



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

later: Mr. KAREPA (Papua New Guinea)

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS

UN/ISA COLLECTION

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 104: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(a) 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 (continued)

(b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/38/SR.15
23 November 1983
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 18: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (Territories not covered under other agenda items) (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/38/23 (Part VI and Add.1), A/38/23 (Part VIII); A/C.4/38/L.2; A/AC.109/724 and Corr.1, 725, 726 and Corr.1, 727, 728 and Corr.1, 729-736, 737 and Corr.1, 738, 739, 740 and Corr.1, 741, 742, 746, 749 and Corr.1, 753 and 754)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/555)

AGENDA ITEM 102: INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES TRANSMITTED UNDER ARTICLE 73 e OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/38/125)

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/477)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued) (A/38/23 (Part IV))

AGENDA ITEM 104: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

- (a) 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 (continued) (A/38/23 (Part IV)); A/AC.109/L.1492, L.1475 and Add.1, L.1487)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/111 and Add.1-2, Add.3 and Corr.1, Add.4; A/AC.109/L.1462)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/38/3 (Part II))

AGENDA ITEM 105: UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/469)

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/549, A/C.4/38/L.6)

/...

Request for hearing

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had received a communication (A/C.4/38/6/Add.12) containing a request for hearing relating to the question of Western Sahara. He suggested that the Committee should decide to grant the request.
2. It was so decided.

General debate

3. Mr. JANI (Zimbabwe) said that, after carefully studying Morocco's position on the question of Western Sahara, his delegation had discovered several shortcomings. First, in asserting that the International Court of Justice had recognized "legal ties of allegiance" between Morocco and Spanish Sahara, in an advisory opinion of 1975, Morocco omitted to mention that, in the same opinion, the Court had noted that the historic links between the Sahara and Morocco did not support claims of territorial sovereignty or preclude the application of the principle of self-determination for the inhabitants of the area. It could even be deduced from the ruling that Morocco's territorial claim was without foundation in international law. Moreover if the Territory belonged to Morocco, as Morocco claimed, it was inexplicable that, five months after Spain's withdrawal in 1975, Morocco had annexed only two thirds of the Territory, leaving the south to another country. That attitude was all the more inconsistent in that since then, Morocco had annexed the portion of Territory which it had initially been willing to give up.
4. Morocco's attitude at the current session was no less bewildering. While at the previous session Morocco had objected to the identification of the parties to the conflict in the resolution before the Committee, on the grounds that the Organization of African Unity had not yet defined the parties and to do so would be tantamount to disregarding the mandate and authority of the summit conference of the OAU, it was inexplicable that Morocco was refusing to accept resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), in which the majority of the African leaders, aware of the need to resolve the crisis, had clearly defined the parties to the conflict. Moreover, Morocco was refusing to enter into direct negotiations with the POLISARIO under the pretext that it was only one of the many parties to the conflict. However, as the OAU had recognized at its recent summit meeting in resolution 104 (XIX), there were only two parties to the conflict: the POLISARIO, which represented the Saharan people, and Morocco, whose position, according to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1975, was without legal foundation. Thus despite its protestations of goodwill, Morocco, in insisting that the OAU should act as interlocutor in the negotiations, was refusing to comply with the wishes which had been very clearly expressed by the African States in resolution 104 (XIX) and thereby refusing to contribute to a settlement of the crisis.
5. It appeared that Morocco feared the outcome of a referendum because it was manufacturing all kinds of pretexts to delay the holding of a referendum. It was advancing the same argument as South Africa which refused to recognize SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

/...

(Mr. Jani, Zimbabwe)

6. His delegation appealed to Morocco to stop delaying and, as the OAU had urged at its 19th summit meeting, enter into direct negotiations with the POLISARIO, which had proved its goodwill by stating that it would be bound by the results of the referendum.

7. Mr. Karepa (Papua New Guinea) took the Chair.

8. Mr. MALINGA (Uganda) said that as the number of colonial Territories diminished, the task of decolonization was becoming more complex. The administering Powers had undertaken the responsibility of preparing those peoples for independence and developing their political, economic and social infrastructures. His delegation was concerned about the numerous losses of human lives resulting from the situation in Western Sahara and welcomed the efforts of the OAU and its Implementation Committee on Western Sahara to organize a referendum in which the people of the Territory would be able to decide freely on their own future. It appealed to the parties to the conflict to abide by the consensus which had emerged in the OAU on the question.

9. With regard to item 104, his delegation welcomed the sustained and effective assistance provided by the specialized agencies to the colonial peoples and their liberation movements. However, that assistance was inadequate in the case of the Namibian people and their national liberation movement, SWAPO. As to items 105 and 106, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the training facilities offered by Member States to the inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories were a vital means of preparing those peoples to manage their Territories when they became independent. Uganda participated in those efforts within the limitations of its modest resources.

10. His delegation wished to commend all Governments, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations, in particular the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, for their fruitful contribution to the cause of decolonization. Colonialism would not disappear without the concerted efforts of all Members of the Organization to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

11. Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (India) paid tribute to the Special Committee of 24 for its tireless efforts aimed at implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, despite the significant results achieved by the United Nations in the field of decolonization, the process was far from complete. There still were retrogressive forces in the world, in particular in South Africa, where a racist régime continued to hold the people of Namibia and the South Africans themselves in bondage.

12. The report of the Special Committee bore witness to the complexity of the problems which remained to be solved in the field of decolonization. While probably no single formula existed, it was fundamental that the peoples concerned must express their will freely and fearlessly. The Committee of 24 emphasized in that connection the need to inform the peoples of the Territories about the options

/...

(Mr. Ramachandran, India)

open to them and the responsibilities of the administering Powers whose obligation was to promote the welfare and progress of the local population.

