



UN L  
MAY 19 1987  
/ A COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE  
19th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 7 November 1985  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 112: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

(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

AGENDA ITEM 109: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(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

AGENDA ITEM 111: 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 (continued)

/...

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.4/40/SR.19  
20 November 1985  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

A/C.4/40/SR.19  
English  
Page 2

CONTENTS (continued)

- (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

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

- (a) REPORT OF THE COUNCIL
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (c) REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 112: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/781)

AGENDA ITEM 113: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/718)

1. Mr. SHOUNA (Sudan) said that the United Nations and the international community had a responsibility towards the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and should give ongoing attention to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the question of offers of study and training by Member States to the inhabitants of those Territories. During the debates, representatives had emphasized that the freedom and independence of colonial peoples were a priority of the United Nations. The importance given to that issue, however, should be translated into concrete measures in all fields, especially teaching and training, so as to enable those peoples to prepare for independence and their economic and social development.

2. The Sudan had contributed to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa by accepting a number of South African students into its teaching and training institutions. Tuition, board and the medical expenses of those students had been borne by the Government. The delegation of Sudan called upon Member States to pay contributions to the Programme so as to enable it to pursue its activities and offer the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories an opportunity to receive training. The administering Powers should take all the necessary steps to inform the peoples concerned of the means put at their disposal. The specialized agencies could, in their respective fields, contribute to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/40/3, A/40/23 (Part VII), A/40/113, 121, 429, 529, 692 and Corr.1; A/C.4/40/L.2; A/AC.109/801 and Corr.1, 802-807, 808 and Corr.1, 809-815, 816/Rev.1, 817-820, 823, 827 and Corr.1, 829, 832 and 834)

(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

AGENDA ITEM 109: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/40/23 (Part V) and A/40/629)

(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

AGENDA ITEM 111: 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 (continued) (A/40/23 (Part V), A/40/318 and Add.1; A/AC.109/L.1558 and L.1561)

(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

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/40/3, chaps. I-VI E)

(a) REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

(c) REPORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

3. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that because of the remarkable success in the field of decolonization, colonialism would soon be a thing of the past. But although the map of the world had changed radically over the past 40 years, the United Nations decolonization machinery was still the same. Instead of examining what the Organization could do for the well-being of the remaining colonial peoples, representatives continued to trot out the same old stereotyped phrases. The assertion that most of those peoples wished to keep their present status was labelled as a colonialist manoeuvre. Yet refusing to recognize that, with few exceptions, colonialism was a thing of the past, served only to undermine the Organization's credibility and reduce its capacity to tackle the real problems.

4. The case of Namibia was an exception. The entire international community was impatient to see that Territory secure its independence in accordance with the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). All the same, he wondered whether it was legitimate for the Fourth Committee to spend valuable time discussing a question which would soon be debated by the plenary Assembly itself, and which was the subject of constant debate elsewhere than in the Committee. The Committee's decision provided for a number of delegations, which had nothing to contribute to Africa or to the solution of its problems, a risk-free opportunity to snipe at Western countries in order to lend credibility to their ideological dogma. But such posturing did not fool anyone, least of all the Namibian people, who would surely prefer a reasoned and sensible discussion of their predicament to point-scoring exchanges.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

5. The impression gained from the proceedings was that there was an inverse relationship between the diminishing phenomenon of colonialism and the resources devoted to it by the United Nations. There were no longer any vast colonial empires and, in the great majority of cases, the Territories dealt with were truly tiny. By discussing and acting on each Territory separately, the Committee was "missing the wood for the trees", and it was using outdated theories of colonialism without taking account of the facts. For example, one argument advanced was that all peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories were by definition disadvantaged and that there was necessarily something radically amiss if they were not yet independent. It seemed that those peoples were alone in believing that independence was perhaps not the solution for a territory of 10,000 inhabitants. Artificial anxieties were being created and amplified, and, wholly unjustified development priorities were advocated. No one seemed to want to ask the one really valid question: whether the administering Powers were properly fulfilling their obligations in the spirit of Article 73 of the Charter.

