

66. The fact that the two International Covenants on Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex) had been ratified by a large number of States encouraged the hope that they would soon enter into force. Those Covenants were a symbol of progress, but their significance paled in the light of the daily reports of violence and cruelty in all parts of the world. Human beings were being tortured and thrown into prison because of their convictions. In those parts of the world where war was raging, more and more refined weapons were being used to inflict senseless suffering. Unjustified and excessive violence and terrorism in all its forms must be condemned.

67. The pessimism engendered by reports of assaults on fundamental human rights by the most diverse régimes throughout the world was not necessarily justified. The causes of violence were identifiable and could be elimi-

nated. For example, it was known that there was a connexion between the widespread use of violence, on the one hand, and injustices within nations and between nations, on the other. The most elementary human right was the right of peoples to control their own destinies. As long as there were nations which had not gained independence and régimes which protected the privileges of minorities while neglecting the will of the people, it could not be expected that violence would be suppressed. To the oppressed, violence might ultimately become the only way out of a desperate situation. It was therefore one of the most urgent tasks of the United Nations to work for the liberation of countries still under colonial domination. All countries should adopt policies based on the will of the people which promoted the people's interests.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*

## 2084th meeting

Thursday, 7 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

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

A/C.3/SR.2084

### AGENDA ITEM 12

**Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections D to F), IV (section J), V (sections A to C, D, paragraphs 436 to 478, 487 to 492, 494 to 506, and E), VI (sections A.1 to 5 and 7, E and G), and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (concluded) (A/9603, A/9637, A/9707, A/9733, A/9737, A/9764, A/9767, A/9785, A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1)**

1. Mr. NOTHOMB (Belgium) said that his country's contribution to the voluntary fund for the International Women's Year, as announced at the 2079th meeting, would amount to \$20,000.

2. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) introduced the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1) on the consideration to be given to the questions arising from the report of the Economic and Social Council. She said it took account of the misgivings expressed by some delegations: it no longer referred in the first preambular paragraph or in operative paragraph 1 to any order of priority for the consideration of the items before the Committee; the second preambular paragraph mentioned only the items which were dealt with only in the Council's report; in operative paragraph 2, it was specified that the request set forth in the draft resolution was without prejudice to the various bodies competent in those fields; finally, in the matter of the financial implications, no details were given as to how the Secretary-General should meet the request addressed to him. She hoped that the intentions of the sponsors would thus be better understood.

3. Mrs. MALLOUM (Chad) thought that the revised text added nothing new and that the sponsors should have withdrawn their draft resolution. In accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, she

moved the closure of the debate and said that her delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1.

4. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) thought that it was too early to proceed immediately to the vote and requested, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure that the discussion should be adjourned until the following meeting.

5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, a motion to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion took priority over a motion to close the debate. Under rule 116, two representatives might speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion should be immediately put to the vote.

6. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) deplored the fact that the Committee was devoting as many meetings to a completely meaningless draft resolution as to such an important item as colonialism. He would vote against the motion of the representative of the United Kingdom if it was maintained, and would vote for the motion of the representative of Chad.

7. Mr. TUROT (France) supported the motion for adjournment, since in the intervening period agreement might be reached. The changes mentioned by the representative of Italy should dispel any remaining hesitation. In any case, the Committee was always free to decide how it would consider the items on its agenda and what priority it would give them.

*The motion to adjourn the debate was rejected by 40 votes to 33, with 18 abstentions.*

8. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) urged the sponsors to withdraw their draft resolution.

9. The CHAIRMAN put the motion to close the debate submitted by Chad to the vote.

*The motion was adopted by 54 votes to 27, with 22 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

*Against:* Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Democratic Republic of Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Albania, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, China, Dahomey, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Nepal, Oman, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zaire.

*Draft resolution A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1 was rejected by 41 votes to 28, with 43 abstentions.*

10. Mrs. BERTRAND DE BROMLEY (Honduras) said that she had voted for draft resolution A/C.3/L.2127/Rev.1.

11. Miss CAO-PINNA (Italy) said that less than one third of the members of the Committee had voted against the draft resolution, the others had voted for it or had abstained.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of item 12 of the agenda.

#### 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 to 4, A/9667 and Add.1, A/9830)**

13. The CHAIRMAN congratulated the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of the fifty-seventh anniversary of the October Revolution. The Committee was the appropriate body to pay a tribute to all the heroes who had fallen for the cause of freedom and in defence of human rights.

