



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.90

5 December 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 1 December 1986, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. TURKMEN (Vice-President) (Turkey)  
later: Mr. CHOUDHURY (President) (Bangladesh)  
later: Mr. MAKSIMOV (Vice-President) (Byelorussian SSR)

- Report of the Security Council [11]
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [19] (continued)

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 11

REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (A/41/2)

The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Security Council (A/41/2)?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: This concludes our consideration of agenda item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 19 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES:

- (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 (A/41/23; A/AC.109/848-A/AC.109/857, A/AC.109/858 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/859-A/AC.109/868, A/AC.109/870 and Corr.1, A/AC.109/874 and Corr.1 and 2, A/AC.109/877 and Add.1)
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/41/673)
- (c) Draft resolutions (A/41/L.33 and Corr.2, A/41/L.36, A/41/L.37)
- (d) Report of the Fifth Committee (A/41/921)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed today at 12 noon.

If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Ahmad Farouk Arnouss of the Syrian Arab Republic, to present the report of the Committee.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur 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 (Special Committee of 24): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration the report of the Special Committee (A/41/23) covering its work during 1986.

The report, which relates, inter alia, to item 19 of the agenda, is submitted in accordance with paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 40/57, of 2 December 1985, on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the Assembly requested the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained independence and, in particular, to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism.

In pursuance of that and other related resolutions, the Special Committee reviewed during the year the implementation of the Declaration with regard to the remaining Territories and formulated recommendations for the application of further measures by States, by the competent United Nations organs and by the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, with a view to accelerating the pace of decolonization and facilitating the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples concerned.

An account of the Committee's examination of, and recommendations on, the specific Territories and other related items is set out in chapters IV to VII, IX and XI of the present report. As these chapters have already been dealt with by the Fourth Committee, and the latter's reports by the General Assembly, I will refer briefly at this stage to some of the action taken by the Committee in relation to general aspects of decolonization.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur, Special  
Committee of 24)

As indicated in the chapters concerned, the Special Committee, to its satisfaction, once again received the close co-operation of the administering Powers concerned in connection with its consideration of individual Territories.

Through the continued co-operation of the Government of New Zealand and by dispatching a visiting mission to the Territory the Committee was able to secure first-hand information on the situation obtaining in Tokelau and to ascertain the wishes of the people of the Territory as regards their future status.

The delegation of the United Kingdom, however, for the first time since the inception of the Special Committee, did not participate in the Committee's consideration of the Territories under its administration. Aware that 10 of the 18 remaining Territories fall under United Kingdom administration, and noting the negative impact which the non-participation of the United Kingdom had on its work, the Committee appealed to the Government of the United Kingdom to reconsider its decision and mandated the Committee Chairman to continue his consultations with the delegation in that connection in the hope that the United Kingdom would resume its participation in the Committee's work in 1987.

Within the context of the question of the list of Territories to which the Declaration is applicable, the Committee took up separately an item entitled "Special Committee decision of 14 August 1985 concerning Puerto Rico". In this regard, the Committee, following the hearing of the representatives of a number of organizations, took a further decision on the item, as set out in chapter I of the report.

In the same context, the Special Committee considered a request by Member States which are members of the South Pacific Forum that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly the reinscription of New Caledonia on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur, Special  
Committee of 24)

After its review, the Committee decided, subject to any directives the General Assembly might give in that connection, that it should take up the request of the South Pacific Forum at the outset of its 1987 session, with a view to submitting an appropriate recommendation thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. Subsequently, the Committee was informed by the same member Governments of the South Pacific Forum that they had decided to pursue, at the current session of the Assembly, the reinscription of New Caledonia on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

As reflected in Chapter II of its report, the Special Committee carried out a number of other tasks entrusted to it by the General Assembly in various resolutions, as well as those arising from its own previous decisions, relating to the question of the publicity to be given to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization.

Bearing in mind the important role being played by non-governmental organizations in the decolonization process, the Special Committee once again appealed to those organizations to intensify their efforts in disseminating the related information. In that context, the Committee decided to continue its consultations with those organizations, in order to encourage further their efforts to counteract the destructive and hostile campaign being waged by South Africa and certain mass media in some Western and other countries, against the true aspirations of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa. The Committee also requested the Secretary-General to take further measures to facilitate the effective dissemination of information on decolonization.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur, Special  
Committee of 24)

During the year, the Committee took part in a number of international conferences and meetings convened by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. In the light of the constructive results and in keeping with related decisions of the Assembly, the Committee decided to continue to hold consultations with the organizations concerned and to participate in conferences, seminars and other special meetings dealing with decolonization arranged by those organizations as well as by the United Nations bodies concerned.

The attention of members is drawn to the proposals outlined in section J of Chapter I, entitled "Future work", which, the Committee hopes, will meet with the Assembly's approval, in order to enable it to proceed with the effective discharge of the task that remains to be completed.

The Special Committee recommends that the General Assembly renew its appeal to the administering Powers concerned to take immediately all the steps necessary for the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions. In that connection, the Special Committee, in the light of the useful results achieved as a consequence of the active participation in its work of all the administering Powers, recommends that the General Assembly again request the administering Powers concerned to participate actively in its work relating to the Territories under their administration.

Further, bearing in mind the affirmation by the General Assembly that direct association of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies is an effective means of promoting the progress of the peoples in those Territories towards a position of equality with States Members of the United Nations, the Special Committee recommends that the General Assembly invite the administering Powers to allow representatives of the Territories

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur, Special  
Committee of 24)

concerned to participate in the discussion in the Fourth Committee and in the Special Committee on the items relating to their respective countries.

The General Assembly may also wish to renew its appeal to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to comply with the various requests addressed to them by the United Nations in its resolutions on the question of decolonization.

On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

Before concluding, I should like to express my personal appreciation to Ambassador Oscar Oramas Oliva, the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations, who has so ably guided the work of the Special Committee as Acting Chairman during the year. That Ambassador Oramas-Oliva has served the Committee with distinction and with his well-known diplomatic skill, his wisdom and, above all, his dedication and commitment to the cause of decolonization, is a matter of record. I look forward to the privilege of continuing to work closely with the Ambassador of Cuba.

I should like to take this opportunity also to thank the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Rafeeuddine Ahmed and the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Najmuddine Rifai, for their leadership, guidance and help, as well as to their entire staff. I am also personally indebted to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Thomas Tanaka, for his support and guidance. He is totally committed to the cause of decolonization. My thanks also go to his assistants for their help and support in preparing my report. I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Rifai, who is leaving us after serving the cause of decolonization for three decades, as representative of his Government, as Rapporteur of the Committee and as a member of the Secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on Oscar Oramas Oliva of Cuba, in his capacity as Acting Chairman 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, to present the report of the Committee.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba), Acting Chairman 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 (Special Committee 24) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly has just heard a succinct account of the work of the Special Committee of 24 during 1986, which was outlined by the Rapporteur of the Committee, our colleague Mr. Ahmad Farouk Arnouss of the Syrian Arab Republic. I shall, therefore, confine myself to a few observations as the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee concerning some of the principal developments that have taken place during the year, as well as the remaining tasks before us, in the field of decolonization.

In briefly reviewing the work accomplished by the Special Committee during the year, members are fully aware that, while we have witnessed some positive developments in several of the Territories with which we are concerned, many of the Territories have marked no significant progress towards the attainment of the dearly held objectives of decolonization as established in resolution 1514 (XV). This is particularly important in respect of Namibia - a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security as a result of South Africa's ruthless repression of the Namibian people, its repeated acts of armed aggression against neighbouring States and its persistent violation of the related United Nations resolutions and decisions.



(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

As I had occasion to elaborate only a few weeks ago in my statement to the Assembly, this ominous threat of a massive escalation of violence in the area exists because South Africa has chosen to defy the world. In light of the continuing defiance by South Africa of its Charter obligations and its persistent use of force to perpetuate its illegal domination of the Territory, it is the considered view of the Special Committee that the Security Council should proceed forthwith with the application of the full and effective measures, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, against South Africa, in order to obtain its compliance with the decisions of our Organization. I need not emphasize the heavy responsibility of certain Western permanent members of the Council in that regard.

I wish to pay a particular tribute to the Governments of the front-line States for their steadfast support for and their commitment to the cause of a free and independent Namibia and for their determined efforts towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). A well-deserved tribute is due also to the leadership of the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for its continued statesmanship in working out an internationally acceptable solution, guiding Namibia to its long-fought-for independence. The Special Committee will, within its own mandate, continue to extend all possible assistance in the achievement of that goal.

During the year under review, the Special Committee has also given close attention to the problems affecting the other colonial Territories, particularly those in the Caribbean and Pacific Ocean. Because of their small territorial size and population, and frequently because of their isolation and limited resources, these Territories, as we are aware, are facing different and highly complex problems. These special circumstances notwithstanding, the peoples of the

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Territories concerned must be enabled to exercise all the rights and privileges set out in the relevant provisions of the Charter and of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In the discharge of their obligations under the Charter, the administering Powers concerned must recognize these rights and permit the peoples of those Territories to make their decisions freely and without inducement. To that end, I should like to underscore the concomitant responsibility of the administering Powers to intensify programmes of political education of the peoples of the Territories under their administration in order to deepen their awareness of the purposes and the objectives of the Charter and the Declaration in relation to their future status.