6. Over the years, the United Kingdom had spared no effort to implement the exacting standards contained in the Charter. The fact that none of its dependent territories had yet indicated any wish to become independent was significant; the United Kingdom would not force them to do so, nor would it stand in the way of their independence if such was their wish.

7. With regard to "foreign economic interests", neither the debates on that subject nor the texts of draft resolutions could contribute to a greater understanding or the solution of the few colonial problems which remained. On the contrary, those mechanical and fossilized assertions which had lost all relationship to reality, served only to complicate the issue by introducing an East-West dimension and did not enhance the reputation of the Committee as a forum for the advancement of Non-Self-Governing peoples. Thus, the representatives of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria had sought to display their indignation because some Western countries had "broken" consensus. But consensus was not an abstract concept which could be monopolized by anyone who saw fit to lay claim to it. It was the result of a whole process which involved compromise and the search for common principles. The same representatives had announced that subsequent texts would be tougher. That was proof that the objective of some delegations was not to solve colonial problems but to cast aspersions on the administering Powers.

8. The United Kingdom was proud of the part it had played in decolonization, and proud of the good government and respect for the rule of law established in the countries placed under its administration. Throughout the process of decolonization, it had involved United Nations bodies as much as possible in the effort to underline the identity of interests between the administering Power, the dependent Territories and the international community.

9. Mr. NAVARRO (Nicaragua) said that the world had not yet completely rid itself of colonialism, contrary to what some asserted in order to protect their selfish interests. First of all, there were Territories in Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia and Africa whose populations still aspired to self-determination and independence. The administering Powers refused to inform those peoples of their rights and the political options open to them; on the contrary, those Powers set up military bases in the Territories and exploited their natural resources. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should apply to all Territories, whatever their size or geographical position. But administrative independence was only a first step towards decolonization, and certain allegedly independent countries were de facto colonies, since neo-colonialism existed in economic, social and cultural matters and in the fields of information and education.

10. After a long struggle against foreign occupation, Western Sahara had believed in 1975 that the hour of liberation was finally at hand. However, the invasion of Moroccan troops had obliged it to resume its struggle under the leadership of the Frente POLISARIO. It was unfortunate that Morocco, an African country and itself a champion of the struggle against colonialism, had considered it advisable to act in that way. Nicaragua believed that the question of Western Sahara was a question of decolonization, which could be resolved only by giving the population the opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination. In that respect, Nicaragua firmly supported resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and General Assembly resolution 39/40, as well as the conclusions of the Final Declaration of the recent Ministerial Meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The two parties to the conflict should undertake direct negotiations with a view to bringing about a cease-fire so as to facilitate - after the withdrawal of the Moroccan troops and Administration - the establishment of a peace-keeping force and to create the necessary conditions for a referendum without any administrative or military constraints under the auspices of OAU and the United Nations. The Kingdom of Morocco had no valid argument for rejecting the settlement framework proposed by OAU and the United Nations, or for justifying its presence in the Territory of Western Sahara, especially considering the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the subject. Morocco should resign itself to admitting that certain victory lay in store for the Saharan Republic, under the leadership of the Frente POLISARIO, the only legitimate representative of the Saharan people, and should take steps to ensure that victory was not paid for too dearly, so as not to jeopardize future relations between the two States.

11. Mr. OYOUE (Gabon) said that his country's constant concern was to see the question of Western Sahara result in a just and lasting settlement. His delegation was a sponsor of a draft resolution which had been submitted by one of the parties to the conflict.

