

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1796th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 November 1968,  
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 12, 13, 23, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapter XVI (section C)] ( <i>continued</i> )	
Report of the Trusteeship Council ( <i>continued</i> )	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: Territories not considered separately ( <i>continued</i> )	
Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Secretary-General;	
(b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples	
Question of Fiji: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <i>continued</i> )	
Question of Oman ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, <i>apartheid</i> and racial discrimination in southern Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <i>continued</i> )	
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
United Nations Training and Educational Programme: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> )	
Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> )	
General debate ( <i>continued</i> )	1

Chairman: Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON  
(Trinidad and Tobago).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Dashteren (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 13, 23, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69,  
70 AND 71**

[For the text of the agenda items, see table of contents above. The relevant documents are indicated in the heading of the summary record of the 1791st meeting.]

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. ADLAN (Malaysia) said that in the years following the Second World War the world had witnessed a most significant political evolution; it had seen a remarkably sustained and successful effort on the part of colonial peoples to emancipate and free themselves from European domination. That phenomenon had resulted in the entry of new States into the family of nations and had changed the political map of Asia and Africa. In scale and complexity, the process of decolonization had almost no precedent in world history, other than the "scramble" for Africa, Asia and the islands of the Pacific in the nineteenth century.

2. The emergence of a large number of independent countries had given further impetus to the process of decolonization, and that impetus had found tangible expression in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The process of decolonization was continuing, but at a tardy rate, and unfortunately many Territories scattered over the surface of the globe were still being administered by Australia, France, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The stage of political and constitutional progress in those Territories varied, according as the administering Power applied more liberal or less liberal colonial policies. Thus, in certain Territories, general elections on the basis of universal suffrage had been held and representative institutions and executive machinery had been introduced. Although such moves were a step in the right direction, his delegation was nevertheless concerned to note that in the final analysis the administering Powers retained undue powers and that, in some cases, the institutions created were merely advisory. Furthermore, the higher posts in the civil service were still in the hands of expatriates. The administering Powers should strive to replace foreign civil servants by local personnel with a minimum of delay, so that the Territories would depend less and less on them and their peoples could prepare to take over the reins of government.

3. His delegation was well aware of the difficulties which many of those Territories faced in their progress towards self-determination and independence. Some of the difficulties were due to geographical situation and economic conditions, but those considerations, real as they were, should not serve as an excuse for delaying the application of resolution 1514 (XV). It was not for the administering

Power, nor for the United Nations, to decide the future of those Territories; that was a matter for the peoples of the Territories, who should be allowed to express their wishes freely and whose wishes must be respected, if not held sacrosanct. For that reason, his delegation supported the principle of visiting missions, which made it possible to ascertain the wishes of the peoples concerned.

4. Although there had been limited constitutional advance in a number of Territories, especially the small ones, the African peoples in large areas of southern Africa continued to be denied their inherent rights. South Africa continued to apply its evil doctrine of *apartheid*, which almost everyone considered a flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations and of all norms of morality and civilization. It persisted in illegally retaining possession of Namibia, just as Portugal maintained colonialism in Angola, Mozambique and elsewhere and the white minority in Southern Rhodesia continued its illegal rule. Colonialism was able to retain its hold in all those Territories because it was supported by foreign economic and financial interests. It was an incontrovertible fact that the systems of colonialism and *apartheid* benefited only a small privileged minority to the detriment of the majority. Nowhere in the world was that truth more eloquently illustrated than in southern Africa. That area of the African continent was a product of white colonization. In each Territory in the area there was a minority of European origin, firmly installed in power, which refused to step down to its rightful status as a political minority. In the Portuguese Territories and in Southern Rhodesia the minority had the backing of the administering Power, and in Southern Rhodesia it had gone a step further and illegally declared independence with the sole aim of maintaining its privileges.

