



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

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

1. The CHAIRMAN expressed the loss and grief which the Committee felt on the death of Mr. Bunche, who during his 26 years in the service of the United Nations had played a central and unique role. His contribution to, and desire for, a reasonable and humane solution to problems such as those of the Congo, Cyprus, Palestine and the Middle East, and those connected with atomic energy, were already a part of history. The Nobel Peace Prize had been an acknowledgement of his qualities as a man and as an international civil servant.

2. He asked the representative of the United States to express the sympathy of the Committee to the people of the United States and to Mr. Bunche's family.

On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Ralph J. Bunche.

3. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Under-Secretary-General for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the world was dismayed at the premature loss of a man of exceptional qualities, who was devoted to peace among States and brotherhood among men. The United States had lost one of its most prestigious sons and the world had lost a servant of the objectives of the United Nations. During his 26 years of service with the United Nations, Mr. Bunche had devoted all his energy, his keen intelligence and his perspicacity to the solution of conflicts and crises.

4. Mr. GRIGG (United States of America) thanked the Chairman for the condolences expressed. Mr. Bunche had started his career with the study of decolonization problems and it was thus fitting that the Fourth Committee should pay him a tribute on his death. He would convey the Committee's sympathy to the family of Mr. Bunche.

AGENDA ITEMS 13, 23, 65, 70, 71 AND 12, 72 AND 73*

Agenda item 13 (continued) (A/8360, A/8404)

Agenda item 23 (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued) (A/8368, A/8369, A/8423 (part IV) and (part IV)/Add.1, A/8423/Add.5 (part I), A/8423/Add.5 (part II) and Add.5 (part II)/Corr.1, A/8423/Add.6 (parts I-III), A/8423/Add.7 (parts I-IV))

* For the titles of the items, see "Agenda" on p. ix.

**Agenda item 65 (continued)
(A/8423/Add.8/Rev.1, A/8520 and Add.1 and 2)**

Agenda item 70 (continued) (A/8398 and Add.1, A/8513)

Agenda items 71 and 12 (continued) (A/8314 and Add.1-5, A/8403 (chapter XX), A/8403/Add.1 (part III), A/8423 (part III), A/8480)

Agenda item 72 (continued) (A/8485 and Add.1)

Agenda item 73 (continued) (A/8530)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

5. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that colonialism was a system based on oppression which had a history of conflict. It began with the conquest of the indigenous people, often by people of a different race. In most cases it was followed by the introduction of a settler-dominated agriculture and the development of industry based on cheap or forced labour. Since conquest always generated resistance, colonialism relied on the application of brutal force against the indigenous people who resisted it. In its turn, resistance increased to such a point that it eventually became greater than the force available to the colonial authorities. In other words, the indigenous people's determination to achieve their liberation eventually forced the colonial authorities to abandon their system of coercion and oppression. It was at that "breaking point" that freedom and independence were won by the indigenous people. The breaking point had been reached in the colonies in southern Africa, particularly in the Territories under Portuguese administration and in Southern Rhodesia. The fact that the bankrupt régimes of Portugal and the racist rebels in Southern Rhodesia were able to apply force beyond the breaking point was due solely to the fact that they depended upon the Western capitalist countries as external sources of extra force.

6. Responsibility for the continued oppression of the peoples of southern Africa lay with the Western capitalist countries whose nationals, companies or monopolies were engaged in economic activities in the area. Since General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) defined colonialism as a crime, such nationals and enterprises and their Governments were committing crimes against the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and other colonial areas. Had it not been for the activities of foreign monopolies, the peoples of Southern Africa would have won their freedom long ago.

