field of the environment.

20. Regarding the location of the university, his delegation supported the recommendation that its various institutions should be situated all over the world, even in developing countries and small countries which needed to improve their university facilities.

21. It fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1, but felt that at the present stage it was useless to ask for further studies. In that connexion his delegation agreed with the Director-General of UNESCO that consideration of questions of detail concerning the project was unnecessary before the General Assembly had taken a decision about the desirability of establishing the university.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 44, document A/8182, annex II, para. 7.

22. His delegation was inclined to think that the time was in fact ripe to take such a decision, but it respected the views of other States which felt that the matter should be examined in greater detail at the twenty-seventh session. He hoped the Second Committee would then be able to take a final decision on that very important proposal.

23. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) recalled that his delegation had voiced certain reservations concerning the establishment of an international university, not in order to check the enthusiasm aroused by the Secretary-General's initiative but to try to place at his disposal a serious work plan. The idea had needed over a hundred years to take shape within an international body, and his delegation felt there was a need for caution and avoidance of undue haste. His delegation was glad to see that the idea had begun to develop that the positions of the various international bodies were becoming reconciled and that reservations were being withdrawn. The initial conception of the international university had been modified, which was a good thing, since a body duplicating the work of national universities would be quite useless.

24. The report of the Secretary-General contained many interesting points and provided a very useful basis for action. Nearly all the experts dealing with the problems involved had agreed that the international university should be an international university system and not a traditional university. He believed that it should be a "system of centres of excellence" with its own *raison d'être*. He considered that it would be more appropriate to call the university "international university system" rather than "United Nations university"; but his delegation could agree to that title.

25. His delegation fully endorsed many points in paragraphs 11 and 15 of annex I to the report (A/8510 and Add.1/Rev.1), since they showed what the framework and the general direction of that new conception should be. The important thing was that, on the basis of objectives on which agreement had been reached, it was now possible to have an idea of the international university. It was also possible to see the university not as a battleground between developing and developed countries, nor as a century-old dream, but as a new international body that would round off the existing network of universities and institutions. He hoped that the university would meet real needs and would help to improve existing universities, thus helping to bring about, in all countries, university reform and the adaptation of higher education to the world of tomorrow. Thus it was essential that the concept of a new international university should take its place among the current endeavours of all countries throughout the world to place education at the service of human development and make it a driving force for profound social changes. The concept would be interesting if it could act as a catalyst for all existing universities.

26. It was necessary to ask which problems were the most important, both in the developing and in the developed countries, so that the general lines for the future university would emerge more clearly. Unfortunately the existing universities were becoming increasingly fringe or marginal elements of society; they were moving further and further away from being the important centres of thought and research that they should be if they were to encourage the

revolutionary innovations which permitted society to adapt to the new forces of change. The universities were usually centres for training the senior staff required in the national economies and they were not important instruments of change in the humanist sense of the term; nor did they satisfy a global and integrated concept of development. In most developing countries, the universities were more than marginal; instead of integrating the *élite* with their geographical and national environment, they tended to produce a cleavage between the *élite* and the country to which they belonged, for instance, by causing an exodus towards other, more developed countries. The universities slowed down the development process by making it bureaucratic and by encouraging a race for higher social status. Since the universities took their inspiration from the European universities and depended on them and had only limited resources, the developing countries could do very little to integrate them in the over-all planning of development. That was why the idea of an international university interested them particularly. There might be a possibility that an international university system would add a new dimension to national universities. However, as the representative of France had said at the previous meeting, it would be a mistake to conjure up too idealistic a picture. Such a university could hardly be expected, for instance, to provide a solution to the problem of the "brain-drain". Nor should it be thought that the international university could in itself ensure international peace and understanding; it would be better to view it as a catalyst for the work of existing universities.