13. In the debate on the question of Western Sahara, there was evidence of increased bitterness which could jeopardize the chances of a peaceful and negotiated settlement. It was to be hoped that through the joint efforts of the United Nations and OAU, the problem would be resolved expeditiously, in a manner consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

14. Lastly, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa was an essential element in the quest for decolonization, and India was proud to participate in the Programme by offering scholarships and seats in its educational institutions. It was regrettable that, for the second year in a row, pledges in real terms had decreased. He hoped that the Programme would continue to receive generous support, particularly from the developed countries.

15. Re-emphasizing India's special commitment to decolonization, arising out of its own experience of colonization, he quoted Nehru's statement that peace and freedom were indivisible.

16. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) said that much had already been done to enable the peoples of colonial Territories to exercise their right of self-determination since 1960, the date of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence - inter alia, the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration, annexed to General Assembly resolution 35/118. However, there still remained much to do, and he called upon the administering Powers to take resolute action to implement the Declaration.

17. Some constructive statements had been made by delegations during their consideration of the various questions before the Committee; his delegation, however, wished to confine itself to the case of Western Sahara. Despite some significant results, the combined efforts of the United Nations and OAU had not yet been able to bring the desired peace. In 1982 OAU had undergone a grave crisis which had interfered with its work. Africa had run the risk of losing an irreplaceable instrument which had been working for 20 years in the interest of African unity. Finally, under dramatic circumstances, resolution AHG/104 (XIX) had been adopted, bringing success to the efforts made by all the African Heads of State. In that resolution they had designated by name for the first time the parties to the conflict, inviting them to undertake direct negotiations in order to arrive at a cease-fire and create the conditions for a self-determination referendum. Senegal had helped to bring about that agreement, thus putting into action a policy based on negotiation and dialogue, which alone were capable of creating the conditions for a peaceful and just solution of the problem of Western Sahara. Unfortunately, the efforts made for implementing that resolution had not succeeded, even though the King of Morocco had declared to the General Assembly on 27 September 1983 that Morocco solemnly undertook to consider itself bound by the results of the referendum and even though the President of the Republic of Senegal and his Algerian colleague had signed a joint communiqué in October 1983

/...

(Mr. Kamara, Senegal)

emphasizing the need to implement fully the resolution on the question of Western Sahara adopted at the nineteenth session of the OAU Summit Conference. In those circumstances, and in the light of the difficulties which continued to block a settlement of the problem, nothing should be done which endangered the Addis Ababa consensus, which was part of the efforts recommended in Article 52 of the Charter for the peaceful settlement of local disputes by existing regional agencies. Although it was certainly easier for the United Nations to take note of the Addis Ababa consensus than for OAU to implement it, nevertheless the path of dialogue, which must lead to peace in Western Sahara, was now open. It was in that spirit that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.2 and was inviting the members of the Fourth Committee to adopt it.

18. Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) resumed the Chair.

19. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia) reaffirmed that his Government's principal objective with regard to the Cocos Islands was to bring about conditions which would enable the people of the Territory to exercise freely its right to self-determination, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Members of the Committee had no doubt gained an understanding of recent developments in the Territory from the Secretariat's working paper (A/AC.109/730).

20. As a consequence of his Government's policy, the Cocos Malay community had in recent years assumed increasing responsibility for the management of its own affairs. That had been facilitated by the establishment of the Cocos Islands Co-operative Society in January 1978 and the Cocos (Keeling) Islands Council in July 1979. Since its establishment, the functions of the Council had been expanded and its powers increased. The satisfactory way in which the Council had fulfilled its responsibilities proved that the community had a deep interest in administering its own affairs and a growing self-confidence in its management and decision-making skills.

21. Having undertaken to examine ways to diversify and strengthen the community's economic base in so far as possible, his Government had effected the transfer, in October 1983, of the provisioning, catering and accommodation services in the Territory to the Cocos Islands Co-operative Society, on terms which would enhance its economic viability. Those services had previously been carried out by an Australian Government body. The Society had continued to operate profitably, with profits amounting in 1983 to \$452,000, as compared with \$213,000 in 1982. Elections had been held in September 1983 for the society's Management Committee, and in October 1983 for the members of the Council. Virtually all those eligible to vote had exercised their right to do so.

22. With regard to education, the construction of two new schools had begun, one on Home Island and the other on West Island. An apprenticeship training scheme by correspondence for young Cocos Malays had been initiated, involving short tuition periods in Perth each year. Six apprentices were currently following the course. Four Cocos Malay students had received Government bursaries to complete their

/...

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

secondary education in Australia. His Government was identifying functions within its administration staffing complement that would in future be carried out by members of the local community and providing the requisite training where necessary. The programme was gaining momentum and 17 people were already performing various functions under contract arrangements with the Co-operative.

23. Since July 1983 when Australia had submitted its report to the Special Committee on Decolonization, there had been significant developments in the Cocos Islands with regard to the exercise by the people of their right to determine their future political status. In November 1982 the Australian Government had informed the community of the general elements of the three options from which it could choose in an act of self-determination. After preliminary consideration of those options by the community, the Chairman of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands Council had indicated that the community believed it could not proceed to the act of self-determination in full confidence without knowing what the Australian Government intended to do about the presence in the Islands of Mr. Clunies-Ross. The Australian Government had purchased the bulk of the property owned by Mr. Clunies-Ross in the Islands in September 1978. The village area had been transferred to the ownership of the Council and the plantation lands leased to the Co-operative Society at a nominal rental. The new Minister responsible for the Cocos Islands since the Australian elections in March 1983, Mr. Uren, Minister for Territories and Local Government, had visited the Cocos Islands in April 1983 to ascertain the wishes of the people, including their attitude to Mr. Clunies-Ross. In the light of the unanimous views expressed at a joint meeting of the Cocos (Keeling) Islands Council and the Cocos Islands Co-operative Society, and other discussions he had held with members of the community, the Minister had informed the community that he would recommend that the Australian Government acquire the remaining property interests of Mr. Clunies-Ross in the Islands with the intention of giving them to the Council. Mr. Clunies-Ross had then decided to submit the case to the Australian courts. The High Court was expected to hear the case in February or March 1984. In October, the Minister for Territories and Local Government had presented to the community a statement concerning its options under an act of self-determination, following broadly the options outlined by the previous Government in 1982. Discussions with the community were proceeding. The Cocos Islands leaders, on behalf of the community, had recently informed the Australian Government that they were now prepared to proceed to an act of self-determination. The Australian Government proposed to invite a United Nations visiting mission to the Cocos Islands to observe the act. It was evident that the Australian Government continued to bear in mind its responsibilities under the Charter; it reaffirmed that it was aware of the importance of co-operative relations with the United Nations and would act in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Cocos Islands in the determination of their political future.