14. Mr. NEYTCHEV (Bulgaria) associated himself with the congratulations offered by the Chairman, particularly since the anniversary of the October Revolution was also celebrated by Bulgaria and all progressive forces. If there had been no 7 November 1917, which had marked the beginning of the process of liberation for all the colonial peoples, the Committee would not now be considering the important matter of self-determination.

15. Mr. POZNYAKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) thanked the Chairman for her congratulations. His country had a particular interest in the question of self-determination and was happy that the liberation movements, which had developed through the progress of socialism, had almost succeeded in eradicating colonialism and imperialism. The day was not far off when the last bastions of colonialism would fall and all Africa would be independent, but it was worrying to see that, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and many United Nations resolutions, the legitimate rights of peoples aspiring to self-determination and independence were still being thwarted. His country, as a socialist State born of the October Revolution, had always supported and would continue to support the legitimate struggle of peoples against imperialist, racist, colonialist and neo-colonialist oppression.

16. The colonialists were trying at any cost to maintain their inhuman domination and exploitation with the support of imperialist and capitalist interests, which continued to derive enormous benefits from their investments in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and elsewhere. Considerable documentation was available on the subject of foreign investment, which represented 70 per cent of all investment in South Africa, and a great deal of information was contained, in particular, in the July 1974 issue of the Bulletin of the Unit on *Apartheid*.

17. The monstrosity of the policy of *apartheid* derived from the fact that racism had been raised to the level of an official ideology and from the fact that racial discrimination, which formed the basis of the South African State, served to oppress 80 per cent of the people. According to reports by UNESCO and other international bodies, African children were forbidden to attend school; 70 per cent needed medical care. Among the Bantus, the infant mortality rate was 20 times higher than among whites. The military budget of South Africa for the year 1974-1975 had nevertheless doubled compared with the previous year. *Apartheid* was a means of repression against the indigenous population, which was deprived of its most basic rights, including the right to move freely in its own country.

Thousands of freedom fighters had been imprisoned and the Expert Committee established by the Security Council under the terms of its resolution 191 (1964) had noted that the methods of the South African police were similar to those of the Gestapo. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which had undergone the terrible experience of the Hitlerian occupation, considered that nazism and *apartheid* were two forms of the same evil, namely, the exaltation of the supremacy of one race over another. The international conscience would never accept the situation of terror and violence prevailing in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and the Arab territories occupied by Israel. As the example of Guinea-Bissau had recently shown, the African peoples were firmly determined to recover their land from the colonialists. His delegation was convinced that the success of the struggle for liberation in Africa lay in the unity of the countries of Africa and their co-operation with the socialist countries and all progressive forces. In that connexion, OAU was playing a very important role and the decisions taken at Mogadiscio in June 1974, during the eleventh session of the Conference of Heads of State and Government of OAU, would intensify the struggle and hasten the emancipation of the African continent. His country urged the full implementation of the right of peoples to self-determination and respect for the rights of the peoples of southern Africa and Palestine so that all peoples might be freed from fascism and aggression.

18. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) stressed the fundamental nature of the right of peoples to self-determination. The United Nations decisions which her Government had fully supported had helped to speed up the process of decolonization and its impetus could now no longer be stopped. It was, however, to be regretted that, so many years after the signature of the Charter of the United Nations and the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)), an item relating to the universal achievement of the right to self-determination and the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was still on the agenda of the General Assembly. At its fifth session, the General Assembly, had, however, reaffirmed the right to self-determination in resolution 421 D (V) and, at its following session, had decided, in resolution 545 (VI), to include an article embodying that right in the International Covenants on Human Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex), which had been opened for signature in 1966 and which, it was to be hoped, would enter into force in 1975.

19. An important step forward had nevertheless been made in 1974 when Portugal had taken the decision to recognize the principle of self-determination in its African Territories and her delegation welcomed that decision.

20. Moreover, as a result of resolution 4 (XXX) and 5 (XXX) adopted by the Commission on Human Rights,<sup>1</sup> two important studies, one relating to self-determination and its historical and current development and the other relating to the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on that subject, had been undertaken in 1974 by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 5, chapter XIX, section A.*

and Protection of Minorities. It was to be hoped that those studies would be ready in 1975 at least in preliminary form, so that the Committee might use them at the thirtieth session.