27. The Iranian delegation fully endorsed the conclusions and ideas in the reports of the Director-General of UNESCO and of the Secretary-General. It would be particularly useful to examine the idea that the international university might add a new dimension to universities in the developing countries. In the field of research, the traditional universities were too set in their ways and too ill-adapted to the interdisciplinary nature of modern science to permit the development of the finest scientific talents and, hence, to promote research into the furthest reaches of human knowledge. Some kind of programming centre, one which had already been described as an invisible university, would be able to bring scientists together and would enable them to undertake that type of research under more favourable conditions. The international university could be a rough model for a programming centre on a global scale.

28. The objectives of the university as a catalyst should be better defined. The character of the international university and the problems posed by it were very well indicated in the relevant decision adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO on 18 October 1971 (A/8510 and Add.1/Rev.1, annex II). Among other things, paragraph 6 of that decision called attention, *inter alia*, to the need for further consultation with young people, who would have a crucial role to play in that field. Paragraph 9 of annex I to the report was also very important. It should be borne in mind that the financing available for the establishment of the university would be modest.

29. The delay should not be a cause for alarm, however, since the idea of such a university had been in the air for over 100 years so that its actual creation could be deferred for one more year. Care would have to be taken to ensure

that the university, once established, would not be forgotten and would not duplicate the work of existing institutions. The creation of a unified Panel of Experts was essential, and the proposed way in which it was to be constituted seemed reasonable. It was quite normal that the Director-General of UNESCO should be closely associated with the expert group. His delegation found the draft resolution satisfactory; with the amendments proposed at the previous meeting, the text would provide a valid basis on which the General Assembly could establish the university in 1972.

30. Mr. SIBAJENE (Zambia) said that the idea of the creation of an international university had been put forward in 1969 by the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization.² Zambia, like other developing countries, suffered from a shortage of skilled labour to ensure its economic development. Such a phenomenon was directly linked with a defective education system of the colonial type, designed to prevent the indigenous population from becoming educated in the disciplines which would allow it to fill posts of responsibility in the various branches of the economy. Thus it was that, when Zambia had achieved its independence, there had been a dearth of doctors, economists, lawyers, accountants and engineers. The mining sector, which was the mainstay of the Zambian economy, was mainly dominated by foreign personnel who had little desire to share their knowledge with the Zambians. Such a background only emphasized the need to create an international institution such as the university currently under consideration. His delegation felt that that institution, designed primarily to satisfy the needs of the developing countries, should have its headquarters in Africa, where 16 of the 25 countries identified as the least developed were to be found. It should emphasize professional disciplines and co-operate with other United Nations institutions devoted to education, such as UNITAR and UNESCO, and profit from their experience. As for the financial aspect, expenditure relative to the functioning of the institution should be charged to the regular budget of the United Nations in order to ensure some continuity; for even if the present state of the Organization's budget was not satisfactory, the dangers of financing based on voluntary contributions would be still greater. The solution would be to use voluntary contributions to complement the regular budget. A proliferation of feasibility studies should not be encouraged since that only delayed the establishment of the university, which was very urgently needed. His delegation was in favour of the recommendation made by the Administrative Board of UNITAR, that the international university should satisfy the need for a learned community of an international character which would be responsible for carrying out the study of issues with global implications.

31. Mr. WOLTE (Austria) said that he was satisfied with the way in which the concept of an international university had evolved. It was encouraging that a consensus had been established on a number of points: they included the idea of a network of centres to ensure some degree of co-ordination; the necessity for flexibility of method; the need for modest funds initially; and the importance of the

ability of the staff employed in its initial stages. His delegation agreed with those of Sierra Leone and Upper Volta that the work of preparation was sufficiently advanced for greater progress to have been made during the current session. However, he was aware that the decision of the Economic and Social Council to defer consideration of the question to the following session was due not to a lack of interest but to concern that the matter should be studied in greater detail—which agreed well with the thought behind operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. The academic community in the universities of his country had adopted a very favourable attitude towards the establishment of an international university, and that only confirmed the necessity of establishing close relations between that university and national academic communities. With that in mind, his country was examining the possibility of affiliation between the international university and certain Austrian institutes. He found the amendment proposed by the Upper Volta representative acceptable, and was certain that the draft resolution under consideration would enable all to examine the plan for an international university in a realistic way. He expressed the hope that the General Assembly would be able to take a decision on the item at its twenty-seventh session.

