

## 2085th meeting

Friday, 8 November 1974, at 10.55 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2085

*In the absence of the Chairman, Miss Dubra (Uruguay), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 55

**Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/9638 and Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2-4, A/9667 and Add.1, A/9830)**

1. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) said that peace and stability depended exclusively on respect for and implementation of the fundamental right to self-determination. It was on the basis of their record in that regard that the sincerity of the self-styled defenders of that right could be tested.
2. His delegation understood colonialism to mean all forms of colonial domination, whether by political, economic or cultural means. A breath of fresh air was blowing across Africa as the new Portuguese Government demonstrated its desire to decolonize its colonial Territories.
3. At the same time, however, those who benefited from foreign investments in colonial Territories argued that mere contacts helped to transform the evils of colonialism into good. Such arguments—as advanced by the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other Western Powers which supported the colonialist régimes in Africa and elsewhere—could not be taken seriously. How could the enslaved peoples, once freed, be expected to pardon those who over the years had endeavoured to perpetuate the régimes which had oppressed them? Nothing could prevent the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the African majority in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa as they pursued their struggle together with those who sincerely wished to help them.
4. Many specious and outmoded legal and political arguments were advanced to justify colonial practices. In the political sphere, the liquidation of the colonial empires was an inevitable process, although it was as yet far from complete. Colonialism continued to exist directly, in the form of capitalistic and imperialistic exploitation and, indirectly, in the far more dangerous form of neo-colonialism, which was aimed at protecting economic and strategic interests. In the legal sphere, the colonial Powers continued to use tactics of exploitation under the guise of a right and a juridical practice that was totally outmoded.
5. He recalled the recent events in Mozambique, where reactionary forces had attempted to declare independence on their own terms. Fortunately, Portugal had not hesitated to put down the rebellion and to re-establish order and security in Mozambique so that it could continue on the path of decolonization. In doing so, Portugal had been inspired by a genuine belief in the urgent need to eliminate all the vestiges of colonialism.
6. The situation that had nearly begun to prevail in Mozambique currently existed in neighbouring Southern Rhodesia, a Territory legally administered by the United Kingdom. That situation had been condemned by the peace-loving British people, who felt that it betrayed their historical tradition. Unfortunately, however, the United Kingdom Government had turned a deaf ear to the appeals of the international community and had trampled under foot the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.
7. The critics of colonialism were often characterized as xenophobes. His delegation, for one, was not opposed to any country, its sole wish being that the colonial Powers should demonstrate by deeds rather than words their professed wish to put an end to colonial practices and co-operate in bringing into existence Governments of the black majorities in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa and in the immediate accession of Namibia to independence. It could not close its ears to the appeals of the freedom fighters held prisoner in the gaols of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, and for that reason it had to speak up, regardless of whether it would be classified as anti-British or even anti-white for doing so.
8. There were no two ways of dealing with the problem: Governments either favoured or opposed colonialism. He appealed to all those who sincerely wished to promote the goals of decolonization to demonstrate that wish in their votes on the draft resolutions before the Committee.
9. Mr. TOKO MANGAN (United Republic of Cameroon) observed that the major problem in connexion with the item under consideration was the refusal of the strong to grant the most elementary human rights to the weak. The tyrant did not listen to reason and had a total disregard for the life of his fellow man. Much was said in the United Nations about peace but manifestations of hatred, violence and conflict were daily realities. Genuine peace could not exist as long as there were some who opposed the triumph of justice.
10. His delegation had not lost faith in the United Nations, which sought to represent mankind as a whole, without distinction. On the contrary, it urged the Organization to adopt a realistic attitude towards events, particularly in the Middle East and southern Africa, where peace and justice were at stake. Apart from moral considerations, the dictates of coexistence required all nations to understand that the future of mankind could not be based on a situation in which a minority enjoyed prosperity while the majority was subjected to poverty and injustice. Peace and

well-being could not be achieved at the expense of the suffering and oppression of millions of blacks in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The aim of the régimes in the latter countries was not only to control the non-white population in order to preserve the economic privileges of an authoritarian oligarchy but also to institute a racial ideology which negated the Charter of the United Nations. Africans were often accused of being unreasonable and unrealistic extremists. However, the truth was otherwise, as those countries which were the accomplices of the racist régimes well knew. There was no lack of facts to demonstrate that *apartheid* in South Africa was an ideology based on racial hatred. The United Nations had repeatedly declared that the policy of *apartheid* was a crime against humanity and that its application negated the Charter of the United Nations. The international community was the guarantor of the principles set forth in the Charter and should therefore affirm its adherence to those principles and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its firm determination to ensure that they were applied without distinction, particularly with regard to the inalienable right of self-determination.

11. It was ironic that it had been the representative of South Africa at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, held in San Francisco in 1945, who had requested the insertion in the Preamble to the Charter of the phrase "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women". Subsequent events had shown that the leaders of the Pretoria régime had no intention of acting in conformity with the principles they professed. In the final analysis, it could be said that the policy of *apartheid* was simply a policy of hate which took the form of racial segregation, oppression and exploitation. The implications of that policy for international peace, stability and security were frightening, when it was considered that non-whites made up the majority of the population of southern Africa. That situation could only lead to revolt, since violence bred violence.