21. Mr. HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the right of peoples to self-determination was recognized in the very first Article of the Charter of the United Nations, which stated that the recognition of that right was an appropriate measure for the development of friendly relations among nations and the strengthening of universal peace. The meaning of the concept of the right to self-determination had been extended since the fifth session of the General Assembly, thanks to the pioneering efforts of the Committee and the peoples subjected to colonial régimes and despite the opposition of the imperialist and colonialist Powers. Those Powers had claimed that the immediate extension of the provisions of the International Covenants on Human Rights to colonial peoples might destroy the very basis of their societies because those peoples would be suddenly brought to a point which civilized countries had reached only after a very long period of development. The international community had fortunately not listened to such arguments and had adopted a series of historic resolutions, including General Assembly resolution 421 (V) relating to the draft International Covenant on Human Rights and resolution 637 (VII) relating to the right of peoples and nations to self-determination. The colonialist régimes had nevertheless continued to oppress the peoples they were exploiting and, in 1960, the General Assembly had been under the obligation to adopt resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It had subsequently reaffirmed the importance of the universal achievement of the right of peoples to self-determination and the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples in a long series of resolutions which included resolutions 2649 (XXV), 2787 (XXVI) and 3070 (XXVIII).

22. His delegation deplored the fact that, to a great extent, the efforts made by the Committee had been useless. Courage and freedom of thought were, however, not lacking in the Committee and he was proud of the resolutions which had been adopted on its initiative. He also wished to thank the Director of the Division of Human Rights for his valuable contribution to the Committee's work.

23. Nevertheless, some basic questions still had to be answered. How long would the colonized peoples have to remain under the yoke of their oppressors? Why was the international community powerless to deal with violations of the recognized rights of those peoples? Because of the imperialist Powers' indifference to the resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the fascist régime was able to stay in power in South Africa and the Palestinian people were deprived of its national Territory in defiance of the principles of the Charter. The oppressed peoples had no need of a long historical past in order to understand that the land of their ancestors belonged to them and that they had the right to exploit their own resources. They needed no computer to know that they were being wrongly exploited by countries which were endeavouring to deprive them of everything, including their own identity. More than 25

years after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations, it was painful to note that millions of people in Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Palestine were being denied the right to self-determination and independence and were thus being deprived of the enjoyment of their most basic rights. At a time in history when the more advanced countries recognized that, in addition to the right to a decent life, work and security, the individual had the right to require society to guarantee him paid leave, leisure and a whole range of economic and intellectual luxuries, it was surprising and saddening that, by impeding the application of the sanctions adopted by the United Nations, some of the Governments of those countries were helping the colonialists to oppress 40 million people who were lacking food, housing and education.

24. His Government had always supported the national liberation movements and it renewed to them the assurance of its solidarity and unflinching support. It was in favour of the heroic struggle being waged by the Palestinian people against the oppression of the Zionist colonizers. The time had come for the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Palestine to exercise their right of self-determination. They must exert pressure on the imperialist Powers and force them to respect the United Nations Charter and resolutions. He appealed to the international community because he was aware that, in accordance with the position it had always maintained, it would spare no efforts to that end.

25. Mr. CATO (Ghana) said that the regularity with which the Third Committee and other organs of the United Nations addressed themselves to human rights questions indicated the concern that was felt over violations or denials of human rights in various parts of the world. The General Assembly's previous resolutions on the item under consideration indicated that peoples still under colonial rule and foreign domination were frequently the victims of inhuman and degrading treatment. Self-determination and independence were therefore a logical first step for those peoples towards full enjoyment of their basic rights and freedoms. It was for that reason that his delegation took the position that the task of the United Nations on matters concerned with the eradication of injustices would not have been accomplished while vestiges of colonialism still existed, while *apartheid* continued to be the law in the southern end of the African continent, and while Palestinians continued to live in tents.

26. It was a matter of great satisfaction to his Government that Guinea-Bissau had become a Member of the United Nations, that a transitional Government under the leadership of Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) had been established in Mozambique, and that Mozambique might join the membership of the Organization in the near future. Those encouraging developments had been made possible as much by the determined efforts of the United Nations as by the events in Portugal. His Government congratulated the new Portuguese Government for deciding to fulfil its obligations under the Charter and accepting the right of the Territories under Portuguese rule to self-determination and independence, thus making the coup d'état of 25 April 1974 meaningful. His Government expected the Portuguese Government to bring the process of decolonization to a happy finality at the earliest possible

date. If it did so, Ghana was prepared to establish sincere and beneficial friendly relations with it.