In the discharge of their primary responsibility, as defined in the Charter, the administering Powers should also do their utmost to ensure that the economies of the Territories they administer are placed on a sound basis and, to that end, should organize effective development programmes, both bilaterally and on a multilateral basis, enlisting to the maximum extent the assistance available from the specialized agencies and other organizations of the United Nations. That such programmes should carefully protect and safeguard the best interests, both present and future, of the peoples of the Territories concerned should be of paramount consideration.

Some of these and other important considerations of the Special Committee, as endorsed by the Fourth Committee, were already acted upon by the General Assembly at this session, and I am confident that the remaining recommendations of the Committee contained in the report before us will receive the Assembly's equally positive endorsement.

As the General Assembly has repeatedly stressed, having regard to the obligations assumed by the administering Powers concerned under Chapter XI of the

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Charter, their co-operation is an essential element in our formulation of appropriate recommendations concerning specific Territories under their administration. Information imparted to us by their representatives and points of views exchanged with them during our consideration of these questions have served as an effective basis for our deliberations. As is apparent and as past experience has shown, the tasks of the Organization with respect to the small Territories are relatively less onerous when it receives the full co-operation of the administering Powers concerned and when the peoples of the Territories are accorded a genuine opportunity to express their true aspirations. As has been previously noted by the General Assembly, the Special Committee received in the past the close co-operation of the administering Powers in connection with its consideration of most of the Territories.

It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that the Government of the United Kingdom chose not to participate in the work of the Special Committee this year. As the Rapporteur of the Special Committee stated earlier, we are particularly mindful in that regard of the fact that 10 of the 18 remaining Territories fall under the administration of the United Kingdom. I wish to reiterate my earnest hope that the appeal addressed to the British Government by the Special Committee in a decision adopted earlier during the year will be responded to positively. On my part, as mandated by the Special Committee, I am continuing my consultations with the Government of the United Kingdom in that connection.

With respect to the dispatch of visiting missions to dependent Territories, I wish once again to reiterate what the Special Committee has so often asserted, namely, that the sending of such visiting missions is the most direct, as well as the most effective, means of securing information on the social, political and

NS/ljb

A/41/PV.90

14-15

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

economic conditions prevailing in the colonial Territories and of ascertaining at first hand the real wishes and aspirations of the peoples concerned. It is hoped that the Committee will be able, with the continuing co-operation of the administering Powers, including in particular the United Kingdom, to dispatch such missions, as and when appropriate.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

The Special Committee is grateful to the Government of New Zealand, which for the third time enabled the Committee to dispatch a visiting mission to Tokelau - this one in July this year. The continuing co-operation of the Government of New Zealand has indeed made it possible for the Special Committee to be fully apprised of the evolving progress by the people of Tokelau towards the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration, and will no doubt further facilitate the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly in respect of that Territory.

In relation to those Territories which are the subject either of conflicting claims to sovereignty or of special interest to some Governments by reason of geographical, historical or other circumstances, the underlying principles embodied in the Charter and the Declaration continue to apply in their entirety to the Territories concerned, taking fully into consideration the need to facilitate the peaceful resolution of divergent claims and interests through negotiations, mutual accommodation and goodwill. I am confident that these issues will be resolved amicably and expeditiously through negotiations and consultations, given the necessary will and commitment of the Governments concerned. The important role to be played by the Secretary-General in that connection cannot be overemphasized, and we are all grateful to him for his continuing endeavours in that regard.

The Rapporteur of the Special Committee has already pointed out that the relevant chapters of the Committee's report now before the Assembly contain a number of concrete recommendations concerning the various problems existing in the remaining colonial Territories. It is my firm belief and hope that the General Assembly, while discussing this agenda item, will give its most serious attention to the recommendations made by the Special Committee. I am confident that the approval by the General Assembly of those and other important recommendations will

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

further enhance the capacity of our Organization to deal more effectively with the remaining colonial issues.

As will be noted in the report placed before the Assembly, it has been a long-standing practice of the Special Committee to attempt to arrive at the broadest possible degree of consensus with regard to decisions on various matters of which it is seized. This method in the past four years has always served well not only in the Special Committee but also in the Fourth Committee and has facilitated the Assembly's consideration of the related recommendations of the Special Committee.

I am confident that members will continue to do their utmost to avoid contentious and divisive procedures and will thus continue to demonstrate their commitment to the cause of those in the still-colonized Territories whose self-determination and independence we have been entrusted with ensuring.

As members are well aware, the Special Committee has always been in the forefront of the efforts of the Organization to rationalize and streamline its methods of work. The Committee thus once again continued to take all appropriate measures to minimize its requirements for meeting services and to control and limit its documentation needs. Furthermore, in response to an appeal made by the Secretary-General at the beginning of the year to intergovernmental bodies to reduce expenditures, owing to the seriousness of the cash shortage confronting the Organization, the Committee, with the close co-operation of its members, was able to accrue a savings of some 68 per cent of the budget appropriated, mainly through the curtailment of official travel relating to the Committee's mandate. That this was made possible without adversely affecting the Committee's effective discharge of its mandate was indeed due to the continuing co-operation and commitment of the entire membership of the Committee to the cause of the Organization.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

I wish to take this opportunity to assure the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, that the Committee will continue to do its utmost to assist his endeavour to achieve optimum results at the minimum possible operational costs. At the same time, I wish to request the Secretary-General and, through him, the offices concerned within the Secretariat to ensure that the Special Committee is not penalized for its constant efforts to minimize its operational costs, inasmuch as the savings realized during the past several years by the Special Committee have been made possible as a direct result of the continuing conscious and concerted efforts on the part of each and every member of the Special Committee. While the Committee will continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General in this regard, it should be clearly understood that the savings effected by the Committee during the recent past should not therefore serve as a pretext for an arbitrary curtailment of the Committee's future budgetary requirements, inasmuch as the Committee, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, intends to pursue its full programme of work as approved by the Assembly.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay a particular tribute to Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, for his outstanding leadership and statesmanship in enabling the Fourth Committee to conclude its work in a most efficient and exemplary manner. His personal dedication to the cause of the peoples concerned is well known, and his contribution to the process of decolonization has been amply demonstrated throughout the session that has just concluded.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

I wish to make a few personal comments at this stage. This year, as Acting Chairman, I have enjoyed the fullest co-operation of my colleagues both in the Committee and in the Secretariat, and I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all of them.

I am particularly thankful to our Chairman, Ambassador Bérhanu Dinka of Ethiopia, who ably guided and set the course of the Committee's work for the year. My appreciation goes also to my friends and colleagues of the Bureau: Ambassador Sten Stromholm of Sweden and Mr. Bronislav Kulawiec of Czechoslovakia, our two Vice-Chairmen; Mr. Ahmad Farouk Arnouss of the Syrian Arab Republic, our Rapporteur; and Mr. Ammar Amari of Tunisia, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, and Mr. Anders Bjurner of Sweden, Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee. Their unfailing assistance and wise counselling have made it possible for me to carry out the task entrusted to me. To each of them, I owe a personal debt of gratitude for their devoted service in the cause of decolonization.

Our Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, has shown a consistent interest in the field of decolonization. We are grateful to him for his interest, co-operation and assistance in our work. I should also like to pay a tribute to all the members of the Secretariat concerned, for the assistance and support which they gave the Committee throughout the year.



(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Having briefly reviewed some of the principal developments in the field of decolonization and in keeping with long-established practice, I should like, on behalf of the sponsors, to introduce two draft resolutions submitted under this item, draft resolutions A/41/L.36 and A/41/L.37. As these two draft resolutions reflect both the developments and problems that I have just outlined, I need not, I am sure, elaborate on their substance.

Draft resolution A/41/L.36 deals with general aspects of decolonization, and by it, among other things, the Assembly would renew the mandate of the Special Committee.

Draft resolution A/41/L.37 deals with dissemination of information on decolonization, and by it the Assembly would once again underscore the importance of publicity as an instrument for furthering the aims and purposes of the Declaration. In this connection, I wish to note with satisfaction the recommendation once again this year of the Committee on Conferences that the arrangements for meeting records under General Assembly resolution 37/14 C, of November 1982, including the provision of verbatim records to the Special Committee, should be maintained; for, in the context of the Special Committee's work, meeting records undoubtedly represent an indispensable tool ensuring the maximum possible dissemination of information on the work of the Committee.

As members of the Special Committee will recall, in connection with General Assembly decision 40/472, of 9 May 1986, by which the Assembly approved certain economy measures put forward by the Secretary-General, including the suspension of verbatim records of the Special Committee, I drew attention to the fact that, given the need for a permanent verbatim reporting section and as the Committee expected to hold not more than 15 meetings in August - a period during which no other United

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Nations bodies with the entitlement to verbatim record, apart from the Security Council, were likely to meet, the proposal to dispense with the Committee's verbatim records would not yield any appreciable savings at all.