12. Recent events, however, gave promise of an end to colonialism in Africa. The realistic attitude adopted by the new Portuguese Government with regard to decolonization was a matter for satisfaction. However, the process of decolonization must be carried to its logical conclusion. His delegation did not doubt the good faith of the new Portuguese leaders, but pointed out that any delay would be damaging to the positive work already accomplished and could provide a fresh opportunity for the emergence of the forces of oppression.

13. Mrs. BAILOR (Sierra Leone) said that a great change had taken place since the Committee had last discussed the item under consideration: the dictatorship in Portugal had been brought to an end, thus creating hope for the peoples of Angola and Mozambique. Her delegation welcomed the independence of Guinea-Bissau, whose representation in the General Assembly demonstrated the success of United Nations efforts to eradicate colonialism and oppression.

14. However, many problems remained. It was a sad commentary on international relations that, more than a decade after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and

Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)), more than 20 million human beings were still denied their basic human right of self-determination. The overriding concern of those people was the achievement of national freedom and freedom from racial discrimination. The majority of them lived in Africa, a continent where man's inhumanity to man assumed its worst forms and where imperialism sought to enslave the very soul of the African under the doctrine of *apartheid*. The various General Assembly resolutions on *apartheid* and racial discrimination had failed to have any effect on the situation in South Africa.

15. The resolutions adopted by the United Nations with respect to South Africa had become almost meaningless, because those who could exert the most pressure continued to trade with and invest in that country on various pretexts. The situation there and in other areas under foreign domination had remained as it was because of the increase in the exploitation of resources and investment. That was the root cause of the perpetuation of colonialism in African and other Territories. If Namibia and South Africa had not abounded in mineral and other resources, the advocates of *apartheid* would long since have abandoned them. Her delegation was not opposed to foreign investment or the exploitation of national resources, provided that those activities had the over-all effect of training and benefiting the indigenous populations and ultimately involving them as partners. However, that was not the case. Foreign investment had been intensified because of the existence of tax incentives, which in turn made the prospects for self-determination even more remote.

16. The struggle against colonialism in South Africa had ceased to be an isolated issue and was now international in scope. It was still fashionable to talk about establishing a dialogue with the *apartheid* régime, but it was impossible to establish a dialogue when one party refused to listen or to respond. The time had come to formulate specific programmes at the international level for the eradication of colonialism and racial discrimination in South Africa. There were those who maintained that the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations would make even more difficult the situation of the very people it was desired to protect. In her delegation's view, however, such a measure would bring home to the South African régime the fact that the entire international community was ranged against it. Her delegation hoped that future recommendations and resolutions on the question of South Africa would receive the unanimous support they deserved and that abstentions and negative votes would become a thing of the past.

17. Turning to the question of Southern Rhodesia, she drew attention to the striking statement in chapter IV of the 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/9623 (part V)), that the Special Committee's study of the economic conditions prevailing in the Territories showed that foreign monopolies had continued to dominate the economies of such Territories as Namibia and Southern Rhodesia and that the colonialist and racist régimes were creating the most favourable conditions for their activities. The report went on to state that the foreign monopolies operating in those Territories had been guided solely by their own interests, continuing to follow eco-

conomic and financial policies without regard to the legitimate interests of the inhabitants.

18. Those conditions were major obstacles to political independence and to social and economic justice for the indigenous populations. It was no wonder that the liberation movements had resolved to fight to the death to remove that menace, and were encouraged in their determination by the success of the liberation movements in the Portuguese Territories. In Southern Rhodesia, repressive movements against African students at the non-racial University of Rhodesia had resulted in the reduction of African enrolment by about one fourth. All must agree that the whole future of the country was seriously affected by any action that deprived those who would ultimately assume control of a free Zimbabwe of the education and training they needed. It could no longer be hoped that the illegal régime would be brought to its knees by economic constraints, for the report of the Special Committee showed clearly that it would continue to make economic progress.

19. Her delegation would continue to condemn the practice of suppressing the indigenous populations fighting for self-determination and independence and to support the liberation movements which were striving to achieve their basic human rights. It was for the Committee as a whole to help further the cause of social, economic and political justice.

20. Her delegation was pleased that the Seychelles would attain independence in the autumn of 1975 and hoped that that would be followed by self-determination for St. Helena. It was often argued that the location, size and doubtful economic viability of certain Territories were factors which militated against the granting of independence to them, but such fallacious arguments merely served to conceal the real issues. Indeed, some States which were Members of the United Nations were smaller than some of the Territories concerned.

21. Mr. PARTHASARATHY (India) recalled that General Assembly resolution 3070 (XXVIII) called upon all States to recognize the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence and to offer moral, material and any other assistance to all peoples struggling for the full exercise of their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. The replies received from Governments (see A/9667 and Add.1) in response to inquiries initiated by the Secretary-General under paragraph 10 of that resolution were a sad commentary on the slowness of the process of decolonization. His delegation hoped that that process would be accelerated.

