



**Chairman:** Mr. Carlos GIAMBRUNO  
(Uruguay).

AGENDA ITEM 51

**Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights (continued) (A/8778 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.3/631, A/C.3/L.1973)**

1. Mr. KHMELNITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that consideration of the item under discussion was always topical because many peoples were still under the yoke of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism. That situation not only impeded the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination but also the development of co-operation and the consolidation of world peace.

2. The current debate coincided almost exactly with the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a historic event for all the peoples of the world. In December 1922 for the first time a multinational State had emerged, based on a new concept, a union of sovereign independent republics. That event must be considered as the true expression of the right of peoples to self-determination, of the right of a nation freely to decide its political status and to determine its economic and cultural development. In that connexion he wished to recall the role of Lenin, who had not only advanced the idea of a Soviet socialist State, but had also set forth the principles of a national policy recognizing the right of nations to self-determination, the right to secede and form an independent State as well as the principle of the equality of nations and the voluntary nature of their union. The development of the multinational Soviet State had confirmed the truth of the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that only socialist democracy made it possible to take into consideration the realities of each people in a multinational State. Proclamation of the equality and the sovereignty of the peoples of the USSR had made it possible to unite the nationalities on a federal basis. Thus a favourable climate had been created for the building of a society based on socialism with common goals, which united millions of peasants and workers in various countries. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, for its part, now had a flourishing agriculture, its industrial production was 113 times higher than what it had been before the First World War; the level of literacy was high inasmuch as three out of every five persons in

the active population, had received secondary or higher education. The Byelorussian Republic had 28 universities attended by 50,000 students, a number that was greater than the total number of students in Czarist Russia. He thought that the experience of peoples who, through their collective efforts, had succeeded in developing a socialist society in a multinational State and in solving very complex national problems was invaluable for peoples struggling for their social and national liberation.

3. The Byelorussian SSR had always been on the side of those who were fighting oppression and aggression and worked for peace and social progress. It would continue to support the efforts of peoples seeking to free themselves from the yoke of colonialism, particularly in southern Africa.

4. The Byelorussian SSR would continue to support all United Nations decisions in favour of the elimination of colonialist and racist régimes. It was guided by the conclusions of the XXIVth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union according to which all United Nations resolutions on the elimination of colonial régimes and on the eradication of *apartheid* and racism should be fully implemented. Since the inception of the United Nations, the Byelorussian SSR had consistently taken a position in favour of the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination, one of the essential principles of international law. The Byelorussian SSR had actively participated in the drafting and adoption of important international instruments such as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the programme of action for the full implementation of that Declaration, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as other texts. The Byelorussian SSR had always condemned the policy of States that violated the right of peoples to self-government and it particularly condemned South Africa which, despite the termination in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 of its mandate over South West Africa, had annexed that Territory and was applying a policy of *apartheid* there. Today most of the people of Namibia lived in slavery and were deprived of their rights. In Southern Rhodesia, the arrival of the Pierce Commission had led to many disorders proving that the people of Zimbabwe did not want an Anglo-Rhodesian solution. Moreover, following the meetings of the Security Council, in January

and February 1972, at Addis Ababa, the Chairman of the African National Council, Mr. Muzorewa, had clearly explained the position of the people of Zimbabwe regarding the collusion between the United Kingdom and the racist régime and their refusal to approve those shameful agreements. Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) had taken up arms and were fighting the Portuguese. In his opinion, all of mankind was obligated to support their legitimate efforts; accordingly, an appeal should be made to all countries concerned to implement United Nations resolutions. In that connexion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR concurred in the view of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1973, in which they expressed their deep concern at the fact that certain States, particularly States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), refused to implement United Nations resolutions. The Byelorussian delegation therefore supported operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which improved the text and strengthened the effectiveness of United Nations action in the field of decolonization. As for the draft resolution as a whole, however, some of its provisions should be clarified.

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Afghanistan and Rwanda had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1973.