In addition, I cautioned that, should verbatim records be dropped, the Committee's report to the Assembly would have to be expanded to include summaries of statements made in the Committee, at an additional cost to the Organization. Accordingly, I suggested that verbatim records be issued ex post facto by the transcription of tape recordings if need be.

It was with these considerations in mind that I appealed then for reconsideration of the Secretary-General's proposal on the Committee's verbatim records, which regrettably went unheeded. Indeed, during the 3-week session of the Special Committee in August this year the permanent Verbatim Reporting Section, as expected, stood idle, as it covered no meetings at all; even the Security Council did not hold a single meeting, during the period. In the meantime, as members have noted, the Special Committee's report to the present session has been expanded to include summaries of statements, and this was particularly regrettable in view of the Committee's outstanding accomplishments in the past in rationalizing its methods of work and controlling and limiting its documentation requirements.

Against this background, by adopting draft resolution A/41/L.37 the General Assembly would reinstate the provision of verbatim records to the Special Committee, and it should be clear that its subsequent authorization to the Secretary-General for a continuation into 1987 of the economy measures introduced in May this year will in no circumstances affect this decision.

In the same context, I cannot over-emphasize the imperative need for the provision of full press-release coverage by the Department of Public Information for all meetings of the Special Committee and its subsidiary bodies.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Speaking on behalf of the sponsors, I wish to commend these draft proposals to the members of the Assembly for their serious attention and unanimous approval.

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The course of the anti-colonial liberation struggle has impressively underlined the historic significance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Owing to concerted action by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations, that Declaration has become an important instrument in the efforts towards the elimination of colonialism, and has lost nothing of its topicality.

Today, the liberated countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America contribute their own weighty share to international affairs. They vigorously advocate the cause of peace, disarmament, social progress and equitable international co-operation. This finds its expression particularly in the activities of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries, which are highly appreciated by the German Democratic Republic. In their Political Declaration adopted at Harare, the non-aligned countries again resolutely condemned all manifestations of colonialism and reaffirmed their unwavering support for the liberation struggle of the peoples still under colonial oppression. The socialist German State whole-heartedly subscribes to that position. At the recent meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany it was again made clear that in my country we feel at one with those forces that are committed to progress in the world and to the preservation and consolidation of peace, are guided by reason and show a sense of political responsibility in the search for solutions to crucial problems facing mankind.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

In view of the alarming international situation, particular significance attaches to the inseparable connection between the implementation of the right to self-determination and the ensuring of peace, as is emphasized in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In order to save our world from the looming danger of an all-out devastating nuclear war and to open up vistas to a secure peace, it is of the utmost urgency to halt the arms race and bring about an improvement in the international climate.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

What is required is the provision of reliable guarantees ensuring respect for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, so that the supreme asset of mankind can be durably preserved under the specific conditions of the nuclear age.

This is the underlying objective of the proposal made by socialist countries to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Such a global system cannot be perceived without respect for the peoples' right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty, and, consequently, includes the unconditional, full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV).

The great successes achieved in the decolonization process must not obscure the fact that some peoples and Territories are still subjected to anachronistic colonial oppression and exploitation. This is true of the so-called small Territories which, for obvious reasons, are still kept dependent by their administrative Powers, and this is particularly true of Namibia.

The German Democratic Republic has had ample opportunity to outline its position on the question of Namibia. It did so, for instance, at the Paris Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the Vienna Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, the fourteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, and in the recent debate on the question of Namibia. Our position is absolutely clear. We deem it an urgent need of our time to finally implement United Nations Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Racist South Africa, the main obstacle on Namibia's road towards independence, must be forced to abandon its policy threatening peace. That requires the immediate termination of any political, economic and military collaboration with the apartheid régime; it requires the imposition on Pretoria of comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

My country will also in the future render solidarity and support to the liberation struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

The fact that a number of peoples in the so-called small Territories are still denied their right to genuine self-determination because the military and strategic interests of the colonial Powers rank higher is alarming and disquieting. There is no doubt as to the grave dangers emanating from that situation not only to those immediately affected, but also to the security and stability in the region and beyond. This is one of the reasons why the German Democratic Republic opposes any attempts at legalizing the de facto annexation of the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We consider it an extremely topical task of the United Nations, in the framework of the decolonization process, to grant independence to the people of Micronesia.

The artificial division of that Territory on the basis of agreements forced upon those peoples, and its use as a military base of the administrative Power for all eternity, cannot be allowed to continue. There is nothing in international law that could be cited to approve such a move. Pursuant to the United Nations Charter, it is the Security Council alone which has the right to take a decision on the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. That Agreement has not been observed. What is more, it has been misused for the purpose of subjugating the people of Micronesia to neo-colonialist rule, depriving it of the possibility to give free expression to their will and to gain genuine independence. It is precisely here where the responsibility of the United Nations lies, and we have to live up to that responsibility.

For that very reason, and committed to the cause of eliminating hotbeds of danger in the world, the German Democratic Republic supports the demand by

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

Mauritius for the immediate return to it of the Chagos Archipelago, including the island of Diego Garcia. The huge military base on that island constitutes a threat to the peoples of the region and other areas, and is a serious obstacle to all efforts aimed at transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

We share the view of the non-aligned countries that the Puerto Rican people has the inalienable right to self-determination and independence and we voice our support for the relevant resolution of 14 August 1986, adopted by the United Nations Special Committee on decolonization.

Seeking to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples also means taking steps against attempts by imperialist forces aiming to deprive the peoples of the fruits reaped as a result of their quest for national independence and social progress.

A policy of neo-globalism characterized by acts of violence, gross intervention in the internal affairs of States, attempts at toppling legitimate Governments with the help of counter-revolutionary gangs of mercenaries, and making independent States obedient, is in grave contradiction to the letter and spirit of both the Declaration and the United Nations Charter.

Nowadays it has become ever more clear that the full enjoyment of the right to self-determination also requires the unrestricted exercise of the right to economic, social and cultural development. In this context, I wish to refer only to one case in point: the serious problem which is becoming ever more acute for the African, Asian and Latin American countries. I am referring to the continuously growing indebtedness to imperialist States and banks. Against this background, to describe and propagate the view that the profit-oriented "free market economy" with its well-known intrinsic shortcomings, is purportedly the only workable, effective development model, seems to be more than dubious. There

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

is no doubt that development aid and private investments are meant to serve as a smokescreen behind which transnational corporations seek to expand and secure their sphere of activities in the developing countries.

Any attempt at replacing traditional, colonial oppression by a far-flung network of neo-colonialist dependency and exploitation must be resolutely opposed.

In his message to the eighth summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Head of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, solemnly reaffirmed that the German Democratic Republic unswervingly stands at the side of all States and peoples that advocate equality-based political and economic relations and oppose imperialist policies of interference and aggression.

Based on that principled position, my country will continue consistently to support the just cause of the peoples fighting against colonialism and neo-colonialism.



Mr. THOMPSON (Fiji): I have the honour today to speak on agenda item 19 on behalf of the seven countries of the South Pacific Forum that are Members of the United Nations: Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

The Forum is the regional organization of the independent and self-governing peoples of the South Pacific. We have experienced a wide range of free and successful acts of self-determination. The great tide of decolonization emanating from this building has swept across the shores of our islands. In 1945, the principle of decolonization was enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Those lofty sentiments, those guarantees of the rights, of the legitimacy, of the aspirations of people throughout the globe for freedom and independence, have changed the political face of our world.

Our focus in this debate will be on New Caledonia. That is our immediate problem in the South Pacific. But our concerns as a region on the question of decolonization are much wider. We share a common abhorrence of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia; we wish to see an end to the colonial era everywhere. All seven South Pacific delegations will vote in favour of the three draft resolutions on decolonization.

The South Pacific region was not caught up directly in the early turmoil of the dismantling of colonial empires. Seeds were however sown. New ideas took root as the people of our region witnessed events in other parts of the world. But it was the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 1960 that heralded the breakthrough in the South Pacific, The transformation from a scattering of island dependencies to the proud group of independent nations that now form the South Pacific Forum. The momentum generated by the Declaration on decolonization made the South Pacific Forum possible. Our support for that Declaration, our support for the principles of decolonization and

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

our support for this Organization is not only a statement of political belief and commitment; it is a recognition of their role in the transformation of our own region.

We cannot stand aside and watch unmoved while that tide which brought independence and nationhood to our shores laps futilely on other shores in our region. The process of decolonization is not yet complete in the South Pacific. Acknowledgement of the rights of Pacific peoples in our midst is not yet universal. There is still work for the Organization - for the Assembly - to do.

That is our assessment of the situation confronting us in New Caledonia. In a way, it has been a reluctant assessment. We had hoped that it might be avoided, that the process of dialogue and discussion, of progress and political evolution, might continue and that the rights of the people of New Caledonia to independence, once recognized by the Government of France and pursued and promoted as an object of reality, would lead to peaceful transition in New Caledonia.

For six years our Heads of Government have met each year in the South Pacific Forum and agonized over the situation of that Territory. They have been mindful of the role of France in the South Pacific. They have been aware of the contribution it has made to the development of people, not only in the South Pacific, but throughout the many parts of the world where the French Empire once spread. We had hoped that co-operation and dialogue might have continued, that the process of political compromise and imaginative constitutional evolution that has marked development of the multiracial independence societies in our region would prevail in that Territory as well.

But we were always mindful too of the role of the United Nations in the process of decolonization - not only of its experience and the collective wisdom it has gained from the supervision of scores of countries moving to independence, but

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

also the role of the United Nations as a forum in which dependent peoples have had the right to present their political, social and economic aspirations directly to the international community. For some years we have been urged by the indigenous people of New Caledonia to support them in the exercise of that right. For five years, Heads of Government of the South Pacific Forum hesitated to take the step. That in no way reflected any hesitation as regards their commitment to the right guaranteed to the people of New Caledonia in the Declaration on decolonization. Rather, it reflected the hope that France would commit itself to that right, thus smoothing the way to a legitimate act of self-determination.

Finally, earlier this year, and with a measure of sadness, the Heads of Government of our region decided that they could no longer hold back. The compromises and undertakings they had seen given to the people of New Caledonia were repudiated by the action of a new French Government in Paris. The institutional framework set up to prepare the pathway for a transition to self-government was undermined. A large measure of the authority delegated to new political institutions in the four regions of New Caledonia was withdrawn - all this without consultation, all this in the face of the universal request from the Governments of the South Pacific region to pursue the path of progress on which the previous Government of France had been well advanced.

Let me trace for a moment the involvement of my own country. Fiji is a multi-ethnic community. We are committed to multiracialism, not only as a goal for Fiji, but as an ideal with relevance throughout our region. We believe that the future of New Caledonia can only be assured if the compromises - the difficult compromises - necessary to make a multiracial community work are pursued in that Territory. We know from experience that they can be. So my Government has played a leading role in the South Pacific Forum deliberations on New Caledonia. We have

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

shared our concerns with the Government of France, since New Caledonia is our immediate neighbour to the west. In 1982 my Prime Minister led a South Pacific Forum delegation to discussions with President Mitterand and his Government in the spirit of compromise and consensus-building within New Caledonia, within the South Pacific region, and between the South Pacific and France, which we believed to be necessary. It was our understanding from those discussions that reforms were under way to alter permanently the political and economic equations within New Caledonia, thus removing Kanak grounds for dissatisfaction. In our discussions since 1982 we have urged the Government of France to adhere to and honour that programme. But now, it is our assessment that there has been a definite turning back, that the political dictates of domestic politics on the other side of the world have had an impact in our region beneficial neither to the people of New Caledonia nor to good relations between the South Pacific and France.

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

Suffice it to say, as Forum Heads of Government did at their meeting in Suva in August, that the change in French policy towards New Caledonia since March 1986 has been a significant backward step. Accordingly, the South Pacific Heads of Government decided unanimously that now was the time to respond to the entreaties of the people of New Caledonia and seek the reinscription of the Territory in the agenda of the United Nations. We have done so in large part in recognition of the constructive role that the United Nations has played in the decolonization of the South Pacific and because of our conviction that it can also assist the progress of New Caledonia to a situation in which it is able to exercise a legitimate act of self-determination, in co-operation with the United Nations.

The Forum's support for New Caledonia's right to self-determination has attracted heartening support. For instance, Commonwealth Heads of Government representing some 50 countries, at their meeting in Nassau, in the Bahamas, in October 1985

"reaffirmed their support for the right of the peoples of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories of the South Pacific to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

(A/40/817, para. 31)

More recently the Forum members were warmly gratified by the strong support received from the 101 members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and their acceptance of the FLNKS as observers. At the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, in Harare, in September, the non-aligned leaders

"welcomed and supported the decision by the members of the South Pacific Forum ... to seek the reinscription of New Caledonia" (A/41/697, p. 75, para. 150)

and

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

"strongly urged the forty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly to reinscribe New Caledonia on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories."

(p. 76, para. 151)

We hope that Member States will acknowledge the restraint with which the Forum countries have always acted. Our concern to maintain dialogue with France is evident from our record. We now ask for representatives' support for consideration of the colonial situation in New Caledonia by the Assembly. It should not have been necessary. New Caledonia was on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories; the Assembly never took it off. France refused to co-operate with the United Nations and ceased to supply the information the Charter requires. It is an anomaly that New Caledonia is not already on the Assembly's agenda in its own right. We are now seeking to rectify that anomaly.

There will be many contentions advanced in this debate, of that we have no doubt: that this Assembly should not be discussing the question at all; that we are trespassing on the internal affairs of France; that the good intentions of France are being called into question; that reinscription is unnecessary. My colleagues from the South Pacific Forum will wish to speak further on these points. Let me say now, however, that none of them is new; all of them were considered in depth by our Heads of Government before they took the unanimous step on which they have embarked to bring about the reinscription of New Caledonia. For New Caledonia is a colony; it is a Non-Self-Governing Territory. We cannot accept that we must regard it as part of Metropolitan France, 20,000 kilometres away.

We have looked carefully at the question whether New Caledonia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory. For guidance we have turned to the history of the Assembly's own findings on this question, to the principles which must guide the membership in making such a determination. The principles are there. They were drawn up carefully, deliberately and systematically. They were overwhelmingly

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

endorsed by the Assembly in resolution 1541 (XV) to clarify the difficult question of the Territories to which the historic decolonization Declaration applied. Their status in international law has been attested to by the International Court of Justice. These principles have guided the decolonization of our region just as they have done elsewhere. As far as we are concerned there can be no disputing their validity. Unfortunately - and I say unfortunately quite deliberately - France, 26 years after the international community embraced the decolonization Declaration and resolution 1541 (XV), has still to accept these fundamental principles.

What do these principles show us? I will not repeat the detailed analysis that is contained in the background paper (A/41/668) which I had the honour some two months ago to circulate to Members of this Organization on behalf of the Forum countries. But, in summary, the application of these principles establishes clearly that the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on decolonization apply to New Caledonia. New Caledonia is 20,000 kilometres from France. Ethnically and culturally it is a diverse South Pacific island group; its constitutional and political history demonstrate a consistent pattern of subordination to Paris. In short it is a Non-Self-Governing Territory in terms of both Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and the decolonization Declaration.

We have examined the precedents. We have looked exhaustively into the procedures, the principles and the rules of the Assembly concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories. We have examined the issues of international law relevant to this request. The Charter is explicit. There are obligations to be fulfilled in the case of Non-Self-Governing Territories and these are not being fulfilled by France today in the case of New Caledonia. New Caledonia is a Non-Self-Governing Territory and France must honour its commitment to the Charter. France must transmit information to the Secretary-General on developments in New

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

Caledonia. France must co-operate with the international community in ensuring that the principles of the decolonization Declaration are faithfully implemented in this case as they have been in almost all other parts of our region.

The detailed analysis that is necessary for the United Nations to make the relevant findings on this subject has been done. The validity of the arguments that the South Pacific Forum countries have marshalled has been acknowledged by the Permanent Representative of France himself, no less. The dispassionate legal and technical analysis which the Forum countries have presented to this Organization, rather than being replied to in kind, has been the subject of the easiest retort which anyone can give when he knows his case is weak. The Forum countries have been subjected to abuse and threats. Where answers to the arguments might have been expected, there have been attacks on our countries and leaders and unworthy questioning of their motives. We have seen distortion and misrepresentation of the facts. For example, we have seen the views of a distinguished international jurist, a member of the International Court of Justice, deliberately misrepresented. We have seen resolutions of the Assembly misquoted and their substance and intent distorted. And not one single point that the Forum has put before the Organization for the past two months has been realistically disputed. The validity of the Forum's case, despite the political hyperbole and the disinformation of the administering Power, remains indisputable.

In conclusion, I return to the basic concern which has guided the Forum countries in this initiative. It is our belief in the principles of decolonization. We support the United Nations in its continued task to see all live in freedom. We believe in multiracialism. We, the peoples of the multiracial South Pacific, stand ready to welcome an independent multiracial New Caledonia to its rightful place in our community of nations.



Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): The Permanent Representative of Fiji has just spoken eloquently on agenda item 19 on behalf of the members of the South Pacific Forum, including Australia, which are also Members of this Organization. The consideration of item 19 - the decolonization item - has always been a very important item for successive General Assemblies, given the ongoing interest of the international community in completing the process of decolonization which began in the 1950s under the auspices of this Organization. So, in this context, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Australian Government on item 19 and in particular on the need for the orderly decolonization of New Caledonia, which is an issue on which Australia and indeed all other countries in the South Pacific and South-East Asian region - the region in which New Caledonia is situated - have an important and legitimate interest.

I wish to recall that the process of decolonization is one in which Australia itself has played a significant part. Two Territories which Australia administered - Papua New Guinea and Nauru - were trusteeship Territories of the United Nations and both achieved independence in co-operation with this Organization. A third Territory - the Cocos (Keeling) Islands - exercised its right to self-determination in 1984 when it voted to integrate with Australia in a plebiscite observed by the Committee of 24 and endorsed by this Assembly.

Our experience of decolonization under United Nations auspices has been productive and it has helped us to play our part in the process of decolonization in our region of the world.

When Australia and New Zealand joined this Organization as founding Members we were its only Members from the South Pacific. Our neighbours in the region were all dependent Territories, subject to metropolitan Powers. A glance at the

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

map of this region today will show how that situation has been transformed. Five former Territories - Samoa, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu - are now fellow Members of the United Nations, while Kiribati, Tuvalu, Nauru, Tonga, the Cook Islands and Niue have achieved independence or self-government. Some of them may join this Organization in the future.

In this process the United Nations has played a major role in implementing the 1960 Declaration on decolonization, through the Trusteeship Council and through the Special Committee of 24, as well as by the petition process and by the dispatch of visiting missions. In the course of decolonization, a new Pacific awareness - a new Pacific consciousness - has matured and is still growing. As the previous speaker has noted, this found expression in the creation, 15 years ago, of the regional body which now links the 13 self-governing States of the region: the South Pacific Forum.

The South Pacific Forum is the South Pacific's equivalent of bodies like the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Organization of American States (OAS). Its centrepiece is the annual meeting of Heads of Government to discuss issues of common concern and to strengthen the growing links between the States of the South Pacific. Starting with 7 members in 1971, the Forum now numbers 13. As the Forum's role has developed, so has the acceptance of it as the spokesman for the independent and self-governing peoples of the South Pacific. As the number of independent and self-governing States has grown, so has the expectation among them that the remaining territories will follow this same path of decolonization.\*

---

\*The President took the Chair.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

It is perfectly understandable that they have turned their attention to the French overseas Territory of New Caledonia, because of strong pressures by its indigenous Kanak population for independence. New Caledonia's immediate neighbours, including Australia, have closely followed developments in that Territory. We have also noted with concern the occasional eruption of violence in New Caledonia, even as recently as last month.

As this pressure for independence grew, the Forum countries could not stand aside. In their collective opinion, instability and uncertainty in New Caledonia could have undesirable repercussions not only within the Territory itself but also amongst its neighbours.

But France has maintained that New Caledonia is an integral part of metropolitan France. It used to maintain that about Algeria too. We all know that in 1986 this attitude seeks to perpetuate a myth and to sustain a legal fiction - a myth and a fiction which future historians may find as bemusing as King Canute's attempt to stem the oncoming tide. France cannot indefinitely resist, in New Caledonia, the wave of decolonization which has already washed over most of this earth.

For over five years the Forum was engaged in dialogue with France on New Caledonia, including continuing contacts and the dispatch of high-level missions. In those days we welcomed signs of evolution in French thinking. The beginnings of constitutional development, including the devolution of greater political responsibility to the indigenous Kanak people, and land reform, encouraged us. Greater attention was paid to Kanak culture. The South Pacific Forum, Australia included, saw these as progressive moves in the direction of orderly decolonization. We wished to build on them in order to facilitate

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

New Caledonia's progress to self-determination. Regrettably, that progress changed course earlier this year, following the French parliamentary elections. It soon became evident that the new Government in Paris saw New Caledonia's future in a different light from the previous Government. While it announced new plans, the reality was different. A referendum would be held. But what, exactly, would be the questions put at that referendum? Who would participate in that referendum? The Forum countries are still awaiting a clear response to those legitimate questions.

Equally important, what of United Nations involvement in the process? On this point there has been no ambiguity. There has been no acknowledgement from Paris that this Organization has any role in New Caledonia's process of self-determination. Indeed, one of the Senators from New Caledonia, Mr. Dick Ukeiwe, told a press conference here in New York only last week that United Nations observers would not be received in the Territory for the proposed referendum.

All this marked for us a turning point in the South Pacific Forum's approach to the problem. The Forum countries felt it was no longer possible for them to give France the benefit of the doubt when they compared France's deeds with its stated plans.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

It was not surprising therefore, that the fourteenth annual meeting of the Heads of Government of the South Pacific Forum in Suva only last August, concluded that the change in French policy towards New Caledonia had marked a significant backward step. That was why all the Heads of Government decided that the United Nations should be asked again to examine the situation in New Caledonia. We often talk here of preventative diplomacy. France itself has supported the notion of preventative diplomacy. The Forum countries want to see United Nations involvement in the decolonization process in New Caledonia just because we want to see further possible violence and conflict prevented.

Australia and its Forum partners are still open to dialogue with France, on a sincere and realistic basis. But we expect to see progress forward, not movement backwards. Our support for reinscription is firm. It is based on well-established principles, and we shall not be deflected by inaccurate or irrelevant references to Australia's internal affairs, which have been brought up simply to confuse the issues and to derail this debate.

Our sole aim is to ensure that New Caledonians are enabled to exercise their rights to self-determination under normal United Nations procedures.

It has been asked: why reinscription now? Why not wait a little, till next year or even the year after that? The Forum countries, including my own, are no longer prepared to accept such counsel. We followed such advice for some five years, but without worthwhile results.

More important, however, is the fact that French plans for the Territory's future are already in the process of being implemented. These plans remain somewhat vague, but they do include a referendum on the future status of New Caledonia planned for next July. Again, why not wait until after the French referendum in New Caledonia? I shall tell the Assembly why the Pacific countries think we should not wait.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

Australia would be the first to agree that New Caledonia's future should be decided democratically but we consider, like many other countries, that the planned referendum is defective in a number of respects.

First, it is not clear, as I have already said, exactly what questions will be posed or who will be eligible to vote. Those fundamental questions remain unanswered.

Australia agrees with its Forum partners on the need for electoral reform in New Caledonia, so that the franchise is concentrated in the hands of those who have a long-term residence in, and a commitment to, New Caledonia. We can well understand why the FLNKS, the group of political parties representing 80 per cent of the indigenous Kanak population, has reserved its attitude to the referendum until those questions are clarified.

Secondly, we need to compare the planned referendum with other acts of self-determination. Are the choices to be offered in fact those laid down in resolution 1541 (XV)? Is adequate provision made for the necessary prior political education? What of international observation by the United Nations, or by other bodies such as the South Pacific Forum itself? The French answers to these questions have not been reassuring.

A third cause for misgivings is that the French seem already confident of the outcome, namely, that New Caledonia's voters - whoever they may actually be at the time - will reject independence. Both Prime Minister Chirac and Overseas Territories Minister Pons have spoken in these terms.

We acknowledge that these are complex matters on which there can be, and are, differing views. That is precisely why the tried and tested United Nations procedures should be utilized, just as Australia utilized them in the cases of Papua New Guinea, Nauru and Cocos. We are not suggesting France do anything which we and New Zealand have not already done ourselves in the South Pacific region.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

If United Nations procedures are not utilized, the inescapable conclusion may be that France will be allowed to present a fait accompli to the international community next July. By that time, this Assembly will not of course be in a position to examine the outcome and might have to live with its consequences.

It is surely preferable that the Assembly assume its duty now, in a spirit of preventative diplomacy so that the right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination is assured. The conclusion we draw from this is that action on reinscription at this forty-first session of the General Assembly is essential. I had the honour and the pleasure to represent my country at the Non-Aligned Summit meeting recently in Harare, at which Australia had guest status. It was clear in Harare that this conclusion was shared by the Summit meeting of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement which called for reinscription at this session of the General Assembly; not at the forty-second session.

Delay would serve only the interests of France, not those of the New Caledonian people, and would present us with a French fait accompli. It is our view that that is the true reason why France is so firmly opposing what is a simple procedural resolution to associate the United Nations - as it should be associated - with the process of decolonization in New Caledonia.

Australia's attitude to France's role in the Pacific has been subject - and I say this more in sorrow than in anger - to misrepresentation and disinformation. It has been suggested to some people that Australia and New Zealand seek to dominate the Pacific and call the tune. It has been suggested to others that Australia and New Zealand do not really support this initiative on New Caledonia. I do not think this kind of thing is in the best tradition of Gallic logic, but let me respond with antipodean directness.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

We stand with our partners of the Pacific Forum as equals. We neither lead, nor are we led. The Forum works by consensus and we are part of that consensus.

Secondly, let me stress that Australia's links with France are close and long-standing. Australians fought and died in two world wars to defend French freedom on French soil. French is the most widely taught language in Australia after English and we have an admiration for French culture. At the political level, it has been specifically agreed that our differences in the Pacific must be managed within the wider framework of a productive and positive bilateral relationship.

Against this background it is ridiculous to suggest that Australia is part of some sinister Anglo-Saxon plot to drive France out of the Pacific and replace French influence with Australian influence. We have neither the will, the interest, nor the capacity to do this. Apart from anything else, this shows a curiously outdated concept of what modern, multicultural Australia is like. It is a concept as outdated as the concepts of nineteenth-century European colonialism.

I would go further and say that what we are advocating is much more likely to help maintain a French presence in the Pacific than to remove it. To France's credit, some of its African colonies became independent in 1960 through a process of mutual and friendly negotiation. As a result, French links with those countries have remained close. That option is also open to France in the case of New Caledonia.



(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

To sum up, the case presented by the members of the South Pacific Forum is firmly based on the decolonization principles laid down in resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV). We seek for New Caledonia only what the United Nations has sought and still seeks for other dependent territories, including, of course, Namibia. We continue our support for decolonization in the basic and principled belief that self-determination should be universal. To bring to New Caledonia the benefits of the decolonization Declaration, we believe the reinscription of the Territory at this General Assembly is an essential first step.