22. The Indian Government had a tradition of consistency and activity with regard to the subject under consideration. Within the means at its disposal, it had tried to assist morally and materially peoples struggling in various parts of the world for their inalienable right to self-determination, independence and human rights. India had no contacts with certain countries which denied those rights to segments of their populations. It would be recalled that India had been the first country to sever trade relations with South Africa in protest against the racist policies of that country's Government. A decision to impose economic sanctions had

been taken in principle as early as November 1944 and when, towards the end of 1945, the Government of South Africa had announced that fresh legislation would be enacted to extend its policy of racial discrimination, the Government of India had immediately acted to prohibit imports from and exports to South Africa as from July 1946. That prohibition remained in effect.

23. Pursuant to various resolutions of the United Nations, India had been extending assistance to the African National Congress, which maintained an office in Delhi. India had contributed and continued to contribute to the liberation movements in Mozambique, Angola, Cape Verde, South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. It was a regular contributor to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. It had also contributed to the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa. A large number of students from southern Africa, assisted by United Nations programmes and by scholarships provided by the Government of India, had been placed in Indian educational institutions.

24. India had been one of the first countries to contribute to the Organization of African Unity's Special Assistance Fund for the Struggle Against Colonialism and *Apartheid*. It had also provided scholarships for African refugees. Following the inauguration of the Special Commonwealth Programme for Rhodesia, the Indian Government had offered 25 scholarships for academic training under the Indian General Cultural Scholarship Scheme as well as places for trainees in government services. A number of Southern Rhodesian refugees had benefited from that scheme. The Government had volunteered such aid in spite of the strain it placed on the limited resources at its disposal to meet urgent development needs within India.

25. His delegation was pleased to note that the struggle against colonialism had produced results at least in some parts of the world. The Portuguese empire in southern Africa, one of the oldest colonial empires in the world, was now being dismantled. The efforts of countries like India to assist the liberation movements in various parts of the Portuguese empire had doubtless contributed to that turn of events. It was to be hoped that continued efforts would soon bring freedom to those peoples who even now were being denied their fundamental human rights.

26. Mr. AL-HINAI (Oman) welcomed the presence of a delegation from Guinea-Bissau in the Committee which proved that that country had achieved self-determination and independence and that there had been a change in the foreign policy of Portugal, which had come at last to realize that Africa belonged to the Africans. He trusted that Mozambique and Angola would soon join Guinea-Bissau in the United Nations.

27. The peoples of South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia had been less fortunate. Much had already been said about the policies of the minority racist régimes in southern Africa, but words alone would not speed up the achievement of self-determination. A more unified and concerted effort was needed on the part of all nations, and especially of those countries which had the right of veto in the Security Council, if the downfall of the racist régimes was

to be achieved and the rights of the indigenous peoples restored.

28. The position of Oman on the right of peoples to self-determination and the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had been stated in many different United Nations forums. His Government firmly believed that the right of peoples to self-determination was a universal principle of international law. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution which the General Assembly adopted as resolution 3070 (XXVIII) and had continued to respect its commitment to co-operate with the United Nations in the effort to achieve universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. His Government had applied economic and other sanctions against the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa and would continue to do so. Oman maintained no relations or contacts of any kind with South Africa or Southern Rhodesia. It had afforded political, moral and material support to the fighters of the national liberation movements and was still doing so.

29. The struggle for national liberation was not confined to Africa; it was present in the Middle East and elsewhere. His delegation welcomed the statement made at the 2083rd meeting by the representative of Sweden in the debate on the present item that the Palestinian problem was not exclusively a refugee problem. The Palestinians were fighting for the right to self-determination and independence. Oman would support the liberation movement in Palestine, just as it supported other liberation movements elsewhere.

30. In conclusion, he said that his Government had made modest contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. Those contributions were now being reviewed and would certainly be increased.

31. Mr. SAYAR (Iran) said that the United Nations was to be commended for its work in the field of decolonization and the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, and its adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was a milestone in recent history. His country had always considered the right of peoples to self-determination and emancipation from foreign domination as one of the more sacred human rights. Iran had always been on the side of the oppressed peoples struggling against colonialism and foreign domination, whether in Indo-China or elsewhere in Asia, in the Middle East, in Algeria or in other parts of Africa.

32. In the field of economic domination, his country had set an example by breaking the grip of the foreign oil companies as early as 1950, and it still stood firmly on the same principles. It had welcomed the admission of Guinea-Bissau to observer status at the previous session of the General Assembly and was happy to see it now on an equal footing as a Member State. The Government and people of Iran welcomed the policy of the new régime in Portugal and trusted that Mozambique and Angola would soon join Guinea-Bissau in the United Nations.