7. It was only too well known that the monopolies served as a means of generating extra force for the purpose of

perpetuating oppression. That was the sole purpose of the Cabora Bassa dam project. The project had been thoroughly discussed in many international forums including the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and had been extensively reported in the world press. It had evoked demonstrations, even in capitalist States. All progressive forces had condemned it and the indigenous people of Mozambique continued to oppose the construction of the dam; for good reason they were fighting and dying to prevent its completion. The Cabora Bassa dam, if completed, would only consolidate the forces of evil in Mozambique. The project was designed to bring outcasts from Western European societies to Mozambique, provide them with free land taken from the Africans and establish for such European social misfits a special régime of privilege based on the South African *apartheid* model. The dam would delay the decolonization of southern Africa because the outcasts would provide major support to the colonialist reactionaries in the region. They would be ready to defend their newly found homes and privileges. They would form a new pillar of international capitalism and imperialism in that part of the world. The Cabora Bassa project constituted the greatest move of international monopolies to secure a place in Mozambique and to liquidate the struggle for freedom and independence of the indigenous people. The Portuguese authorities themselves had stated quite clearly that, under the project, 1 million whites from Portugal, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Western Europe would be settled in the area. In July 1970, the Chief of Staff of the Portuguese forces had declared that the solution for the security and progress of the Portuguese overseas Territories was to settle 3 million whites. The world should strongly condemn such undertakings as the Cabora Bassa dam and the Cunene River project in Angola.

8. He fully understood why certain countries were unable to support resolutions on such a sensitive item as that relating to activities of foreign economic interests. However he could not accept the flimsy explanations they gave for that attitude and for allowing their nationals and companies to plunder the colonial Territories and helping the colonial régimes in their oppression of the indigenous people. Governments such as those of the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and France, which allowed their nationals and companies to operate in southern Africa, could not claim to have any respect for the lives of the indigenous people. They stood condemned of murderous activities in southern Africa.

9. His delegation could not accept the contention that the activities of any foreign economic interests were beneficial to the indigenous peoples of the Territories of southern Africa. All of them helped the colonial régimes; all exploited and oppressed the African people and all impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Arguments to the contrary only proved partnership in crime and helped to make Portugal an arrogant colonial Power despite its lack of resources. Whether or not those Governments whose economic activities helped the colonial régimes of southern Africa chose to stand by the side of the Africans in the struggle for freedom, freedom would be won. If they so wished, they could prevent their nationals and companies from operating in southern Africa. No civilized constitution could stop Governments from taking measures

against their nationals or companies engaged in criminal actions overseas, particularly when those crimes were crimes against humanity. Civilized constitutions were designed to serve mankind and the just struggle for freedom and independence. All delegations should therefore support a strong resolution on agenda item 70 and work to implement it faithfully.

10. Mr. SEVILLA BORJA (Ecuador) said that he fully concurred in the views expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 304 of the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/8401/Add.1) and considered it disturbing that, despite the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the programme of action contained in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), the pace of decolonization was continuing to slow down. The situation in various Territories whose peoples were still denied the right to self-determination could not be considered the inescapable legacy of a former era; it was an unacceptable anachronism incompatible with the Charter, the principles of international law and the will of the international community. Those considerations applied to all such Territories and not only to those in southern Africa, where the situation constituted a threat to international peace and security.

11. The colonial system, with its concomitant social and economic injustice, exploitation and violation of human rights, persisted for various reasons: the power politics of great Powers, strategic interests, economic interests, the inability of certain administering Powers to comply with the obligations they had contracted under the Charter, and so forth. It was true that, as the representative of New Zealand had pointed out, in a few cases the situation was a result of the very nature of small Territories, whose special problems could not be solved by a rigid formula. But it was the duty of the international community to seek new and flexible formulas for such cases.

12. His delegation was endeavouring to play its part in solving the remaining colonial problems, both in the General Assembly and in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, whose reports it endorsed. It was particularly concerned over the persistence of foreign colonial presences in Latin America. Of the 40 or so Territories considered by the Special Committee, 11 were in the Latin American region. The perpetuation of the colonial system there was intolerable to those who had fought for their inalienable right to self-determination one and a half centuries earlier.

13. The list of Territories considered by the Special Committee should be reviewed since certain examples of the classical colonial phenomenon were omitted, as in the case of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico were struggling valiantly for the freedom which had been denied them so often in their troubled past. His delegation hoped that the African countries, which had received the support of the Latin American people in their struggle, would view with sympathy the lofty aspirations of the Puerto Rican people. His delegation had, at the current session of the General Assembly, voted for the inclusion of an item

entitled "The colonial case of Puerto Rico" (see A/8441 and Add.1 and A/8500). Despite the result of the vote on the question, the struggle of Puerto Rico was far from ended.

14. Documents A/8368 and A/8369 contained communications concerning the negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom on the subject of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas). His delegation was pleased to note that the negotiations were being conducted in a spirit of co-operation and hoped that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) of 16 December 1965, progress would be made on the fundamental issue of sovereignty.

15. Paragraphs 10 to 12 of the annex to chapter XXVI of the report of the Special Committee contained important information on the status of Belize (see A/8423/Add.7 (part IV)). It was to be hoped that negotiations would lead to a satisfactory solution of the difficult problem, which involved territorial claims by countries in the Latin American region, and that the solution would meet the aspirations of the parties concerned, including the people of Belize.

16. With regard to the Caribbean Territories, he hoped that the co-operation of the independent Latin American countries would play a decisive role in freeing the Latin American region from colonial domination once and for all.

17. It was to be noted that two administering Powers—Australia and New Zealand—had adopted a most co-operative approach towards the United Nations. The decision of those two Governments to receive visiting missions to Territories under their administration was most praiseworthy. The visiting missions to Papua New Guinea and Niue could only help the cause of those two Territories and enable the Organization to understand the problems of small Territories. Visiting missions were beneficial to all concerned and it was to be hoped that other colonial Powers would take similar decisions.

18. Annex II of chapter X of the Special Committee's report (see A/8423/Add.5 (part II) and Add.5 (part II)/Corr.1) contained an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations. His delegation appreciated the Spanish Government's attitude towards colonial problems and welcomed the fact that it was willing to allow a United Nations presence in Spanish Sahara. It hoped that the preparations for the census would be completed as speedily as possible, but failed to understand why the Spanish Government restricted the possibility of receiving a United Nations visiting mission at the time when the census would be held. It fully appreciated that the preparations were complicated in view of the nomadic nature of the population and the geography of the Territory and accordingly considered that a visiting mission would help the United Nations better to understand the difficulties involved. The Spanish Government should therefore allow a mission to visit the Territory before the time of the census.

19. In conclusion, he hoped that, at the current session, the Committee would adopt more individual resolutions than it had done in the past. Previous resolutions had covered a number of Territories which differed from one

another considerably and he was of the opinion that it would be more profitable to all concerned to adopt individual resolutions.

20. Mrs. SKOTTSBERG-ÅHMAN (Sweden) said that her delegation found the general debate on the Territories in southern Africa useful but had always had rather strong doubts about the usefulness of holding a second general debate, like the current one, covering an assortment of agenda items. The second general debate covered a wide range of questions which, although all pertaining to the general theme of decolonization, were in reality too disparate to be treated together and led to incoherence in the debate. The individual items did not receive the serious and proper consideration which they deserved and some were not mentioned at all. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly the Committee should perhaps reconsider that arrangement. The items in the second general debate could very well be classified in small groups which would lend themselves to one common debate, and more time would have to be devoted to them. Her delegation wondered whether the Committee ought really to spend most of the session on the problems of southern Africa, to the detriment of all other Territories. The small colonies might appear insignificant in comparison with those in southern Africa, but they still posed important problems for the people living in them. The summary treatment which was being accorded to them obscured the characteristics of the individual problems and tended to strengthen the temptation to generalize and to issue sweeping conclusions. Such an approach did not yield very practical results.

21. There were three questions which, in her delegation's view, could be considered closely connected, the question of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter, the West Indies Associated States, and the small Territories. Those questions had not received much attention in the current debate—a trend that might reflect a certain reluctance to face realities, as could be surmised from the fact that not even the Special Committee had found it possible to deal seriously with those matters. That strange hesitancy appeared to be connected with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1969, which contained the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its relationship to resolution 1514 (XV), which had been adopted by the Assembly the day after the Declaration. The Declaration was the main cornerstone for the work of the Special Committee, and of the Fourth Committee as well, being the basis for the decolonization activities of the United Nations. It might be wondered why its companion resolution 1514 (XV) had been totally relegated to the background. The three questions she had mentioned might yield some explanation for the neglect accorded to the small Territories. In the 1950's the question of information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, required from the administering Powers under Article 73 e of the Charter, had been the focus of sharp constitutional controversies. After the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) the colonial question had begun to be viewed in the shorter perspective of political freedom and the question of information from the Territories had gradually lost importance. For several successive years the resolutions on the item had been couched in

general terms, mostly technical in nature and non-controversial. In 1968, however, the resolution on the item had gone from generalities to specifics, listing certain Territories such as the Caribbean islands of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla and St. Lucia, to which St. Vincent had been added the following year. The General Assembly had deplored or condemned the decision of the United Kingdom to cease to transmit information under Article 73 e on the grounds that the islands had changed their status. The Assembly had thereby rejected the contention by the United Kingdom and the islands themselves that they had attained full internal self-government and that consequently the United Kingdom Government no longer had either the obligation or the right to furnish the United Nations with information on their internal affairs.

22. Resolution 1541 (XV) listed three criteria for determining whether a Non-Self-Governing Territory could be said to have attained a full measure of self-government. The first was, of course, independence as a sovereign State, the second, free association with an independent State, and the third was integration in an independent State. In the Associated States the second criterion obviously applied. The principles enumerated in resolution 1541 (XV) clearly spelt out the conditions under which such an association should come about if it was to be recognized as full self-government.

23. The main provisions were that the association should be the result of a free and voluntary choice by the people of the Territory concerned, expressed through informed and democratic processes, and that the Territory should retain its freedom to modify its status through the expression of the will of the people by democratic and constitutional means. Furthermore, the associated territory should have the right to determine its internal constitution, without outside interference, in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people. In other words, the principle of self-determination was the basis for the establishment of associated status.

24. In the opinion of her delegation, the conditions laid down in resolution 1541 (XV) had been met in the case of the West Indies Associated States. The Governments of those States, elected on the basis of universal suffrage, had freely chosen their new status as the one best suited to their current needs. Whenever the peoples concerned felt that they wanted to change their form of government, they were free to sever their association with the United Kingdom and to proceed to any other status, including independence.

25. The declaration which had been adopted during the summer of 1971, known as the Grenada Declaration, was proof that the islands had indeed retained their freedom of choice. The purpose of that Declaration was to terminate the association of the various States with the United Kingdom and to create a new independent federation in the Caribbean. The requirements of resolution 1541 (XV) thus having been fulfilled, the principle contained in that resolution—to the effect that the obligation to transmit information under Article 73 e of the Charter ceased when the constitutional relationship between the associated Territory and the independent State was such that it precluded the latter from requesting information relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory concerned—should become applicable. Since those

matters were the exclusive concern of the Associated States, her delegation found it hard to understand how the General Assembly could go on, year after year, condemning the United Kingdom for having ceased to transmit information concerning them and how it could call on the United Kingdom to resume transmission of the information. Such a procedure was tantamount to using Article 73 e as a means of labelling as colonies Territories which were not merely called self-governing by the United Kingdom, but in reality were, and felt themselves to be, fully in command of their internal affairs. In fact, it seemed insulting for the United Nations to tell peoples who had themselves chosen that status that it was not good enough.

26. One of the reasons adduced for the failure of the United Nations to apply resolution 1541 (XV) to the Associated States was that the United Nations should satisfy itself that those peoples had indeed freely chosen their status by sending a visiting mission to the Territories concerned and that the United Kingdom had refused to allow a visit by such a mission. However, there was no Charter obligation for an administering Power to accept such missions in its Non-Self-Governing Territories and resolution 1541 (XV) referred to the sending of missions only in connexion with integration. It was stated that the United Nations could, when it deemed necessary, supervise the processes leading to integration. Visiting missions could nevertheless play a useful role when a fundamental constitutional change occurred in a Non-Self-Governing Territory, and willingness on the part of an administering Power to give such missions access to its Territories could help to dispel the misgivings and distrust of many Member States concerning the motives of colonial Powers. When a Territory had attained as substantial a measure of self-government as the Associated States, it also had to be ascertained whether its leaders were willing to receive a United Nations mission. Her delegation was not entirely convinced, however, that the fact that a United Nations mission was prevented from visiting the Territories in question was the only reason for the General Assembly's refusal to accept the status of association as decolonization.

27. In 1965, a similar pattern of association had been agreed upon between the Cook Islands and New Zealand. Before the new constitutional arrangement had been put into effect, elections had been held in the islands. At the unprecedented invitation of the New Zealand Government, the elections had been supervised by the United Nations. Despite that fact, and although no one really doubted that the Cook Islanders had freely chosen their new status, the question had been debated at considerable length in the Fourth Committee. In the end, and not without some difficulty, the choice of the islanders had been approved and New Zealand had been released from its obligation under Article 73 e of the Charter. To her delegation, the most remarkable point about the discussion was the argument that for a colonial people voluntarily to limit its own sovereignty was inconsistent with the spirit of resolution 1514 (XV). A colonial people should, it had been argued, continue to be subject to that resolution until it could afford to be completely independent. Then, and only then, had the people fully exercised their right to self-determination and been decolonized.

28. It might well be asked whether resolution 1514 (XV), which established authoritative guidelines for decoloniza-

tion, had not developed into something close to a dogma. The assumption seemed to be that all colonial peoples wanted, or should want, independence, irrespective of their circumstances, lest they be held in contempt of resolution 1514 (XV). In the process, resolution 1541 (XV) had become practically unmentionable, at least in resolutions, no matter how applicable it might be. The inability of the General Assembly to take due account of resolution 1541 (XV) had led to unfortunate consequences and contradictory resolutions. Every year the General Assembly stated that it was fully aware of the special circumstances prevailing in small Non-Self-Governing Territories and asked the Special Committee to take them into account. In the same breath, however, it also stated that those special circumstances should in no way delay the granting of full independence. The special circumstances thus tended to be ignored, not only in the General Assembly but also in the Special Committee and its sub-committees. The reluctance of the United Nations even to mention resolution 1541 (XV) was regrettable, since, as a complement of resolution 1514 (XV), it could be put to good use in dealing with all the small colonies, for some of which full independence was clearly not a viable proposition. The reluctance of the United Nations to recognize, at least publicly, anything less than full independence in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) might well have been instrumental in hampering attempts to give serious consideration to the problems and prospects of the small Territories. Unless the United Nations was prepared to tackle problems realistically and to try to find the solutions best suited to the particular circumstances of the various Territories concerned, it would be evading its responsibilities with regard to the peoples of those Territories.

29. The United Nations should never, by applying rigid formulas and abstract principles which did not fit the realities of the case, try to force the issue in any given Territory. It was, after all, dealing with human circumstances and human beings, and not with theoretical cases. What was right for a large Territory in Africa or in Asia could not automatically serve as a model for a small island which was completely isolated. The only safe guide was the will of the people concerned. Whatever they found best suited to their needs and ambitions they were entitled to have, whether it was independence or some other form of self-government adapted to their special circumstances, and the United Nations must respect their free choice. There must be an open-minded and flexible approach if the United Nations was to be of any real help to the small Territories.

30. There was, of course, one point on which flexibility was not permissible and that was the right of self-determination. However, there was not just one supreme moment of self-determination. It was a continuing process which entailed a series of decisions at every stage. It was for the people to speak and for the administering Power and the United Nations to listen, to give advice and to help give effect to the expressed wishes of the people.

31. In conclusion, her delegation hoped that it would be possible for the Special Committee, at its following session, to give long-overdue consideration to the question of how the small Non-Self-Governing Territories might best organize their future through the free exercise of their right

of self-determination. In United Nations phraseology, the expression "self-determination and independence" had been used so often that there was a danger of confusing the two concepts. They were not the same. Independence was, after all, only one of the alternatives to which self-determination could lead, and not its exclusive end in every single case.

32. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the Committee had concluded its general debate on the seven questions which had been grouped for the debate, urged the sponsors of draft resolutions on those questions to submit them without further delay. In accordance with the decision already taken by the Committee, the draft resolutions would be considered in the order of their submission.

AGENDA ITEM 66

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/8388, A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.3 (parts I and II), A/8424, A/8473, A/C.4/738 and Add.1, A/C.4/740, A/C.4/L.994)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.994)

33. The CHAIRMAN announced that Jamaica, Pakistan, Singapore, the Sudan and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.994.

34. Mr. PSONČAK (Yugoslavia), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/L.994, said that Chad had also joined the sponsors. He drew particular attention to the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 1 to 5, 7, 8, 14 and 18 to 21. Compared with resolutions adopted on the same question at previous sessions, the draft resolution contained a number of new provisions. The sponsors had wished to emphasize that the United Nations, bearing in mind the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice and the Security Council's recent deliberations on Namibia, had the will and means to discharge its responsibilities with regard to the people of Namibia in a more practical manner. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/8424) and the chapters of the report of the Special Committee relating to Namibia, as well as the statements of petitioners, had greatly facilitated the work of the sponsors and had enabled them to establish new objectives. They realized that the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia in no way diminished the obligations incumbent on all Member States under Article 25 of the Charter and had explained those obligations in detail in operative paragraphs 6, 9, 14 and 15 of the draft.

35. The sponsors also believed that the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations should play a greater part in the struggle of the Namibian people for the restoration of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. In that respect, operative paragraphs 9 and 10 called for specific forms of assistance to Namibia.

36. In view of the Advisory Opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice, the special responsibilities of

the United Nations for Namibia, and the current situation, the primary purpose of the sponsors had been to explain in greater detail the functions and responsibilities of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Under operative paragraph 11 the Assembly would call for appropriate action on the report of the Council and in operative paragraph 15 it would call upon all States to co-operate fully with the Council in its efforts to discharge its responsibilities. Operative paragraph 13 (a), (b) and (c) enumerated some responsibilities of the Council. The sponsors believed that the Council should assume special responsibility for the problem of Namibia and that it had proved its ability to assume the role of the United Nations body primarily responsible for the Territory. They therefore attached particular importance to operative paragraph 16 which raised the question of the expansion of the membership of the Council. The role which the Council was called upon to play in current circumstances would require the appointment of a full-time Commissioner for Namibia as soon as possible—a point which was reflected in operative paragraph 17. The paragraphs proposing new responsibilities for the Council in no way detracted from the importance of the other paragraphs, particularly those relating to the responsibilities of other United Nations bodies. Only through a more active commitment to the cause of Namibia on the part of all United Nations bodies would it be possible to achieve the ultimate goal of liberating the Namibian people from their state of servitude and to give them the possibility of exercising their right to self-determination and independence.

AGENDA ITEM 73

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (continued)
(A/8530, A/C.4/L.995)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.4/L.995)

37. Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal) said that man was the most important element in the struggle to promote economic and social development. Education and training therefore had a vital role to play and the best contribution which States could make to that cause was to provide scholarships. Assistance in the form of supplies of material goods and food-stuffs, although important, was less so than assistance in preparing human beings for the tasks that lay ahead. By training the *élite* of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, Member States would be contributing to their political emancipation and to the viability of new structures in those Territories. He was pleased to announce that his delegation had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

38. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that his delegation had also become a sponsor of the draft resolution, which it considered very important from the cultural point of view because it would help to develop the capacity of the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories for bettering themselves through education. His country had decided to make available six scholarships for students from Non-Self-Governing Territories and had so informed the Secretary-General.

39. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) recalled that in resolution 845 (IX) of 22 November 1954, the General Assembly had invited Member States to extend their offers of study and training facilities to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories, not merely at the university level but also at the post-primary, technical and vocational levels and since 1954, some two dozen countries, including his own, had been offering such facilities. His country's contribution had consisted in providing facilities at its educational and training institutions. Under Pakistan's cultural scholarship scheme scholarships were offered for undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate studies in arts, science, medicine, engineering and agriculture, while fellowships were offered for research at the post-graduate level. For the award of scholarships during the academic year 1971/1972, 114 nominations had been invited from 48 countries, including one each from Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesians in exile. Some 40 students would benefit from the facilities offered by Pakistan during the year 1971/1972.

40. The level of education in Non-Self-Governing Territories was not advanced enough for the inhabitants of those Territories to benefit from scholarships for higher education and his Government was considering a proposal to include in the cultural scheme a few scholarships for study at the post-primary level, in general, and technical fields, for the indigenous inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. His delegation, too, had decided to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 68

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued)

41. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question from Mr. OUE'DRAOGO (Upper Volta), stated that all draft resolutions on the question of Southern Rhodesia should be handed in at the morning meeting on Friday, 10 December or submitted to the Secretariat by 6 p.m. on Friday, 10 December.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.