The draft resolution before us on reinscription is a non-polemical and procedural one. In supporting it, we are aiming to emphasize the feelings of so many countries that New Caledonia has the same right to self-determination as that already exercised by other French territories which we see seated in this Assembly. How can any Charter signatory not support this unanimous call by the countries of the South Pacific for reinscription?

The Australian Government believes that a vote in favour of any procedural resolution seeking to defer, amend, or impede action on draft resolution A/41/L.33 would be supporting a manoeuvre, the sole purpose of which would be to delay any United Nations involvement with the process of self-determination in New Caledonia until too late, until after the French Government has conducted its own referendum there. Any country voting for such a procedural manoeuvre would, therefore, be seen as a party to obstructing the process of orderly decolonization.

The Australian Government also believes that a vote against - or even an abstention - on draft resolution A/41/L.33 itself would not be understood by the Pacific Forum countries. It would, in fact, be seen as a vote to obstruct the process of peaceful decolonization in which the United Nations has so far played such a leading and successful role. I hope we shall all, on this issue, stand by

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

one of the most firmly established principles of this Organization, rather than permit this principle - self-determination - to be submerged by pressures related to aid, trade, proximity or previous colonial associations.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): I should like to begin on a personal note. On my first assignment to the Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations some 21 years ago, I was assigned responsibilities in Committees dealing with decolonization issues. Those were turbulent and yet exhilarating years; turbulent because the pace and restless momentum of change had already begun to infuse into international relations the sense of participation and democracy to which we had been only slightly accustomed; exhilarating because we, who worked in the United Nations, felt a direct involvement in the reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of human persons, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, to which our Charter stands trustee.

Twenty years later, much of the turbulence has ebbed. Peoples once inhabitants of colonies are now the proud arbiters of an independent destiny. In their freedom and the opportunity this Organization has helped to secure for them lies the stark and vivid contrast to those nations and peoples to whom the rights of history are still denied.

Decolonization is not an issue only of ethics or morals or feelings of fraternity. The values this institution represents are far older than the United Nations itself. They are the essential human values of trust, of compassion and of the awareness that only by working together can we reduce our common vulnerability to the savage forces of our times, some wielded by nature, some created by man himself. These are values far too easy to trade for strategic ambition and sheer commercial greed. History in one form is a serialization of episodes where the excitement of discovery and the triumph of human ingenuity have been brutalized by their conversion into synthetic relationships of dependence.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

Debates in this Assembly during the current session have mirrored our anguish at the situation in southern Africa. Namibia continues to be denied its rightful place in our Assembly. The population of South Africa is denied its right to a democratic and representative Government which can take a legitimate part in our proceedings. In both cases, deadlines have been destroyed, commitments compromised and our will vilified. With one foot in the grave and the other on a banana peel, the régime in Pretoria has little time left, but each moment of that brief span is a moment notched on our conscience and a testimony to our failure. Only a few months ago, our Secretary-General talked of the winds of change which have fundamentally altered the political map of the world but which have yet to cross the shores of South Africa and Namibia. One of his predecessors, Dag Hammarskjöld, had compared the United Nations to a ship at sea where "we have to meet the impatience of those sailors who expect land on the horizon tomorrow, also the cynicism or sense of futility of those who would give up and leave us drifting impotently". Our impatience is growing, but cynicism and a sense of futility have yet to erode the spirit of the people of Namibia and South Africa, whose faith in this institution endures, however little we may have been able to do to redeem our promise to them.

Draft resolution A/41/L.36, which is before us, affirms once again that the continuation of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations poses a serious threat to international peace and security. Administering Powers in strategically sensitive and vulnerable regions of the world have a particular responsibility in this regard. The Pacific Ocean, as Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India observed only last week, has traditionally been an arena of rivalry.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

The United Nations has specifically designated one of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under its consideration, namely, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, as a strategic territory for which the Security Council has a special responsibility. My country welcomes the evolution of a democratic, post-colonial society in the Trust Territory. We look forward to its emergence free of foreign interference or pressure, with the full participation of the United Nations and its responsible bodies.

We note also the decision of the South Pacific Forum to request the inscription of New Caledonia on the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories and the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly in that regard. The decision of the Forum was subsequently supported by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their Eighth Summit Conference held at Harare in September. India endorses the affirmation of the inalienable right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination and independence, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV), and also the request to the administering Power concerned to extend its co-operation to the Special Committee on decolonization. We note in particular that the Forum leaders have stated that their decision to bring the question before the United Nations reflects their consistently expressed desire to see New Caledonia move to independence by peaceful means.

Addressing the Commonwealth Heads of Government Regional Meeting in New Delhi in September 1980 the late Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, asked:

"How can we acquiesce in any theory which tries to justify the threat to our security environment or condone existence of foreign bases and cruising fleets? Independence implies responsibility of deciding what is good and safe for ourselves and of charting our own course. Any big-Power conflicts in our oceans of neighbourhood will hit us hard. Great Powers have great

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

responsibilities. It is up to them to turn away from the pursuit of power, which is in any case illusory, return to the negotiating table and come to an understanding to dismantle the apparatus of confrontation".

The Fourth Committee, under the wise guidance and chairmanship of my friend and colleague Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, has in the current session continued its record of thorough and painstaking work relating to the question of decolonization. As the Chairman told the valedictory meeting of the Fourth Committee for the current session, even though no colonial Territory has attained independence or joined the United Nations during the forty-first session, it is clear that decolonization remains high on the agenda of the international community.

Many years ago, in the very first years of our own sovereignty, our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru declared:

"The real test of independence lies in foreign relations. All else is local autonomy".

This Organization is committed to giving each people the right not only to determine its domestic affairs but to pursue its relations with the outside world. That is what decolonization is all about and it is to that we stand committed today.

Mr. IGLESIAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish) Looking at events from the perspective of history, today we realize that, indeed, more than 40 years ago those who met in San Francisco to sign the Charter in an attempt to eradicate the terrible scourge of war from the face of the earth not only had in mind avoiding confrontation between peoples but they sought instruments which would enable men to find the right paths to attaining peace within their own borders. The fact that today the number of countries represented in the Organization is more

(Mr. Iglesias, Chile)

than three times the number of the original signatories of the Charter is the clearest proof that in this span of time we have indeed been able to provide a substantial number of peoples with appropriate peaceful means with which to realize their ambitions in peace and harmony, by eliminating the bitterness of confrontation and death. Many peoples have attained their freedom without having to endure the suffering which others had to undergo in order to achieve independence.

The principle of self-determination of peoples comprises two aspects of varying importance. The first can be found on a strictly academic level together with the principles of non-intervention - Latin American in origin - equality of States, respect for sovereignty and many others. These form a host of principles, which, as the corner-stones of countries' foreign policies, support the formal position of most of the States of the world. A second expression of this principle can be found in certain specific cases of decolonization, in which Non-Self-Governing Territories, as well as the so-called administering Powers, both play a very important role. This aspect, which is more pragmatic than academic, is dealt with by the United Nations machinery in its attempt to build certain basic components to bring about individual national identity in each of those areas of the world.

Chile, throughout the decades, has continuously supported the consolidation of this fundamental human right, which is the sum total of the interests and the needs of every community and impels it to attain its place in history in harmony with other peoples of the world. Neither subjugation nor disguised trusteeship nor ideological subordination respects self-determination. On the contrary they make a dead letter of the real needs of nations and they encourage them to desperate solutions.

(Mr. Iglesias, Chile)

The United Nations, when it was created at the end of the Second World War, could not remain idle in view of a process that was already taking shape in some regions. Motivated by the altruistic desire to ensure future peace and fashion the real geo-political map of the major Powers, it gave preferential attention to this appeal from many groups and institutionalized basic mechanisms to enable the principle of self-determination to be applied.

Self-determination encompasses a political component which is invisible at first glance, essentially variable and often imbued with ideology. Furthermore, self-determination is usually identified with political independence, arising from the full exercise of sovereignty, although that is merely one of its aspects. A substantial part of self-determination lies in the aspiration to achieve economic and cultural independence which is even more difficult to achieve in today's world in which interrelationships are becoming increasingly closer.\*

---

\*Mr. Maksimov, (Byelorussian SSR), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Iglesias, Chile)

The United Nations, immersed in political debates, is not unaware of that fact and, therefore, its consideration of that principle also takes place in this context. The very contents of the General Assembly resolutions that specifically refer to self-determination testify to this. Resolution 1514 (XV) has an abundance of theoretical provisions, but the language in which it sets forth a concept of self-determination does not establish a direct and immediate link between the concept and some specific administrative steps with international scope that have been taken by the group of persons purporting to exercise that right. Similarly, resolution 1541 (XV), which lists the three precise variants of what we might call "crystallized self-determination" - that is, independence, integration and free association - does not expressly include or deal with other possibilities; rather, in the careful language characteristic of this type of resolution, it leaves the door open to other ways that international practice or political determination may devise.

Despite the doubts that many have with regard to this item, there is a very clear perception of what self-determination means in the international political arena. That is why the task of decolonization is legitimately regarded as imperative in today's world.