33. There was a darker side to the picture, however. It was saddening to see racial discrimination applied in Africa, where the Africans were denied human dignity and their

most essential rights and where *apartheid* was still very much alive. Namibia was subject to foreign domination. In Rhodesia, a handful of whites denied every right to the black majority, which could not yet decide its own destiny. Such a situation was an anomaly in the second half of the twentieth century, when so many newly independent countries were joining hands in the struggle for development. But the peoples of southern Africa were not the only ones which were struggling for their liberation. In the Middle East the unfortunate Palestinian people were denied the very right to nationhood and a mother country. They had been driven from their native land, forced to endure untold suffering and had lived as refugees for more than a quarter of a century. They too were entitled to exercise their right of self-determination. The Palestinian question and the problem of the Middle East were only two sides of the same coin. The root of that conflict, which threatened to precipitate the world into another war, was the injustice which had been done to the Palestinian people and the refusal to recognize their legitimate rights and aspirations.

34. Despite such setbacks, there had been real progress since the General Assembly had adopted the Declaration on decolonization at its fifteenth session, as was clear from the number of newly independent States that were now Members of the United Nations. He was sure that a concerted effort on the part of the international community would be successful in removing the last shadows from the bright picture. As a member 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, Iran would do its utmost to support the efforts of the national liberation movements to free their peoples from the colonial yoke.

35. Mr. GAVRILUK (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the position of the Byelorussian SSR on the item under discussion was set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/9667). In pursuing that policy the Byelorussian SSR proceeded from the belief that the self-determination of colonial and dependent peoples on the basis of the complete liquidation of colonialism was an essential condition for the successful economic, social and cultural progress of those peoples and was in the interest of international co-operation and the strengthening of peace throughout the world. Its solidarity with the peoples who were struggling to realize their right to self-determination derived from the socialist character of the relationships existing in the Byelorussian SSR and from its ideology of proletarian internationalism, which rejected any form of exploitation of man by man and affirmed the friendship and brotherhood of the working people of all countries. It resolutely upheld the well-known tenet of Marxism that no people could be free if it oppressed other peoples.

36. The Byelorussian SSR was proud that the principle of national self-determination, which was universally recognized and confirmed in the United Nations Charter, had first been formulated by the Great October Socialist Revolution and had been comprehensively and consistently realized in the establishment of the Soviet Union—a socialist multinational State. In their successes in all spheres of life the Byelorussian people clearly demonstrated the vital role of the full realization of the right of peoples to self-determination.



37. The process of liquidating colonialism, on the basis of the right of peoples to self-determination, was developing successfully, for powerful forces were acting in its favour, especially world socialism which was a natural and reliable ally of the peoples engaged in that struggle. The development of détente had also had a beneficial effect on that process and was creating better opportunities for colonial peoples to attain independence and protect their national interests. The birth of new States from former colonies and dependent Territories was a striking indication of the insuperability of the national liberation movements. Three new States—Bangladesh, Guinea-Bissau and Grenada—had just joined the United Nations, and soon Mozambique and a number of other Non-Self-Governing Territories would achieve independence. The liberation struggle of the peoples under the yoke of the racist régimes of southern Africa was strengthening and expanding. A distinctive feature of the decolonization process was the close organic link between the movement of colonial peoples for their national self-determination and the struggle of progressive and democratic forces for peace and social justice. That had been particularly apparent in the downfall of the Portuguese colonial empire, a development which had created favourable new conditions for the struggle against colonialism, had led to the increased isolation of the racist régimes in southern Africa and had encouraged the liberation struggle wherever colonial domination persisted.

38. The peoples of the world still had a long way to go to achieve the final liquidation of colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, and even greater efforts must be made to overcome the opposition of the colonialist and racist régimes and the international imperialist circles which supported them. That was clearly demonstrated by the triple veto at the 1808th meeting of the Security Council<sup>1</sup> of the recommendation by most members of the Council that South Africa should be expelled from the Organization. General Assembly resolution 3222 (XXIX) entitled "Human rights and fundamental freedoms", adopted on 6 November 1974, strongly condemned the policy of those States which were assisting the racist régimes in southern Africa and elsewhere. The Byelorussian SSR considered that the time had come for all States which were providing political, economic and military support to the racist régimes in southern Africa to comply unconditionally with the relevant decisions of the United Nations aimed at ensuring the realization of the inalienable right to self-determination of the peoples of the colonial Territories and also of their right to control the economic resources of those Territories. Otherwise the actions of the United Nations aimed at extending human rights and fundamental freedoms would be futile. The racist and colonialist régimes were trampling on the most elementary human rights: chapter IX of the 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/9623/Add.3) described the situation in Namibia, which was illegally occupied by the Republic of South Africa. Colonialism was hindering the realization of human rights not only by perpetuating inequality but also by creating material conditions which prevented the realization of human rights. As foreign

monopolies plundered the wealth of those countries, the peoples were deprived of the resources which were essential for the guarantee of human rights. Chapter IV of the report of the Special Committee (A/9623 (Part V)) described in detail the activity of foreign companies in colonial countries. That document showed that the infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the colonial world was dictated by the mercenary interests of foreign monopolistic circles. Consequently, the struggle for national self-determination of the colonial countries and people involved, in addition to the conquest of political independence, the implementation of measures to liberate them from economic dependence and from all forms of imperialist exploitation. In that context the actions taken at the international level to withdraw support from particular countries or capitalist companies of the colonialist and racist régimes deserved special support. The twenty-third regular session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, held at Mogadiscio from 6 to 11 June 1974, had recommended the study of economic sanctions and other measures which might be applied against the countries and companies which continued to trade with or invest in the racist régimes in southern Africa.

