

interveção MP



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.3/SR.1873

19 November 1971

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

Twenty-sixth Session

THIRD COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED
AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 16 November 1971, at 3.30 p.m.

CONTENTS

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 (continued)

Fundação Cuida o Futuro

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mrs. SIPILLA	Finland
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. MOUSSA	Egypt

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the four working languages (English, French, Russian or Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and also incorporated in one copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 19 NOVEMBER 1971, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 24 NOVEMBER 1971.

The co-operation of participants in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

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 (A/8331; A/C.3/L.1877-1880)
(continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that, at the request of several members of the Committee, it had been decided to extend the deadline for the submission of amendments to 5 p.m. on Thursday, 18 November.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) thought that the decision might result in a proliferation of amendments and subamendments and therefore expressed opposition to the extension of the deadline.

The CHAIRMAN explained that, on the contrary, the deadline had been extended so that the sponsors of amendments could reach agreement and thus reduce the number of amendments.

Miss PRODJOLALITO (Indonesia) said that her country had had the good fortune to reassert its right to self-determination shortly after the Second World War; since its independence, it had provided all possible material and moral support to the peoples still deprived of that right. Unfortunately, despite the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, despite General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and resolution VIII of the 1968 Teheran Conference, there were still peoples deprived of the fundamental right of self-determination. Indonesia supported and would continue to support the just efforts of the colonial peoples to achieve self rule, not only in political affairs but also in economic and social matters. The concern of the former colonies which had achieved independence for their brothers still in captivity had provided the world with an edifying example of collective moral responsibility and Indonesia wished to remain associated with those manifestations of solidarity.

Her delegation therefore favoured the adoption of a resolution along the lines suggested by the Economic and Social Council in document A/8331.

The continuation of colonial rule was threatening not only basic human rights but also world security, and should therefore be of concern to the United Nations on two different scores. As 23 years had elapsed since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and 11 years had elapsed since the adoption

(Miss Prodjolalito, Indonesia)

of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, one could understand the impatience, or rather the hunger and thirst for justice, of the peoples still under colonial rule.

Mr. GOLOVKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the question under consideration was of vital importance for the peoples under colonial domination. The situation had not improved, as had been hoped, and many countries were still suffering under the colonial yoke, despite the efforts of the United Nations and despite some degree of progress, which was demonstrated by the admission of four new Member States in the current year.

With the momentum given by the progressive forces, the United Nations had condemned colonialism and imposed sanctions against those who practised it. Yet colonialism persisted in its classical form and in its new form of neo-colonialism. Portugal was still waging its colonial war against Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and the peoples of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa were still struggling for their independence while certain capitalist countries, particularly the United States, were giving economic and military support to the forces of colonialism and oppression. Despite their protests, the imperialist countries were undoubtedly helping to subjugate the peoples under colonial domination.

In addition, one could not overlook the cruel violation of the human rights of the people of Viet-Nam and the atrocities committed against that people in violation of the most elementary principles of justice.

Israel, with the support of the imperialist Powers, was also continuing its struggle against the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine and had already revealed in the Committee the close ties which existed between Tel Aviv and Pretoria.

Another example of imperialism was the situation in Northern Ireland, where the British were impeding the self-determination of the people.

Opposition to colonialism in all its forms was one of the fundamental objectives of the Soviet Union, which considered it essential to give every assistance to the national liberation movements and strictly implement the resolutions of the United Nations in order completely to eliminate colonialism once and for all and thus strengthen peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Golovko, Ukrainian SSR)

The history of the United Nations had shown that the majority of States were pursuing that same goal and had demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt the growing strength of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces. Those forces would certainly continue to grow in strength and the efforts to thwart them were doomed to failure.

Mr. SENDAULA (Uganda) said he was happy to see that, after 22 years of complete isolation, the People's Republic of China had assumed its rightful place in the United Nations.

Uganda had always supported the peoples under colonial domination in their fight for independence and it noted with concern that many peoples were still subjected to such domination, as was the case in the Portuguese colonies of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau), or to the tyranny of a racist minority, as was the case in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The situation in southern Africa was a violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and a constant threat to international peace and security. The minority racist régimes in southern Africa had deliberately ignored the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Declaration and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Tension was mounting in South Africa and, if a racial conflict erupted, it would have far-reaching consequences and would threaten the peace of the whole world. In addition, South Africa and Portugal had already threatened the peace and security of the neighbouring independent African States, and the Republics of Senegal, Guinea and Zambia had been the most recent victims of the racist attacks.