24. Mr. Karepa (Papua New Guinea) resumed the Chair.

/...

25. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) said that resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, sanctioned the inalienable and imprescriptible right of peoples to self-determination and national independence. That recognition of the vast anti-colonialist movement in Africa, Asia and Latin America had not been prompted by the awakening of a universal conscience that had suddenly become receptive to ideas deemed subversive not long before, but to the admirable struggle which the peoples had waged and the extraordinary sacrifices they had made in order to win their freedom, and to the contradictions that had divided the colonial Powers and the great Powers. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania, whose people had been obliged to engage in sustained armed resistance to colonial penetration, attached great psychological, moral and political importance to that historic resolution.

26. Africa, which at the Berlin Conference had been handed over, a helpless victim, to European colonialism, had been despoiled of its human and material resources. Decolonization had given rise to disputes about boundaries and to territorial claims based on a wide variety of pretexts. It was therefore not surprising that Africa should be hostile to any conquest, to colonialism and to neo-colonialism. It was likewise not surprising that OAU had decided to adhere firmly to the rule of the inviolability of frontiers inherited from colonialism, in the absence of any desire freely expressed by the parties concerned. That explained the interest taken by the continent as a whole in the problem of Western Sahara, which was a typical example of incomplete decolonization that had led to a ruinous war involving risks of internationalization and the artificial division of Africa. Eight years after the outbreak of that fratricidal conflict, and after a crisis that had lasted for almost 18 months, OAU had adopted, by an almost unanimous vote of its members, a resolution offering a realistic and practical means of reaching a solution to the problem of Western Sahara that would be genuine because it was negotiated and democratic.

27. His country, which together with Senegal and Ethiopia had prepared that resolution, the outcome of long and laborious consultations and negotiations, was firmly convinced that it represented the only chance and indeed the last chance for north-west Africa and Africa as a whole to settle that conflict once and for all, in conformity with international law. As his delegation had observed at the thirty-seventh session, anyone who approached the problem with sincere realism and action-oriented logic would have to conclude that negotiations were necessary to close the Saharan file. That was also the view of the great majority of States Members of the Organization, which considered that the parties involved were clearly the Kingdom of Morocco and the POLISARIO Front. That had likewise been the opinion of the OAU mission which had visited the Territory and the three neighbouring countries in May 1975. Since then, the General Assembly had consistently expressed the same view. In 1983 once again, at its nineteenth Summit Conference, OAU had designated the POLISARIO Front as the representative of the Saharan people and had requested it to negotiate directly with Morocco.

28. Introducing draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.2 on behalf of 40 delegations, including 24 African delegations, he said that it reproduced in full a resolution adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its nineteenth

/...

(Mr. Ould Hamody, Mauritania)

ordinary session; after taking note of the OAU resolution, the General Assembly would request that certain practical steps be taken in the last 3 paragraphs of the draft. The OAU resolution was a compromise text which the sponsors had agreed to in order to avoid controversy and confrontation. He hoped that the draft resolution would receive the unanimous support of all members of the Committee. Showing the same courage, sense of realism and justice and sincere desire for compromise as had been manifested by Africa, the Committee should ensure that the United Nations provided OAU with political and logistic support, where appropriate. That was the intent of the sponsors of the draft; they wanted the United Nations, by ratifying the OAU decision, to demonstrate the importance which the international community attached to certain basic principles, such as the inalienable and inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and independence and the negotiated settlement of disputes.

29. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that, without repeating information already available to the Committee in the documents of the Special Committee on decolonization, he would none the less like to review some major developments as they related to the improvement of the social, economic, political and cultural conditions of the Territories administered by the United States. As members were aware, those Territories had long had the institutions and rights which were the hallmark of a free people, including freely elected representatives, freedom of speech and the press and freedom of assembly and religion. The United States warmly encouraged the growth of self-government and was proud of the fact that democratic, representative governments had been established in those Territories. It would willingly continue to work with the leaders of each Territory to promote political, economic and social development in accordance with the wishes of the people. Just as it respected the views of the peoples of those Territories, it asked the members of the Committee to respect their right under the Charter to determine their own future.

30. In the past year, the peoples of Guam, American Samoa and the United States Virgin Islands had made tremendous strides towards economic self-sufficiency and self-determination. In that regard, the Government of the United States had provided considerable assistance, focusing on improving government efficiency by reducing burdensome Federal regulations and by providing technical assistance in transportation, medicine, communications, economic development, finances and management. In 1983, it had completed a multi-million dollar capital improvement programme to set the stage for the necessary economic diversification and growth. Co-operation between the Federal Government and the Territorial Governments was facilitated by frequent visits of the Governors to Washington and of Federal officials to the Territories, as well as by the presence in Washington of the territorial representatives in the United States Congress and of the Governors' own representatives.

31. On the economic front, all of the Territories were working hard to expand their economic bases. They were becoming more active participants in the development of their regions. At the request of the territorial Government, for example, the United States Government had applied for associate membership in ECLA

/...

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

for the United States Virgin Islands. It would make an application to the Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee in respect of the same Territory. Similar action had been taken several years before to obtain associate membership for Guam in ESCAP. The United States was pleased that the Special Committee had noted those steps with satisfaction in its recent report on the Virgin Islands.