27. The situation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia was quite different. The majority African population in those Territories was still subjected to barbarous repression and degrading treatment. In that connexion, the recent debate in the Security Council, as a consequence of General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX) on the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, had caused his delegation considerable pain. He was referring to the drama at the 1808th meeting of the Council on 30 October 1974<sup>2</sup> in which the United States, the United Kingdom and France, against the decision of 10 other delegations and the desire of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Assembly, had forestalled action aimed at meting out to the South African racist Government the treatment that it fully deserved. That decision suggested that a solution for the South African tragedy was still remote. The effectiveness of the United Nations was only equal to the degree of political will demonstrated by every Member and that will must be demonstrated. His delegation judged adherence to freedom and justice not by mere words alone but by example. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations required the international community "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace". *Apartheid*, which was a form of aggression against an entire population, was a threat to peace and security, and expulsion of South Africa had been one of the weapons available to the international community for putting *apartheid* to rout. The irony was that the very countries that advocated peaceful methods should have frustrated efforts which could have achieved changes in the situation by peaceful methods. Under such circumstances, Ghana wondered how such changes could be brought about.

28. Ghana had been under British rule for 114 years. In spite of that fact, it had emerged from that status without bitterness or rancour. Like many other countries with other former colonial Powers, Ghana had been able to establish new relationships with the United Kingdom because it shared certain ideals with that country. There was therefore no reason for the British Government or the French Government to fear that their interests and investments in South Africa or Rhodesia would be hurt. However, his delegation did believe that economic relations and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) arrangements gave support to the racist régime. It could not be maintained that the sale of French arms to South Africa had no bearing on the military and social situation of that country. Nor could one accept the argument, repeated by the *Glasgow Herald* in its editorial of 4 November 1974, that the United Kingdom had a responsibility to the United States and to NATO in connexion with the defence of Europe. The responsibility of the United Kingdom, the United States and France, individually or collectively, should be aimed at achieving global peace and not at serving limited interests. Europe had as much right to its security as Africa did, but his delegation believed that the nature of the relationship that existed between NATO and certain European countries

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year*.

on the one hand, and South Africa on the other, was unwholesome, and that it gave comfort to the racist Government of South Africa and added to the suffering of the majority indigenous population. It therefore hoped for a change in such relationships. His delegation had for long believed that the subjugated peoples who were struggling to regain their dignity and freedom would overcome every obstacle, and it felt that the international community, which had the capacity to support their struggle, must continue to do so.

29. He wished to thank the Director of the Division of Human Rights for his useful statement at the 2081st meeting and the Secretary-General for his reports on the question being studied, which provided the Committee with all the information it needed to consider the item. He also appreciated the assistance which certain Governments, United Nations specialized agencies and some non-governmental organizations and institutions had been giving. He thanked the Swedish delegation for its most noble statement at the preceding meeting.

30. Ghana remained resolutely opposed to colonialism and to every denial of basic human rights wherever that denial occurred, whether in Africa or in Palestine. The United Nations had drawn up a blueprint for a new world economic order. There was also a need for a new world social order in which colonialism and the exploitation of man by man would be replaced by sincere international co-operation; otherwise, the concepts of justice, equality and the right of peoples to self-determination would remain a dead letter and there could be no peace.

31. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that the very title of the item before the Committee expressed one of the basic objectives of the United Nations as set forth in paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter. Day by day new States emerged to swell the ranks of those that were struggling for the cause of self-determination. The struggle against colonialism had taken on new vigour after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which had been a milestone in the struggle against the domination of man by man. Fourteen years after the adoption of that historic document, Portugal had radically changed its policies and amended its past errors. Paradoxical as it might seem, even the veto cast in the Security Council on 30 October 1974 by the representatives of the United Kingdom, France and the United States against the expulsion of South Africa from the Organization was a good sign for those who were struggling for their freedom, because it highlighted the tragic aspects of *apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia. The fact that three great Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, which maintained relations of various kinds with South Africa had nevertheless, in their statements to the Council, condemned that country's colonialist policy towards Namibia was proof that the day was not far distant when South Africa would be forced to withdraw from Namibia, leaving it free, at last, to exercise its rights.

32. However, even though traditional colonialism was on the way out, colonialism continued to exist throughout the world in different forms but with the same result,

namely, the domination and exploitation of the less developed countries by the great Powers and the persecution of everyone who attempted to oppose that neo-colonialism. The international community had a duty to condemn those practices and to undertake a vast worldwide information campaign in order to ensure respect for human rights and enforce the implementation of various international instruments on the subject, such as paragraph 5 of the Teheran Proclamation of 1968.<sup>3</sup> Churches, political, civic and cultural organizations, and all human beings, young or old, who believed in justice and universal brotherhood must be involved in that action.

33. Panama, which was itself a victim of neo-colonialism and could only condemn such infringements of the dignity of peoples and of the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of States, was ready to support any measure aimed at eliminating colonialism and racial discrimination.