Uganda condemned those policies and rejected the interpretation of "self-determination" given by the racist minority in South Africa. Despite the lying statements of the Government of South Africa, its Bantustan policy was undeniably designed to perpetuate the detention in concentration camps of 15 million non-whites in approximately 16 per cent of the land of that country.

With regard to the situation in Rhodesia, his delegation was opposed to independence before majority rule. Referring to the negotiations conducted by

/...

(Mr. Sendaula, Uganda)

Lord Goodman, the United Kingdom Minister for Foreign Affairs had said that considerable progress was being made but that certain problems still remained to be settled, and had gone to Rhodesia for that purpose on 14 November. The Ugandan delegation was sceptical about those negotiations, since it was known that Ian Smith had assured his fellow whites that their privileged position would be maintained at the expense of the African majority. It was also known that the purpose of the negotiations between the United Kingdom Government and the illegal régime in Rhodesia was to restore legal government in that country. His delegation believed that those negotiations would not lead to a peaceful settlement unless the representatives of all shades of political opinion in Rhodesia, including those favouring majority rule, were represented. There was, however, a possibility that Ian Smith might have persuaded the United Kingdom Government to recognize his régime in return for a vague and general promise of majority rule in the future - say, in 20 or 30 years - which would be absolutely unacceptable to Uganda. In its view, Rhodesia should return to colonial status under the United Kingdom Government and the appropriate arrangements for independence should then be made. The independence of Rhodesia should be declared at a constitutional conference attended by leaders of various political groups in Rhodesia, including the representatives of the Zimbabwe people who were detained in prisons. Any other settlement would be a sell-out for the people of Rhodesia and would have disastrous consequences for Rhodesia, for Africa and for world peace in general.

The questions concerning southern Africa were raised in the United Nations year after year, and year after year resolutions were adopted which were never implemented. In the meantime, the problem was worsening each year. Time and again, the attempts of the Afro-Asian countries to achieve positive measures towards a solution of the problem had been called "irresponsible" by certain Member States. Those countries were accused of talking in unrealistic terms and of adopting resolutions that were not practical.

With regard to the resolutions, it was said that they were impracticable and unenforceable. Yet it was never said why that was so, although the answer was obvious. The countries which could make the resolutions on southern Africa effective did not find it expedient to do so, because to them racial and economic

/...

(Mr. Sendaula, Uganda)

considerations were much more important than the crimes of apartheid and colonialism. The representative of Somalia in the Special Political Committee had neatly summarized that phenomenon when he had said that apartheid ensured quick investment returns for the trading partners and that investments and trade strengthened the power of the ruling minority, to the mutual satisfaction of both sides. South Africa's major trading partners did not deny that fact and the United States representative on the Third Committee had admitted it when he had urged South Africa to bear in mind that, as more and more blacks assumed positions of authority and responsibility in the United States, the racist régimes would find it increasingly difficult to do business with the United States industry and Government.

On 4 November 1971 the United States Congress had decided to permit the import of chrome from Rhodesia in spite of the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). His delegation reiterated its support of the appeal to the United Nations made by the African Group in the United Nations to recognize the importance of the matter and to act in accordance with the degree of responsibility which it demanded. He hoped that the Government of that country would heed the appeal.

Uganda supported the right of peoples to self-determination not only in southern Africa but in all parts of the world. To those who said that economic viability should be considered before political viability and those who argued that when the population of a certain territory was small that territory should not exercise its right to self-determination, it replied that freedom and independence were benefits to which the whole of mankind was entitled and that if those territories were allowed to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination they could play a constructive role in the world community.

As to the question of the Middle East, his delegation supported Security Council resolution 242 (1967) as a basis for the solution of the conflicts in that area and it hoped that Ambassador Jarring would continue his efforts, with the co-operation of the parties concerned. It also supported the efforts of the OAU delegation of Heads of State which was currently trying to find a peaceful solution to the problem of the Middle East.

Miss PINTASILGO (Portugal) reviewed from the humanitarian, social and cultural standpoint - which was what concerned the Third Committee - the course of

/...

(Miss Pintasilgo, Portugal)

events from the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2649 (XXV) to the issuance of document A/8331.