5. Throughout southern Africa, Europeans held all the key positions in political and economic life. They were pre-eminent in the modern sector of the economy, they managed the small and medium-sized enterprises in industry and finance, they provided the skilled labour for the manufacturing industries, and they held the higher posts in the administration. The majority of the population was relegated to the rank of unskilled labourers in agriculture and industry and occupied the lower posts in the administration. Thus, there was no doubt that the activities of foreign economic interests were impeding the achievement of the goals of the United Nations. Of course, not all foreign interests were harmful, and his delegation was not against foreign economic activity as such; in fact, many independent countries encouraged foreign investment in their national development. However, those were two different questions and the operation was on entirely different levels. Whereas in an independent country the indigenous population could control the situation, in a colonial economy or in one branded with *apartheid* it could not resist penetration by foreigners. Since they wielded the power, the foreigners were able to regulate relations between themselves and the indigenous population, modify the systems of land tenure, and determine the conditions of labour and the nature of the economic activities of the majority of the population.

6. The role played by monopolies in the economy of southern Africa had been looked into by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementa-

tion of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In 1964, Sub-Committee I of the Special Committee had begun to study the question in relation to Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and, since 1966, Southern Rhodesia. In 1968, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2307 (XXII), paragraph 14, the Unit on *Apartheid* had published a paper entitled *Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa*.<sup>1</sup> It was clear from all those studies that foreign capital was naturally attracted towards southern Africa by the abnormally high rates of profit which could be expected, owing not only to the richness of the mineral deposits but to the more important fact that labour was plentiful and cheap.

7. Economics was a determining factor in social change and, as history showed, material progress led to freedom and equality. Foreign interests, however, did nothing to raise the living conditions and promote the social advancement of the peoples they exploited, nor to facilitate the inevitable political changes. The local populations still had to think in terms of merely existing, and could not develop their personality. Their wages were substantially lower than those of the Whites, and in all sectors only the most humble positions were open to them. In certain Territories, those considerations were even more significant, since property and educational electoral qualifications were imposed, and consequently the majority of the people had no hope of being able to participate in the political life of the country. The sole aim of many of the foreign economic interests was to derive the maximum profit from their activities and not to promote the well-being of the indigenous population, leaving the latter only the gleaning; they considered, on the contrary, that any improvement in the conditions of the local population would result in an increase in production costs and would upset the *status quo*. In order to preserve their privileges and maintain their profits, foreign interests did not scruple to exert pressure on the Western countries, particularly those which were members of the Security Council. Because of the political structure of their countries, they were able to participate directly or indirectly in the formulation of the policy of their Governments. In view of the large amounts of Western capital invested in southern Africa, there was every reason to believe that the Western countries, particularly those which were members of the Security Council, would not change their policy with regard to southern Africa.

8. Recently, the United Kingdom Government had encountered obstruction by the House of Lords in connexion with Rhodesia. It would no doubt be instructive to look into the question what economic or other interests had led certain British parliamentarians to oppose the Government's policy. Before that, one had seen the tremendous pressure to which the United Kingdom Government had been subjected, within and without the Government, when it had taken the laudable decision to continue the embargo on arms to South Africa.

9. In view of the part played by foreign monopolies in southern Africa, it was understandable that the main purpose of the sanctions against Rhodesia was to induce the economic interests to bring pressure to bear on the Smith

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.K.8.

régime to change its present policy. Nevertheless, in southern Africa, there were interests other than economic ones at stake; there were, above all, the human and political rights of the majority of the population and the very existence of the United Nations as an international organization for peace. The Western countries should realize that it was in their long-term interest to work against those who were obstructing the political, legal or constitutional solutions to the problem of southern Africa; they should realize that to support industrial and other monopolies meant damaging their own interests and that they should abandon their short-sighted policy.

10. Although, because of the posture taken by some of its Members, particularly those with a veto in the Security Council, the United Nations appeared incapable of resolving the problems of southern Africa, it was comforting to note that it had been tackling certain peripheral problems and that it had been able, for instance, to give assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and to the peoples of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Portuguese colonies. That assistance should be viewed not only from the moral and humanitarian viewpoint, but also from the angle of the practical political impact it could have. Assistance to the victims of *apartheid* was an expression, perhaps symbolic but nevertheless tangible, of the concern felt by the United Nations on the question of the *apartheid* policy and its concern with the principle of majority rule. The United Nations should intensify its efforts in that field and should ensure that the training programme devised for the peoples of southern Africa would prepare the recipients to assume positions of responsibility when their respective countries became independent. It must be borne in mind, however, that that programme could not be other than a short-term one and that the ultimate aim was to establish a just and equitable society and government.