32. Mr. MOBARAK (Lebanon) said that his delegation had been very interested by the report of the Secretary-General (A/8510 and Add.1/Rev.1). He noted with satisfaction the aims, functions and general conceptual basis of a United Nations university which, to be viable, should concentrate its activities on research and training in relation to problems which affected mankind as a whole. The university should be capable of complementing and strengthening the work of the institutions of research and higher education already existing both within the United Nations system and outside it; it should also be capable of giving a pioneering lead to, and exercising a catalytic effect upon, the work being done in other institutions. In the examination of problems concerning mankind as a whole, exceptional standards of objectivity could be obtained in an institution of an international character which was not subject to the influence of any one point of view. The training of young research workers and the dissemination and publication of findings should constitute a part of the activities it undertook. His delegation considered that the advisability of establishing a United Nations university was widely accepted. That university would certainly have a catalytic effect and would provide for existing national institutions an ideal forum for discussion which would enable them to develop new methods. His delegation, which had already co-sponsored a draft adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 2691 (XXV) of 11 December 1970, was now also among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1; he thought that the membership of the Panel of Experts established in accordance with Assembly resolution 2691 (XXV) should be enlarged to not more than 20 so as to make room for five additional experts.

33. Mr. PINZON (Colombia) recalled that his delegation had participated in the elaboration of the draft resolution. The idea of establishing an international university had been in the air ever since the early post-war years and the foundation of the United Nations, and much work had been accomplished since then to bring this plan to fruition

² Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A.

in accordance with the principles, the nature and the purposes of the United Nations. The French representative's reference to an idealistic picture was appropriate to the plan under consideration, as it was to all plans relating to culture, spiritual values, and improving the quality of human life; but that idealistic picture should in no way lead to the enterprise being written off as Utopian, as the French representative had intimated that it might be. The information provided in the reports of the Secretary-General (A/8510 and Add.1/Rev.1) showed that the undertaking was opportune and viable. His delegation did not consider it realistic, at that stage of the discussion, to spend time on the problem posed by the title of "International University"; some parties wished to speak of a United Nations university, while others were ready to replace the very word "university", despite the number of human values it evoked, by the descriptive name "International University Centre".

34. He thanked the Panel of Experts for their contribution, and said that the studies which they had carried out showed that the international university should be envisaged not in a conventional sense but as a network of centres for research, co-ordination and discussion on technical, scientific and political questions concerning mankind. He did not share the opinion of the French representative that it was unnecessary to establish an international university because there already were universities which were international in spirit. In addition, it would be misleading to say that the international university would not only serve no purpose but would even cause the developing countries problems such as increased "brain-drain". In the view of his delegation, the international university could increase and improve cultural and scientific relations between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. During the discussion of that question in the Economic and Social Council, the argument had been advanced that such a university would be an expensive undertaking and would mean a certain amount of duplication. His delegation approved the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel of Experts, the precise aim of which was to avoid possible duplication. With that aim, the international university would make use of the academic or administrative infrastructure already existing both within the United Nations system and outside it. Implementation of the plan would be accomplished in stages. Certain parties had expressed a desire for further details on the university's areas of activity: it was only necessary to refer to the reports of the Secretary-General, the Panel of Experts and the Director General of UNESCO, to the decision taker by the UNESCO Executive Board, and the recommendations of UNITAR. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for agreeing to incorporate in their text the amendments which he had submitted jointly with the Japanese delegation; however, since the present text, despite certain imperfections, had the advantage of being acceptable to a large number of delegations, he would not press those amendments and would vote for the text as modified by the amendments of Upper Volta.

35. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) regretted that paragraph 8 of annex I to the report did not explain the reasons for the failure of previous attempts to create an international university since that would have permitted a better evaluation of the present proposal and might have helped to avoid

previous pitfalls. His delegation also felt that the differences of opinion about the name of the proposed institution, which were revealed in paragraph 7 of that document, gave rise to considerable uncertainties and that none of the documents so far available stated clearly what should be the goals of the institution. One might ask how the General Assembly could take a decision on establishing an institution whose name remained ambiguous and was not intended to reflect its real activities. To call the proposed body a "United Nations University" would be to place the idea in a completely new perspective and risk additional complications: it would imply a need to define the moral, political and legal responsibility of the United Nations in such a case, as well as the exact role to be attributed to UNESCO; the question would also arise of how such a body could reconcile the need to take into account priorities and policies created by the various United Nations organizations with the academic freedom and independence which the Panel of Experts considered absolutely essential. In the various papers submitted it was proposed to make the university a body aimed primarily at political, sociological and other related studies; it was also necessary to define the role it would play in technological development. As several representatives had pointed out during study of the draft resolution on the transfer of technology and the UNIDO report, that was still the main lever for development and the key to economic equilibrium at the international level.

36. He also drew the attention of the Committee to the communication from the Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO (A/8510/Add.1/Rev.1), which was extremely important for a decision on that matter: it showed that some members of the Executive Board had serious doubts as to the feasibility of creating the university. They considered the present studies insufficient, regarded several aspects of the project with a cynicism described as well-founded and made it clear that important questions remained unanswered. During the discussions of the Executive Board, it had even been suggested that the resolution as finally adopted would not give the General Assembly a clear idea of what the Board had decided. Furthermore, great caution was necessary since the financial implications of the project were only vaguely described in the documents submitted.

37. In document A/8510, annex I, paragraph 20, the fact that 385 replies to the questionnaire sent to the international academic community had been received by 20 August 1971 was described as a fundamentally satisfactory result; in fact, the result was poor when compared with the thousands of questionnaires distributed by UNESCO, and the proportion of genuine university members who had replied was extremely small.

38. His delegation felt the aims of the project should be clearly defined, on the basis of thorough examination, and should correspond to clearly determined needs. It none the less approved of most of the proposals in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1 and in particular of operative paragraph 8; its only objection was to operative paragraph 3, which could be deleted, as several delegations had already suggested, since its wording seemed to indicate a certain lack of confidence on the part of the General Assembly in UNESCO which was, however, according to the Charter, the organization most competent to deal with higher

education and to which complete responsibility should be given for any further study on that matter.

39. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that some of the arguments in favour of the creation of the proposed university were more emotional than convincing, which was perhaps due to the difficulty of studying that problem with equanimity because of the limited amount of time available. The project certainly aroused enthusiasm and, if its basic value could be proved, was of great interest. However, the documents submitted and the statements made to the Committee on that matter only strengthened the doubts already formulated by the Soviet delegation: the arguments for the project were unclear and the Executive Board of UNESCO had in reality only made a recommendation of principle, calling attention to the need to continue study of a number of problems (see A/8510, annex II, para. 6). Furthermore, the Panel of Experts established by UNESCO and the United Nations to study the matter had concluded that the proposed new institution might duplicate the work of other bodies in some fields; none of the experts consulted had been capable of defining the place to be occupied by the university in the United Nations system, and it might be wondered how and why it would play the co-ordinating role proposed for it in paragraph 17 of annex I to the report. The experts all seemed to have described what was desirable rather than what was possible.

40. The Soviet delegation approved the principle behind the submission of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1. However, owing to lack of time, it had been unable to obtain the detailed comments of its Government and was not yet in a position to make a statement on the matter. It also had some doubts about the wording of the draft, and particularly of operative paragraphs 4 and 7: the proposals made in those paragraphs concerning the subsequent responsibilities of UNESCO seemed illogical when compared to the provisions in other paragraphs; UNESCO should be given complete authority. He suggested improvement of the draft text by the addition of a new operative paragraph after paragraph 4 on the following lines:

“Requests the Secretary-General to remain in contact with UNESCO and the other United Nations organizations involved and to submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session and to the Economic and Social Council at its fifty-third session all such additional information as he shall consider worthy of attention”.

That new paragraph would help in arriving at a single point of view.