At its twenty-seventh session the Commission on Human Rights had considered the request for a study set forth in paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 2649 (XXV) (paras. 138-143 of its report). In paragraph 141 of the Commission's report reference was made to the discussion on the fundamental question as to whether the right to self-determination formed part of the generally recognized international law or merely represented a principle of universal application. That question gave rise to others, such as the distinction between colonial domination and foreign domination and the definition of what was now understood by the idea of a people. All those questions required an in-depth analysis and not the mere repetition of dogmatic affirmations, and it would therefore have been desirable for the Commission on Human Rights to indicate the essential criteria which should be applied in the preparation of a study of that type, tracing the structural evolution of the terminology of the various resolutions and of the concepts set forth in those texts. The Commission could also have considered the underlying reasons why the resolutions on the subject had not been put into effect and the relevant historical and socio-cultural conditions, in addition to the legal texts. The prestige of the United Nations was at stake. The Organization was suffering from a disease which was common at the present time, that of the abuse of words and slogans, as reflected in the proliferation of resolutions. The torrent of words in the United Nations, no matter how sincere were those who uttered them, could be only a substitute for a genuine analysis of the facts.

In his statement to the Press at the opening of the current session of the Assembly the Secretary-General had said that the Organization could only mature and develop a sense of responsibility through experience and co-operation in collective decision-making. In modern States there was a continuous and dialectical tension between the technical equipment which the machinery of the State should be able to use in carrying out its tasks and the inalienable right of all citizens to participate in decisions which concerned them. By analogy, in the United Nations there existed the same polarization; however, the two elements were not in balance. The euphoria of participation prevailed over the technical aspects of the process

(Miss Pintasilgo, Portugal)

of seeking solutions and as a result the practical effect of United Nations action was lessened. In other words, the Organization was not able to use its potential for promoting peaceful understanding. For example, Article 1 of the Charter established that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to bring about by peaceful means the settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. The Economic and Social Council resolution appearing in document A/8331 spoke of recourse to "all available means" in the struggle for self-determination. Portugal would accordingly welcome any attempt to make an analytical study which would have the effect of increasing the objectivity of the work of the Organization, including its work in the context of the application of resolution 2649 (XXVI), which referred directly to Portugal.

For example, the very concept of self-determination should be examined. The United Nations itself had acknowledged different manifestations of self-determination. In some cases representative groups had been consulted; in others self-determination had been proclaimed by the administering Power; in others the United Nations had considered whether a community was capable of achieving self-determination; there had even been talk of accepting as a form of self-determination the occupation of a territory by a Member State. In the debate, the absolute concept of political self-determination and a multi-dimensional concept of self-determination, reflecting social, economic and other factors, had been juxtaposed.

What worried Portugal was the monolithic character of the solutions proposed by the United Nations, which, owing to the large number of their supporters, were turned into a new form of oppression on the international scene. History showed that different communities had achieved self-determination in very different ways and it was essential to allow for the possibility of various solutions in consonance with political, social and cultural circumstances. In absolute terms perhaps it was true, as had been said, that only the great Powers were genuinely independent, for the other countries were limited by the fact that they were weak by comparison. All concepts were born of a particular situation and at a particular time. To understand Portugal's position correctly it was necessary to understand the underlying socio-cultural reality and, in addition, to bring the available information up to date.

/...

(Miss Pintasilgo, Portugal)

In document S/5448 the Secretary-General had recognized that the Government of Portugal had not denied the principle of the self-determination of the peoples of its non-European territories. There was, indeed, a Portuguese concept of the meaning of that term. For more than five centuries Portugal had been under the influence of very diverse cultures, and its ethnic composition was very complex. As a result, the Portuguese people of European origin were open and receptive to other cultures and civilizations. It must be recognized, however, that that mixture of cultures had not always been adequately reflected in politics. The present Government of Portugal was seeking the appropriate political expression of that socio-cultural reality with respect to human rights. In August 1971 an important constitutional reform had been introduced with a view to recognizing increasing autonomy in the various territories. They had been given political and administrative autonomy with respect to internal matters, including the right to deny entry to other Portuguese if they considered it contrary to the interests of the territories; they had been given economic autonomy, by virtue of which each territory was to have its own development plan determined by its culture and its history so that it could rapidly industrialize and diversify its structure; finally, they had been given financial autonomy.