11. As long as colonialism had not been completely overcome, Malaysia would continue to give full support to those who were struggling to secure their freedom and their just rights.

12. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) said that, in a sense, the Fourth Committee could be regarded as a self-liquidating body. While the number of agenda items allocated to the other Committees tended to increase, the number referred to the Fourth Committee was expected to decrease as decolonization proceeded. That had been the case since the creation of the United Nations, and particularly since the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 1514 (XV). Of the original Trust Territories, nine had acceded to independence and only two remained under consideration by the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly. Of over 100 Non-Self-Governing Territories, only forty-four had yet to gain their independence, more than seventy having achieved independence or some recognized form of self-government. Between the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of the General Assembly, five Territories had become independent, and four of them were already Members of the United Nations. Although that was cause for pride, the current situation was not as bright as it should be. The scope of the Fourth Committee's activities was beginning to expand again, and the work of the Special Committee had become so heavy that, although it had been meeting since February 1968 (apart from meetings held by

its sub-committees), it had not yet been able to conclude its current meetings.

13. That situation inevitably led one to the conclusion that, despite the efforts of the United Nations, the process of decolonization had not progressed as satisfactorily as had been hoped. The perennial problems of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration were glaring examples of the ineffectiveness of most of the measures taken so far in connexion therewith. In fact, the United Nations had to exert every effort in order not to lose ground. That relative immobility could be attributed to several causes which the Committee had had an ample opportunity to examine in connexion with the questions of Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies.

14. That colonialism could continue to exist in the second half of the twentieth century, despite the disappearance of entire empires, was difficult to conceive unless one went to the heart of the matter and examined its various aspects, as illustrated by the documents available to the Fourth Committee, and particularly the reports of the Special Committee. One definite reason for the persistence of colonialism was the presence of vested economic interests in the colonial Territories. The examination of the situation in Southern Rhodesia and in the Portuguese Territories had established the fact that, besides the die-hard fanatics of the "white man's burden" or of the "Christian civilizing mission", economic and other interests still played a major part in the subjugation of the colonial peoples. As could be seen from document A/7320/Add.1, the dominance of foreign interests in the economic life of the colonial Territories was really alarming. It was not only that some sectors of the economy were monopolized by foreign interests and that large agricultural holdings were in the hands of colonists or foreign companies; the activities of foreign interests permeated the entire economic fabric of the Territories. The report of the Special Committee (A/7200/Rev.1) confirmed that the exploitation of the wealth of the colonial Territories and the control of their economic life remained the backbone of colonialist policy and constituted, together with another factor, the greatest impediment to decolonization.

15. The other factor was the existence of military bases in colonial Territories and the military activities and arrangements of the colonial Powers in those Territories. As the Special Committee indicated in chapter IV of its report, that aspect of the colonial phenomenon largely affected the current status of the colonial Territories and influenced their future. A simple example of that was the question of Oman, as described in chapter XVII of the report. As could be seen from paragraph 46 of that chapter, Mr. Harold Wilson, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, had announced on 16 January 1968 that his Government had decided to withdraw its forces from the Persian Gulf by the end of 1971. Only a month after that statement, as reported in paragraphs 47 and 48 of the same chapter, the rulers of the nine Sheikdoms of the area had decided to form a federation of their territories. It was obvious that such an agreement, which was to be welcomed as laying the foundations for viable modern States, would not have been possible without the certainty of the withdrawal of foreign military forces and of alien political influence.

