

## 2088th meeting

Tuesday, 12 November 1974, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Aminata MARICO (Mali).

A/C.3/SR.2088

### 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.2-5, A/9667 and Add.1, A/9830, A/C.3/L.2128)**

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Lebanon, Malaysia and the Upper Volta had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128.

2. Mr. ELTAYEB (Sudan) said that the right to self-determination was a corner-stone of justice; it was impossible for any people to enjoy their legitimate human rights without being able to exercise sovereignty and to choose the political régime and the means of social and economic development which they desired. The fact that an increasing number of countries were joining the United Nations indicated that the right to self-determination would triumph and would disperse the remnants of colonialism. The basic goal of self-determination would be achieved despite the procrastination of the imperialist countries.

3. Although the United Nations had passed many resolutions on the question of attaining self-determination, progress was slow. Some countries were ignoring those resolutions or were implementing them only in so far as it suited their own purposes, on various pretexts. The racist régimes of southern Africa would be unable to continue without support from such countries. Companies representing world monopolies continued to exploit African workers and to inflict the worst type of slavery in modern times. His delegation believed that all Member States should respect the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and should enforce and strengthen sanctions against the racist régimes. Implementation of the resolutions in question should be controlled in order to reveal which countries were not complying with them. It was the basic duty of all States to continue to provide moral and material assistance to the liberation movements until victory for the people in their struggle for self-determination had been achieved.

4. His Government looked with favour upon the new régime in Portugal, and that had been indicated in the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Sudan in the General Assembly at the 2255th plenary meeting on 3 October 1974. It was to be hoped that Angola and Mozambique would soon achieve independence. His delegation had been pleased with Portugal's recognition in the United Nations of the right of the peoples of the countries under its administration to self-determination and political freedom and hoped that the guarantees which had

been made by the Portuguese Government would soon be implemented.

5. The collusion between the Zionist group and the racist white minority group in South Africa was no coincidence; it resulted from the similarity of the two systems, which were both based on the law of the jungle. The usurpation of the rights of the peoples by those two intransigent groups would fail in the face of the peoples' determination. The Palestinian people would achieve self-determination and recover their lands, as their cause was just. The logic of their position would shortly be heard at the General Assembly;<sup>1</sup> his delegation welcomed that victory for all peoples striving to gain their independence. Many resolutions had been passed by the General Assembly denouncing the Zionist group, but the Zionists continued their deplorable methods of aggression and falsification of the truth. However, injustice and untruth would be short-lived and the people of Palestine would achieve independence. The international community should try to isolate Israel and ensure that no United Nations aid was provided to it.

6. It was essential to provide moral and material unconditional assistance to newly independent countries so that they could consolidate their Governments and economies, and all advanced countries had a special responsibility in that respect. The Sudan provided as much assistance as it could to liberation movements because of its faith in the legitimacy and justice of the cause of national liberation.

7. Mr. NEYTCHIEV (Bulgaria) said that his country, true to its international obligations, to the Leninist principles of the self-determination, freedom and equality of all peoples and nations and to a policy of friendship and brotherhood with all peoples who were under the yoke of foreign domination, steadfastly opposed colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid*, racism and all forms of national oppression. It therefore consistently implemented the decisions of the United Nations concerning the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination. Bulgaria's position on the question under discussion was well known and was based on its recognition that the right of peoples to self-determination and independence was a universally accepted principle of international law. The liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism and the attainment of independence by many States of Africa and Asia was a direct consequence of the implementation of that principle. Bulgaria had included the principle in its national constitutional law. It had also been one of the first to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 A (XXI), annex), and it had participated actively in the elaboration of all the important international documents on the subject under consideration. It advocated the further development of international co-operation with

<sup>1</sup> 2282nd plenary meeting, held on 13 November 1974.

respect to the protection of human rights and the struggle against racism, colonialism and *apartheid*. Having in the past endured a long period of foreign oppression and slavery, Bulgaria resolutely opposed imperialist policies and all forms of domination over other peoples, and the Bulgarian people were actively participating in the struggle for the final liquidation of all vestiges of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

8. Bulgaria actively supported the legitimate right, recognized by the United Nations, of national liberation movements to use all means of struggle, including armed force, and attached great importance to the provision of broad political, moral and material assistance to the peoples engaged in that struggle. The active participation of the specialized agencies could contribute much to the efforts of the United Nations to promote the liquidation of colonialism and the provisions of support to the colonial peoples striving for their independence.

9. His delegation was convinced that the development of détente and the realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence would contribute greatly to the success of the struggle against racism and colonialism. The easing of international tension would help to restrain the forces which were providing support to the racist and colonial régimes and furthering the exploitation of the colonial peoples. The improvement in the international situation was creating the necessary conditions for the development of the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. Favourable results had already been achieved; the overthrow of the Fascist dictatorship in Portugal had strengthened the common struggle against colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