Portugal frankly acknowledged that it had made mistakes in the past, but it appealed to the international community at least to respect, if it could not accept, its pledge not to repeat those mistakes and to try to find its own way within the multiplicity of solutions and options recognized by the United Nations.

Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) said that for years the General Assembly had been reiterating the principle of self-determination, thus giving expression to criteria which were upheld by the immense majority of Member States. Unfortunately, its efforts had not always been effective. Recently the process of decolonization had been brought to a halt by the reluctance of certain Powers to allow peoples to exercise their inalienable right. On the one hand they violated the decisions of the United Nations with respect to certain colonial and dependent territories and on the other they sought to reduce the scope of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), which unequivocally recognized the right of self-determination as a principle of universal value.

/...

(Mr. Alarcon Quesada, Cuba)

Events in Guinea (Bissau), Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Rhodesia were eloquent proof that if the most anachronistic forms of colonialism and the most monstrous forms of racial segregation persisted in southern Africa, that was due exclusively to the policy of certain Powers, particularly the imperialist Powers constituting the membership of NATO, which were giving military, financial and diplomatic support to Portugal and the racist régimes and which were in reality the beneficiaries of the oppression of the African peoples. At its 1984th meeting the General Assembly had indicated by an overwhelming majority its reaction to the step taken by the United States in permitting the importation of chrome from Rhodesia. If the decision of the United States Congress was studied more closely, it would be seen that in reality it authorized the purchase of chrome produced by Union Carbide, a United States company, with the labour of Africans. The business was a very lucrative one for the imperialists, who could count on cheap manpower thanks to the oppression of the Africans, and it was ore which despoiled them of their wealth in order to introduce it into the metropolitan market.

The draft resolution in document A/3331 stressed the universal character of the principle of self-determination and unequivocally condemned colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. That position fully coincided with the position of Cuba. In that connexion he would like to draw attention to a case which until now, thanks to the manoeuvres of an imperialist Power, had not figured in the debates of the United Nations. He was referring to the case of Puerto Rico, a Latin American nation which had never been able to exercise its right to self-determination. Having been a Spanish colony in the nineteenth century, it had passed directly into the hands of the United States and at no time had it enjoyed even formal independence. After more than 70 years of United States rule, that country had preserved its national culture: its language, its customs and its traditions.

The United States objection to discussion of the situation of Puerto Rico in the United Nations constituted a denial of Puerto Rico's rights and of its nationality as one distinct from and alien to that of the United States. Although Puerto Ricans did not have the same rights as other United States citizens, they were used in all the wars of aggression waged by the United States, and Puerto Rico was forced to participate in such wars to a greater extent than almost any of the

/...

(Mr. Alarcon Quesada, Cuba)

states. In terms of participation in the Viet-Nam war, Puerto Rico ranked seventh. Nevertheless, many Puerto Ricans were imprisoned or sentenced to penal servitude for life, simply because they disagreed with the administering Power.

It was the duty of States that pursued an anti-colonialist policy to affirm that policy and take steps to make it a reality. He welcomed some of the provisions of the draft resolution (A/8331) and some of the amendments. Finally, he said that history had shown that the liberation of peoples was the result of their own struggle against foreign domination, while also depending on the support given them by other peoples. Cuba would always remain true to those principles and would continue to demand that the General Assembly make them a reality for all.

Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) recalled that Cyprus had become an independent State in 1960, a year marked by the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The history of Cyprus in the United Nations was marked by its continuous support for the struggles of all peoples who were fighting for their independence, as proved by the fact that it had always supported such peoples both in the United Nations and in other forums. For that reason the fact that there still were peoples who were under the brutal yoke of colonialism was anachronistic, sad and a danger to international peace and security. His delegation firmly believed in the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter and especially in operative paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 (XV) which had become the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. His delegation, therefore, supported all who were struggling against colonial and alien domination anywhere in the world and believed that the General Assembly should adopt a resolution expressing the world community's feelings about colonialism.

Mrs. INAVATULLAN (Pakistan) said that the process of decolonization was based on the principle that peoples must define their own destiny. Thus, Pakistan had become what it now was, by the will of the people of West and East Pakistan. Since it owed its existence to the principle of self-determination, it was natural that Pakistan should support it whole-heartedly. Pakistan had been among the first to express itself in favour of support for liberation movements, but its satisfaction at the progress which had been achieved was tempered by the consideration that there

/...