34. Mrs. POKHAREL (Nepal) said that the right of peoples to self-determination and freedom had become a universally recognized principle of the present-day world. Much progress had been achieved in the field of decolonization, the latest evidence being the recent attainment of independence by Guinea-Bissau, through the untiring efforts of the liberation movements, and its admission to the United Nations. Her country would like to see Angola and Mozambique as Members of the United Nations in the near future, and wished to congratulate the new Portuguese Government on its policy towards its former African colonies. By acting in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Portugal had won the respect of all Members of the Organization.

35. In southern Africa, however, millions of human beings were still deprived of their most elementary rights and continued to live in conditions of slavery. *Apartheid*, a crime against humanity, still flourished in South Africa and the racist Vorster régime continued to scorn the repeated appeals of the international community for justice and reason and to flout all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly with a view to putting an end to that odious policy. Only international co-operation and concerted action on the part of all States Members of the United Nations would make it possible to eradicate *apartheid* and racial discrimination. In that connexion, her delegation commended all States which supported the legitimate cause of the liberation movements in South Africa. It urged all those which, while verbally condemning *apartheid* in United Nations organs, continued supplying the racist Government of South Africa with economic and military support to observe the United Nations resolutions on *apartheid* and exert pressure on the racist régime to abandon its policy of oppression and racial discrimination.

36. In Namibia, in defiance of General Assembly resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973 condemning the policy of bantustans imposed by the racist South African régime, the Pretoria régime continued to create such "homelands", which destroyed the territorial integrity of the country and the unity of its people. In Southern Rhodesia, the Zimbabwe people were still being humiliated

<sup>3</sup> See *Final Act of the International Conference on Human Rights* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.68.XIV.2), p. 3.



and persecuted by the illegal Salisbury régime, and Ian Smith was consolidating his policy of racism and racial discrimination.

37. Her country strongly condemned the policies of the Vorster and Smith régimes and would continue to support the oppressed peoples of southern Africa in their struggle for freedom and independence. Her delegation wished to express its appreciation to the States Members of the United Nations and to such bodies as the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Special Committee on *Apartheid* for their untiring efforts in the fight against colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

38. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Chairman for the congratulations she had addressed to his country and to the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of the fifty-seventh anniversary of the October Revolution, which had marked not only a change of social system, but also the end of a world order based on the enslavement of man by man, violence and war. By its current foreign policy, the USSR sought to defend the interests not only of the Soviet people and all the socialist peoples, but also of all progressive and peace-loving forces throughout the world or, in other words, of all workers. The Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence were put into practice at the international level through the conclusion of treaties between States. His delegation was convinced that world peace was a prerequisite of economic development and social progress for all countries, and of respect for the rights and fundamental freedoms of the peoples of all countries. It was gratified by the strengthening of co-operation between the socialist countries and the developing countries, which were defending their rights and their legitimate interests with increasing effectiveness and making an active contribution to the solution of international problems. The USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR would spare no efforts to continue that co-operation in the context of the Third Committee's work.

39. Miss CABALLERO (Mexico) said that her country had always taken an anti-colonialist stand and had always defended the principle of the right to political independence, respect for the sovereignty of nations and the

right of self-determination of peoples. Mexico had fought for 11 years to obtain its political independence and, faithful to its past, it rejected whatever vestiges of colonialism might continue to exist in the world. The countries of the third world now had to fight against a new form of colonialism, namely, economic colonialism, which was perhaps more cruel than its predecessor. Mexico firmly believed that all States had the right to exercise their full and complete sovereignty over their national resources and to adopt legislation regulating foreign investment. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which was to be submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration in accordance with its resolution 3082 (XXVIII) also envisaged international action to control the activities of transnational corporations in developing countries.

40. The gap between wealthy and under-developed countries continued to grow, despite the interdependence of their two worlds. If the countries of the third world needed the industrialized countries, it was equally true that the prosperity of the latter depended on the raw materials they obtained from the developing countries. That was why Mexico called for a new international economic order that would make it possible to eliminate the age-old injustices of which modern economic colonialism was the most glaring example. Her delegation would support any resolution to that effect submitted to the Committee which conformed to Mexico's traditional position.

41. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that the statement by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a country which was notorious for its violations of human rights, was an incitement to violence and only served to poison the atmosphere at a time of negotiations and searching for peace.

42. Mr. HUSSAMY (Syrian Arab Republic) observed that he had merely recalled the many General Assembly resolutions recognizing the rights of the Palestinians, which he urged the representative of the Zionist régime to consult.

43. Mr. BARROMI (Israel) said that what he had meant was simply that the remarks of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic were out of place in the Committee.

*The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.*