10. His delegation attached great significance to the successful implementation of the Programme for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 3057 (XXVIII), annex) and considered that efforts should be concentrated on the organization of specific actions aimed at the international isolation of the racists and colonialists of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and, eventually, the liquidation of their régimes and the granting to the peoples of those countries the right to self-determination and independence. Bulgaria therefore consistently implemented all the relevant United Nations decisions and resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolution 3070 (XXVIII); it had been one of the first to ratify the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex). The consistent and strict implementation by all States of the decisions of the United Nations concerning the right of peoples to self-determination and independence was a decisive factor in the liquidation of the remaining hot-beds of colonialism and racism. Bulgaria, for its part, had always implemented and continued to implement all the United Nations recommendations on the application of economic and other sanctions against colonial and racist régimes, and it had no relations of any kind with the Governments of South Africa and Rhodesia. At the same time the Bulgarian mass media, in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly, were actively engaged in informing the population about the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the liquidation

of colonialism and the realization of the right to self-determination, freedom and independence. Bulgaria had also always co-operated and continued to co-operate with African and other States in providing comprehensive assistance to the peoples engaged in the struggle against colonialism and racism and would continue to advocate the adoption of the most effective measures in that respect. It therefore considered that the recent triple veto in the Security Council<sup>2</sup> would in no way contribute to the triumph of the just causes of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia. His delegation advocated the genuine implementation of the right to self-determination of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and also the restoration of the legitimate national rights of the people of Palestine. It considered that full respect for and implementation of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine were essential for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

11. The liquidation of colonialism and neo-colonialism and the realization of the right to self-determination and independence were basic conditions for the effective guarantee of all human rights. His delegation was therefore prepared to support any appropriate measures aimed at the speedy elimination of racial discrimination and of the policy and practice of *apartheid*. It would continue to provide all possible aid and assistance to the legitimate cause of the peoples' struggle for self-determination.

12. Mrs. TAKLA (Egypt) said that the right of peoples to self-determination was a permanent factor of international life, which made the victory of the peoples in their just struggle inevitable. The change in the policy of the Portuguese Government towards its former colonial Territories had put an end to much suffering and it was logical that the other Portuguese Territories should gain independence as soon as possible. Her delegation hoped the example of the Portuguese Government would be followed by other Powers, so that further suffering would be avoided. There was no doubt that the right of peoples to self-determination was a prerequisite for the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. That was borne out in the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other United Nations documents. The universal realization of the peoples' right to self-determination was inevitable in a world where peace and justice would prevail. While the efforts of the United Nations and the international community would undoubtedly contribute to the full realization of that right, the heroic struggle of national liberation movements would be the main factor in that success and would lead not only to the freedom of the peoples but also to the liberation of those countries that were still under the imperialist yoke. Humanity and freedom were inseparable, and as long as there were peoples in the world who still suffered under imperialist and foreign oppression, they would be deprived of true freedom.

13. Her delegation had noted with appreciation the adoption of a number of important resolutions by the Economic and Social Council, including resolution 1864 (LVI), 1865 (LVI) and 1866 (LVI), and it hoped that

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, 1808th meeting.*

they would be implemented as soon as possible. However, the imperialist forces continued to defy the resolutions on the right to self-determination despite the serious consequences for the peoples of the world. Israel still denied the Arab people the right to independence and liberation and the same was true in southern Africa. Israel had denied the Palestinian people the right to exist; the Jewish people had settled in Palestine as if there had been no people living there already. Yet Palestine had a people with rights and aspirations, a history and a heritage, and moreover a future, despite all denials of their rights. The forces of domination and oppression were calling on the Palestinian people to return to their homes, forgetting that they themselves occupied those homes, which they had usurped. That was the so-called logic on the basis of which those forces moved people around the world as if the world were a chessboard. They assumed rights which they denied to others and imposed a fictitious supremacy over supposedly inferior peoples. Egypt utterly rejected those actions and called on all States to join in putting an end to foreign domination and oppression in all parts of the world. It was not enough to condemn imperialism; the imperialist régimes should be completely isolated in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. The liberation movements must be given moral and material support so that they could continue their just struggle for independence. The decision of the United Nations to invite representatives of the African liberation movements (see resolution 3163 (XXVIII)) and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (see resolution 3210 (XXIX)) to participate in its discussions was a constructive step which would undoubtedly contribute to greater effectiveness in the work of the United Nations. The ideal of an international community based on justice and freedom from aggression, imperialist and foreign domination, exploitation and racism in all forms must be made a reality. Egypt had always fully supported the liberation movements, believing that the unity of the liberation movements and consolidation of the progressive forces would help to attain the goal of an international community and order based on equality, justice and peace.

14. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba) observed that the indissoluble link between the right to self-determination and independence of peoples and the effective exercise of fundamental human rights was unequivocally affirmed in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 55 of the Charter expressly stated the interrelationship between self-determination and respect for human rights, and Article 56 established the commitment of all Members of the United Nations to the achievement of those purposes. The self-evident truth that self-determination and independence were a necessary prerequisite for the effective enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms had been repeatedly and unequivocally reaffirmed by various organs of the United Nations.

15. Nevertheless, the stubborn persistence of colonialism was noted each year in the General Assembly. Although increasingly isolated by the international community, the forces of colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism continued in their efforts to hold back the tide of history and deprive millions of oppressed people of their human rights.

16. The international community had good reason to welcome the events that had occurred in Portugal earlier in the year. The liberation struggle of the indigenous population of the Portuguese African colonies had not only paved the way for the independence of those Territories but had also enabled the Portuguese people to rid themselves of a Fascist tyranny which for more than 40 years had deprived them of their most fundamental civil, political and economic rights. The Cuban people had closely followed the process of national liberation in the Portuguese colonies in Africa and was confident that the peoples of Angola and Mozambique would soon achieve their legitimate rights, thus following the example of Guinea-Bissau.