6. Mr. KANGWA (Zambia) noted that much had been said in the Third Committee and elsewhere regarding the fundamental importance of self-determination in the effective observance of human rights. The States Members of the United Nations had generally condemned the denial of human rights by racist and alien régimes in Africa and elsewhere and many statements had been made expressing sympathy for the millions of innocent persons who, in inhuman and degrading conditions, continued to suffer from colonialism and foreign domination in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and other colonial territories under foreign domination. Yet, despite the condemnations and expressions of sympathy, the situation was unchanged and his delegation was obliged to question the sincerity of certain great Powers and States members of NATO. It could not understand how a Member State could condemn the prevailing situation while helping racist régimes, through economic and military assistance, to prevent the implementation of the provisions of the Charter and of resolutions on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Zambia had stated repeatedly that to ensure observance of human rights in colonial countries and those under foreign domination, political power must be in the hands of the indigenous population. That was why it rejected the negative approach of Member States which maintained that the Third Committee was not a political forum. His delegation did not see how it was possible to discuss non-observance of human rights in colonial and racist countries without speaking of the causes and examining the question of the right of the colonial or racist régimes to control by force the activities of the human beings living in those territories. His delegation felt that the United Nations should give priority attention to the causes of the prob-

lem and then consider the effects. In South Africa and Namibia, blacks lived in an unprecedented state of terror and oppression. Because of laws such as that on the suppression of communism, it was impossible for Africans to engage in political activity without breaking the law and becoming guilty of offences. Zambia, like all peace and freedom-loving countries, was also concerned at the annexation by South Africa of the international Territory of Namibia. In the British colony of Southern Rhodesia, the white minority alone enjoyed fundamental human rights. The police methods applied by the South African police had been adopted in Southern Rhodesia and the "security" measures introduced recently by the rebel régime of Ian Smith sought to abolish the last vestiges of human rights in that colony.

7. Zambia considered that the United Kingdom, as the administering Power of Southern Rhodesia, had the moral and political obligation to protect the African population of that colony from the rebels. The African people of Zimbabwe could not trust the latter and had therefore rejected the proposals for a settlement, refusing to fall into the trap set for them and to legitimize the violation of human rights by recognizing the existence of the rebel régime.

8. In the so-called Portuguese Territories also, Africans were deprived of fundamental human rights. Portugal was a very poor country which, in its struggle against liberation movements, received massive economic and military assistance from Western Powers and States members of NATO. Without that assistance, Portugal would already have admitted defeat. Actually, according to the Special Mission 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 (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I) that had gone to Guinea (Bissau), the liberation movements controlled vast areas of that Territory. In addition, in Angola and Mozambique the liberation movements had also liberated large areas. When Portuguese troops had to retreat from an area, they destroyed everything in their path and the liberation movements had to rescue the population, provide food and shelter, construct hospitals, schools and other facilities, which was obviously very difficult in view of their very limited resources. He therefore felt that the Third Committee could not remain insensitive to the sufferings of the populations of liberated areas and that, regardless of the views of certain Member States, the Committee should call upon the United Nations and the specialized agencies to provide humanitarian assistance to those populations.

9. His delegation also supported the idea of inviting liberation movements like PAIGC (Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde), FRELIMO (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique) and others recognized by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to address the Third Committee on the social and humanitarian needs in the liberated areas. It also supported the idea of requesting the Secretary-General in consultation with the specialized agencies, OAU and

interested non-governmental organizations, to submit a preliminary report at the twenty-eighth session recommending practical means of extending humanitarian assistance to the peoples of the liberated areas and the colonies. That was one of the reasons why Zambia had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.3/L.1973.

10. Zambia had always believed that a solution to the Middle East problem could not be found without taking into account the rights and aspirations of the people of Palestine and attached great importance to the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967). It joined those delegations which had called upon Israel to co-operate and withdraw from the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 conflict.

11. In order to ensure the effective observance of human rights, the following measures should be adopted: firstly, all Member States, and in particular those members of NATO, should strictly observe the trade and arms embargo and other sanctions against the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa. Secondly, the Western and NATO countries—which were in the best position to do so because they sustained the Portuguese economy and army—should put political and diplomatic pressure on Portugal to surrender before it was too late. Thirdly, South Africa should be told to refrain from any political and military commitments in Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola and to give up its *apartheid* policy; certain NATO and Western countries which had huge investments in South Africa could play an influential role in that respect. Fourthly, the United Kingdom Government should call a constitutional conference in Southern Rhodesia, in which all racial groups would be fairly represented, to discuss the future of that colony. If Ian Smith's rebel régime failed to respond positively to that suggestion, there was no alternative but to use force. Fifthly, the United States Government should stop buying Rhodesian chrome so as to ensure the effectiveness of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; his delegation hoped that that Government would respond positively to its appeal. Lastly, the NATO countries should join those freedom-loving countries which were giving material support to the liberation movements in colonial and foreign-dominated countries in order to ensure the speedy implementation of the right to self-determination and observance of human rights.

12. The Africans and all those nations which had consistently condemned colonialism and racism in southern Africa and elsewhere believed in non-violence, as the Lusaka Manifesto had shown when it had appealed to the racist régimes to enter into negotiations. Unfortunately, that appeal had met with a rebuff. In the circumstances, his delegation would like to ask those Member States which had always preached the principles of a peaceful settlement of the problems of southern Africa what solution they proposed; the African peoples could wait no longer in a state of servitude and no foreign rule, whatever its character, could be a substitute for independence. That was why the struggle for self-determination in the colonial and

foreign-dominated countries would continue and might lead to increasing loss of human life and property. That was also why Zambia appealed once more to all Member States, particularly those which were members of NATO, and Western countries, to realize the situation and take effective and positive measures to persuade the racist régimes to change their policies before it was too late.

13. Mr. ILOY (Congo) said that imperialism, capitalism and colonialism were the main causes of the slavery which was still rife in the colonies in the twentieth century. The question under consideration by the Third Committee represented an effort by the United Nations, confronted with the inhuman policies of enslavement of the colonial and capitalist nations, to enable man to enjoy his rights to self-determination and independence, i.e., to full freedom. That aspiration of the peoples under foreign and colonial domination should be understood by the colonial and capitalist Powers which had also, in the course of their history, had to take up arms to win their freedom.

14. In the twentieth century, the fight for freedom was mainly being waged in the African continent. The weapons of the capitalist and colonialist Powers were so highly developed that there were countless victims every day. Those victims were the fighters of the African and Palestinian liberation movements and the people of the liberated areas in the Portuguese Territories, against whom the Portuguese armed forces were using napalm bombs and chemicals. More than three quarters of the colonial peoples were leading a life unfit for human beings in the areas controlled by Portugal, the illegal régime of the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia and the fascist régime of Pretoria. Yet, Portugal and South Africa had signed the Charter of the United Nations and should endeavour to implement the decisions and resolutions of the competent United Nations organs, in particular the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) concerning the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration. Portugal and South Africa should also apply the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilians in Times of War of 12 August 1949, to the fighters of the liberation movements and the civilians who had been arbitrarily arrested. Yet, in that part of the world those countries were maintaining what Mr. Henri Lopes, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of the Congo, had described at the 2045th plenary meeting of the General Assembly as a situation in flagrant contravention of the principles of the Charter and a criminal denial of man's fundamental human rights, his dignity, value, equality and the rights of peoples. Portugal was a small country which could not pursue that colonial war without the financial, military, political and diplomatic complicity of certain Powers, in particular the NATO Powers. Strengthened by that same support, the minority racist régime of Pretoria not only imposed its dictatorship and inhuman *apartheid* régime in South Africa and Namibia but also threatened the

sovereignty and peace of States in southern and central Africa which had thrown off the colonial yoke. Portuguese aggression against the countries bordering on the so-called Portuguese Territories and the persistent intervention of the South African police, armed forces and mercenaries disturbed order and international peace, in flagrant violation of the principles of international law concerning friendly relations among States and peaceful coexistence.

15. His delegation appealed to the NATO Powers to grant the colonial peoples the right to freedom, which was honoured in their own national constitutions, and to discontinue all forms of assistance to Portugal. The People's Republic of the Congo, for its part, had no relations with Portugal and South Africa. It gave and would continue to give moral, material and financial support to the liberation movements, in particular to MPLA (Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola), whose headquarters was at Brazzaville. It considered the national liberation movements of Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Cape Verde and Mozambique to be the only true representatives of the peoples of those Territories and called upon the Security Council to take all necessary steps to ensure the full and rapid implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

16. Mr. ZAIDI (Pakistan) said that the recognition in the Charter of the United Nations of the right of peoples to determine their own destiny had accelerated the process of decolonization in the last quarter of a century. Pakistan also owed its independence to the exercise of that right, which had enabled the people in the Moslem majority areas of British India, in the east and west of the subcontinent, to join together to create the State of Pakistan. It was thus natural for Pakistan to support the right of all peoples under colonial and alien rule to determine their own political and economic future.

17. The progress made so far notwithstanding, the goals established by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) were still far from being achieved. That was especially true in southern Africa, where Portugal continued to impose its oppressive rule on its colonial Territories. The illegal racist minority régime of Ian Smith remained entrenched in Zimbabwe. The administering Power, the United Kingdom, could not avoid its responsibility for assuring majority rule in that country.

18. Unless the last vestiges of colonialism were eradicated from southern Africa, the explosive situation prevailing there might give rise to a world-wide conflagration. The United Nations should adopt the most stringent measures to make the régimes in southern Africa desist from their inhuman course. To be meaningful, those measures would require the full support of the major economic and military partners of the racist régimes in southern Africa, for it was with their help that those régimes were able to resist the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous people for dignity and liberation. His delegation could not accept the arguments advanced by certain States to justify their failure to comply with the decisions of the Security

Council. The conflict in the Middle East was also the result of the denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Palestine. Until that right was recognized and the legitimate aspirations of that people had been accorded a central place in any solution of the question, the problem would go unsolved. The United Nations, which had, after all, helped to bring about the situation in which the Palestinian people found itself, had a special responsibility towards that unfortunate and heroic people. His delegation had been heartened to note that the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to self-determination had been recognized in several General Assembly resolutions. It hoped that in the near future that people would be able to assert its own identity and overcome the consequences of oppression and aggression.

19. In resolution 2649 (XXV), the General Assembly had requested the Commission on Human Rights to study the implementation of the United Nations resolutions relating to the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination. The Secretary-General was to be congratulated on the valuable reports he had submitted to the Commission on the subject.

20. United Nations resolutions and declarations had always drawn a clear distinction between instances where the exercise of the right to self-determination was legitimate and instances where it was not. The right of peoples to self-determination was tempered by the principle of the territorial integrity of States. The principle of self-determination could not extend to areas which were integral parts of the territories of Member States. It was in recognition of that principle that paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) provided that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a sovereign State was incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter. If any exceptions to that principle were allowed, it would cause such anarchy as to destroy the very basis of international order. Recent events had served to underline the relevance of that principle. In 1971, the United Nations had been witness to the physical dismemberment of a Member State by the use of external armed intervention. If that situation was not to become a precedent and to imperil the security and territorial integrity of other States, it was important that the results of the incident in question should be normalized through negotiations on a basis of equity. If the international community were to accept the results of the use of force as a *fait accompli*, that would reflect poorly on its adherence to the principles of the Charter. The Committee should therefore reaffirm that the right to self-determination should be speedily accorded to all peoples entitled to it, while it should also underline the importance of adhering to the principle of the territorial integrity of legally established sovereign States.

21. Mr. VARGA (Hungary) said that the collapse of the main colonial empires had failed to bring with it the end of colonial oppression and exploitation. Vestiges of colonialism still remained and the champions of colonialism were frantically struggling to survive.

As a result, millions of people continued to suffer from colonial oppression. The ex-colonial Powers spared no effort to continue wielding influence in many parts of the world, and especially in Africa. In so doing, they lent many-sided support to the racist, reactionary régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the bastions of neo-colonialism. It was also with their help that Portugal was conducting a genocidal war in its African colonies. Such policies promoted the attainment of their neo-colonialist aims, since the ruthless exploitation of the African population enabled them to pocket enormous profits.

22. The survival of colonialism in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal, together with the desperate efforts of the ex-colonial Powers to continue to exercise political, economic and military influence in those areas were the reasons why relevant United Nations resolutions concerning the right to self-determination of colonial peoples had failed to have any effect. His delegation pledged its full support to United Nations efforts to liquidate the last vestiges of the colonial system and to help oppressed peoples to win independence at the earliest possible date. His Government endorsed the principles and objectives laid down in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and supported the peoples fighting against imperialism and colonialism. In particular, it regarded as legitimate the struggle waged by the peoples of South Africa, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). It also pledged its solidarity with the just struggle of the Palestinian people. It did not recognize the racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia. It condemned the colonial aspirations of Portugal, the racist policies of South Africa and all countries which supported those reactionary régimes.

23. His delegation supported the draft resolution on the item (A/C.3/L.1973); however, it felt that the word "political" should be inserted after the word "humanitarian" in preambular paragraph 7.

24. Mrs. DAES (Greece) said that the fundamental principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples was of paramount importance in the common law of mankind. Denial of that right was not only incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations but also constituted a serious impediment to world peace and international co-operation.

25. Her country had always supported the Organization in its efforts to abolish the colonial system. From the outset, it had been closely associated with all action taken to promote and implement the right of peoples throughout the world to self-determination. In particular, it had supported the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the International Covenants on Human Rights, resolution VIII of the International Conference on Human Rights, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the

United Nations. It had ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It contributed to the programme for providing study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories and to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. It was implementing all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and had banned all commercial transactions and other relations with the Government of Southern Rhodesia.

26. With regard to the effective steps to be taken to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions on the elimination of colonialism and racism, her delegation wished to make certain suggestions. All States should respect the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace, as provided in Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter. They should ratify the international Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, implement all the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly those of the Security Council, take constitutional, legislative and administrative measures for the speedy realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, independence, freedom, justice and human dignity. The Governments of Member States, the United Nations, the specialized agencies and all international institutions should carry out a campaign to enlighten the peoples of the world, and particularly youth, with a view to eliminating all forms of racial discrimination, including *apartheid*. They should intensify their efforts in the field of public information, using all the mass media, including the press, radio and television. Member States should co-operate with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Finally, Member States should study further the application of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as well as the principle of the sovereign equality of States, which included, *inter alia*, respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of States and non-interference in their internal affairs, in accordance with the Charter. In that connexion, her delegation hoped that the Commission on Human Rights would consider at its twenty-ninth session the relevant resolutions of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

27. Mr. LUBIK (Poland) said that his Government had always supported United Nations efforts to eliminate colonialism and racism and to ensure the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. His country had assisted in the preparation and adoption of effective international measures to combat colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and all forms of national oppression. It firmly supported the just struggle of peoples for self-determination and liberation from colonial and foreign domination in South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and also the struggle of the Palestinian people. His country

did not maintain diplomatic, economic, cultural or other relations with the racist and colonialist régimes and condemned the actions of Governments which, through their assistance to those régimes, were encouraging them to continue their inhuman policy directed against peoples struggling for their independence.

28. The existence of colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination on the African continent and in other parts of the world constituted a permanent threat to international peace and security. His country was continuing to provide support to all African national liberation movements struggling for the realization of their fundamental human rights and was in favour of the full and speedy implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

29. His delegation hoped that the current discussion in the Committee on the item would lead to the adoption of new instruments to combat the evils of the twentieth century. It believed that the efforts being made by his country and other progressive countries with a view to ensuring decolonization, equality and the maintenance of international peace and security would soon bear fruit. His delegation subscribed to the ideas contained in the draft resolution before the Committee; however, it had reservations regarding the phrase "humanitarian and material assistance" in operative paragraph 5, because it felt that political assistance was also needed. Material assistance was of course very important, but it should be clearly stated in the resolution that such assistance should be provided by various United Nations programmes which were financed by voluntary contributions. If the sponsors would take into account his suggestions, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

30. Mrs. LAFONTANT (United States of America) said that respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, as set out in Article 1 of the Charter, was one of the most important purposes of the United Nations. During the preceding few years, substantial progress had been made in the field of decolonization, largely owing to the efforts of the United Nations. Ninety-seven per cent of the people who had been under colonial domination in 1940 had achieved self-determination and independence. Her delegation had on many occasions reaffirmed her Government's support for the right of individuals and peoples freely to determine their own destinies. The right to self-determination and independence must be universal. Self-determination was a continuing process whereby peoples could decide, in the light of existing conditions, the manner in which they wished to exercise that right. Independence was only one of the alternatives from which peoples could choose. Freedom of choice was indispensable to the exercise of the right of self-determination and if that freedom was to be meaningful it must be associated with freedom of thought, conscience, expression, movement and association.

31. Many peoples still remained under colonial rule or were otherwise denied the right freely to determine

their own future. Peoples and nations which had enjoyed freedom and independence before the Second World War had been denied the basic rights of the human person. The situation in South Africa, where 18 million blacks and other racial minorities had been denied the right to full participation in the political, economic and social life of the nation, was of special concern. The United States supported the right of the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea to self-determination.

32. There had been a tendency to view the right of self-determination as a collective right affecting groups of people. There was, however, also the basic right of the individual who was oppressed or otherwise dissatisfied with his condition to leave his country and seek his destiny elsewhere. Freedom of movement, guaranteed under article 13 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, was a fundamental freedom which was as important as freedom of thought and expression. It enabled the individual freely to choose the society most congenial to his ideals. Her delegation was heartened to see that in law and in practice most countries recognized article 13, paragraph 2, and did not impose insuperable barriers to their nationals' freedom of movement or to emigration. Freedom of movement must be regarded as an integral part of the right of peoples to self-determination.

33. Mr. GHACHEM (Tunisia) said that his country attached the greatest importance to the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and to the speedy granting of independence to colonial peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights. It had always upheld the rights of freedom fighters and wished to reaffirm its solidarity with oppressed peoples struggling for the implementation of the principles embodied in the Charter, the Universal Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other international instruments. In resolution 2787 (XXVI), the General Assembly had confirmed the legality of the peoples' struggle for self-determination and liberation from colonial and foreign domination. That was precisely the situation of the peoples of southern Africa, in particular those of Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), as well as of the Palestinian people. Like all other peoples, the Palestinian people was entitled to its homeland. However, General Assembly resolution 194 (III), paragraph 11 of which affirmed the refugees' right to return, was still not being implemented; the Palestinian people's right to survival was being suppressed by the Israeli Zionists, who persisted in flouting the General Assembly resolutions and defying the United Nations, the four great Powers and all Members of the Organization which had witnessed and assisted the birth of their country. He noted that when Israel, South Africa or Rhodesia was involved, certain great Powers paid no heed to the United Nations, whose moral authority could only decline as a result.

34. Tunisia did not maintain diplomatic, economic or other relations with the racist and colonial régimes,

including those in South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal, and believed that steps should be taken to isolate those countries. The struggle of the subjugated peoples was following the tide of history, and any attempt to halt it was doomed to failure.

35. The process of negotiations which had been initiated regarding Namibia should continue on the basis of the independence of peoples and of territorial integrity and should be extended to African colonial problems as a whole.

36. Despite repeated condemnations by the United Nations, Portugal refused to change in any way and clung to legal fictions in an attempt to justify an indefensible policy, while endeavouring to crush by armed force the demands of the peoples under its domination. Experience showed, however, that colonial Powers always came to recognize in the end the right of peoples to self-determination. Portugal should therefore accept a political solution and negotiate with the liberation movements. As to the United Nations, it should show that it was resolved to eliminate colonialism by increasing its moral and material support of the liberation movements. The specialized agencies should also pursue their efforts in that direction. Finally, all peoples and countries devoted to peace and justice should intensify their assistance to the liberation movements. In order to ensure the implementation of the General Assembly resolutions relating to racism and colonialism, the Security Council should not hesitate to take new measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

37. Tunisia, for its part, would continue to provide assistance to the liberation movements which were struggling for the implementation of fundamental human rights and for their national independence; it would do so not out of fanaticism and in order to incite violence but, in the words of President Bourguiba, because it was uncompromising in everything that had to do with human dignity.

38. Mr. KRUMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union's position regarding the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was well known. For the preceding 55 years, since the socialist revolution, the Soviet people had been constantly concerned with the question and had supported the struggle of the peoples oppressed by imperialism, in keeping with the ideological inheritance of Lenin, founder of the Soviet State, who had foreseen how important the problem would become for the world.

39. The Soviet State's contribution to the struggle against colonial oppression was determined by the multinational character of the Soviet State itself. The fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was based on the total equality of the peoples composing it and was the first example in history of a voluntary union of free and equal peoples, would be marked on 30 December 1972. The establishment of the Soviet Union, an

expression of the Marxist-Leninist nationalities policy, had been a major event with incalculable political, social and economic consequences; it had enabled new standards of international co-operation to be set and had been a factor in the internationalization of the proletariat. A people of a new kind had arisen—one which had worked for the construction of socialism and fought to defend it; new and harmonious relations had been formed, in a spirit of brotherhood and co-operation, between classes, between social groups and among nations themselves. The enormous progress made in all fields demonstrated the effectiveness of that concept.

40. The right to self-determination was one of the principles which formed the basis of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet State, whose contribution to the struggle of peoples for the elimination of colonialism was reflected in a series of legislative texts adopted after the October Revolution. After the Second World War and the defeat of the Fascist military forces, which had resulted in particular from the participation of the Soviet people, a great movement had arisen for the elimination of régimes of colonial exploitation and oppression and more than 70 colonial Territories had gained independence. The collapse of colonialism was a great victory for the progressive forces of mankind; it had enabled millions of people to regain their freedom and dignity. The support consistently provided by the Soviet Union to national liberation movements had played a major role in the establishment of the right of nations to self-determination as a principle of international law which had, on the proposal of the Soviet Union, been embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. The Soviet Union had also been among the sponsors of many extremely important resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and other United Nations organs regarding the struggle against colonialism and the realization of the principle of self-determination.

41. The adoption of such documents as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and, above all, the Declaration on Social Progress and Development had greatly assisted colonial peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence.

42. Yet, the struggle was far from ended. More than 10 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, colonialism continued to be rampant both in its classic form and in disguised forms. The attempts to involve certain independent countries in imperialist military and political agreements, the establishment of puppet régimes, the imposition of unjust agreements in trade and other fields, and the granting of economic

or technical assistance with political conditions attached were various manifestations of contemporary neo-colonialism. In that context, attention should also be drawn to the policy being pursued by members of NATO who were openly supporting the colonial and racist régimes in Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and thus encouraging them to flout United Nations resolutions and decisions with impunity. He also wished to cite the case of the Gulf Oil Company, recently reported in the American press; Gulf Oil, reaping large profits in the Portuguese Territories, where it had made substantial investments, would in 1972 pay the Portuguese colonial authorities more than \$30 million in royalties, a sum equal to half of Portugal's expenditure in the criminal war it was waging in Angola. It was perfectly obvious that Portugal would not be able to retain its African Territories without the assistance of its allies. He also wished to mention the agreements reached between Lisbon and the NATO countries for the establishment of military bases in the Azores, Cape Verde, Guinea (Bissau) and Angola.

43. To achieve their goals, the colonial régimes resorted to all sorts of stratagems. They maintained that the peoples of southern Africa wished to undertake a "peaceful dialogue", but that was obviously a manoeuvre aimed at dividing the African States, destroying anti-imperialist unity and maintaining southern Africa in the capitalist orbit, not only as a bastion against independent Africa but also as a supplier of precious metals. The Soviet Union strongly objected to those so-called dialogues, which were based on inequality and discrimination and enabled the stronger party to obtain whatever it wanted.

44. He then drew attention to the struggle of the Arab countries, which for more than five years had been victims of Israeli aggression. The United Nations had demanded on many occasions that Israel should withdraw its armed forces from Arab territories and permit the Palestinians to return to their homes, but Israel, disregarded those decisions and continued its war of occupation, Israeli military circles being the paid agents of imperialism and reaction.

45. His delegation wished to stress once again that the principle of self-determination of peoples was not merely a political principle; it was also a principle of international law which in fact responded to a demand by the popular masses throughout the world. As a result, the time had passed when imperialism, arms in hand, imposed its law. In that regard, it was impossible to overemphasize the importance of the Security Council meetings at Addis Ababa, at which the representatives of the African peoples, supported by their allies, particularly the socialist countries, had succeeded in unmasking in Africa itself the implacable enemies of Africa. The African peoples knew that the struggle would be long, but if they remained united and co-operated with progressive forces throughout the world, particularly the socialist countries, their struggle would be crowned with success. No matter what methods were employed by the forces of imperialism, the peoples struggling against colonialism, aggression and foreign occupation were always victorious in the end. The elimination of colonialism and racism was, moreover, essential to the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world. In the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the XXIVth Congress, Mr. Brezhnev had recently stressed once again the importance of implementing the United Nations decisions regarding the elimination of the last colonial régimes and of universally condemning all manifestations of racism and *apartheid*.

46. The policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics derived from the very nature of socialist society and Marxist-Leninist ideology; it was incompatible with the exploitation of man by man, of one nation by another. The Soviet Union was implementing the resolutions of the United Nations, including those providing for sanctions against the racist régimes in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. It hoped that all peoples struggling for liberation, particularly those of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), would gain independence, and it would continue to give them its full support.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*