With regard to actual positions taken on the problem of decolonization, that of my country is in keeping with the principles I have just analysed. Fortified by those tenets, our representatives participate in, and give their views on, the development of the process. Thus, Chile decided to support and co-sponsor the draft resolution on the inclusion of New Caledonia in the list of territories examined by the Committee on Decolonization. For we share the concern of the countries members of the Pacific Forum, in which we have observer status. We believe that the situation in New Caledonia, with regard to everything that



(Mr. Iglesias, Chile)

exclusively affects the achievement of the goal of self-determination, is also inextricably linked to the cause of the human rights of its inhabitants - a subject in which France has shown particular interest in other regions of the world.

With regard to the item on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), we favour a solution negotiated by the two parties in a dialogue held in a climate of peace.

We have always attended and extended our co-operation in the various sessions of the Committee on Decolonization, especially, its Sub-Committee on Small Territories. In the United Nations Council for Namibia, which represents - in the eyes of the international committee and under the law - the illegally occupied international Territory of Namibia, we have repeatedly expressed our commitment to decolonization and have also stated in no uncertain terms our abhorrence of apartheid. Our condemnation of the implementation of the practice of bantustanization is equally well known. We have supported all resolutions on Namibia that deal with the item objectively, with the aim of assisting the Namibian cause, and leaving aside all selective and biased argumentation.

Decolonization is a task on which we are making progress but on which much still remains to be done. My country reiterates its intention to support all activities designed to carry out that task, without political or ideological motives and for the sole purpose of attaining the final goal: the self-determination of peoples.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic):  
Article 1, paragraph 2 of the United Nations Charter states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

A number of countries have indeed been able to exercise those rights and have acceded to independence and become Members of the international Organization. The momentum towards decolonization led to the adoption by the General Assembly of the historic resolution 1514 (XV), which affirms the right of colonial countries and peoples to self-determination. The Committee on Decolonization has been the instrument through which that Declaration has been implemented. It has made a significant contribution by keeping colonial countries and peoples informed and, hence, making it possible for them to exercise the right to self-determination.

The peoples of the colonial Territories have shown their determination to exercise that right and thereby accede to independence and a life of freedom and dignity. Over 59 States, with populations numbering more than 80 million, have become independent since the adoption of the Declaration. That momentous achievement of the United Nations took place despite the obstacles placed in the path of those Territories. At first, the obstacles seemed intractable, but they were overcome by the unstinting and concerted efforts of this Organization. The international community is deservedly proud of its crucial role in this respect.

A large part of the credit in this sphere goes to the members of the Special Committee of 24, who have worked tirelessly to focus the attention of the world on the problem of decolonization and to mobilize world public opinion to extend both political and moral support to the colonial peoples in their efforts to exercise their right to self-determination. The Special Committee of 24 has played and still plays a major role in focusing international efforts on the complete implementation of the Declaration.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

My delegation has been privileged to be a member of the Committee since its inception. I was gratified personally to work under the guidance of Ambassador Oscar Oramas Oliva. I wish to congratulate him on the outstanding manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Special Committee and on his wide experience and wisdom, both of which enabled us to reach the successful conclusions reflected in the report. We are confident that the Committee will continue to perform its task until all vestiges of colonialism are eradicated, a goal which we hope will be realized soon.

As regards the question of decolonization, the international community is still facing some difficult problems, one of the most intractable of which is that of Namibia. Suffice it to refer to the international efforts that have been put forward this year, such as the Paris and Vienna conferences on the independence of Namibia, the New Delhi meeting of non-aligned countries on Namibia, and the various seminars and symposiums, together with the unstinting efforts of the Committee of 24, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, and the resolutions adopted at the end of our consideration of item 36 of the agenda of the forty-first session of the General Assembly: all testify to the international community's concern to resolve this problem.

Failure to achieve the independence of Namibia through the United Nations plan for Namibia, as reflected in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is due mainly to the intransigent position of the Pretoria apartheid régime, which rejects the implementation of this resolution and resorts to prevarication and procrastination. With the support of the United States of America, it seeks to

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

link the independence of Namibia to extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of the Cuban troops that are legally present in Angola. From this rostrum we appeal to all those who stand for justice and freedom to spare no effort, to leave no stone unturned, to enable the people of Namibia to express its genuine aspirations fully and in complete freedom, without any procrastination or postponement, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The problem of Namibia parallels that of Palestine. The people of Palestine have been deprived of their main rights. They have been expelled from their homeland. They have been subjected to such policies as depopulation, murder, detention, repression and domination by the racist colonialist Zionist entity, which aims at the expulsion of the population and expropriation of their territory. The people of Palestine are still waiting to enjoy their full rights, which were confirmed by the General Assembly - including those of self-determination, return to their homes, and the establishment of their independent State on the territory of Palestine. The close collaboration and alliance between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes, especially in the military and nuclear fields, play a serious role in co-ordinating the imperialist designs to subjugate the peoples of the Middle East and Africa.

Political freedom, which was one of the early fruits of the struggle waged by the colonial peoples, led them to independence. However, imperialist interests are trying to reassert their domination over the people and to control their destinies through economic hegemony. Certain territories are still under colonial control. Others are used for military purposes in order to ensure the strategic and military interests of the colonial States.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

The United States spares no effort to postpone the decolonization process in these Territories. It resorts to various pretexts, under whatever names, such as free association and political unity. These are but attempts to camouflage its perpetuation of domination and the act of annexation.

The American military measures in Micronesia give cause for serious concern. Not only are they designed to turn the Territory into a colonial dependency and strategic military bridgehead, but they are based on denying the rights of the people of the region to sovereignty in disregard of its free will.

Moreover, the United States declaration of 3 November 1986 concerning the granting of commonwealth status to the Northern Marianas and Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia and their association with the United States is a unilateral measure that violates the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement of 1947 and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The international community, represented in the Security Council, should debate this issue and decide on it.

As regards Puerto Rico, we confirm once more our support for the right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). This people still clings to its national unity, its cultural identity and its demand to exercise its right to self-determination, despite all the pressure brought to bear on it. To ensure full implementation of the Declaration it is incumbent on us to intensify our efforts to achieve this noble end.

We in the Syrian Arab Republic support the struggle of peoples for freedom, believing as we do that freedom is found in unity. We are as one against one enemy, whatever its name, be it colonialism, racism, apartheid or Zionism. We look

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

forward to the realization of freedom, independence and dignity for all peoples of the world.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Many wise and well deserved words are traditionally spoken, in this forum and in others, by delegations representing different continents, on the role and significance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Figuratively speaking, the Declaration represents the cumulative expression of an urgent need, realized by the States Members of the United Nations at the end of the 1950s, to do everything possible to eliminate the colonial system, which was an affront to the conscience of mankind. Among the numerous documents adopted by the United Nations only a very few can claim the same powerful political content and lasting influence on international affairs. However often it is cited, the Declaration will always retain the freshness and vigour of its fundamental premises, stressing as it does that "all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory", and "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". (resolution 1514 (XV))

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The Declaration is a manifesto of anti-colonial forces and from the dialectical point of view it is the historical antithesis of the philosophy and the policies founded on violence, intimidation, inequality, oppression and discrimination on the basis of race, religion, or colour. The inevitable outcome of the struggle between two opposites was the emergence of dozens of newly independent States, which have gained national liberation and rightfully become Members of the United Nations.

The Soviet delegation is particularly gratified by the fact that the idea of the equality of States and nations proclaimed by our Great October Revolution was embodied in the Declaration; the idea that roused the oppressed masses to action and became a powerful catalyst of anti-colonial processes. In the new wording of the Communist Party Programme, adopted by the XXVIIth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, it is stressed that

"The Soviet Union is on the side of those States and peoples which rebuff the attacks of the aggressive forces of imperialism and defend their freedom, independence and national dignity. Solidarity with them is now an important part of the common struggle for peace and international security."

The implementation of the Declaration on decolonization has enriched the world with the vast experience gained by peoples of colonial and dependent countries in their struggle for freedom and independence. The peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania have regained a sense of national dignity, and this has become an important factor for social progress.

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is playing an ever increasing role in the field of decolonization, including United Nations activities in this area. In the joint Soviet-Indian declaration adopted during the visit to India of

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Mikhail S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union and India noted

"the vitality of the Movement in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, aggression and apartheid, intervention and hegemony and for the establishment of a new international economic order".

In referring to the undeniable achievements in the struggle for the elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, one cannot but mention that each new step in that direction is met by ever increasing resistance on the part of the colonialists and neo-colonialists. Even today the rotting cankers of colonialism continue to poison international development, and if the collective scalpel of the world community fails to excise them the consequences for international peace and security may be extremely serious.

By deferring sine die the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples colonialists of various hues and stripes, as well as neo-colonialists, are trying to perpetuate age-old backwardness, underdevelopment and lack of unity among the indigenous population in the dependent Territories.

Instead of building industrial facilities in the colonial and dependent Territories, developing agriculture to satisfy the serious need of the indigenous population for foodstuffs, developing a transportation network and increasing employment, the Administering Authorities are increasingly making use of those territories for military purposes. They are building new military bases, airfields, testing ranges and other military facilities as if only these militaristic facilities can help the peoples of those Territories to gain genuine independence and statehood.