17. In other Territories not administered by Portugal, the situation remained serious. There was an obvious link between the dependent status of some Territories and the negation of human rights there, as well as between the continued existence of imperialism and that of racism and colonialism. If imperialism were to disappear, colonialism would lose its *raison d'être*. For that reason, it was clear that the struggle of peoples did not end with the achievement of self-determination and that colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism could not be eliminated as long as imperialist interests continued to exist. His delegation therefore supported the anti-imperialist struggle for self-determination and independence of peoples in Indo-China, Africa, the Middle East and the Americas.

18. There were many examples of the links between colonialism and imperialism. In the Middle East, Zionism was used to implement a policy of colonization of the ancestral lands of the Palestinian people and other Arab territories occupied by force in flagrant violation of the Charter and numerous United Nations resolutions. According to recent reports, the Jordan Valley, the Golan Heights, Jerusalem and other areas had become the scene of fresh manifestations of conventional colonial policy.

19. In Rhodesia, the people of Zimbabwe continued to be subjugated by the white minority with the connivance of various Western consortia, which constituted the backbone of the Rhodesian economy. The recent statement by the United Kingdom Government that there were no United Kingdom firms operating in the Territory of Rhodesia because such firms had been registered as Rhodesian companies did not alter the fact that the profits earned by such firms were used in violation of United Nations resolutions.

20. In Namibia, foreign interests—and particularly mining interests—had strong reasons for preserving the present status of the Territory and denying self-determination to the indigenous population. The documents 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 showed that various Western enterprises were engaged in intensive activities in Namibia. In South Africa, the high yield on Western investments—higher than could be obtained in other countries—was attracting a substantial flow of capital which bolstered the *apartheid* policies of the white minority régime. It should be added that various North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Powers, principally the United States, the United Kingdom and France, had

supplied and continued to supply military equipment, either directly or indirectly, to the racist régimes of southern Africa. It was clear that such aid encouraged the brutal repression of the liberation movements in that part of the world. Moreover, those régimes enjoyed the support of the NATO countries at the international level, as was evidenced by the triple veto interposed recently in the Security Council, in defiance of world public opinion.

21. Unfortunately, old-style colonialism was not confined to Africa. In the Latin American country of Puerto Rico, 75 years of military occupation and colonial rule and the ruthless exploitation of natural and human resources by the United States had not subdued the Puerto Rican people, whose struggle for self-determination and independence was now reaching new levels of militancy. That struggle would inevitably lead to national liberation. Many Puerto Rican patriots had for more than 20 years languished in United States gaols and could be considered as the longest-standing political detainees on the American continent. Panama had also been subject, for more than 70 years, to North American military occupation of a part of its territory which was of great strategic and economic importance. It had been turned into a colonial enclave and was used as a training ground for forces that could be used to interfere in the affairs of other Latin American countries.

22. He stressed the close co-operation that existed between all the retrogressive forces of the world. For example, until recently the racist South African régime had maintained close military co-operation with the former Portuguese régime in the African colonies. Southern Rhodesia continued to enjoy a similar arrangement with South Africa. According to recent reports, the bonds between zionism and the racists of South Africa were being strengthened. In view of that situation, all the peoples of the world must unite in their support of the struggle by oppressed peoples for self-determination and independence.

23. His delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128. All countries interested in ensuring the effective guarantee of human rights had an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their sincerity in that regard by voting in favour of the draft resolution.

24. Lady GAITSKELL (United Kingdom) recalled that the United Kingdom had played a full part in all the discussions on self-determination that had been held since the establishment of the United Nations. Her Government fully recognized the right of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories to determine their own constitutional future and had adopted a policy towards its remaining dependent Territories which was based on the principle of self-determination in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants. The United Kingdom was anxious to co-operate with the United Nations in securing the implementation of that principle. In that connexion, her Government fully co-operated with the Special Committee and had recently invited a mission from the Special Committee to visit the Gilbert and Ellice Islands in order to observe the holding of a referendum on the future of the islands.

25. Her delegation warmly welcomed the acceptance by the new Portuguese Government of the principles of self-determination and independence for its overseas colonies.

26. The Fourth Committee and the Special Committee were particularly concerned with the question of self-determination and her delegation held the view that discussion of those questions should be concentrated in those two bodies. For that reason, her delegation had not dwelt in detail, in the debates of the Third Committee in previous years, on the situation in Southern Rhodesia, a situation for which the United Kingdom had a precisely defined responsibility. However, since a number of comments had been made on the specific question of the human rights of the citizens of Southern Rhodesia during the debate on the item concerning the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, her delegation felt that it might be useful to make clear its position on that question.

27. Rhodesia had been internally self-governing since 1923. At no time between 1923 and its unilateral declaration of independence on 11 November 1965 had Rhodesia ever been directly governed or administered from London. In practice, if not in strict law, Rhodesia's relationship to the United Kingdom during those years had been virtually the same as that of the so-called "self-governing Dominions", such as Australia and Canada. No British Government department had had any control over the raising of taxes in Rhodesia or over its army or police force. The form of active administration in the Territory had therefore remained unchanged by the unilateral declaration of independence. There had been no British Government administrators, let alone British troops, serving in Rhodesia before 1965 and, of course, there had been none there since.

28. The analogy which some had chosen to draw with the policy of the United Kingdom in respect of other colonial Territories did not, therefore, hold water. It might be asked why the Government of the United Kingdom had not washed its hands of Rhodesia after the Rhodesian unilateral declaration of independence. The answer was that its constitutional responsibility for the territory gave it some residual influence and it had felt that it was its duty to exercise whatever influence it had for the benefit of the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole.