39. The principle of solidarity with the peoples waging the struggle against imperialism and for their freedom and independence was one of the basic principles of the foreign policy of the Byelorussian SSR, which would continue to support the full and final liberation of all peoples from the foreign yoke and the speedy liquidation of the policy of *apartheid* in southern Africa.

40. Mr. HSING Sung-yi (China) said that earth-shaking changes had taken place in the world since the Second World War. The Asian, African and Latin American peoples had become increasingly awakened; the old colonialist system was crumbling rapidly; the heyday of imperialism and colonialism was past. In recent years, the people of southern Africa had achieved historic progress in their struggle for national liberation because they had adopted every means, including armed struggle, to achieve their end with the support of all justice-loving peoples throughout the world. Of the many forms of struggle, armed struggle was one of the most important ways of achieving national liberation. That incontrovertible truth had been borne out by the experience of the people of Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique, and would be confirmed by the experience of many more colonial peoples. As had been pointed out at the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Mogadiscio, Somalia, from 12 to 15 June 1974, the way to independence for the colonial countries and peoples lay through constant armed struggle. Advancing along that road, the African people would surely win still greater victories and finally eradicate colonialism and racism from the African continent.

41. At the present time, there were still many crimes of oppression in Africa. In Rhodesia, the white colonizers, who comprised less than 5 per cent of the total population, were occupying about half of the total territory, where the fertile land lay, while the Africans, comprising over 94 per cent of the population, were forced to live in dire poverty on less than half of the total area, where the land was

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year*.

unproductive. The racist régime of Southern Rhodesia had enacted more than 60 laws and decrees imposing racial discrimination and depriving the Africans of all their rights and their freedom of speech, assembly, the press and association. In South Africa, the 15 million Africans occupied only 2.6 per cent of the total territory, while 3 million whites occupied 87.4 per cent. The racist régime of South Africa flogged, arrested and imprisoned the nationalists fighting for their liberation, thus making South Africa a hell on earth. In Namibia, Africans could neither vote nor be elected to office and were not eligible for governmental posts. They had been forced to live on reservations marked out for them by the racists and they would be the victims of bloody repression as soon as they showed the slightest sign of resistance. The people in the Portuguese colonies were also living in dire poverty and misery. Was not that sombre picture the result of the prolonged criminal rule of imperialism and colonialism over the colonial peoples?

42. While talking volubly of human rights and equality, certain Western Powers were giving all-out support to the racist and colonial régimes and had seized the resources of and extorted enormous profits and huge amounts of strategic materials from those areas. Such hypocrisy could not but provoke indignation and strong condemnation.

43. The stark reality was that so long as imperialism and colonialism existed, there could be no question of human rights and equality for the colonial peoples. In order to attain national independence and liberation, regain their inherent national dignity and ensure respect for their human rights, the colonial peoples must uproot imperialist and colonialist forces. The national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples was inseparably bound up with the struggle of all the world's peoples against imperialism, and particularly against hegemonism. There could never be human rights and equality, still less any guarantee of or respect for human rights, if the struggle for them was divorced from the struggle against imperialism and hegemonism and failed to attack the reactionary role of imperialism and colonialism. In that regard, he said that the imperialism which flaunted the flag of socialism and masqueraded as a reliable friend of the African people and the liberation movements was peddling its hypocritical argument of détente everywhere, alleging that détente had opened up prospects for the national liberation movements. Its true aim was to prevent the colonial peoples from rising in revolt and to leave them at the mercy of imperialism and colonialism. The peoples must be on the watch and ready to expose such reactionary views for what they were. One thing which must be realized was that a revolutionary situation was developing rapidly in southern Africa, where colonialism was putting up a last-ditch fight. If a reactionary régime was not attacked, it would not fall. It invariably resorted to counter-revolutionary dual tactics to deal with revolutionary people. Consequently, the revolutionary people must use revolutionary dual tactics against it. Whether in fighting or in negotiations, it was essential to protect the fundamental interests of the people and to base all action on a constant reinforcing of their strength. Only thus would the people remain invincible in their revolutionary struggle, steadily grow in strength and finally emerge victorious.

44. The Chinese people had experienced the same sufferings as the African peoples; they too had been subjected to ruthless oppression and plunder by colonialists and imperialists. The African people were therefore close to their hearts. The Chinese Government and people had always opposed imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism and they deeply sympathized with and firmly supported the African and other non-independent countries and peoples in their just struggle for national independence and self-determination and for basic human rights. China was giving them all the assistance it could and would continue to do so until they won complete victory.