(Mrs. Inavatullan, Pakistan)

was still a long way to go to reach the goal set by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) especially with regard to Africa. Portugal continued to impose its rule on all its colonial territories; the illegal racist minority régime of Ian Smith remained in Zimbabwe, and in Namibia the Government of South Africa continued to defy the United Nations. Clearly, that state of affairs had become untenable and if the evils of colonialism were not eradicated the explosive situation might provide the occasion for a world-wide conflict along racial lines. The United Nations should call upon the régimes in southern Africa to desist from their inhuman course. To make that truly meaningful it would require the support of the major trading partners of South Africa, which included, among others, three permanent members of the Security Council. With their help South Africa was continuing to augment its military strength and becoming the most powerful State in that region. For that reason, her delegation appealed to all Member States to go beyond the arms embargo, and to the permanent members of the Security Council which co-operated with South Africa to cease doing so and to assist the oppressed peoples to attain their independence. They should realize the grave consequences that would flow from their policy of putting their national economic interests above those of the international community.

There was another conflict which was also the result of the denial of the right to self-determination - the conflict in the Middle East. Pakistan had already expressed its views on the subject which were based not on cultural and other bonds with the Arab people but on objective judgement. The Middle East problem was the problem of Palestine, the problem of a people whose right to freely determine their own future had been denied. It should be remembered that the effect could not be removed unless the cause was eliminated. Her delegation had been heartened to see that the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine had at last been recognized in resolutions 2535 (XXIV) and 2649 (XXV) and hoped that the recognition of those rights would lead to constructive measures to ensure the implementation of those resolutions.

/...

(Mrs. Inavatullan, Pakistan)

Pakistan's relations with one of its neighbours had also been disturbed due to the failure to allow for the free exercise of the right to self-determination. Resolution 2649 (XXV) affirmed the legitimacy of the struggles of peoples under colonial and alien domination who were recognized as being entitled to the right to self-determination; it called upon Governments that denied the right to self-determination to recognize it and, in addition, stated that the acquisition and retention of territory in contravention of the right of the people of that territory to self-determination was inadmissible and a gross violation of the Charter. It had thus been established that the right to self-determination must be tempered by the principle of territorial integrity of States, namely, that the principle of self-determination could not be extended to areas that were integral parts of the territories of Member States. If that principle was not respected it would cause such anarchy as to destroy the present international order. As the Permanent Representative of Pakistan had stated in the First Committee, the free exercise of the right of self-determination constituted a definitive act producing irrevocable results, which could not be left in a state of challenge. It need only be recalled that resolution 1514 (XV) stated in paragraph 6 that any attempt at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country was incompatible with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. In that connexion, her delegation also believed that adherence to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States would avoid the possibility of conflict and ensure the restoration of normalcy and safety for the people in the area.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) recalled that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama had stated in the plenary General Assembly that Panama would reaffirm its solidarity with those who were fighting against the vestiges of colonialism and condemned all forms of oppression or racial discrimination. Panama had always fulfilled the obligations incumbent upon it under the United Nations Charter, in particular, those designed to bring about the total elimination of all kinds of colonialism, whether economic, political, racial or ideological. Colonialism was an ancient evil which had enslaved many peoples and which had not been defeated, since it still persisted in many forms, and at the same time other more dangerous methods which strengthened it were emerging. Nevertheless, it should be borne in

/...

(Mr. Rios, Panama)

mind that the right to self-determination was one of the basic principles of the United Nations and that if that principle was violated it would open the way for the law of the jungle. Therefore, the United Nations must make the principle meaningful, make it a reality, because it was the essence of the legal equality of States.

Much had been said about self-determination and some people had even used the term to conceal purposes which, according to international ethics, could not be openly admitted.

The United Nations must give meaning to self-determination so that the peoples, particularly in the small nations, could determine their destiny freely, without the threat of force by the powerful. Panama, therefore, opposed any foreign intervention in the internal affairs of States; it opposed traditional colonialism and the new forms of oppressing nations with less resources, and it opposed racial discrimination, the most infamous of the violations of human rights. Finally, he expressed the hope to see the fulfillment of Panama's wish that the huge resources wasted on arms might one day be used to combat the systems which openly or secretly tried to proclaim the superiority of some over others.

Mr. DERWINSKY (United States of America) said in reply to the Cuban delegation that it was the United Nations that had rejected the proposal to place the question of Puerto Rico on the agenda of the General Assembly.