16. Another important facet of the colonial problem was the inescapable fact that the status of some Territories was influenced by geographical, demographic, economic and other factors which the General Assembly had recognized in its various relevant resolutions. Unfortunately, no formula had yet been found to resolve those difficulties and to make the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) fully applicable to those Territories. That was a negative factor in the process of decolonization of some Territories, where, there was sufficient reason to think, the right of self-determination could have been exercised earlier. It was therefore the duty of the Committee to provide the peoples concerned with every facility to enable them to exercise that inalienable right as speedily and as effectively as possible. For that reason, his delegation would endorse any directive by the General Assembly to the Special Committee for a study of ways whereby the right of self-determination might be exercised in those Territories.

17. For that purpose, visits by special missions appeared essential. It was obvious that, without direct contact with the peoples of those Territories, discussion in the United Nations might become merely abstract and the human element which motivated all United Nations actions in that field might dwindle and disappear. Consequently, no effort should be spared to emphasize to the administering Powers the necessity of receiving visiting missions from the Special Committee. The contribution of such missions to the process of self-determination had been sufficiently demonstrated by the success achieved by the visiting missions sent by the Trusteeship Council and the few that had been sent by the Special Committee, the most recent of which had been the mission to Equatorial Guinea. His delegation therefore supported the decision taken by the Special Committee at its 636th meeting on 19 September 1968 and hoped that the General Assembly would endorse it.

*Mr. Solomon (Trinidad and Tobago) took the Chair.*

18. Mr. RAOELINA (Madagascar) recalled that his delegation was one of the original members of the Special Committee and that it had therefore been able to make a thorough study of the problems now before the Committee.

19. Many countries had achieved independence in Africa and Asia during the past twenty years. Some of them had done so before the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), while others owed their independence to the United Nations and to those countries that stood for the principles of freedom and justice.

20. His delegation considered that all peoples had the inalienable right to self-determination, to full freedom and to the exercise of sovereignty, i.e., the right to choose freely and in a democratic manner their future political and economic and social status. The right of peoples to self-determination was explicitly laid down in Articles 1 and 55 of the United Nations Charter, and implicitly in Chapters XI, XII and XIII. The principles of equal rights and of the right of self-determination were indissolubly linked and were the foundation on which the whole United Nations system rested.

21. Unfortunately, despite the current of ideas in support of emancipation which had been at its strongest after the

Second World War, colonialism was still rife and was still being endured by several million human beings. Certain Powers continued to think that they had the right to remain in territories they had appropriated centuries ago. They seemed to have forgotten that those territories were peopled with communities whose origins, customs and language were totally different from their own and which had the right to constitute themselves into nations. Other Powers, on the other hand, were using new methods to subject whole populations to a new form of colonization.

22. The principle of self-determination should no longer be considered simply as a moral or political assumption, but rather as an established principle of modern international law. The administering Powers must become fully aware that they were entrusted with a very important mission, that of ensuring that another State obtained its independence. They should also realize that it was their solemn duty to apply the principle of equality, for the subjection of peoples was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of fundamental human rights.

23. Certain administering Powers considered that the principle of self-determination must be applied if a State was to be properly prepared for independence. His delegation saw no objection to that view, provided that full freedom was guaranteed to the formerly colonized State within a reasonable time-limit. His delegation regarded autonomy as a sign of internal sovereignty, which could be described as the positive aspect of independence.

24. Unfortunately certain administering Powers had shown a certain amount of reticence and had not sufficiently assisted the United Nations in its task of seeking suitable means of ensuring rapid implementation of resolution 1514 (XV). Madagascar offered full support to all Africans and other brother peoples who were struggling for their liberation and independence.

25. The Committee must find ways of eliminating the last vestiges of colonialism in all its forms. The colonial problem should concern not only the small States; it should also, and mainly, concern the big States.

26. With regard to the activities of foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories, his delegation noted that Territories still under the colonial régime usually had only very limited resources. It was therefore necessary to ascertain to what extent foreign interests impeded the implementation of the Declaration in those Territories. In that connexion the wording of the item was open to question. It was surely desirable that colonial Territories should attain independence on as firm and sound an economic basis as possible. His delegation thought that foreign investments should not be condemned outright, for such Territories might end up as victims of neo-colonialism if the independence they achieved rested on an economically weak foundation. It was nevertheless a fact that the exploitation of cheap labour must be condemned. To put an end to such exploitation, the administering Powers must take strict measures to control private companies and protect the interests of the population. They should in particular apply the International Labour Code adopted by the ILO.