45. Colonialism and imperialism were based on the enslavement, oppression and plunder of millions upon millions of Asian, African and Latin American people. Such régimes were bound to perish with the complete victory of those peoples. China was convinced that if the peoples in southern Africa maintained their vigilance, strengthened their unity and persevered in the struggle, they would surely surmount all difficulties and hazards along their road and advance to final victory.

46. Mr. ELIAN (Romania) said that a fundamental tenet of Romanian policy was that international peace, security and co-operation could be achieved only on the basis of complete equality between nations and States and full respect for the national interests of all peoples. The universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples were essential if genuine respect for human rights was to be assured.

47. The Romanian people, which had had centuries of foreign domination in its past history, stood shoulder to shoulder with all peoples that were struggling for self-determination. It had set its face against imperialism and foreign interference in the internal affairs of other States, and it supported all peoples that were struggling for political and economic independence. The right of self-determination was now firmly established in international law, and any denial or violation of that right was a threat to peace and to all mankind.

48. The world was going through a period of rapid change, the balance of power was shifting, and the determination of peoples to assert their sovereignty over their national resources was becoming stronger and stronger. The trend towards détente and collaboration was still meeting strong resistance and there were still imperialist and colonialist forces which were blind to the development of human society and were trying to prevent progress. That was why the President of Romania had recently stressed the need for increased solidarity and co-operation between all anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces and all peoples that wished to live in freedom, sovereign dignity and peace.

49. Important changes had taken place since the previous session of the General Assembly, particularly in Africa, where the trend towards the liquidation of the colonial régime of domination had been accentuated. Guinea-Bissau had become independent and had been recognized by Romania immediately. Romania had also welcomed the signature of an agreement at Lusaka between Portugal and Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) trans-

ferring political power to the people of Mozambique. Romania had always supported the people of Mozambique in their struggle for independence, and he recalled the joint communiqué that had been signed in June 1973 by Romania and FRELIMO, the first international act undertaken by FRELIMO as the legitimate representative of the people of Mozambique. Romania believed that the speedy opening of negotiations between Portugal and the representatives of the liberation movements of Angola, the Cape Verde Islands, Sao Tomé and Príncipe for the transfer of power to the peoples of those Territories would result in the implementation of the declaration of principle on decolonization made by the Portuguese Government.

50. Everything was ripe for a final struggle against colonialism, racism and the régime of *apartheid* applied by the minority régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia. The fact that 30 million Africans were still under the colonialist and racist yoke of the white minority in South Africa placed on the United Nations the heavy responsibility of achieving one of its main purposes under the Charter, namely, creating an effective instrument for the defence and promotion of the independence and sovereignty of nations. The decisive factor in achieving independence was the determined and unrelenting struggle of the national liberation movements, which were entitled to use every means at their disposal, including armed struggle, to ensure respect for their right of self-determination.

51. In a spirit of solidarity, Romania was developing multilateral relations of friendship and co-operation with the national liberation movements. Hand in hand with other States and the progressive forces of the entire world it was actively supporting their right to use any form of struggle to achieve freedom and national independence. On the principle that international recognition of the liberation movements would help to strengthen them and to speed up the process of decolonization, Romania had recognized the new States immediately after the proclamation of their independence and established diplomatic relations with them. There were therefore in Bucharest missions representing several national liberation movements, which had strong political and diplomatic support from Romania. Great prominence was being given in Romania to information about the struggle of colonial peoples for their liberation by sending journalists to the liberated territories, showing documentary films, organizing exhibitions and publishing studies and monographs. The press, television and radio gave wide coverage to the situation in the dependent Territories, emphasizing international solidarity for the liberation movements and unmasking the imperialist and colonialist forces.

52. Romania was strongly in favour of inviting representatives of the national liberation movements to participate in international meetings, such as the sessions of the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. In the specialized agencies, Romania was striving for the adoption and implementation of effective programmes of material aid to those movements in the economic, medical, cultural, training, social welfare and other fields. It was striving for the prompt implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of other United Nations resolutions calling for the end of colonialism and policies of racial discrimination

and *apartheid*. In that connexion, he recalled that the Romanian expert on the Sub-Committee on Elimination of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had been appointed Special Rapporteur for the study on the right of peoples to self-determination based on the Charter of the United Nations and other United Nations instruments, approved by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1865 (LVI). That study would be a useful contribution to the efforts of United Nations bodies to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

53. In conclusion, he said the Romanian delegation would strongly support any initiative by the Third Committee to increase the United Nations contribution to the struggle against colonialism and racism.

54. Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) said the increasing membership of the United Nations showed how many countries had been able to exercise their right of self-determination despite the opposition of the colonial Powers. Nevertheless, many peoples still remained under the colonial yoke. It was the duty of all Member States to aid and support those peoples in the struggle for their liberation.

55. He paid a tribute to the new Portuguese Government for the efforts it was making to eliminate the last vestiges of colonialism from its African Territories. He welcomed the presence of Guinea-Bissau in the Committee and expressed the hope that Angola, Mozambique and the Cape Verde Islands would soon be represented also. He was sure that the action of the new Portuguese Government would be an example to those colonial Powers which hitherto had shown themselves obdurate.