12. One way of promoting a settlement of the conflict would be to invite each party to express its point of view on the organization of a referendum on self-determination. Some of the interested parties seemed to reject that idea, and he wondered whether there really existed sufficient political will to settle the

(Mr. Oyoue, Gabon)

question. On the other hand, Morocco had a very positive attitude, since it had fully undertaken to respect the results of such a referendum. It had even proposed to organize the referendum in January 1986 and to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman and Secretary-General of OAU to undertake the necessary consultations with the parties concerned. Finally, Morocco had decided unilaterally to declare a cease-fire as a preliminary step towards the referendum.

13. For Gabon, the organization of a referendum on self-determination was the only compromise solution which could facilitate the settlement of the Western Sahara dispute. The international community should therefore urge the two parties to agree to the Organization of the referendum as soon as possible.

14. Mr. KOROLEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples had enabled many of those countries to make their views known to the States belonging to the United Nations, the non-aligned movement, OAU and other international bodies. However, a number of countries were still subjected to colonialism. That was the true, in particular, of the small colonial Territories, whose populations were deprived of their right to independence by imperialist circles, especially by the United States of America. Not only did the Western Powers hamper economic and social development in those Territories, but they used them as military bases and strong points for combating national liberation movements.

15. Of all the Territories placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations, Micronesia was the only one in which the objectives of trusteeship were as far from being implemented as they had been when the United States had received the mandate almost 40 years ago. The United States had not respected any of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system provided for under Article 76 of the Charter, and had never had any intention of doing so. Thus, the Charter stipulated that the trusteeship system must "further international peace and security". However, as soon as the United States had begun to administer Micronesia, it had transformed atolls such as Bikini, after deporting the population, into sites for nuclear tests, which had had effects on many other atolls. Kwajalein had for decades served as a testing ground for intercontinental nuclear missiles. All that was obviously against the wishes of the States of the region, which desired to see the South Pacific become a denuclearized zone.

16. Article 76 of the Charter enjoined the administering Power to "promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories". The United States of America had not only done nothing to that end but was trying to divide Micronesia, thus contravening the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In order to achieve its objectives, it had recourse to all kinds of "agreements" and plebiscites. However, it was hard to believe that the forces confronting one another were equal when a scattered population, which had not been prepared for autonomy or economic independence, was seen facing the most powerful country in the capitalist camp. But even under those conditions, Washington sometimes met with a rebuff from the Micronesians. It was clear that the latter did not wish to live on top of a powder keg.

/...

(Mr. Korolev, Byelorussian SSR)

17. The Western countries had often claimed that the particular characteristics of small colonial territories required special solutions and that the presence of military bases contributed to the economic development of their peoples. The documents of the Special Committee and even an occasional New York Times article showed that to be nothing like the case. What was really established was that those territories were subject to plundering by dozens of transnational corporations and that everything was being done to prevent them achieving economic independence.

18. It was essential to recall that Micronesia was not an American possession and that any change in the status of a strategic territory under trusteeship could only be carried out by the Security Council. It was time that the international community rejected the fait accompli and rescued the Micronesian population from the yoke of colonialism and military adventurism.

19. Mr. TAGAL (Malaysia) said that the United Nations had made an immeasurable contribution to the process of decolonization, in particular through resolutions 1514 (XV), 1541 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). It had been able to show the flexibility needed to circumvent the many difficulties encountered in the complex process of decolonization. Various modalities of attaining self-rule and independence had been defined in order to adapt them to the great diversity of dependent territories in the political, cultural, economic and social fields.

20. However, despite the remarkable achievements, it was deplorable that interest groups were continuing deliberately to obstruct the process of decolonization. Thus it was that the sovereignty of certain territories was still being disputed. Elsewhere, the reforms carried out by the administering Powers remained inadequate. Above all, there was Namibia, still under the control of the illegal apartheid régime in power in South Africa. That was the greatest challenge to the United Nations. Malaysia was deeply committed to the struggle of the Namibian people for the freedom to which they had so long aspired.

21. Nevertheless, he noted with satisfaction that tangible progress had been made in a number of small territories. The administering Powers were co-operating closely with United Nations visiting missions and the establishment of legislative and executive bodies was a step in the right direction, notwithstanding their limited authority.

22. Malaysia unreservedly supported the struggle of all peoples under colonial domination to achieve their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

23. Mrs. BERMUDEZ GARCIA (Cuba) stressed that, contrary to what the spokesmen of imperialism claimed, colonialism was not dead but was perhaps more dangerous than ever under its various cloaks because it was more subtle.



(Mrs. Bermudez Garcia, Cuba)

24. The territories in the Pacific were acquiring increasing strategic, political and economic importance for the United States of America, which remained deaf to the complaints of the original inhabitants and refused to let the Fourth Committee consider the question of Micronesia. It was even claiming to be contributing to the development of those islands, whereas all the information confirmed that they were lagging badly in the economic, political, social and cultural fields. On Guam, the population had denounced nuclear colonialism and claimed their most elementary rights. Law 17-52 showed clearly that the Government was prepared to use every possible means to have the land forcibly expropriated by the American army restored to its original owners and detailed the amounts of compensation due. It should be emphasized that that law had been unanimously adopted after the United States of America had offered \$39.5 million to the expropriated owners, an offer considered insulting by the interested parties. The Committee should use every means to enable the people of Guam to exercise their right to self-determination as soon as possible and to work for their development in freedom and sovereignty. In Micronesia, the population was slowly dying out, victims of the radioactive effects of the nuclear tests carried out by the United States of America, whose duty it had been to protect the territory's inhabitants and promote their development. Many Micronesians did not approve their territory's current political status, which did not allow them the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence. They were protesting against the improper exploitation of their natural resources by large capitalist corporations, the use of their land and sea areas for military purposes and nuclear tests, and the poverty-stricken conditions in which they had to live next to the wealth of the colonists.

25. The seminar organized by the Special Committee at Havana in April 1985 had dealt with Puerto Rico and the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands in particular. Its participants had issued a statement in which they recognized Puerto Rico's right to self-determination and independence, declared their concern at the growing militarization of Puerto Rico and its use for launching acts of aggression against other countries, and supported unreservedly Argentina's claims to the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands.

26. Most of the specialized agencies associated with the United Nations played an important part in implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, it was eminently desirable that the International Monetary Fund's collaboration with the Pretoria racist régime, in defiance of General Assembly resolutions, should be forcefully condemned.

27. Mr. ASHUR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that while paying tribute to the Organization for what it had achieved in the field of decolonization, it should not be forgotten that the aim of its resolutions devoted to the subject, and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in particular, was the definitive elimination of colonialism, which was still rife in many regions of the world. That objective had not yet been achieved because the colonialist countries had not conformed with the resolutions and had not honoured the commitments which they had undertaken on signing the Charter.

(Mr. Ashur, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

28. Despite the many resolutions adopted by the Organization, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the people of Namibia had not yet gained independence. In South Africa, the black majority continued to suffer the apartheid régime's repression, tyranny and terrorism. That situation had only been able to continue because the colonial Powers, the Zionist entity, transnational corporations and certain international financial bodies were giving support to the Pretoria régime in many forms. Although those Powers and the Zionist entity were straining to keep their close co-operation with the South African régime secret, it was known to everyone. The military bases established by the colonial Powers in the territories which they administered also represented an obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Furthermore, certain permanent members of the Security Council had prevented the adoption of numerous resolutions on the independence of those peoples by abusing the right of veto.

29. The Palestinian people was also still living under the yoke of colonialism. Since the occupation of their land by the Zionists, the Palestinians had been forced to wander throughout the world, pursued by those same Zionists who sought to annihilate them. The adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) on the partition of Palestine had been the greatest error ever committed by the United Nations. In accepting the creation of the Zionist entity, the Organization had contributed to the dispersion of the Palestinian people, and it seemed less capable than ever of assisting that people to recover its land and to form an independent State.

30. Commitment to the cause of freedom and to the elimination of colonialism was one of the principles which had inspired the Libyan revolution of 1 September. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would continue to support the struggle of peoples subjected to colonialism and racist domination until they achieved independence.

31. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, emphasized that the problem of Western Sahara was a problem of decolonization. Contrary to what Morocco claimed, a Saharan people did indeed exist and was represented by the Frente POLISARIO. The United Nations Visiting Mission to the Territory in 1975 had clearly ascertained that the inhabitants were virtually unanimous in their wish to achieve independence with the assistance of OAU and the United Nations, and that they approved the objectives and activities of the Frente POLISARIO. However, Morocco had always wished to disregard that reality, as when, for example, it had organized the famous Green March. Even the Madrid Agreement of 1975, which Algeria did not recognize, had been violated twice. The Organization of African Unity had proposed a peace plan, but Morocco had blocked the organization of a referendum on self-determination. It was attempting to turn the conflict in Western Sahara into a bilateral conflict, while OAU, the United Nations and the movement of non-aligned countries had long ago stated that it was nothing of the sort. Algeria, which was proud of having attempted to bring together the two belligerent parties in a spirit of loyalty and responsibility, denounced Morocco's defiance of the Maghreb, Africa and the entire international community.

32. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said he considered that what had been said previously regarding the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands - by representatives of countries situated thousands of kilometres from the Pacific Ocean - was a string of shocking absurdities. Completely different information was to be found in the Communiqué of the Sixteenth South Pacific Forum, held in August 1985 and attended by practically all the independent States in the region (A/40/672), as well as in the report of the recent United Nations Visiting Mission to the Territory (T/1878). The Soviet Union had been offered the opportunity to judge for itself, since it had been invited to participate in that mission, but it had not deemed it advisable to be represented.

33. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the United States representative's comments, said that his country had taken part in a visiting mission to Micronesia in 1973 but the representatives of the colonial Powers had refused to allow the Soviet point of view to be included in the report; since that time, the USSR had left the task of drawing up reports of visiting missions, which were nothing more than works of propaganda, to the three colonialist sisters: the United States, France and the United Kingdom.

34. Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom) said that, in calling the United States, France and the United Kingdom "colonialist sisters", the Soviet representative was confusing those three countries with the USSR, Byelorussia and the Ukraine.

35. Mr. MASABO (Burundi) said, for the benefit of the representative of Morocco, that Burundi respected other countries and wished to be respected in return. If a dispute arose between Burundi and another country, it would seek a solution through dialogue and negotiation.

36. With regard to Western Sahara, he wondered why Morocco spoke of a cease-fire and the organization of a referendum, if it considered, as it had affirmed, that the Territory belonged to it. Morocco must surely know that neither the International Court of Justice nor the Special Committee on decolonization had ever said anything in confirmation of that position. Only the African peace plan contained in OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX) and approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 39/40 would enable a just, peaceful and lasting settlement to be reached.

37. Mr. LUKANGA (Mozambique), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, although Indonesia's contribution to liberation struggles was undeniable, no one would believe that the people of East Timor had invited the Indonesian Army to invade their country. To date, the Indonesian Army had massacred 200,000 people. Should two standards be applied, and should the barbarism of Western colonialists be condemned, while that of a non-aligned country was considered admissible? Was Namibia supposed to have invited South Africa and the Palestinians to have invited Israel? The greatest paradox was that the colonial Power which formerly had occupied Indonesia had resorted to the same distortions and half-truths in order to discredit Indonesian nationalism. Mozambique was too familiar with those colonial practices - from which it had itself suffered - to be deceived by them.