29. Precisely because of its concern for the protection of human rights in Rhodesia, the United Kingdom had insisted that it maintained ultimate responsibility for Rhodesia and for the timing of full independence. Successive Governments of the United Kingdom had been unwilling to grant independence to a numerically small group of European settlers because they had not felt sufficient confidence in the readiness of the white minority to protect the human and democratic rights of the majority of Rhodesia's inhabitants. Since 1945, the history of the relationship between the United Kingdom and Rhodesia had been studded with attempts by various Governments of the United Kingdom to find a satisfactory formula for the granting of independence. In all those attempts, the objective of the United Kingdom had been to use the extremely limited leverage of its residual constitutional powers to compel protection for the rights of the majority of the population. Since the unilateral declaration of independence, the United Kingdom had laid down five principles as a prerequisite for the granting of independence. Those principles were: first, that there should be unimpeded progress towards majority rule; secondly, that there should be guarantees against retrogressive amend-



ments of the Constitution; thirdly, that there should be an immediate improvement in the political status of Africans; fourthly, that progress should be made towards ending racial discrimination; and fifthly and most important, that the Government of the United Kingdom should be satisfied that any settlement was acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole. The attachment of successive Governments of the United Kingdom to those five principles hardly accorded with the assertion made in the Committee that the silence of the United Kingdom with regard to the African people of Rhodesia represented a setback for democracy. If that were true, it was hardly likely that the Government of the United Kingdom would have brought the problem of Southern Rhodesia to the Security Council, that it would have asked for mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia under Chapter VII of the Charter, that it would have co-operated with the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), or that it would have made successive attempts to improve the lot of those suffering in Southern Rhodesia as a result of the violation of their human rights.

30. It was regrettable that the United Kingdom, which over the past 30 years had nurtured self-determination and independence in so many countries, now found itself faced with a peculiarly intractable challenge to its policy of promoting self-determination. In that connexion, she had been disappointed by the reference made by a delegation at an earlier meeting to the superficial difficulties of finding a solution. It was all too easy to fall into the trap of casually dismissing some of the most intractable human rights problems. However, members of the Committee should try to avoid that trap. She could readily sympathize with the impatience and feelings of frustration of the African peoples who lived close to the white régimes of southern Africa. What was more difficult to understand was the attitude of some other delegations which were quick to identify and condemn abuses of human rights in countries other than their own. Over the past several years, the Third Committee had become a closed society with a language of its own, a language little understood in the outside world. The constant repetition of the words "colonialism", "imperialism", "neo-colonialism" and "racism" had become an incantation and seemed to have a narcotic effect on some delegations.

31. In conclusion, she reiterated what the representative of the United Kingdom had said at the 2092nd meeting on 15 October 1974 of the Fourth Committee in the debate on Rhodesia: the Government of the United Kingdom accepted its particular responsibilities and would continue to play its full part in the attempt to promote a just and lasting settlement which would ensure the future of all Southern Rhodesia's people. She hoped that others would do the same.

32. Miss ILIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her country's position on the question of the right of peoples under colonial and foreign domination to self-determination, freedom and independence had been constantly manifested through its full political, moral and material support to such peoples in their struggle to achieve those rights and through its opposition to the policies and practices that prevented those peoples from enjoying their basic human rights. Her country had always actively participated in all activities of

the United Nations and the non-aligned movement to eradicate colonialism, racism, *apartheid* and alien domination as major obstacles to the realization of the right of self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial and foreign oppression.

33. The process of the liberation of peoples was inevitable and, as a result of changes in Portugal, had recently received a new incentive. The accession of Guinea-Bissau to independence should mark the start of a new era in "colonial" Africa where the peoples of Mozambique and Angola and others would soon achieve full sovereignty over their territories and natural resources. Only then would the threat to peace constituted by the situation in southern Africa be permanently eliminated.

34. The restoration of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people was also an indispensable condition for the enjoyment of their inalienable rights, repeatedly confirmed by the General Assembly, and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Obviously if it were not for the military and economic co-operation of some Governments with existing unlawful régimes, in open disregard of United Nations resolutions calling for severance of all relations with such régimes, the process of liberation of countries and peoples under colonial and foreign oppression would already have been achieved.

35. The introductory statement by the Director of the Division of Human Rights on the subject under consideration (2081st meeting) and the reports by the Secretary-General presented to the General Assembly both at the twenty-eighth session<sup>3</sup> and at the present session (A/9667 and Add.1) pursuant to resolutions 2955 (XXVII) and 3073 (XXVIII) were encouraging. Her delegation welcomed the appointment of special rapporteurs by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at the twenty-seventh session to undertake studies on the historical and current development of the rights of peoples to self-determination on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and other instruments adopted by the United Nations organs, with particular reference to the promotion and protection of human rights and on the implementation of United Nations resolutions relating to the rights of peoples under colonial and foreign domination to self-determination. Such studies would help in further identifying and eliminating all obstacles to the realization of the rights of peoples to self-determination.