56. It was regrettable that white minorities still dominated South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe and applied a policy of *apartheid* and racial segregation. He called on all Western Powers that were supplying the minority régimes in southern Africa to respond to the call of world public opinion and boycott those régimes; their resulting isolation might bring them to their senses.

57. In the Middle East his country believed that the only way to peace and justice lay through recognizing the Palestine Liberation Organization and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and their right to return to the homes from which they had been expelled by the Zionist colonialists. Their right to return had been recognized by the United Nations in General Assembly resolution 194 (III), and their right to self-determination had been reaffirmed by the General Assembly in resolution 3089 D (XXVIII). He welcomed the fact that resolution 3210 (XXIX) dated 14 October 1974, by which the General Assembly had invited the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the debate on the question of Palestine in the plenary meetings had been adopted by a very large majority. The Zionist manoeuvres which had led to the partition of Palestine were at the root of the tragedy in the Middle East. He welcomed the fact that the representative of Sweden, a Western Power, had called for justice for the Palestinian people, for without it there could be no peace in the Middle East. It was surprising that the Zionists often quoted paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, stressing the right

of everyone to leave any country including his own, but entirely ignored the end of the paragraph which proclaimed the right of everyone to return to his country. However, even the exercise of the right mentioned in the first part of the paragraph did not entitle the zionists to expel the inhabitants of Palestine and to occupy their land.

58. Saudi Arabia supported all the national liberation movements and scrupulously respected the United Nations resolutions on decolonization. It had no relations with the racist minorities in Africa or elsewhere, it applied sanctions against them and it contributed to the funds for assistance to the victims of *apartheid* and colonialism. The Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (see General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII)) would undoubtedly mark a step forward towards the elimination of racism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, and it had his country's full support. The information media of Saudi Arabia were keeping the people informed of all developments connected with racism, and his Government was providing scholarships for persons from South Africa to study in his country's universities, thus helping to prepare the future leaders of Africa.

59. Lastly, on the instructions of his Government, he wished to state that Saudi Arabia would give all possible moral and material support to any efforts to eliminate such crimes against mankind as colonialism, racism and racial discrimination and would spare no effort to assist subject peoples to achieve self-determination and independence.

60. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed her delegation's deep concern at the manner in which General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had been ignored by certain States, notably in southern Africa. It would continue to voice its indignation as long as there were countries which remained under colonial domination and alien subjugation.

61. It welcomed the changes that had taken place in Portugal, which represented a very significant milestone in the history of the peoples who had been exploited and oppressed under the former dictatorship not only in the colonial Territories but also in Portugal itself. The downfall of the fascist régime in Portugal had brought hope to the millions of oppressed people in the Portuguese colonies and their supporters. Her Government was encouraged by the attitude toward decolonization of the new Portuguese Government and by its recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. It welcomed the admission of independent Guinea-Bissau to the United Nations and hoped that Mozambique would become a Member before the conclusion of the General Assembly's thirtieth session and that it would not be long before Angola and other colonial countries were granted independence. Her Government would give its full support to the Portuguese Government in its endeavours to complete the process of decolonization.

62. The spirit of decolonization in the former Portuguese Territories of Africa was, however, marred by the continued atrocities in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. That was why the degrading and inhuman practices of the racist minority régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were met with violence—the only course

of action left to the oppressed peoples. She recalled that the President of FRELIMO had stated that FRELIMO had never fought against the Portuguese people or against the white race, but against the colonial system of oppression and exploitation. In Rhodesia, the Government of the United Kingdom had refused to take any action towards the realization of the right to self-determination and independence of the people of Zimbabwe; the so-called negotiations between that Government and the illegal Smith régime should delude no one, for if negotiations were to be real and meaningful they should be conducted, not with the illegal régime, but with the true representatives of the people of Zimbabwe. Independence negotiated without consideration for the will of the majority of the people of Zimbabwe would be a sell-out. The Government of the United Kingdom had as much responsibility for the administration of Southern Rhodesia as it had had before Smith's unilateral declaration of independence; the United Kingdom thus remained as the only colonial Power, besides the racist Vorster régime, in southern Africa.

63. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist white minority was outrageous and constituted a challenge to the integrity of the United Nations. In spite of the fact that the United Nations had entrusted the United Nations Council for Namibia with responsibility for administering the Territory and people of Namibia, the South African racist régime was still deeply entrenched there, flouting all the decisions of the United Nations and strongly consolidating its policies of *apartheid*. The people of South Africa were constantly subjected to humiliation, degradation and discrimination of the worst kind, and the policies of *apartheid* continued to thrive in the midst of all the protests from the world community. The intransigence of the South African *apartheid* régime was partly due to the continued support it enjoyed from some States members of NATO. While they claimed that they were acting in accordance with United Nations resolutions concerning South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the facts showed that their moral, social, economic and military collaboration with South Africa continued to be strengthened. NATO members were becoming more involved than ever before in military activities within South Africa under the pretext of a communist threat, and recently there had been joint military exercises between the United Kingdom and South Africa. France and the United States continued to have close military ties with South Africa. Those three countries had exercised their power of veto over the will of the majority at the 1808th meeting of the Security Council in respect of the question of expelling South Africa from the United Nations. To her delegation and to all other peace-loving people who valued human dignity, that action by France, the United Kingdom and the United States was an abuse of power; power was meant to be used to protect and defend the oppressed and humiliated, not to condone oppression, and her delegation could not but condemn such action.