(Mr. Lukanga, Mozambique)

38. Relations between Mozambique and East Timor had been forged in the course of centuries of colonial domination. Timorese political dissidents who had been deported by Portugal had taken refuge in Mozambique and, since the beginning of the 1960s, the people of Mozambique had become aware of and had supported the struggle of the people of East Timor. Mozambique backed liberation struggles because it adhered scrupulously to the Charter of the United Nations and to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

39. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco) observed that the representative of Algeria had declared to the Security Council in 1975 that the question of Western Sahara jeopardized that country's "geopolitical interests", and that accounted for Algeria's interest in a solution to the problem. That was also what had been said in essence by Mr. Boumédiène, then President of Algeria, to the United Nations Visiting Mission to that Territory. If Algeria had not opposed the Madrid Agreement of 1975, the problem of Western Sahara would no longer exist. Many delegations thought that way, even if they did not say so publicly.

40. With regard to the Frente POLISARIO, which was being represented as a liberation movement, it had never been recognized as such by OAU, and not one OAU resolution or decision taken before 1983 made mention of the Frente POLISARIO. The OAU Liberation Committee, which had been instructed to assist all African liberation movements, had never helped the Frente POLISARIO. It was therefore clear that the Frente POLISARIO had no legitimacy whatsoever. Moreover, its militants bore no resemblance to the true fighters who had resisted the Spanish colonizers.

41. Finally, rather than accuse Morocco of delaying tactics, it would have been better to listen to its Minister for Foreign Affairs, who had calmly described the evolution of the question. Morocco had accepted, in 1981, the idea of a referendum on self-determination, not because it doubted the fact that Western Sahara was Moroccan, but in order to settle the problem peacefully through dialogue, and to lay the ground for a better future with neighbouring countries. The OAU Implementation Committee on Western Sahara, composed of seven Heads of State, had been created that same year. That body had worked assiduously, and its decision (A/36/512-S/14692), which had been approved by the OAU Summit and the United Nations General Assembly, provided for all the necessary arrangements for a settlement, which could have been achieved had one element not been lacking: political will. It had been said in paragraph (a) V of that decision that the people of Western Sahara would be given the choice between independence or integration with Morocco; and, further on, that troops should "be effectively confined to their bases in conformity with the recommendations of the fifth session of the Ad Hoc Committee of Heads of State on Western Sahara". Morocco had accepted those arrangements.

42. Mr. MESSAHEL (Algeria) said that Algeria would not be turned away from its duty, which was to support all just causes, especially when the cause was that of a sister country. To seek to prevent the just and definitive solution of a problem of decolonization was a rearguard action. It was pointless to try to stifle the voice of a people that was struggling for recognition of its right to self-determination and had the support of the international community.
43. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco) recalled that the decision of the OAU Implementation Committee for a settlement of the problem of Western Sahara had been endorsed by the parties at two successive sessions of that Committee. The Implementation Committee has been assisted in its task by a delegation from the United Nations. The Chairman of OAU had already embarked on the necessary preparations to set the date for the cease-fire and organize the referendum on self-determination. Two weeks after the peace plan had been adopted, however, Algeria had manoeuvred with OAU to have a "Saharan Republic" admitted to that Organization. That was the reason for the impasse. Algeria no longer mentioned that decision, which had contained the elements for a peace settlement. The decision had been forgotten and only OAU resolution AHG/Res. 104 (XIX) was mentioned now. Moreover, Algeria had never said openly that it did not agree with the decisions taken and had never expressed any reservations. He would like to hear a public statement from Algeria on that score. Morocco, on the other hand, had accepted the proposed peace plan without any reservations. It was not Morocco that had obstructed the settlement process. As its Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation had recalled clearly at the 16th meeting and in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.4/40/L.4, Morocco had accepted the principle of a referendum organized under United Nations auspices, with all the necessary safeguards, and had undertaken to abide by the results. It was very easy to wax eloquent about the action one was taking to promote decolonization, but Morocco would take lessons from no one when it came to the fight against colonialism.
44. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mr. Mansour Omar of the Frente POLISARIO wished, in continuation of the hearing granted him by the Committee at its 9th meeting on 15 October, to provide additional information on the question of Western Sahara.
45. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco), speaking on a point of order, said that the petitioner whom the Chairman proposed to hear had already made one statement to the Committee and the Committee was therefore entitled to know why it must listen to him again. It was surely the Committee's practice that each time it heard a petitioner it must first take a decision in that regard. Could the same petitioner be heard several times in succession and thus enjoy rights that Members of the United Nations did not?
46. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had indeed decided to hear the petitioner in question. In the present instance, the petitioner was not going to make a new statement but simply to provide additional information as a follow-up to the original hearing.
47. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco) objected that the petitioner should have been heard before the rights of reply, since normally the latter must always come at the end of the debate. What would happen if another petitioner wished to follow suit?