27. It had been said that small Territories should not become political entities if they were not economically viable. He thought that the populations of such Territories should first of all be allowed to decide on their future under the auspices of the United Nations and in co-operation with the administering Powers. When they were not economically viable, they should be afforded the opportunity of associating with an independent State or group of States, within a federation or confederation, with the help of the United Nations. When those Territories associated with an administering Power, their leaders should be able to apply directly to the United Nations specialized agencies for economic aid.

28. If the United Nations was to acquit itself of its difficult task in the matter of decolonization, visiting missions would have to be organized. The use of missions made it possible to gain valuable information on the situation prevailing in the Territories and to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants when those wishes had not yet been officially expressed.

29. He hoped that the administering Powers would give those matters due thought in 1969 and that they would decide to give all the help they could to the Special Committee in its task of decolonization.

30. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he wished to deal only with the questions which his delegation considered had a direct bearing on the problems posed by decolonization.

31. As the Chairman of the Committee had said, the final battle to be waged against the colonial Powers was the longest and most arduous and one for which effective solutions must be sought.

32. The part played by the monopolies in maintaining colonialism and racism was particularly striking in southern Africa, which was exceptionally rich in mineral deposits. American, German, British and French companies exported those raw materials, which were used in particular for the manufacture of armaments and were often intended for the use of such colonial Powers as Portugal for the purpose of putting down the national liberation movements in their territories. It was common knowledge that southern Africa would enable imperialists to acquire the strategic raw materials they might need if they were unable to have access to other sources of supply. Mining operations were being conducted at a pace that had gradually accelerated and investments had correspondingly increased.

33. Detailed information had already been supplied on that subject by many delegations. The investments made by foreign companies in southern Africa had proved very profitable. In South Africa, Angola and Mozambique, the annual returns often amounted to from 20 to 30 per cent of capital investments. If investments in that region of Africa were assessed at over \$5,000 million, the annual profits would therefore amount to more than \$1,000 million.

34. By its pitiless exploitation of the indigenous populations and by the imposition of the system of *apartheid* which deprived Africans of all their economic, social and

political rights, the colonial system enabled all those companies to enrich themselves shamelessly. That situation was, of course, not peculiar to southern Africa. The same conditions had been created in Oman as a result of the concessions granted for the exploitation of petroleum by such companies as Dutch Shell. All those examples, which had already been mentioned on many occasions, bore out the conclusions of the Special Committee's report to the effect that the activities of foreign companies in colonial Territories were the principle obstacle to independence and to the establishment of social and economic justice.

35. With regard to the military activities of the colonial Powers in the territories they administered, the Special Committee had noted that they were one of the most serious obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and that in some cases they constituted a serious and growing threat to peace and international security. In its resolution 2326 (XXII), the General Assembly had requested the colonial Powers to dismantle their military bases and installations in colonial Territories and to refrain from establishing new ones and from using those that still existed to interfere with the liberation of the peoples in colonial Territories in the exercise of their legitimate rights to freedom and independence. No colonial Power, whether it were Portugal, the United Kingdom, the United States or certain others, had heeded that injunction. On the contrary those Powers were trying to preserve those bases or acquire others with a view to exerting political pressure on States that had newly gained their independence. The abusive use of military strength by the colonial Powers to suppress the legitimate aspirations of the colonized peoples to self-determination and independence must be rigorously condemned.