32. The Governor of American Samoa had announced that a constitutional convention would be held in January 1984 to review amendments to the Samoan Constitution for the first time in 10 years. If amendments to the Constitution were adopted by the Convention, they would have to be approved by the voters of American Samoa at the next general election. That was not to suggest that the people of American Samoa wanted a substantial change in their relationship with the rest of the United States: on the contrary, as noted in a letter from the Governor of the Territory to the Department of State dated 21 April 1983, the people of American Samoa felt that it was in their best interests to continue as an unincorporated Territory of the United States. He regretted that the Special Committee had not seen fit in its report to reflect that feeling, which had also been conveyed to it in the course of the most recent visiting mission. He felt bound to commend to the Fourth Committee's attention the Governor's opinion that self-determination for the people of American Samoa was manifested in "the wish of the people to maintain their present status and remain part of the American family". It had not been the intention of the authors of the United Nations Charter to force people to change their status contrary to their expressed wishes, and his delegation endorsed the Governor's request that the United Nations should respect the wishes of the people of American Samoa in the matter. The United States was strongly committed to the self-determination of all peoples, including, of course, the peoples of its own Territories.

33. Mr. DIAWARA (Mali) said that respect for the universal principles which underlay the basic right of peoples to self-determination and independence was a sacred duty of States. However, in spite of commitments entered into and joint efforts, the fact was that that right was not universally respected; in Namibia, for example, the racist Pretoria régime, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, in particular those of the Security Council, and thanks to complicity within the Organization itself, continued to obstruct the independence of the Namibian people. Following the unanimous acceptance of resolution 435 (1978), in which South Africa had participated, it had seemed that Namibia would shortly attain independence - until the Pretoria authorities had decided to link that independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The colonial and racist policy of the South African Government was breeding serious conflicts in southern Africa. The States Members of the United Nations, by virtue of their commitments under the Charter, should take action that was more specific in order to help the Namibian people recover their full independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. That liberation struggle should not be perceived as an ideological confrontation between great Powers. The adversaries were an anachronistic colonial régime and millions of men determined to assert that national existence.

/...

(Mr. Diawara, Mali)

34. The question of Western Sahara was of grave concern to his delegation because it set the brother peoples of the African region against each other. After overcoming many difficulties, the nineteenth Summit Conference of OAU, which had been held in June 1983, had finally adopted a resolution containing all the elements for a just and lasting solution in the matter. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation of Mali had stated in the General Assembly, several years of war in Western Sahara had shown that military confrontation was no solution. History demonstrated also that every dispute and every war had been terminated at a negotiating table. That was the price of peace in Western Sahara, a price which the parties to the conflict, the Kingdom of Morocco and Frente POLISARIO, must pay in honour and dignity.

35. Mr. SPAIN (Guinea-Bissau) regretted that, despite the numerous efforts of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, the problem of Western Sahara was still not settled. The States Members of the United Nations must act to ensure that the Sahrawi people speedily recovered its identity and its right to live in freedom and security, thereby promoting peace and stability on the African continent.

36. The implementation of resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), unanimously adopted by the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, was the best means of reaching a lasting solution through negotiations. It was regrettable that Morocco, contrary to its earlier commitments, categorically refused to co-operate with the OAU Implementation Committee in studying ways and means of carrying out that resolution. It should therefore be called upon to abandon its policy in the Western Sahara and to comply with the provisions of the OAU resolution.

37. From the attitude shown by Morocco and the statements made by representatives of certain United Nations Member States it was to be feared that the hope, widely shared after the nineteenth session of the OAU Assembly, of quickly finding a solution to the problem was only illusory. It must be stressed, however, that any delay in the implementation of the OAU resolution would only increase tensions and promote confrontation instead of dialogue.

38. With reference to the situation in southern Africa, he said that the African countries must combine their efforts and mobilize their resources to meet the common enemy, the fascist, racist and illegal régime of South Africa, which was desperately trying not only to perpetuate apartheid and its control over the resources of Namibia but also, in violation of many legal instruments, to destabilize the front-line States by acts of aggression and banditry.

39. Mr. CHORNY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the substantial results thus far achieved in the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples must not obscure the fact that imperialism was stubbornly clinging to its last bastions of colonialism while modernizing earlier, and creating new, forms of dependence. A whole series of small territories were thus being subjected to the pernicious activities of Western States, headed by the United States of America and the United Kingdom. In that

/...

(Mr. Chorny, Ukrainian SSR)

connection, the documents presented by the Special Committee of Twenty-Four constituted irrefutable evidence of the sad reality imposed by the administering Powers on the populations of a large number of colonial island territories in the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean.

40. In violation of the provisions of the International Trusteeship System, whose basic objectives were "to further international peace and security" and "to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence", the United States, with its well-known brazenness, was using the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia) for its own military and strategic purposes, seeking to transform those islands, some of which had been the site of numerous nuclear explosions, into a perpetual appendage of United States territory and a military bridgehead.

41. Thus, the United States was continuing to establish in the Trust Territory and in the Marianas and the Palau new naval and other military bases. One of those atolls had even been converted into a target for testing intercontinental ballistic missiles such as the new MX missiles. As a member of the Senate of the Palau had stated at the 1982 session of the Trusteeship Council, the United States was trying to use Micronesia as a pawn in its military game and to secure an agreement enabling it to stockpile nuclear, chemical and biological weapons on those islands.

42. As to its obligations under the trusteeship system, the United States had not promoted the economic advancement of the inhabitants of Micronesia but had done everything to undermine conditions for their independent economic development. The fact was that the dependence of the Micronesian economy on foreign capital had not decreased. The Territory was suffering from considerable unemployment and shortages of water and electricity, while transport and communications were in a deplorable state. The working paper of the Special Committee on decolonization (A/AC.109/739) stated, inter alia, that "the Trust Territory was still [in 1982] in a position of almost total economic and financial dependence on the Administering Authority. In particular, the structural imbalances in the economy had not been significantly reduced and appeared unlikely to be redressed in the short term. As was noted by the 1980 Visiting Mission, the Territory's economic self-sufficiency could only be considered a long-term objective". In spite of the high-sounding statements concerning increased allocations to the Trust Territory, the data of the United States State Department itself showed that the funds in question had gone primarily for United States personnel and military installations, and only thereafter for "improvement". It should also be mentioned that the United States refused to deal with the consequences of the one-crop system, which doomed the Micronesian populations to a miserable existence.

43. International public opinion had also been indignant over the attempt by the United States to impose on certain parts of Micronesia, against the will of the populations concerned, a neo-colonialist status disguised as a "commonwealth" or "free association". Apart from serving the military plans of the Pentagon, that attempt had no other aim than to decide the fate of peoples by methods which

/...

(Mr. Chorny, Ukrainian SSR)

recalled the worst episodes of colonial brigandage and which had been firmly denounced in numerous resolutions of the United Nations, which should continue to do its utmost to oppose a manoeuvre whereby the administering Power sought to absorb politically a trust territory and prevent the population from exercising its legitimate right to the creation of a unified independent State.

44. The neo-colonialist policies of the United States also aimed at making Puerto Rico an outpost enabling it to control the Caribbean and to intervene against the liberated countries and the countries in the process of liberation in Central America. It was the military bases of Puerto Rico which were used to organize the armed invasion of Grenada in the same way that the bases on Guam had formerly been used for bombing Viet Nam. Puerto Rico also played a big role in the expansion of United States economic influence in Latin America. Almost all of the profits made by United States companies, of which there were more than 300, were repatriated to the United States and were not reinvested in the Puerto Rican economy.

45. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, observed that it was not the first time he had had to interrupt a statement on irrelevant matters and asked the Chairman to request the speaker to stick to the items on the agenda.

46. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to do so.

47. Mr. CHORNY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the armed aggression against Grenada, a small non-aligned country, constituted a new example of the actions which United States imperialism, flouting the purposes and principles of the United Nations, directed against the progress made in the struggle of peoples for national liberation. The General Assembly had condemned with the utmost energy the armed intervention of the United States, which it had described as a flagrant violation of international law.

48. Mr. BADER (United States of America), rising again to a point of order, noted that Grenada was no more on the Committee's agenda than was Puerto Rico.

49. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Ukrainian SSR to confine himself to the items on the agenda.

50. Mr. CHORNY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that behind United States activities in the Indian Ocean, where the United States was trying to transform Diego Garcia into an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" and where it had installed a powerful nuclear naval base, could be discerned a desire to control the important natural resources of the region and the lines of communication used by world trade, to put a brake on the activities of national liberation movements and to obstruct the strengthening of the economic and political independence of liberated States. In that context, the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, at their meeting at New Delhi, had expressed their full support for Mauritian sovereignty over the Chagos archipelago, including

/...

(Mr. Chorny, Ukrainian SSR)

Diego Garcia, which had been detached from the territory of Mauritius in violation of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2066 (XX). Considering that the establishment and strengthening of the military base at Diego Garcia had endangered the sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of Mauritius and other States, they had called for the early return of Diego Garcia to Mauritius. The services rendered to the United States by the former colonial Power (the United Kingdom) which, having annexed Diego Garcia, had leased it to the United States, could be compared to the support granted by the United States to the United Kingdom at the time of its colonialist adventure in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

51. All those facts showed that there was an urgent need to eliminate the vestiges of the colonial system, to put an end to the neo-colonialist activity of the United States and certain other Western Powers and to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples without delay.

52. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) resumed the Chair.

53. Mr. ROA-KOURI (Cuba) said that the nineteenth ordinary session of the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government had given new hope to the Sahrawi people in its unrelenting struggle for self-determination, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as to the international community. The African countries, including Morocco, had on that occasion reaffirmed their desire to see the parties to the conflict, Morocco and the Frente POLISARIO, enter into negotiations for a cease-fire and organize a referendum through which the people of Western Sahara would exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

54. No one was unaware of the contribution the Moroccan people had made to the struggle for independence in Africa but, incomprehensibly, although the Sahrawi people did not constitute a threat to the territorial integrity of Morocco, although the historic links between Morocco and Western Sahara had lost all force, although the Sahrawi people controlled 90 per cent of its territory, although the majority of States members of the Organization of African Unity and States Members of the United Nations called for a withdrawal of Moroccan troops from Western Sahara and warned against the danger to the peoples of the region of the alliance between Morocco and the United States, and although the United Nations favoured implementation of OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), Morocco persisted in maintaining its forces of occupation in Western Sahara and refused to negotiate with the Frente POLISARIO, the sole legitimate representative of the Sahrawi people, legally constituted as the Government of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. In fact, it pursued its expansionist aims and, instead of serving the cause of decolonization, defended its economic and military interests.

55. The draft resolution (A/C.4/38/L.2) sponsored by, among others, Cuba and Mauritania (a country which, having initially claimed a part of the territory of Western Sahara, had recognized some years previously the legitimate right of the Sahrawi people to sovereignty) condemned no one and only requested the collaboration of the United Nations with a view to the implementation of agreements which Morocco had already accepted at the regional level.

/...

(Mr. Roa-Kouri, Cuba)

56. Cuba hoped that Morocco would abandon its pointless intransigence, which ran counter to history, and recognize the existence of the Sahrawi movement in accordance with the will of the international community, which would be expressed yet again through the adoption of draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.2.

57. Mr. NOVASH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the vestiges of colonialism and racism had not been completely eliminated, despite the many advances made in 20 years. The South African Government persisted in its policy of apartheid, and the peoples of Namibia, Western Sahara and many small island Territories scattered throughout the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean region were still under the colonial yoke and had not yet had an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, as established in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). That situation could not but stir up tension and conflict in the world.

58. The administering Powers tried to delay the liberation of those Territories, and sometimes even to institutionalize a régime of colonial dependence or semi-dependence, invoking various specious pretexts such as limited area, small population, geographic isolation and inadequacy of economic infrastructure. At the same time, they mercilessly exploited their natural and human resources.

59. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples clearly proclaimed the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence and committed the administering Powers to taking immediate steps with a view to ensuring the exercise of that right. It stipulated that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should not serve as a pretext for delaying independence and condemned all attempts aimed at disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country and the installation of military bases or arsenals. The General Assembly had on several occasions condemned those colonial States which impeded the self-determination and independence of the peoples of small Territories and denounced the attempted arbitrary modification of their status, as a result of which certain States no longer communicated information under Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations.

60. The colonial Powers paid little attention to the decisions of the General Assembly, as was shown in the report of the Special Committee on decolonization and other documents submitted to the Fourth Committee. They did not take concrete steps to ensure the autonomy of the small island Territories of the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean region. The latter were in a difficult economic position: they depended very largely on tourism, their agriculture, industry and infrastructure were inadequately developed and their financial dependence on the administering Powers was growing. They suffered the negative effects of activities of Western transnational corporations, which exploited their physical and human resources. The Special Committee on decolonization called attention to those problems every year, but to no effect.

/...

(Mr. Novash, USSR)

61. Furthermore, the administering Powers used those Territories for military purposes. They declared such Territories to be within their sphere of interest, even when the Territories were thousands of kilometres from the country of the administering Power, and they installed military bases with a view to achieving their expansionist goals. For that purpose, they had confiscated huge areas of those Territories, expelled the inhabitants (for example at Diego Garcia and Kwajalein), and diverted substantial resources which could have been used for the Territories' economic development. The colonial Powers would thus do everything possible to retain the bases which they had installed in Guam, Puerto Rico, Diego Garcia, Bermuda, the Turks and Caicos Islands, the Pacific Ocean (Micronesia) and elsewhere. The presence of such military installations, apart from representing a major obstacle to the independence and self-determination of peoples under trusteeship, represented a threat to international peace and security, to the extent that it led to the creation of new centres of tension.

62. As a member of the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council, the Soviet Union had often drawn the attention of the members of the Fourth Committee to the problem of implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia). That Territory, currently under the trusteeship of the United Nations, could not be permitted to be annexed by the United States and transformed into a colony under the guise of a "free association" or "commonwealth".

63. The situation of Puerto Rico was also a source of serious concern to the members of the Special Committee on decolonization. The representatives of a number of Puerto Rican organizations had, during the August session, described the very negative impact of United States colonial policies.

64. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that he could not understand how the representative of the Soviet Union, like the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, could insist on speaking on items which were not on the agenda. There were many questions which the United States would like to raise, for example that of Afghanistan, but his delegation had too much respect for the rules of procedure to follow the same path as the Soviet Union.

65. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Soviet Union to confine his remarks to the items which were on the agenda.

66. Mr. NOVASH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the question of Puerto Rico was considered by the Special Committee on decolonization every year; he was convinced that the Puerto Rican people would see their aspirations satisfied, whether the United States wished it or not.

67. Mr. BADER (United States of America) repeated his objection.

68. The CHAIRMAN once again requested the representative of the Soviet Union to abide by the rules of procedure.

/...

69. Mr. NOVASH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the consequences of the perpetuation of colonial situations were serious and, in particular, represented a threat to international peace and security. Proof thereof was to be found in the recent conflict in the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), when the United Kingdom had deployed vast military resources, as well as in the United States intervention in Grenada. The Soviet delegation considered that the Special Committee's recommendations to the Fourth Committee could help accelerate the liberation of small colonial territories and that the General Assembly should approve them at its current session with a view to helping to eliminate all obstacles in the way of the freedom and independence of peoples. For its part, the Soviet Union was ready to collaborate actively in the realization of those objectives.

70. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, observed that the representative of the Soviet Union had characterized as a lie the affirmation of the representatives of the colonial Powers to the effect that the peoples of certain territories wished the colonial régime to continue. In support of that affirmation, he cited the statement of the Governor of American Samoa to the effect that the population of that Territory had exercised its right to self-determination by manifesting its wish to maintain its current status. It was worth mentioning that the Governor was a resident of the Territory and had been elected by the population. His statement was not that of a colonial Power.

71. The United States delegation was well aware that the Soviet Union had its own idea of the status which different people, including those under its own domination, should have. However, the way in which self-determination should be exercised must correspond not to the wishes of the Soviet Union or the United States but to the wishes of the people of the Territory concerned; the United States respected and would continue to respect those wishes.

72. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United States had attempted to maintain that certain peoples wished to maintain the colonial régime, citing a statement by the Governor of American Samoa. However, it was clear that the colonial Powers tried to force the inhabitants of Territories under their domination to say what they wished them to say. The colonial Powers did not develop the economies of those Territories and did not prepare the inhabitants to enable them to express their views independently on their future political status. The arguments of the representative of the United States could be refuted by citing a more recent example when, during a meeting of the Trusteeship Council in May 1983, the representative of the Palau Islands, also a citizen of the Territory and elected by the population, had said very clearly that if the Palau Islands had the necessary economic potential, their inhabitants would favour independence.

73. The colonial Powers slowed the economic development of the Territories under their domination while they conducted military activities there and imposed agreements regarding the leasing of land. They imposed on such Territories the régime that they wished, as the United States had done in Puerto Rico.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

74. It had to be borne in mind that the question of Puerto Rico was already before the United Nations. Members of the Fourth Committee would recollect that the summary record (A/C.4/SR.2062) of a meeting held on 16 November 1973 reported in extenso a statement made by the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, who had pointed out that it was established practice in the Committee that in speaking on one item delegates could refer to other colonial questions. That procedure was quite logical, since colonial questions were closely interrelated. Although the colonies might be situated in different parts of the world, the principle of colonialism was one and the same, whatever the colony might be and whoever might be the colonial Power. The historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) was applicable equally, and in its totality, to all colonial Territories, in whatever continent they were situated. The item on Puerto Rico had been studied by the Special Committee at its plenary meetings on the basis of the report submitted by its working group which had been instructed to submit a report relating specifically to the procedure to be followed by the Special Committee for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) with respect to Puerto Rico. The result of the consideration by the Special Committee of the question thus posed had been the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 30 August 1973. In the fifth preambular paragraph of that resolution the Special Committee considered the necessity of furthering the study of all pertinent aspects of the situation with respect to the procedure for the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) regarding Puerto Rico. In the operative part it decided, among other things, to keep the question under continuous review.

75. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that he was under the impression that the Chairman had already ruled that statements on the question of Puerto Rico had no place in the Committee. He asked whether the representative of the Soviet Union wished to raise a point of order in connection with that decision.

76. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), continuing his statement, read out paragraph 59 of the summary record of the 2062nd meeting, on 16 November 1973, which reproduced the end of the statement made by the Chairman at that meeting:

"Thus, as could be seen, that question was among the items submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee and it had been on those facts that the Chair had based itself in proceeding in the way it had done, which he considered just and correct".

77. Regardless of the efforts of colonial Powers to justify the existence of colonial Territories and their activities in such Territories, the opinion of the United Nations on the matter was well known to all.

78. Mr. BADER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Soviet Union had implied that the statement by the Governor of American Samoa, which he (Mr. Bader) had cited earlier, had been made under pressure from the United States and that, if the

/...

(Mr. Bader, United States)

population preferred to maintain its association status with the United States, it was because of political and economic pressure. Such a statement, coming from the representative of the Soviet Union was quite extraordinary. The United States did not tell its allies or the peoples of the Territories that it administered what they should say or think. The United States did not have that ability. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, appeared to be expert in that field. There were virtually no cases in any forum of a member of the Soviet bloc stating an opinion on a subject which was different from that of the Soviet Union.

79. Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that nobody could believe that a people would want to live in a state of dependence under colonial domination. The entire statement by the representative of the United States was simply laughable.

Hearing of petitioners

80. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Kentaoui (Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO)) took a place at the petitioners' table.

81. Mr. KENTAOUI (Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO)) said he was gratified that a representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya should have been elected Chairman of the Fourth Committee, as that country had proved that it could resist the force of imperialism, which, despite all its arrogance and aggressive intentions, had not succeeded in diverting the Revolution of 1 September from its noble goals. Thus, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya remained the indestructible ally of peoples fighting for their freedom.

82. When considering the conflict between the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic and the Kingdom of Morocco at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly must remember that the continuing war in Western Sahara, due purely to the belligerence of Morocco, entailed serious consequences not only for peace and stability in Africa but also for the very existence of OAU. That was why the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU had adopted, in June 1983, a comprehensive peace plan to end the conflict.

83. Thus, at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa, the OAU Assembly had adopted a resolution on Western Sahara (AHG/Res.104 (XIX)), which had been carefully worded to remedy the faults and weaknesses in the action undertaken to date by OAU. It should be stressed that that resolution had been adopted at a session from which the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, the fifty-first member of OAU, had temporarily and voluntarily withdrawn, a sovereign and eminently responsible act that the whole of Africa had welcomed as a substantial contribution to the peace efforts.

84. OAU, like the United Nations, was fully aware that the war between the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic and the Kingdom of Morocco was a fact, as the King of Morocco himself had recognized.

/...

(Mr. Kentaoui)

85. The direct negotiations, the first of which had been held in 1978 and the most recent in March 1983, seemed to have shown that the King of Morocco had accorded the Addis Ababa peace plan the value due to it as an African solution, in accordance with established reality. Morocco should have taken advantage of that opportunity to emerge from its isolation and to contribute to the peace efforts. Unfortunately, it had to be said that Morocco's promises to collaborate with OAU had lasted no longer than the length of a conference.

86. In 1981, King Hassan II had officially declared in public that he would not accept the results of a referendum unless they confirmed "Moroccan sovereignty" over Western Sahara. Again, in July 1983, the King of Morocco had declared that he would reject the results of the referendum if they favoured independence for Western Sahara. It had been in the same spirit of arrogance and cynicism that he had taken up the question again at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly in September 1983 and had avoided applying the formula proposed by the Implementation Committee of OAU. Indeed, pursuant to resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), the current Chairman of OAU had sent a mission to several African countries to establish the necessary contacts to facilitate a meeting of the Implementation Committee in order to enable direct negotiations to take place between the Frente POLISARIO and Morocco. To the surprise of all, the Moroccan delegation, having arrived at Addis Ababa, had sabotaged the meeting.

87. At a time when Africa was deeply concerned by the war in Western Sahara and the stability of the continent, and when it was endeavouring to protect law and justice and was sparing no effort to find a political and African solution to that war, King Hassan II, in connivance with foreign Powers known for their imperialist designs, was building up his military arsenal and displaying his disdain for peace and his indifference about the future of the African continent.

88. The aggressive Rabat régime had opted for total confusion by speaking of a referendum without negotiation, which was a hypocritical and fraudulent attitude. Indeed, it could be seen from history that there had never been a free, general and valid referendum for people under domination without negotiations between the people and the occupying Power. No African territory had been able to end a conflict with a colonial Power without prior negotiations.

89. However, King Hassan II could not disregard the basic reality: the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic was a social, political and military force to be reckoned with in the region. In fact, Morocco and its allies acknowledged that fact: otherwise, the Frente POLISARIO and Morocco would not be currently stating their respective positions before the Fourth Committee.

90. The United Nations had always been faithful to its Charter with respect to decolonization, particularly in the case of the conflict in Western Sahara. The task of the United Nations had been made easier by the adoption of OAU resolution AHG/Res.104 (XIX), which it could not but support and strengthen in accordance with the principle inherent in co-operation between the two organizations. Moreover, that resolution was along the lines of those adopted by the Fourth Committee.

/...

(Mr. Kentaoui)

91. He said that he wished to describe the current situation in Western Sahara: on 20 May 1983, the tenth anniversary of the liberation struggle had been celebrated with major popular and military demonstrations attended by more than 400 delegations from 80 countries, providing ample proof of the international solidarity enjoyed by the Saharan people.