64. The question of the Palestinian people remained a burning issue, and it was the duty of the United Nations to see that the Palestinian people were treated with justice and decency. A nation could not live as refugees indefinitely. The Israelis must accept the fact that the Palestinians had the right to self-determination and must move out of all the occupied Arab territories.



65. The right of peoples to self-determination and independence was not a subject of bargaining between the oppressor and the oppressed. It was only logical that when that right was denied, every possible means should be used for its restoration so that the oppressed too could enjoy fundamental freedoms and human dignity.

66. Mr. IPSARIDES (Cyprus) said that the United Nations, since its establishment, had moved towards the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence; the adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had opened a new era in the history of mankind through the universal condemnation of the domination by one people of another and the universal acceptance of the elementary right of peoples to decide their own destiny. Before the establishment of the United Nations and the adoption of the Declaration, colonialism, and indeed any form of foreign domination, had been internationally accepted as a political system of administration and admitted as a constitutional legality; thus domination by force and the denial of fundamental human rights had been treated as the norm. For example, the United Nations had been unable to take a stand for self-determination in relation to the situation in Algeria, which had first come before it at the tenth session in 1955. However, since the 1960 Declaration and with the rapidly growing number of Member States of the United Nations, which was in itself an eloquent proof of the rate of success of the United Nations in decolonization and self-determination, a new climate had evolved. The United Nations had moved towards awakening the conscience of mankind—indeed, towards becoming the conscience of mankind—where decolonization and self-determination were concerned.

67. However, despite the progress so far achieved, there were still peoples in many countries who lived under the yoke of foreign domination and oppression. The United Nations had certainly not failed to profess convictions about the inadmissibility of *apartheid* and racism, or to adopt measures containing pious exhortations. Where it had failed was in the practical application of its professed beliefs and in the effective and faithful implementation of the decisions and measures which most of its Members had voted for. While no one was free from collective responsibility for that failure, grave responsibility rested particularly upon those States which, having put economic, political and strategic considerations above the requirements of conscience, either refused to implement those resolutions or aided and abetted other countries in their negative attitude. For example, it was particularly deplorable that some Governments, disregarding the relevant Security Council resolutions and relying on dubious considerations of external defence and internal security, were supplying South Africa with the means of continuing the oppression of the African majority and encouraging it to export *apartheid* beyond its borders and thus to pose a real threat to neighbouring African States.

68. The Declaration had reflected the awakened conscience of mankind with respect to that issue. In the circumstances, the attempt to hold back progress and to maintain order by force, without remedying the basic wrong, was doomed to failure and only caused increased conflict and strife, for it was futile to try to stem the tide of freedom or to arrest the course of history. In a rapidly changing world, the essential quality of statesmanship was the ability to adjust to rapidly changing conditions, and the sooner the administering, dominating or oppressing Powers adjusted themselves to the age, the better for them and for the whole world. It could not possibly be in the true interests of those Powers themselves to persist in a policy of domination and inequality, with all the resultant internal conflict and increasing international friction. No Government or people, however strong in material force, could for long disregard the fundamental moral principles with impunity or to ignore the force of world opinion. The concept of colonialism referred to any domination by force, injustice and exploitation of one people by another.

69. Cyprus had itself in the past experienced colonialism in one of its gravest manifestations—the policy of divide-and-rule—and had emerged from that state of colonial dependence after a long and arduous struggle. It had then experienced an unprecedented and brutal conspiracy by a senseless régime amounting to gross intervention in its affairs and had been the victim of ruthless aggression with a view to its geographic and demographic dismemberment, as a result of which one third of its population had become refugees in their own country. It therefore espoused with particular vigour the cause of liberation of all peoples from colonialism, oppression and racism. It sympathized with them whether they were in South Africa, Namibia or Southern Rhodesia; in Mozambique and Angola, where it was to be hoped that they would soon attain independence, following Portugal's display of courage and realism in the case of Guinea-Bissau; or in the Middle East, where the acquisition of territory by armed force could not be tolerated and the Palestinian refugees should be allowed to return to their rightful ancestral homes. Cyprus at the same time saw the question of colonialism, domination by force, exploitation and other forms of oppression from the broader viewpoint of peace and stability in the world, for there could be no enduring peace without universal freedom. Interdependence was one of the main characteristics of the era, for with the advancement of technology the indivisibility of humanity, and hence of freedom and of peace, was clearer than ever before. As long as colonialism and alien domination persisted, mistrust and suspicion would result which would frustrate all efforts for the advancement of a peaceful world. It was therefore in the vital interests of all mankind that colonialism should be speedily terminated.

*The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.*