36. There seemed to be a direct relationship between the degree of success of the victories gained by those fighting for their freedom in certain colonial Territories and the obstinacy displayed by the NATO Powers in retaining certain strategic points. Consequently the small territories were acquiring ever increasing importance in the eyes of the colonialists, since they might be used to impose a collective colonialism, which would be a new form of subjection or would serve as the starting point for repressive operations. Guam, for example, was serving as a base for the United States in the Viet-Nam war. As the Special Committee pointed out in its report, the maintenance of bases was contrary to resolution 1514 (XV) and to the spirit of the United Nations Charter. The same might be said of Gibraltar and Puerto Rico. The United Kingdom, Australia and other colonial Powers invoked all manner of pretexts for their continued presence in certain Territories. In the belief that they were hoodwinking public opinion, those Powers proclaimed from time to time that important constitutional amendments had been introduced. However, when it came to specific Territories such as Papua and New Guinea, the indigenous inhabitants had very limited powers, and the colonial Administration was the only body that governed. In the British possessions, the introduction of new legislation had little meaning, since, in the last resort, the High Commissioner held absolute power, for example, in such Territories as Fiji, the Seychelles and St. Helena. The new status which had been conferred on a number of British Territories in the West Indies and the so-called



association with the colonial Power represented, in fact, annexation pure and simple. Similar conditions prevailed in Puerto Rico. The colonial Powers were anxious to conceal the actual situation and had continually refused to accept visiting missions, which would have provided first-hand information on the economic, social and political situation and on the wishes of the indigenous peoples.

37. Referring to the part which could be played, in the process of decolonization, by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations, he noted that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2311 (XXII) had scarcely been implemented. A number of institutions, such as IBRD, in reply to the letter addressed by the Secretary-General on 30 April 1968 to the international organizations concerned, requesting them to furnish information relating to the steps taken and/or envisaged by them in implementation of resolution 2311 (XXII), had stated that they had no intention of implementing the resolution. His delegation strongly protested against such a refusal, and felt that the loans granted by the Bank to Portugal and South Africa should be cancelled; the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations were expected to render assistance to the peoples of the colonial Territories, and should in particular not refuse to give assistance to the freedom fighters of Mozambique and Angola.

38. In his country's view, the efforts made by the imperialists to retain their hold on colonial Territories were the chief obstacle to total decolonization. The General Assembly must immediately invite the colonial Powers to take emergency measures for the transfer of authority to the representatives of the indigenous peoples. Those Powers must agree to dismantle all military bases, to safeguard the interests of the peoples, to prevent the remittance abroad of profits made by foreign concerns in the colonial Territories, and to put an end to foreign immigration and the deportation of indigenous people. Every remaining obstacle to the full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) must vanish without delay from all colonial Territories.

39. His country adhered to the policy which it had always followed in regard to colonial peoples, and would continue to render all necessary assistance to the imperialists' victims.

40. Miss STOKES (New Zealand) said that her delegation was not very happy about the new arrangement of the Committee's agenda, whereby some fifty Territories in addition to other subjects were to be dealt with in a single comprehensive debate lasting only a few days. New Zealand on many occasions in the past had voiced regret that more time had not been allotted to consideration of the problems of the small Non-Self-Governing Territories. As the decolonization process moved forward, the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories were inevitably those where there were increasingly difficult obstacles such as small size, remoteness and lack of resources. For those small communities, economic viability might be scarcely attainable, and political viability itself raised important considerations. She doubted whether the Committee could, in the few hours of debate available, discuss in an informed, positive and helpful way the whole range of problems entailed in

the future of some fifty small Territories; to that extent, she thought the Committee was failing fully to discharge its responsibilities towards those Territories.

41. New Zealand had voted in favour of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and had taken effective measures to comply with its objectives in those Territories where it was the responsible authority. In 1962, Western Samoa, a Trust Territory which New Zealand had administered since 1947, was the first Pacific Trust Territory to become independent. In August 1965, the Cook Islands had chosen, under United Nations supervision, to become fully self-governing in free association with New Zealand; they could become fully independent in the future if they so wished. New Zealand had also discharged its obligations in the case of Nauru, which had become independent in January 1968.

42. In Niue and the Tokelau Islands, constitutional developments were in accordance with the people's wishes. New Zealand representatives had made detailed statements in the Special Committee during the year concerning those two Territories, and a comprehensive annual report had been submitted to the Secretary-General in accordance with Article 73 *e* of the Charter. The peoples of Niue and the Tokelau Islands were well aware of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which, in 1963, had been translated into their languages, a copy of the text being made available to every family. New Zealand had encouraged the islanders to make known their views on the future. They were well aware that New Zealand would do all it could to enable them to exercise their right to self-determination as and when they so wished. But the people had made it clear that they wanted their constitutional progress to be deliberate. The New Zealand Government had undertaken to respect their wishes.

43. It had been a cause of disappointment, therefore, that the Special Committee had criticized New Zealand for its alleged slowness in promoting the political development of those Territories. In that connexion, she recalled that the New Zealand Prime Minister, in the statement he had made to the General Assembly at its 1694th plenary meeting on 14 October 1968, had stressed that the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories faced a variety of problems and that no single set of rules could be applied to them. He had also mentioned the special problems faced by the small Territories, which included Niue and the Tokelau Islands, which could not simply be ignored, declared non-existent or impatiently dismissed as evasions of a colonial power determined to hang on to the last. He had gone on to point out that, with regard to the future political development of Niue and the Tokelau Islands, his Government would continue to be guided by the wishes of the people.

44. During the year, the Special Committee had discussed the sending of visiting missions to Territories. New Zealand needed no convincing that visiting missions could play a valuable role, and had never excluded the possibility of a visit or visits to Niue and the Tokelau Islands before the right of self-determination was exercised. At the same time the New Zealand Government had informed the Special Committee that, in its view, it would be unreasonable for the United Nations to send a visiting mission to two of the

smallest and remotest Territories unless it were also making a wider tour of the area.

45. She regretted that it was not possible to comment in detail on all the Pacific Territories within the scope of such a debate. She would, if necessary, return at a later stage to the question of Fiji, a territory with which New Zealand had many and varied associations.

46. Her delegation would be especially interested to hear Australia's comments on developments in the situation in the Trust Territory of New Guinea. New Zealand had taken part in the 1968 Visiting Mission to New Guinea. Mr. J. M. McEwen, New Zealand Secretary for Maori and Island Affairs, had been elected Chairman of the Mission, which had travelled extensively in the Territory from February to April. The report<sup>2</sup> which had resulted was a most useful document, containing constructive suggestions on political and constitutional matters. The report generally commended the Australian Administration for what it had accomplished, especially in the economic field. The constructive approach of the Australian Government had been confirmed in the document "Programmes and Policies for the Economic Development of Papua and New Guinea", which had been made available to delegations during the session. Her delegation was particularly struck by the conclusions in the section of the report dealing with the future of New Guinea. It showed that, contrary to the impression gained at times in the Committee's debates, not all the peoples in colonial Territories sought immediate independence. It showed also that it was necessary to distinguish the problems of one territory from another and served as a warning against any attempt to seek to apply rigid formulas to every territory regardless of the real wishes of the population.

47. She reserved the right to speak again about those and other Territories at a later stage when draft resolutions were submitted.

48. Mr. KOTHARI (India) said that eight years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, forty-six Territories were still under colonial rule. Increasingly alarming problems were arising in southern Africa, where the rights of 20 million Africans were being violated in the most flagrant way. To quote the introduction to the annual report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, in that part of the world the United Nations was meeting "a solid wall of defiance" in its efforts to put an end to colonialism (A/7201/Add.1, para. 148). The Secretary-General had also pointed out that the basic cause for that situation was that certain administering Powers were not complying with United Nations resolutions and that other Powers appeared to be reluctant to extend their full co-operation to the Organization in the application of effective solutions to the outstanding problems (*ibid.*, para. 147). Such attitudes could be partly explained in terms of the economic interests of the old colonial Powers, which had been the object of detailed consideration in the Special Committee's report on the activities of foreign economic and other interests (A/7320 and Add.1).

49. In the second half of the twentieth century many developed countries had still not fully understood the evils of colonialism. Two administering Powers in particular were acting as if the world were still in the nineteenth century. Their attitude had been typified by an article in *The Economist* of 9 December 1865 (103 years ago) which had been reproduced in the same weekly on 11 December 1965. That article had stated that the Europeans, and above all the Anglo-Saxons, should in their own interest, control the industrial enterprises of Asia, Africa and those parts of the American continent settled by African, Asian or hybrid races; an industrial system should be established whereby a large coloured labour force would work under the direction of a small number of Europeans in conditions which would provide maximum production at a minimum cost. It could be seen that in certain colonies, especially in Africa, the situation had changed very little since that article had been written.

50. He wished to reiterate that his delegation and his Government fully supported the struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) to regain their national dignity and independence. His delegation also hoped that the relevant administering Powers and their allies would heed the voice of the international community before it was too late.

51. In the case of the small Territories, he noted that, according to the report of the Special Committee, the rate of progress towards self-government and independence had so far been very slow. The same old methods of exploiting the people and their land were still being used. For example, according to the report of the administering Power, in the Seychelles there was a ruling class composed of European landowners, and a lower class principally composed of Africans. In that Territory, the constitutional changes were not of a kind to promote the process of decolonization. Under the terms of the Seychelles Order 1967, the Governing Council of the islands was composed of three *ex officio* members and four nominated members along with eight elected members, but in any case it was simply an advisory body as, under the new Constitution, the key powers were concentrated in the hands of the Governor.

52. The administering Powers had continued to maintain their intransigent attitude on the question of visiting missions, and the Committee should use all its influence to ensure that that attitude changed.

53. His delegation denounced the decision of the United Kingdom to separate three of the Seychelles and form a "British Indian Ocean Territory" for military purposes. Such an action violated the territorial integrity of the Seychelles; moreover, as the Special Committee had pointed out, the construction of military bases in that "British Indian Ocean Territory" would increase the tension in Africa and in Asia and would hamper the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

54. In the case of the Fiji Islands, India feared the dangers inherent in a settlement imposed upon a colony where two or more communities lived. For the independence of the Fiji Islands to be a practicable proposition, an arrangement

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 2 (T/1690).

should be reached which would encourage interracial co-operation, confidence, and harmony. It appeared that the principal parties were at present trying to draw up mutually acceptable constitutional arrangements. He hoped that their efforts would be most successful and that the colonial régime in that Territory would shortly be ended.

55. It was the opinion of his delegation that the continuance of colonial domination in certain Territories undermined the authority of the United Nations and prejudiced the chances for lasting peace. It was to be hoped that the allies and friends of colonial Powers which had still not understood the inexorable march of history would contrive to persuade them that it was in their own interests to consider the realities of the situation.

56. Mr. SKINNER (Guatemala), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that on 25 November 1968 (1795th meeting) the representative of the United Kingdom had stated that his country and Guatemala were continuing their efforts to reach an agreement with regard to Belize (British Honduras). He wished to point out that since Belize was not a Trust Territory under the terms of the Charter, the Fourth Committee was not competent to discuss it.

57. Mr. LUARD (United Kingdom) said that it was regrettable that the USSR representative levelled accusations in such extreme and vague terms against certain

administering Powers. According to that representative, all the small Territories would be used as military bases; in fact, out of the two cases which he had mentioned—Ascension Island and Gibraltar—only Gibraltar had a military base, and it could hardly be said that the right of its population to self-determination was thereby impaired. The Special Committee's report clearly established that there were only military bases on two of the Territories which the United Kingdom administered.

58. In fact, it was known that the USSR too was involved in imperialist activities, but its representative felt that discretion was important on that matter.

59. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said in reply to the representative of the United Kingdom that he had confined himself to making general remarks because the facts to which he had referred were already well known and, moreover, he did not wish to delay the Committee's consideration of the ten items before it.

60. In connexion with the United Kingdom representative's remark on the foreign policy of the USSR, he could give a detailed reply showing that his country pursued a policy of peaceful coexistence with other systems; however, such a discussion would not be relevant to the agenda.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*