41. Whereas Assembly resolution 2691 (XXV) contained concrete recommendations, operative paragraph 3 left open the question of what documentation the Panel of Experts would have to evaluate and when it would do so. What was more, there were documents already available which members of the Committee were quite capable of scrutinizing and appraising; in reality, the difficulty lay primarily in the need to know the positions of Governments. That was why it was not logical to retain that paragraph.

42. The draft resolution was also illogical and inconsistent in other respects. For example, the additional information

alluded to in paragraph 6 of the decision adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO (A/8510, annex II) referred in particular to the guarantee of academic freedoms—a concept which was not very clear and which the USSR could not approve in such vague terms. What was more, the university envisaged was not to be of the traditional type and it was not known exactly how it would operate. It would be a mistake to establish it before delving into that aspect. For those reasons, he would like to consult the sponsors of the draft resolution on some possible amendments. For example, in the third preambular paragraph it would be better to replace the words “appropriate United Nations bodies” by the words “appropriate intergovernmental bodies of the United Nations system”. Again, in operative paragraph 1, the words “with appreciation” might be deleted: the General Assembly should sometimes be sparing in its praise.

43. With regard to the financial implications, the Soviet delegation had carefully listened to the questions which had been asked, questions which it considered fitting and proper. On the other hand, it had found the replies less satisfactory. For example, he wondered how operative paragraph 5 could have financial implications. As it stood, the statement of the financial implications amounted almost to extortion. The representative of the Controller should justify the funds he was asking for.

44. In conclusion, he said that if the sponsors of the draft resolution agreed to consultations, the Soviet delegation was prepared to take part in them; otherwise, it would have to reserve its position on operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

45. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that he would have preferred the original version of the draft resolution; he would therefore like to comment on the revised text. First, he supported the suggestion of the representatives of Sierra Leone and Upper Volta to delete the words “through the Executive Board of UNESCO” in operative paragraph 2.

46. As to operative paragraph 3, the United States delegation was not convinced of the need to keep the Panel of Experts—to say nothing of increasing its membership—since its work could be done by the Secretariat. If, however, the majority of the Committee wished to retain operative paragraph 3, his delegation would support the Jamaican suggestion to delete the last five words of that paragraph.

47. Again, while there was no doubt that UNESCO was the body which was most appropriate and most directly concerned, the UNESCO General Conference would complete its seventeenth session in mid-November 1972, which was too late for submitting comments and observations to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session in time for it to consider them and take a decision. The United States delegation therefore suggested that operative paragraph 7 be deleted.

48. As to the financial implications, he wondered whether the implementation of operative paragraphs 2 and 5 really required additional funds.

49. Finally, he thought it would be better to call the institution “The United Nations Academy of Studies”, a

title which would be more in keeping with the present conception of the institution.

50. The United States delegation would support the draft resolution provided some changes were made in it.

51. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) mentioned the interest which India had always shown in the idea of an international university, which was already envisaged in the philosophy of Tagore, Gandhi and other great men. They would no doubt have been enthusiastic about the proposal before the Committee. That was why India had participated with the greatest interest at all stages of the work.

52. It seemed that agreement had now been reached on certain points. It was accepted that it was possible and desirable to establish the university, even if some details remained to be worked out. Similarly, it was recognized it would be an inter-disciplinary institution at a post-graduate level, that the United Nations university would consist of a network of affiliated institutes and that it would be decentralized and polymorphous; it would study mainly problems of concern to humanity as a whole; and lastly, it was essential to promote interest in it among young people.

53. In his delegation's view, the first objective was to establish a university that would be a valid and useful institution for all, in which research would have a really universal character. The second objective was to help to solve major world problems, in particular in development, observance of human rights, environment, population, application of science and technology, inter-cultural relations and exploration of the oceans and outer space. The third objective was to help to renew national universities which would receive a new impulse from the institution.

54. He suggested that a provision should be added to the draft resolution to the effect that the views expressed by Member States in the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session should be taken into account by the Economic and Social Council.

55. Since draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1 had laudable aims and provided both for a period of reflection and for the continuation of studies on the question, his delegation would vote for it. He endorsed the suggestions of Upper Volta and expressed the hope that they could be accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution without the need for a vote.

56. With reference to the timing of the various stages outlined in the draft resolution, he said that the representatives of UNESCO and of Greece had reassured him somewhat by their explanations.

57. Unlike the representative of Jamaica, he saw no need for deleting the last five words of operative paragraph 3, since, on the contrary, it would be useful to have the widest possible co-operation.

58. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution.

59. She realized that many delegations considered the question sufficiently ripe for a General Assembly decision

in principle at the current session, and wished to thank those delegations for having nevertheless taken into consideration the views of other delegations which did not think it very wise to decide on the matter before having all the relevant information. The draft resolution thus reflected the wisest possible consensus and it would enable the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to take the necessary decisions in the course of 1972.

60. The United Kingdom delegation saw no objection to the deletion of the words "through the Executive Board of UNESCO" from operative paragraph 2, but it had some doubt about the United States suggestion to delete operative paragraph 7. In her delegation's opinion, the report of the Economic and Social Council should be published as soon as possible; the observations of the UNESCO General Conference could be published subsequently as an addendum to the report. She hoped the General Conference would be able to approve the report at the beginning of its session so as to facilitate the work of the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session. Like the United States representative, she felt that the title "United Nations University" was not very appropriate and that it might be given further consideration by the Panel of Experts. Her delegation reaffirmed the reservations it had already expressed concerning the financial implications.

61. Mr. DE SILVA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that in his statement at the previous meeting he might not have given all the necessary details concerning the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1200/Rev.1 for UNESCO

62. In response to an enquiry from the United Nations Secretariat, the Director-General of UNESCO had offered to finance the travel and per diem costs for the five additional members of the Panel of Experts, which would mean that UNESCO would be responsible for an amount equal to the United Nations contribution, namely \$7,000, for the five members appointed by the Director-General.

63. UNESCO was also prepared to arrange for one meeting of the Panel at UNESCO headquarters, where all the necessary facilities would be provided.

64. Regarding the United States proposal to delete operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, he proposed to quote certain provisions of UNESCO's Constitution with a view to providing the Committee with the precise information it should take into account in its consideration of the proposal and reserving the position of the governing bodies of UNESCO, namely the General Conference and the Executive Board.

65. Article IV.B.5 of the Constitution provided that subject to the provisions of article V.5 (c), the General Conference should advise the United Nations on the educational, scientific and cultural aspects of matters of concern to the latter, in accordance with the terms and procedure agreed upon between the appropriate authorities of the two Organizations. Article V.B.5 (c) provided that between ordinary sessions of the General Conference, the Board might discharge the functions of adviser to the United Nations, set forth in article IV.5, whenever the problem upon which advice was sought had already been

dealt with in principle by the Conference, or when the solution was implicit in decisions of the Conference.

66. While not taking a stand on the United States proposal, he would have to reserve the position of the UNESCO General Conference and Executive Board in the event of the proposal being adopted.

67. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), replying to a question from the Chairman as to whether he wished to respond to the amendments proposed, said that the Committee was confronted with a dilemma: either the amendment would have to be put to the vote and thus cause disagreement on a question which was not in itself controversial or the Committee would have to decide not to vote on the draft resolution at the present meeting so that further informal negotiations could take place on the amendments, particularly with the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, Upper Volta and other delegations.

68. As to the financial implications, speaking in his personal capacity he said that he would be prepared to redraft operative paragraphs 2 and 5 in consultation with the Controller to ensure that they had no financial implications. He would like to hear from the Secretariat whether in that case the Secretary-General would no longer be able to prepare the report requested in the draft resolution.

69. He would therefore leave the decision to the Chairman.

70. After a procedural discussion in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) and Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) took part, the Committee decided to close the debate on the draft resolution and to vote on it at the following meeting.

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/8403/Add.1 (parts IV and V); A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2)

71. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) read out the changes that had been made in the earlier version of the revised draft resolution. In the first place, in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2 the title had been changed to read: "Immediate measures to eliminate the prevailing state of uncertainty due to the present international monetary crisis". Other differences from the previous draft included the addition of two preambular paragraphs, the second and the fifth, and the deletion of the fourth.

72. In the operative part, the words "to take immediate measures to" had been added after the words "market-economy countries"; the word "on" had been inserted before the words "the level". The words "and as an urgent measure" had been inserted before the words "to arrange". The words "and make whatever other adjustments that

might be required" had been replaced by the words "taking into account the interests of the developing countries". The words "final reform" had been replaced by the words "indispensable reform".

73. Mr. ISAKSEN (Denmark) said he regretted that he could not accept the amendments to the operative part concerning import surcharges. It was true, as the representative of Pakistan had observed, that the Danish Government had imposed a 10 per cent import surcharge, but that was a temporary measure affecting only about half the products imported and it would be lifted progressively. Moreover, on 1 January 1972 his Government would be introducing a system of preferences in favour of the developing countries and the products covered by it would be exempt from the surcharge. His country was as interested as other countries in a return to monetary stability and shared the concern expressed by other delegations on that question.

74. In conclusion, he was sorry to say that he would be unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2 on account of the unfortunate changes made in the operative part.

75. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that he had studied with interest the various changes made in the draft. At one point, the United States delegation had hoped to be able to support the draft resolution, but the changes made in the second revised version prevented it from doing so. It objected, first of all, to the two changes in the preamble and to some changes in the operative part, and particularly to the introductory wording of the fifth preambular paragraph which called attention to another resolution adopted by the Second Committee on the same question. The Committee should comply with the provisions of rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

76. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that he would have liked to support the original draft resolution but was afraid that he would be unable to vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2, because of some of the changes made in the preambular and operative parts. It was very difficult for the developed countries to vote for such a draft. Not only did it contain a direct reference to another resolution on the international monetary situation, but it called upon the developed market-economy countries to take certain measures immediately, although they had not yet finished considering that problem.

77. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that, in the belief that the international monetary situation called for co-operation on the part of the international community, he would have voted in favour of the first revised version of the draft resolution but would be obliged to abstain in the vote on the second revised draft because of some new provisions which his delegation found unacceptable.

78. Mr. OGISO (Japan) expressed reservations concerning the two new preambular paragraphs. With regard to the second part of the operative paragraph, he thought that the questions at issue should be studied by the competent organ in the United Nations system. Because of those reservations the Japanese delegation would abstain in the vote.

* Resumed from the 1439th meeting.

79. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that he would have been able to vote for the first revised version of the draft resolution, but would have to abstain when a vote was taken on the new text.
80. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that he would vote for the draft resolution, particularly since its new title made it clear that the measures suggested were different from those provided for in the resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1, submitted by the Group of 77. He welcomed the changes made in the operative part, particularly as it was made clear that the measures to be taken immediately should not prevent progress towards the longer-term objective of reforming the international monetary order with the full participation of the developing countries.
81. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said that he could have voted for the original draft resolution but would be unable to support the new draft, mainly because of the inclusion of the fifth preambular paragraph.
82. Mr. VAN VUUREN (South Africa), recalling that he had already stated that he would be prepared to vote for any measure that would help to resolve the current monetary difficulties, said that he would vote for the draft resolution under consideration.
83. Mr. RAHNEMA (Iran) said that he would vote for the draft resolution for the reasons stated by the representative of Brazil.
84. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the spirit of accommodation they had shown and said he would vote for the newly revised draft resolution.
85. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) recalled that India was one of the sponsors of resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1, and felt that it would be pointless to adopt a second resolution on the same subject, particularly as it did not have the support of the developed countries. His delegation would abstain in the vote.
86. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he, too, would have to abstain in the vote on the revised draft resolution, but not for the reasons given by other delegations. The reason for his decision was that although the changes made in the original draft resolution made the text more precise they did not alter its substance or make the proposed measures any less superficial.
87. Mr. GOBBA (Egypt) congratulated the sponsors on the spirit of co-operation they had shown in their attempts to improve the draft resolution as a whole and particularly the fifth preambular paragraph and the operative part.
88. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) thought that it was an extremely unorthodox procedure to adopt two almost identical resolutions on the same question. His delegation particularly objected to the operative part of the draft. The question of the level of assistance to the developing countries had nothing to do with the monetary situation. Nevertheless, the Greek delegation would vote for the draft resolution.
89. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said he would vote for the draft resolution but wished to make it clear that, although the sponsors had made some changes that strengthened the text, draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2 was weaker than the resolution already adopted on the same question. Although it would vote for the draft, the Cuban delegation wished to express reservations regarding the third preambular paragraph, since Cuba had not participated either in the meeting or in the drafting of the resolution in question. With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, the Cuban delegation maintained the reservations it had voiced concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1.
90. Mr. DIAW (Mali) said that he was convinced that the current crisis called for immediate and effective measures. In the draft resolution the monetary situation was considered only from the point of view of certain countries and called only for provisional measures, whereas resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1 dealt with the monetary crisis as a whole. The delegation of Mali would accordingly abstain in the vote.
91. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia) said that he would vote for the draft resolution in spite of the difficulties that it presented for his delegation. With regard to the operative part, he recalled that the Colombian Minister for Finance had said at a meeting of the International Monetary Fund that the 10 per cent surcharge should be abolished in accordance with the Generalized System of Preferences, and that the industrialized countries should redouble their efforts to prevent deterioration of the terms of trade from having an adverse effect on the developing countries.
92. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) said that he too saw a close similarity between the draft resolution under consideration and the one appearing in document A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1, concerning which his delegation had already expressed its opinion. His delegation would abstain from the vote.
93. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution. He recalled, however, that Australia had voted against the draft which had been adopted as resolution 84 (XI) of the Trade and Development Board and against draft resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1. He regarded the language in the second and fifth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2 as not prejudicing the Australian Government's position on those previous resolutions. The Australian vote for the present draft was accordingly to be interpreted as embracing its continued opposition to the earlier resolutions.
94. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution. He wished it to be clear, however, that he interpreted the operative part in accordance with the position adopted by his delegation during the general debate on the item, i.e. that there should be a broader range of fluctuation for exchange rates in the interests of a better balanced international monetary system. He observed that the idea of realigning currencies was not mentioned in the Programme of Action adopted at Lima. His delegation would, however, vote for the draft resolution.

95. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.2.

The draft resolution was adopted by 52 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

96. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) said that in a spirit of compromise his delegation had not insisted on a reply to the request it had made the day before. It nevertheless entertained doubts about the procedural validity of allowing a draft resolution to be amended after the debate had been closed. Although his delegation had not asked for a separate vote on the second and fifth preambular paragraphs, it wished to emphasize that it was opposed to those provisions. The failure to mention the International Monetary Fund in the operative part was regrettable since, in its view, that body was the most competent in monetary matters and was sufficiently representative.

97. Mr. MVOGO (Cameroon) said that he was not altogether satisfied with the draft resolution, which he considered too weak. Nevertheless, he had supported it as a stop-gap measure until others were taken that would go to the heart of the problem.

98. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) requested that the two draft resolutions adopted on the monetary situation should as soon as possible be presented to the plenary Assembly simultaneously, and no later than the following Tuesday. He feared that the resolutions would lose most of their impact if they were not brought before the Assembly promptly.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Ralph J. Bunche, former Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs

99. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) requested the Bureau and the Committee to consider the possibility of cancelling the meeting scheduled for the following morning as a mark of respect for the late Mr. Ralph Bunche, a great international civil servant.

100. Mr. ALULA (Ethiopia) supported the request of the United States representative. The qualities displayed by Mr. Bunche in his defence of a great cause were well known to everyone. His delegation expressed its condolences to the bereaved family and to the United States of America.

101. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of the PHILIPPINES, expressed his delegation's profound sympathy to the stricken family and to the Secretary-General. He also conveyed the condolences of the Committee to the United States representative and to the bereaved family. Mr. Ralph Bunche would be remembered as an indefatigable defender of the cause of peace. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to accede to the request of the United States representative.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.