92. The Saharan State was so important that unless the Kingdom of Morocco listened to reason, it would clash finally and inevitably with the strength of the Saharan people. That was proved by the fact that the forces of aggression had been obliged to build a wall, with United States assistance, behind which they had taken refuge in the extreme north of the Sahara in order to protect themselves against the heroic operations of the Saharan people's liberation army. The wall had not been enough, however, to halt the incursion of the Saharan people's forces.

93. Whereas the Moroccan army held a very limited area, the remainder of the country was entirely liberated and the Saharan people had organized themselves, had set up institutions, and were making every effort to expel the enemy once and for all from that small part of their territory still occupied.

94. The Saharan Arab Democratic Republic was a member of OAU and, both by its nature and out of deep conviction, was a non-aligned country, having diplomatic relations with more than 56 countries, in Africa, Asia and Latin America especially.

95. The Republic's efforts in the social and cultural field were yielding increasingly beneficial results despite the constraints imposed by the war and the Moroccan aggressor. Free education, the widespread literacy campaign, the construction of hospitals and the existence of public services illustrated the social and cultural level it had attained.

96. In conclusion, he reminded Morocco that it was time to draw the inference from eight years of war, which had cost it serious losses of human life and property, and to shoulder its responsibilities before it was too late to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the OAU peace plan. The capacity of the African continent to solve its own problems must not be underestimated, and King Hassan II was belittling himself if he forgot that he himself was the Head of State of an African country.

97. In any event, a peace that was not reached through African wisdom could not be imposed by the force of American arms, whatever their quantity and degree of sophistication. That force could not discourage the Saharan people or change the course of events. Like the other African peoples who had waged wars of liberation against foreign occupation, the Saharan people would inevitably liberate the rest of their country. To prove its good will and determination, the Frente POLISARIO was ready to enter into political negotiations for peace with Morocco, a peace without which the days of the Moroccan monarchy were numbered.

/...

(Mr. Kentaoui)

98. The Frente POLISARIO called upon the international community, the African countries, particularly, to witness its complete readiness to engage in a negotiating process, leading to peace with Morocco, within the time fixed by the OAU Assembly at its nineteenth session, namely 31 December 1983.

99. Mr. Kentaoui withdrew.

100. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Khalil (Parti de l'Union nationale sahraouie) took a place at the petitioners' table.

101. Mr. KHALIL (Parti de l'Union nationale sahraouie (FUNS)) said that his party had been established in 1968 under the Spanish occupation. The brutal methods of the colonialist régime had never weakened its determination. In 1974, Spain had been compelled to recognize it as the only representative political force in the Territory of Western Sahara. FUNS had then fought against Spain's manoeuvres to create an entity separate from the Kingdom of Morocco in order to safeguard its own selfish interests. In May 1975, it had sent a delegation to His Majesty King Hassan II under a very ancient tradition whereby there was an indestructible bond between the King and his subjects.

102. The Sahara was a desert running east to west from the Red Sea to the Atlantic, and north to south from Algeria, Tunisia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to Mauritania, Chad and the Niger. The climate imposed upon it a special way of life, marked by the absence of frontiers and by solidarity among its inhabitants, which was a necessity for a nomadic people. Although the people of the Sahara were traditionally nomads, the inhabitants of Western Sahara, who had always lived near the Atlantic coast, were for the most part settled and had contributed to the prosperity of the Kingdom of Morocco under various royal houses.

103. Algeria was now claiming the right of the Algerian Saharans to exercise their right to self-determination in Western Sahara. Would it claim the same right tomorrow in other neighbouring countries where there were Saharans living? To do so would be as absurd as to claim that the Italians, for example, as a Latin people, could exercise their right to self-determination in Portugal or Romania.

104. The so-called Saharan Arab Democratic Republic had been created by Algeria, which had taken advantage of Spain's hasty withdrawal. In the confusion, a number of countries had recognized that "Republic". A pseudo-army had been set up to seize the territory of Western Sahara through military action, and a movement, the Frente POLISARIO, had been given all the necessary means to ensure its success and credibility. The Saharan Arab Democratic Republic was in fact simply a prolongation of the Algerian Republic and possessed no territory save that in Algeria. The pseudo-army was made up of people who had massed at Tindouf after a long-lasting drought, and who were instructed ideologically and trained to attack Western Sahara and to serve Algeria's expansionist aims. How then could the Frente POLISARIO claim to represent the inhabitants of Western Sahara? Why did not the Saharans of the Algerian Sahara - more than 500,000 people living in total isolation and currently being used against the inhabitants of Western Sahara -

/...

(Mr. Khalil)

exercise their right to self-determination? The provinces of Western Sahara were completely open to the movement of goods and persons, no one was imprisoned and there were no demonstrations, because there were no Frente POLISARIO sympathizers in the territory.

105. It was curious, when the Frente POLISARIO did not exist in the territory of Western Sahara, that certain States such as Ethiopia should seek to foist it on the territory from outside as a legitimate movement. The explanation was, in fact, a guilt complex resulting from its own non-implementation of United Nations resolutions on the Eritrean people. Other countries, either out of ignorance or by letting themselves be swayed by subjective considerations, alleged that the Frente POLISARIO was the sole representative of the people of Western Sahara. The delegations of Cape Verde and Sao Tome and Principe, which regarded the presence of a representative of PUNS in the Fourth Committee as a mere farce staged to enlist the support of international public opinion, should be reminded that their credibility should be based on justice and international morality and not on selfish and passing interests.

106. His Majesty King Hassan II, desiring to satisfy international public opinion and the African countries in particular, believed that a referendum would be the ideal formula for settling the dispute. PUNS was convinced that the people would reaffirm that they were part of the Kingdom of Morocco.

107. Mr. Khalil withdrew.

AGENDA ITEM 106: OFFERS BY MEMBER STATES OF STUDY AND TRAINING FACILITIES FOR INHABITANTS OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES (A/C.4/38/L.6)

108. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bulgaria and Kenya had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/38/L.6.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.