36. The Committee should give full attention to the responses from the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations set forth in the Report of the Secretary-General submitted in accordance with paragraph 10 (a) of General Assembly resolution 3118 (XXVIII) (A/9638 and Add.1, Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2-5) and to the measures taken by the Secretary-General to give effect to paragraph 10 (b) of the same resolution (A/9830). Particularly important were the decisions of those agencies to extend or increase the scope of their assistance to the liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States, including the decision to consider simplifying procedure for requesting and providing such assistance and

<sup>3</sup> A/9154.

the decision to extend to such national liberation movements invitations to attend the meetings of those agencies as observers when matters pertaining to the Territories in question were dealt with. However, in view of the difficulties sometimes encountered in the implementation of those decisions, the members of the executive bodies of those agencies should spare no effort to increase the scope and effectiveness of such assistance to the peoples under colonial and foreign domination and to the liberation movements.

37. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq) said that the progress of the right of self-determination had not been easy because the imperialists had sought to prevent the liberation movements from gaining their countries' independence. The efforts of the developing countries, to deepen the roots of political independence and to complete their economic independence in terms of achieving a dignified life without external interference, and the struggle of the peoples still under imperialist rule, to achieve independence and the economic level already attained by other countries, were both cases with scope for the exercise of self-determination. In the first case, the State was preserved from foreign interests in every area and was able to ensure the security of its system and, in the second, the exercise of the right of self-determination would gain for those peoples their international status. Both types of effort were defined within the legal framework of duties and obligations without which the international system would fail. The Committee was dealing with the subject under consideration within a specific framework, which his delegation had defined during the twenty-eighth session at the 2017th meeting of the Third Committee. There were two main targets, namely, the recognition of the legitimacy of the right of self-determination and the exercise of the right as a means to obtain fundamental human rights. For people still under foreign domination, the right of self-determination was in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

38. Imperialism needed political and economic exploitation in order to exist and such exploitation could not continue without oppression and inequality. Therefore imperialists did not respect the human rights of those they exploited.

39. One recent negative example had been the veto exercised by three members of the Security Council regarding the decision endorsed by the majority of Member States to expel South Africa from the United Nations. The familiar pretexts for that action were unacceptable. As long as the conditions for the implementation of Article 6 of the Charter existed, then that Article should be implemented. The right of veto was a privilege accorded to five States which were permanent members of the Security Council and were thereby particularly responsible for preserving international peace and security and for protecting the obligations conferred by the Charter. By their misuse of the veto, the three States in question had not fulfilled their obligations under the Charter but had served illegitimate interests. Similarly, the pretext that Member States once outside the United Nations could not be affected by the pressure of the international community was unacceptable, since under the terms of Article 6 of the Charter there was nothing to prevent subsequent action to compel the Member State expelled to respect legality. The

pretexts offered for the veto were merely the excuses of the friends of the *apartheid* system. He quoted Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter, and reminded the Committee of the theory of dialogue propagated after the meeting of the Security Council at Addis Ababa in 1972, namely that there were indications of change within the *apartheid* system itself. He doubted the usefulness of waiting any longer for such change.

40. There had been positive developments in that Guinea-Bissau had achieved its independence and was now a Member of the United Nations, where it would soon be joined by Mozambique and Angola. He expressed appreciation and respect for the Government of Portugal for its recognition of the historical fact that victory was always on the side of the people struggling for their freedom. Another positive development had been the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3210 (XXIX) whereby the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the true representatives of the Palestinian people, had been invited to participate in the General Assembly discussion at plenary meetings on the question of Palestine. The Palestinian people was a people like any other with the right to self-determination after the deprivation it had suffered as the victim of imperialism and Zionism. That right would soon be strengthened by other measures.

41. His Government supported the liberation movements on the basis of its humanist policies and according to its principle that the Arab national revolutionary movements were part of the international revolutionary movement which should unite to eradicate racial discrimination and promote peace. Solidarity was required to eliminate all old and new forms of imperialism in order to achieve progress in all countries and readjust the balance of the international community, thereby strengthening international peace. His Government would spare no effort to see that all countries enjoyed basic human rights.

42. At the previous meeting of the Committee, the representative of Israel had offered some platitudes on the question of the self-determination of peoples. It had also alleged that the Iraqi Kurds were deprived of self-determination and that a policy of genocide was practised against them. The Kurds did not live only in Iraq, but also in four other States Members of the United Nations. With regard to the human rights aspect, the Kurds were a national minority in his country and Iraq reported on their rights to the competent bodies of the United Nations. Those bodies had never found that his Government had violated its obligations concerning human rights. Proof of that was to be found in the section of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination dealing with the examination of the second periodic report submitted by Iraq<sup>4</sup> and in the summary record of the Committee meeting during which it was considered.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the Working Group of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had not found the communications relating to the alleged violations of the human rights of the Iraqi Kurds to be admissible. He asked the representative of Israel how her

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 18*, paras. 104-107.

<sup>5</sup> See CERD/C/SR.182.

Government accounted for its practices concerning the occupied Arab lands under discussion in the Special Political Committee or for the fact that her Government stood condemned by the United Nations. He asked her what her Government had done for the liberation movements in Africa or what she could say concerning the poor position of the oriental Jews in Israel. Only by extreme bias could the representative of Israel have dismissed at the previous meeting of the Committee the question of the rights of the Palestinian people as a political matter more appropriate for discussion in other forums of the United Nations. The enclave of Israel had been established through a violation of the rights of the Palestinian people. Israel was condemned by enlightened public opinion for its persistent violations of the Charter, and its allegations were merely an attempt to divert the attention of the world community from the problems caused by imperialism and colonialism whose concealed partner was zionism. However, the progress of the third world would not be stopped and the countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, with whom his Government particularly identified, would no longer be swindled but would gain victory despite imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and zionism. He wished in passing to assure the representative of the United Kingdom that he was not addicted to those terms, but that they had definite meaning.

43. In closing he offered the Committee a proverb: "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

44. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate on item 55 had now ended.

45. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) apologized to the representative of the Upper Volta who had been one of the original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128, but whose name had been inadvertently omitted from the list.

46. She revised operative paragraph 4 by inserting the words "calls for" between the words "independence and" and "their immediate release", and revised operative paragraph 6 by replacing the final three words of that paragraph, "without undue delay", by the words "as soon as possible".

47. Mr. BAL (Mauritania) said that he was sure that the position adopted by the representative of Liberia at the previous meeting had been the result of a misunderstanding, since that country's attitude toward the liberation of African peoples, including the use of armed struggle, was well known. Moreover, at a meeting of the African Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity at Mogadiscio in January 1974, the representative of Liberia had made a large financial contribution to the liberation movements.

48. While he understood the concern of the United Kingdom representative with regard to her country's relations with Southern Rhodesia, he thought that she might also have mentioned countries still under United Kingdom rule in Oceania and the Pacific. As far as Southern Rhodesia was concerned, the United Kingdom had never condemned the Smith régime outright. If ever such a motion of censure were to be brought, his delegation would be on the side of reason.

49. Mr. THOMAS (Liberia) expressed his appreciation of the statement made by the representative of Mauritania concerning Liberia's position. It was his Government's policy to support complete freedom for all peoples and to oppose any violation of human rights. Since the previous meeting, he had reviewed General Assembly resolutions adopted at the twenty-eighth session and had found that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128, to which his comment had related, was almost a replica of a paragraph in a resolution already adopted. He therefore withdrew his statement made at the previous meeting and said he would support the draft resolution.

50. Mr. HSING Sung-yi (China) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128. The Chinese people had realized from their own experience that moribund colonialism relied on armed force to wage a last-ditch struggle and that without the victory of the armed struggle of the colonial peoples, colonialism would not disappear. Armed struggle was therefore the basic means that colonial peoples used in their fight for the right to genuine independence and national self-determination. The use of other forms of struggle was not, of course, ruled out. The draft resolution manifested the just demand and strong determination of the third world countries and peoples to fight against oppression and enslavement by imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and zionism and for self-determination and independence.

51. His delegation was pleased to note that historic progress had been made recently in the national independence movement in southern Africa. Through prolonged armed struggle, the people of Guinea-Bissau had attained independence, and, under pressure of the people, the Portuguese Government had recognized the right to independence of the peoples in its colonies. However, the decolonization process in the Portuguese colonies was far from complete, the vigilance must be maintained at a high level against the disruptive activities and deceptive tricks of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism. Vice-President Santos of Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) had recently reaffirmed the importance of armed struggle. China believed that so long as the colonial peoples strengthened their unity and maintained vigilance, they would surely surmount all difficulties and win final victory.

52. Mr. CRESPO (Portugal) reaffirmed the belief of his Government that the principle of self-determination was an inalienable right of all countries and peoples. Accordingly, Portugal was doing its best to speed the process of self-determination and independence of the African peoples of Mozambique, Angola, São Tomé and Príncipe and Cape Verde. It supported the drive for self-determination of other peoples under colonial and foreign domination.

53. His delegation supported most of the contents of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128. It took note with satisfaction of the paragraphs which recognized what had been achieved in Portugal. However, in the light of that recognition, his delegation felt that operative paragraph 6 was not very appropriate. He therefore wished to inform the Committee about some of the more recent developments in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

54. In Angola, a complete cease-fire had been reached with the three liberation movements, and they had opened offices and were freely pursuing their political activities. The Portuguese Government was actively negotiating with them with a view to the formation of a transitional government that would lead the country to independence. In São Tomé and Príncipe, talks had taken place between the Government of Portugal and the Movimento de Liberdade de São Tomé and Príncipe, and another meeting would take place in the near future to make the final arrangements for the constitution of a provisional Government that would lead to independence there. In Cape Verde representatives of Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC) were establishing party offices, and the process of self-determination and independence would take place in complete accordance with the Algiers agreement between Portugal and PAIGC signed on 26 August 1974.

55. The main objective of the Government of Portugal was to reach the goal it had set itself of granting self-determination and independence to the peoples under its administration as soon as possible. In doing so it considered that the process of decolonization must be pursued in conditions of peace and in such a way that lasting peace and well-being would be firmly established.

56. His delegation therefore considered that operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128 was very harsh towards the Government of Portugal and it called for a separate vote on that paragraph. With regard to operative paragraph 8, he pointed out that NATO as such had no relations with the racist régimes of southern Africa.

57. Mrs. SHAHANI (Philippines) said that her delegation would support draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128, the terms of which were in keeping with her Government's policy in respect of the territories of southern Africa and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. She welcomed the change that had taken place in Portugal's colonial policies. Her Government's position with regard to *apartheid* was well known and in the Credentials Committee her delegation had voted against recognition of the credentials of the South African delegation in voting in favour of the draft resolution before that Committee.<sup>6</sup>

58. Mr. SHUKE (Albania) said that the people of Albania had followed closely the struggle of oppressed peoples for self-determination, national liberation and independence. His Government pursued a policy of principle in that regard: it had always supported and would continue to support the just struggle of such peoples to throw off the yoke of colonial domination. Consistent with that policy, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128.

59. He emphasized that the colonialists would not renounce their policies voluntarily. The oppressed people had therefore rightly chosen the path of armed struggle as the only means of achieving national liberation. Referring to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 5 and 6, he pointed out that the essential prerequisite for the

realization of self-determination in the Portuguese Territories was the resolute struggle of the peoples of those Territories. In that connexion, he welcomed the successes achieved by the people of Guinea-Bissau.

60. Mr. ARIZAGA (Ecuador) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128 as a whole. However, it had certain reservations with regard to two of the operative paragraphs. It felt that the phrase "including armed struggle" in paragraph 3 should be deleted, since the use of the words "by all available means" was sufficiently explicit. Similarly, in paragraph 7, the phrase "notably the peoples of Africa and the Palestinian people" should be deleted. If a vote was taken paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would abstain on the two paragraphs to which he had referred.

61. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom) observed that the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to operative paragraph 6 hardened rather than softened the terms of that paragraph. He suggested that the word "*Urges*" should be replaced by "*Calls upon*" and the phrase "without undue delay" by "with all appropriate speed". He felt that those amendments might solve some of the difficulties of the Portuguese delegation.

62. Mr. SPEEKENBRINK (Netherlands) recalled that the Netherlands Government, in its commentary on General Assembly resolution 3070 (XXVIII) in the Report of the Secretary-General (A/9667), had drawn attention to the close relationship between the right of peoples to self-determination and the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. By virtue of the right of self-determination, which was reaffirmed in the Charter of the United Nations and the International Human Rights Covenants, all peoples should be able freely to determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

63. His delegation considered draft resolution A/C.3/L.2128 to be lacking as far as recognition of the essential connexion between the right of self-determination and the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms was concerned. Some of the operative paragraphs of the draft contained elements which his delegation could not support. If a vote were taken by paragraph on the operative part, his delegation's vote would be based on the merits of each paragraph. His delegation could, however, support the preamble, although it would have to abstain if a separate vote were taken on the first preambular paragraph because it referred to General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), on which his delegation had abstained.

64. His delegation was unable to support operative paragraph 2, since it contained no stipulation that the forms of assistance called for should be given in conformity with the Charter. The terms of operative paragraph 3, which endorsed the legitimacy of the struggle for liberation by all available means, including armed struggle, were equally unacceptable, being at variance with the Charter. His delegation would vote for the deletion of the phrase "including armed struggle" if a separate vote were taken.

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 3, document A/9779.



65. His delegation considered that operative paragraph 7 contained elements on which the Committee was not qualified to pass judgement and which would have to be decided upon in the forthcoming debate in the plenary General Assembly. The fact that his delegation would abstain if a separate vote were taken on that paragraph should not be interpreted as indicating a position on the substance of the problem with which it dealt. Operative paragraph 8 contained the implication that NATO maintained a variety of contacts with the racist régimes of southern Africa. The implication must be rejected. Similarly, the suggestion that the maintenance of political relations with the racist régimes of southern Africa encouraged those régimes to persist in their policies was unfounded. On the contrary, his delegation was convinced that the improvement of the situation in southern Africa would be best served by the maintenance of such political relations. His delegation could not endorse the selective tone of operative paragraphs 8 and 9. Its position with regard to the question of the severance of links with the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia had been clearly stated in the Special Political Committee and the Fourth Committee.

66. As a result of the above-mentioned considerations, his delegation would have to abstain in the vote on the operative part of the draft resolution.

67. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that the Committee should proceed to a vote on the draft resolution.

68. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) said that she had consulted some of the sponsors of the draft resolution and none had expressed any objection to the amendment to operative paragraph 6 proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

69. Mrs. FAKOTOFIRINGA (Madagascar), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had not spoken on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution. Her own delegation, for one, preferred not to amend paragraph 6 as currently worded.

70. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) said that in the time available she had been unable to consult all the sponsors of the draft resolution. She hoped that the representative of Madagascar would be able to accept the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom.

71. Mrs. RAKOTOFIRINGA (Madagascar) said that she would have to consult the head of her delegation before accepting any amendment to operative paragraph 6, since her instructions had been to maintain the original wording.

72. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) suggested that the representative of Portugal should be asked if the amendment was acceptable to him; if it was not, then her delegation would support the retention of the original wording.

73. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) said that the original wording of operative paragraph 6 should be retained.

74. Mr. CRESPO (Portugal) said that he would be obliged to abstain in a vote on operative paragraph 6 as originally

worded, but if it was amended in accordance with the United Kingdom's proposal, he would vote in favour of it.

75. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that he understood the desire of some members to take a vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting but, while not wishing to make a formal proposal, his delegation would be pleased if the voting could be deferred until the following meeting so that the sponsors could have time to consult.

76. Mr. EVANS (Australia) endorsed the suggestion of the representative of Panama.

77. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) said her delegation would request a separate vote on operative paragraphs 3, 8 and 9 of the draft resolution.

78. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) was pleased to note that the representative of Portugal would be able to vote for operative paragraph 6 if it was amended, but she also appreciated the position of the representative of Madagascar. If the latter was unable to proceed without further instructions, perhaps the vote should be postponed.

79. Mr. TRAVERT (France) agreed with the Moroccan representative's suggestion. The amendment put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom had been a compromise which he was sure the sponsors would understand.

80. Mr. GHAUSSY (Afghanistan), supported by Mr. LEHTIHET (Algeria), said that in view of the many separate votes which would be requested on different paragraphs, he too thought the voting should be deferred until the following meeting.

81. The CHAIRMAN said it appeared to be the feeling of the Committee that the vote should be taken at the following meeting.

82. Miss HARELI (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement by the representative of Iraq had simply been a repetition of the distortion of truth and history which had been put forward in former years and which was responsible for the conflict in the Middle East. With reference to the Iraqi Kurds, the persistent reports which her Government had received gave the lie to the statement made by the representative of Iraq. As for the "Israeli practices" currently being discussed in the United Nations, the so-called findings of the so-called Tripartite Committee<sup>7</sup> were based on fabrications and unreliable witnesses. The Tripartite Committee was in fact made up of three individuals who were all on the same side.

83. Her Government had helped many countries both before and after their accession to independence. It had set an example of international co-operation and would continue to do so. It had voted for the admission to the United Nations of the African countries, even those of the Arab League which it had known would rank among its enemies.

84. The Jews were one people, no matter what part of the world they came from and national unity was stronger than

<sup>7</sup> Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

ever. It followed that the oriental Jews had an equal place in her country.

85. Her Government's view on the Middle East conflict could be found in the statement made by Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs at the 2255th plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 3 October 1974.

86. Miss NURU (United Republic of Tanzania) said with reference to the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom that the practices of colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism were condemnable by any standards and no people could enjoy human rights under any of those régimes. They must be condemned until they had been eliminated.

87. The Government of the United Kingdom had told the world that the rebels of Southern Rhodesia would be brought to their knees in weeks, yet 10 years had passed since it had made that statement. If the United Kingdom had been sincere in its efforts to find a solution to the problem of Southern Rhodesia, it could have done so by now. After all, it had wasted no time in crushing the rebels of Anguilla, and she failed to see why it had treated the Smith régime differently. She reiterated her delegation's disappointment at the United Kingdom's handling of the Southern Rhodesia question, which had had the effect of denying the indigenous people their fundamental rights and freedoms.

88. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) expressed regret at the television interview broadcast the previous day on an American television channel in which certain individuals had publicly declared their intention to assassinate the head of the Palestinian delegation, who was scheduled to address the General Assembly according to the majority decision of that body. In any other country, such a threat of assassination would lead to arrest. She doubted that Members of the United Nations could be sure of their lives in New York when a recognized delegation was thus openly threatened. If the principles of democracy were invoked in defence of that declaration of intent to commit an assassination, she would refer the Committee to article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 2106A (XX), annex); she hoped the United States Government would make the appropriate distinction between democracy and a violation of the principles laid down in such international instruments. She further hoped that there would be no repetition of the unpleasant incident to which she had referred.

89. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was not the Arabs but the Zionists who had distorted the history of Palestine. Zionism had become entrenched in Palestine through the distortion of history but the Zionists would not admit that fact. The representative of Israel had stated that she did not wish to discuss the problem of the Kurds but it was she who had introduced the subject. Israel might co-operate with African countries which had gained independence, but it had never

assisted the liberation movements or voted in favour of granting them observer status at the United Nations. As to the question of the oriental Jews in Israel, quotations from articles which had appeared in *The New York Times* on 15 June 1971, 16 August 1972 and 12 November 1974 all pointed to the disunity of the Jewish population. The Israeli representative had made allegations about Arab terrorism, but terrorism had been unknown in the Arab countries until it had been introduced by the Zionists. He wished to remind the Israeli delegation that the first acts of terror had been perpetrated by Zionist organizations. That could be proved by an Israeli source; the article "That can happen only in Israel" concerning terrorization and discrimination against Iraqi Jews, which had appeared in the weekly *Holam Hazeh* in Tel Aviv on 27 April 1966. Other examples of Zionist terrorism could be cited. However, the tide of history could not be reversed and despite Zionist propaganda, zionism would perish.

90. Mr. ALFONSO (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to make it clear to the representative of Israel that the remarks he had made in his earlier statement concerning Israeli policies in the occupied Arab territories had been based on an official statement made by the Israeli Minister of Defence, Mr. Shimon Peres, on 4 August 1974.

91. Referring to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, he pointed out that his delegation had not invented the terms "colonialism", neo-colonialism", "imperialism" and "racism". As long as those practices continued to exist, it was necessary to call them by their proper names.

92. Miss HARELI (Israel) said that she questioned the credentials of any country which could publicly hang Jews in the central square of its capital, as Iraq had done.

93. Mr. AR-QAYSI (Iraq) said that the representative of Israel had made the same remark to the Committee three years earlier and his answer was on record. He questioned the credentials of her delegation, since she as a Zionist claimed to speak on behalf of the Jews of the world. Some Jews did not accept the Zionists as their representatives: in that connexion he quoted excerpts from a publication by the United States branch of the Guardians of the Holy City and other publications in which the writers gave examples of Zionist treachery during the Nazi holocaust. Furthermore, Zionist terrorist groups had undermined the position of Jews in many countries in order to uproot them and thus encourage their immigration into Israel. The Zionists had not been elected or appointed by the majority of Jews to represent all Jews. According to the Bible and to Jewish belief, the Jews had been chosen by the creator of the universe to serve him in a special way and thereby to serve all mankind. They had not been chosen to rule over other peoples. He asked how far Israel had served the people of Palestine.

*The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.*