The plunder by foreign monopolies and transnational corporations greatly damages the interests of the peoples of colonial and dependent Territories, whether



(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

in southern Africa or in small island colonies. It is precisely this sort of activity that is one of the major obstacles to the earliest and fullest implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, the restructuring of international economic relations on a just, democratic basis, and the establishment of a new international economic order.

Recently, under cover of misleading assurances, the imperialists have been trying persistently to impose an ingenious system of neo-colonialist exploitation on the peoples of colonial and dependent Territories. Neo-colonialism has been camouflaged by all kinds of propaganda labels, such as "free association", "commonwealth", and so on.

The fact that the approximately two dozen countries and Territories, which remain in colonial bondage are in the fullest sense of the word scattered all over the world also makes the completion of the decolonization process more difficult. These Territories are situated in Africa and in the Atlantic and Pacific areas. There are various Administering Authorities applying various forms and methods of colonial rule and domination and striving to disunite the peoples of those Territories. Furthermore, the peoples themselves are at different levels of development; they have different languages and cultures, different ways of life; and often they know little or nothing about each other. And yet they share a common fate: that of a painful colonial dependence. They have but one adversary, imperialism, which is particularly important, they all share the desire to free themselves from colonial bondage. This desire is the common denominator in their political activities. It follows from this, we believe, that the problem of decolonization is indivisible, whether it is a matter of the elimination of colonialism on the African continent or in the ocean islands of the Atlantic or the Pacific. This indivisibility means that all the peoples of the colonial and

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

dependent Territories have the right to choose their own path of political and economic development, to establish equal and mutually beneficial relations with their neighbours and other States and to live in peace and security.

This indivisibility also implies that States Members of the United Nations must pay attention to the needs of all colonial and dependent Territories and peoples. We should not strive for the liberation of just one of the colonial and dependent peoples, while at the same time neglecting the fate of the peoples of other colonial and dependent Territories.

Finally, this indivisibility means that nobody can remain a purely passive onlooker in the struggle for decolonization. The policy of self-permissiveness which the colonialists and neo-colonialists are attempting to pursue with regard to dependent Territories and countries must be opposed by energetic and concerted efforts by Member States; political responsibility must be accepted for the fate of these peoples and Territories, and the political will and determination must be shown to take practical steps in this important field.

Guided by this important principle, the Soviet Union resolutely supports the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization in the cases of Namibia, Micronesia, New Caledonia and other colonial and dependent Territories.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

An important part of the work being done to ensure universal implementation of the Declaration is being carried out by the Special Committee of 24, headed by its Acting Chairman, Ambassador Oramas Oliva, the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations.

The people of Namibia are still suffering under the colonial racist yoke. The racist Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and its exploitation of its natural and human resources, violating numerous United Nations decisions and resolutions, including resolutions of the Security Council, and ignoring the will of the international community of States. The apartheid régime relies on the support of its Western partners, particularly the United States and Britain, which make it impossible for the Security Council to use the means at its disposal to exert pressure on Pretoria. That régime is also attempting to stifle the national liberation movement of the Namibian people and to impose a neo-colonialist alternative upon them in order to retain its political, military and economic control over Namibia.

In the joint Soviet-Indian declaration, the Soviet Union and India called for "the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from its territory, as well as for the full and timely implementation of all relevant United Nations resolutions on granting independence to Namibia, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

In accordance with United Nations decisions, the Soviet Union is providing and will continue to provide necessary political and material support to the Namibian people and to their vanguard, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). It will also make full use of the United Nations potential to ensure the complete liberation of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Soviet public organizations actively support national liberation movements struggling against colonialism and racism. The Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Asian and African Countries makes an annual contribution to the fund of the Organization of African Unity to increase international awareness of the situation in southern Africa. The Committee supports the Solomon Mahlangu Freedom College for the children of South African and Namibian refugees. Hundreds of students from that region of the African continent have received education in such fields as economy, health care, science and culture at Soviet educational institutions through the Committee's scholarship programme.

Of serious concern to us is the situation in the United Nations strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which is being annexed before the very eyes of the United Nations by the United States and turned into its military-strategic stronghold and a colonial appendage. On 3 November it was officially announced in Washington that three parts of the United Nations strategic Trust Territory - the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia - were being given the status of so-called commonwealth and so-called free association with the United States. The Presidential statement in that regard states unambiguously that the 1947 Trusteeship Agreement, which, as Members know, was concluded between the Security Council and the United States, "is no longer valid" with respect to the aforementioned Micronesian entities. All that has been done in disregard of the Security Council, which is responsible, under the United Nations Charter, for that strategic Trust Territory and in violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The United States, by exerting severe economic and political pressure, has imposed on the Micronesians oppressive agreements that are incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Trusteeship over that Territory. The recent

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

American actions are but an additional link in a long chain of unlawful and anti-Charter steps by Washington with regard to Micronesia, and indeed are in violation of operative paragraph 6 of the Declaration on decolonization, which clearly and unambiguously states:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

(resolution 1514 (XV)).

In open defiance of that provision, the administering Power has broken that single strategic Trust Territory down into four parts and dissolved the united national congress, this after the congress had unequivocally rejected the association of Micronesia with the United States on the pattern of the Puerto Rico model and clearly expressed itself in favour of preserving the unity of the Marshall, Caroline and Mariana Islands.

Despite its obligation to promote in the Trust Territory conditions that would enable the people of Micronesia freely to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, the United States has so far failed to do so. Notwithstanding Article 76 of the United Nations Charter, it has failed to create conditions that would favour the rapid economic development of Micronesia and its establishment as an independent State. Politically controlled and totally dependent economically upon the administering Power, the people of Micronesia are being deprived of the opportunity to make their own free choice, independently and without outside interference.

The administering Power, again acting in contradiction with Article 76, has failed to contribute to the progress of the population of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence. The negotiations imposed upon the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Micronesians with regard to the future political status of some parts of the Territory were not and, indeed, could not be equitable. The so-called compacts and agreements prepared during the negotiations are not equitable either. The so-called plebiscites and referendums held in Micronesia with a view to securing approval of the agreements on so-called free association and commonwealth status with the United States had absolutely nothing to do with genuine acts of free expression of will and self-determination by peoples, as advocated by the United Nations.

By staging another so-called plebiscite in Palau on 2 December - the seventh consecutive one and the second in the course of this year alone - the authorities once again are depriving the people of Palau of the right to make a choice other than neo-colonialist dependence, namely, that of complete freedom and true independence.

The United States refers to the Trusteeship Council resolution of 28 May 1986 in its unilateral attempts to change the status of the United Nations strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. However, that resolution was adopted in violation of the Trusteeship Council's mandate under the relevant provision of the Charter. From that mandate, it follows unequivocally that the Trusteeship Council is not empowered to take any decisions concerning changes in the existing status of the aforementioned United Nations Trust Territory or to make any recommendations with regard to a so-called new status for the strategic Trust Territory as a whole or for parts thereof.

The Soviet Union categorically opposed in the Trusteeship Council the sending of a special mission to Palau because that mission was clearly designed to cover with the United Nations flag another American attempt to impose upon the population of Palau, by means of economic and political pressure, the status of a United States nuclear springboard, which it has repeatedly rejected.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The anti-Charter nature of the Council's mission to Palau is also confirmed by the fact that in essence it is aimed at giving an appearance of legitimacy to the process of the fragmentation of a single Trust Territory undertaken by the United States in direct violation of the United Nations Charter.

The basic position of the Soviet Union on Micronesia was again reaffirmed in the TASS statement of 12 November 1986, which stated:

"The actions undertaken by the United States with respect to the United Nations Trust Territory of Micronesia are unilateral, arbitrary and legally invalid. The Security Council alone is authorized under the United Nations Charter to take decisions on the termination of a United Nations Trusteeship Agreement. The United Nations and the international community as a whole must resolutely reject the illegal ambition of the United States to act as a ruler of the destinies of peoples. The United Nations continues to bear responsibility for that Territory until the achievement of genuine independence by its people".

The process of decolonization will not be completed when political independence is achieved by the peoples of colonial and dependent Territories. The establishment of a new international economic order and the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and equitable basis are in the interests of all mankind and in particular of the developing countries. This is extremely important in the light of the fact that imperialism resorts not only to political but also to economic means to prevent newly independent countries from standing tall and breathing freely. That is why it is so important for the fledgling States of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania to remain vigilantly on guard and protect the flag of political and economic independence which they have raised.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The New Delhi declaration on the principles of a non-violent world free of nuclear weapons, signed by Mr. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Mr. Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, emphasizes that

"in the nuclear age mankind must adopt a new political thinking, a new concept of the world, that provides a reliable guarantee of the survival of mankind".

A safe world on the eve of the twenty-first century would be a world of law and order, strict compliance with the United Nations Charter and all the norms of international law, and respect for human rights and freedoms everywhere.

New political thinking consonant with present-day realities objectively requires a fresh approach and new, practical solutions to the problem of decolonization inherited from the past. The main objective now is to establish in United Nations activities in this area a new scale of priorities, foremost among which must be practical action by States to ensure implementation of the Declaration.

The Soviet Union, together with other States Members of the United Nations, is ready for vigorous, practical action.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.