48. The CHAIRMAN reiterated that the petitioner was simply going to provide additional information. If another petitioner also wished to supplement his original statement, the Committee would follow the same procedure.

49. Mr. HADDAOUI (Morocco) said that he would not press the point further but reserved the right to speak after the petitioner. He also took note of the fact that, if another petitioner also asked to be heard a second time, the Committee would not prevent him from doing so.

50. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Omar (Frente POLISARIO) took a place at the petitioners' table.

51. Mr. OMAR (Frente POLISARIO) explained that he was speaking in connection with the 6 November 1985 statement by the King of Morocco in which the King had refused to withdraw his occupation forces and administration from Western Sahara and had evoked the spectre of civil war. That statement contradicted the King's earlier statement to the General Assembly on 23 October, in which he had claimed to want to solve the problem of the Territory peacefully, and proved that Morocco had no intention of allowing the Saharan people the possibility of exercising its right of self-determination through a referendum conducted freely and without administrative or military pressures.

52. Moroccan colonialism stubbornly refused to look the facts in the face. Morocco sought to justify its occupation by the Madrid Agreement of 1975 yet that Agreement gave it no sovereignty over Western Sahara, Such sovereignty had always belonged only to the Saharan people. The former administering Power, Spain, had itself recognized in a memorandum submitted to the International Court of Justice in 1975 that any Non-Self-Governing Territory had its own legal status under international law, a status which all neighbouring States must respect. The title held by the administering Power was subordinate to the population's right of self-determination.

53. The decision of the OAU Implementation Committee to which Morocco made such frequent reference had been adopted pursuant to a resolution - OAU resolution AHG/Res. 104 (XIX) - which provided for negotiations to be undertaken between the Frente POLISARIO and Morocco. If that decision had never been implemented, it was because Morocco had refused to negotiate. Morocco was also refusing to withdraw from the Territory in order to allow the United Nations and OAU to organize a referendum on self-determination. Apparently, it attached more importance to the alleged stamp of approval brought it by foreign leisure activities in the Territory than to the decisions of the United Nations, OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

54. The Frente POLISARIO was indeed recognized by OAU since the latter had admitted to its membership the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic whose President was the General Secretary of the Frente POLISARIO. Like OAU resolution AHG/Res. 104 (XIX), the admission of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic to that Organization, had been the outcome of nine years of consideration and consultation among the African Heads of State. No one could question the care with which the African countries handled any matter relating to decolonization, especially when an African Territory was involved. For Morocco, however, anyone who did not approve of its actions ceased to be either credible or competent.

/...

(Mr. Omar)

55. The Saharans were unanimous in wanting independence. If Morocco was so sure that they wanted integration, however, then let it agree to the organization of a referendum which would take place without military or administrative pressures. But what Morocco really wanted, as the statement of its King confirmed, was for the United Nations to legitimize a sham referendum which would take place under Moroccan occupation and Moroccan supervision and with the participation of Moroccans. That was a crime which the United Nations could not tolerate, for that would be to bow to a fait accompli and give up defending the right of peoples to self-determination.

56. Mr. Omar withdrew.

57. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.4/40/L.13.

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

58. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing on agenda item 34. He suggested that, in accordance with the usual practice, the request should be circulated as a Committee document, for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

59. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.