Moreover, the people of Puerto Rico had elected in 1952, freely and by an overwhelming majority, to retain its status as a Commonwealth in association with the United States and had confirmed its will to continue in that status by subsequent elections. At present, the Chief Executive of Puerto Rico was the leader of the political party in favour of Puerto Rico's becoming a state of the United States. If the people of Puerto Rico voted to become a state of the United States, the United States would respect their will.

Puerto Ricans were free citizens of the United States and many of them were currently living in the continental territory of the country. The large Puerto Rican population of New York had a Congressman to represent them and many citizens of Puerto Rican origin occupied Government posts at various levels.

(Mr. Derwinsky, United States)

In conclusion, he said that there was no emigration from Puerto Rico to Cuba while, on the other hand, many Cubans wished to emigrate to the United States, where they were welcome.

Replying to the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that that country tended to distort history; if fruitful negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union were to be possible they must rest on firm and clear historical bases.

The Baltic States had enjoyed a short-lived freedom between the two world wars before being invaded first by Soviet and then by Nazi troops. Towards the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union had occupied the Baltic States and incorporated them in its territory. The United States Government had never recognized that incorporation. Since then, the Baltic peoples had suffered from the collectivization of their farms, the nationalization of their industries, religious persecution, mass deportation and forced transfers, which were aimed at radically altering the ethnic composition of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. His delegation condemned mass deportation wherever it was practised and recognized the right of self-determination of all peoples. He hoped that the delegation of the Soviet Union would accept those comments in a positive spirit and that there would be an improvement, in the Soviet Union, in the treatment of citizens of non-Russian origin.

Mr. NYANG'ANYI (United Republic of Tanzania) said in reply to the Portuguese delegation that the Portuguese representative, quoting from statements of respectable United Nations personalities who were fighting for peace, justice and equality had implied that Portugal believed in peace and justice.

In her statement, however, the representative of Portugal had not referred to those Chapters of the Charter which dealt with the right of peoples to self-determination. His delegation wondered why Portugal did not implement United Nations resolutions and why it continued to adopt colonial tactics in Africa. Portugal had frustrated all attempts by its colonies to achieve independence by peaceful means and had forced the people to resort to arms. Furthermore, its opposition to the phrase "by all available means" in the draft resolution before the Committee was inconsistent with the Charter.

/...

(Mr. Nyang'Anyi, Tanzania)

Tanzania was opposed to violence, but it was Portugal which was the aggressor in Africa. If, as it said, Portugal had realized its mistake, the Tanzanian delegation urged it to correct it as soon as possible. No matter what Portugal did, the struggle for self-determination in the Portuguese colonies would continue unremittingly until independence had been achieved.

Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) said in reply to the representative of the United States that it was untrue to say that there was a Puerto Rican representative in the United States Congress. One of the reasons why Puerto Ricans did not go to Cuba was because they had been forbidden to do so by a United States body in which they were not represented.

It was true that Puerto Ricans were United States citizens, but that they had been granted citizenship in 1917, when the United States needed the 200,000 Puerto Rican soldiers who had fought in the First World War. And that figure represented only half the number of Puerto Ricans who had fought in subsequent United States conflicts. When it was remembered that Puerto Rico had a population of only 3 million it was possible to obtain some idea of the significance of that figure.

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro

It was true that there were many Puerto Ricans in New York and it was only necessary to go through the areas they lived in to become aware of the desperate and humiliating situation of the million Puerto Ricans, or one third of the Island's population, in the United States. That wave of emigrants, forced by colonial exploitation to endure the most brutal discrimination, was sufficient proof of the colonial oppression of Puerto Rico.

Mr. ZENKYAVICHUS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the United States had no right to speak of the Baltic peoples and thus interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. The peoples of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania had embarked on the road to self-determination when they had chosen the socialist way and asked for incorporation in the Soviet Union.

Mr. EL-SHAWI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, said that the noble position of the United States, which was concerned at the

(Mr. El-Shawi, Iraq)

deportation and expulsion of the indigenous populations of the Baltic States, was admirable. He wondered whether it was prepared to defend that principle throughout the world, including Palestine and the occupied Arab territories.

The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Committee that there was very little time left to consider the remaining items on the agenda. She requested them to study carefully the documents on those items and prepare appropriate draft resolutions. She also urged them to try to reach agreement on the various drafts in informal meetings and thus expedite the Committee's work.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro