

UNITED NATIONS

Press Section
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(FOR USE OF INFORMATION MEDIA -- NOT AN OFFICIAL RECORD)

Twenty-sixth General Assembly
Third Committee, 1873rd Meeting (PM)

Press Release GA/SHC/1712
16 November 1971

SOCIAL COMMITTEE ENDS DEBATE ON RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) this afternoon concluded its general debate on the right of peoples to self-determination, hearing statements by the representatives of Indonesia, the Ukraine, Uganda, Portugal, Cuba, Cyprus, Pakistan and Panama.

Rights of reply were exercised by the representatives of the United States, the United Republic of Tanzania, Cuba, the Soviet Union and Iraq.

Before the Committee under this item is a draft resolution contained in a note by the Secretary-General (document A/8331) and provisional amendments to that resolution (documents A/C.3/L.1877 to L.1880 inclusive).

Under the draft resolution, recommended by the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly would condemn colonial powers suppressing the right of peoples to self-determination, and condemn States contributing to the creation of a "military-industrial complex" in southern Africa.

The draft resolution and the amendments are expected to be discussed later in the week. At its next meeting, at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, 17 November, the Committee will take up the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

Statements in Debate

Miss KUSTIJAH PRODJOLALITO (Indonesia), citing her nation's struggle for self-rule, said that because of the "arduous nature of that struggle" it had provided material and moral support to those peoples not yet free.

Her country supported the just efforts of the people under colonial rule to achieve self-rule, not only politically but in the economic and social realms.

She favoured adoption of the draft resolution before the Committee.

The United Nations, she continued, had a "double concern" in this area, since the continuation of colonial rule "threatened basic human rights and world security".

(more)

"Because of our own historical experience, we are prompted to lend our voice and efforts to the cause of decolonization", she stated.

A.B. GOLOVKO (Ukraine) said the question before the Committee was not academic but of vital concern for millions still suffering under the yoke of colonialism and racism. A series of United Nations documents proclaimed and affirmed the rights of people to self-determination, and colonialism in all its manifestations had been outlawed and racism condemned as a crime.

Colonial wars continued, especially in the form of the policies of terror and persecution pursued by Portugal in southern Africa, he said. Some capitalist countries, especially the United States, was strengthening racist States by giving economic and military support.

He said much had been done to "emasculate" colonialism, but the essence of it remained in the desperate efforts of the colonialists to smash liberation movements. Also, the rights of the Palestine peoples were trampled underfoot, and close links existed between Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

He went on to observe that the latest manifestation of colonialism was seen in Northern Ireland, where the desires of the peoples for self-determination were being crushed by the United Kingdom military forces.

Expressing support for national liberation movements, he stated that there was a willingness by the majority of United Nations Members to take effective action to strengthen anti-imperialist forces.

He concluded by expressing the belief that the principles of self-determination and independence would eventually succeed in a universal victory over the forces which were committed to their destruction.

E.L. SENDAULA (Uganda) said his country continuously supported the fight for independence by those under colonial domination.

Despite recent advances, he noted with concern that too many people in southern Africa were subjected to "outright colonialism". In South Africa, a "critically explosive situation" existed in which there was a growing danger of violent racial conflict, as evidenced by the increasingly repressive legislation and the police and military build-ups. "If conflict breaks out, the peace of the world will be adversely affected", he declared.

(more)

With regard to Southern Rhodesia, he said his country would accept a solution of the question based on "no independence before majority rule".

He expressed scepticism over the outcome of the current talks between Sir Alec Douglas-Home, Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, and Ian Smith, head of the Rhodesian regime. "We believe these negotiations will not lead to a peaceful settlement unless the representatives of all political areas, especially those of the Zimbabwe people, are included", he stated.

Anything less, he went on, would be a surrender by the United Kingdom to Mr. Smith and would be unfair.

Independence in Rhodesia must be achieved through a constitutional conference.

He said nothing had been done to implement the many United Nations resolutions on Southern Rhodesia, and stated that "the international community should be ashamed of such a poor performance". He said that those most able to make those resolutions effective "do not find it expedient to put them into force". To them, he said, "social and economic considerations are more important than the crimes of apartheid and racial discrimination".

He urged the United States Government to reconsider its decision to import chrome from Southern Rhodesia and to uphold the Security Council sanctions.

Regarding Palestine, he supported resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council as a basis for a solution of that situation as well as the efforts of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and Ambassador Jarring towards that end.

Miss MARIA DE LOUNDES PINTASSILGO (Portugal), commenting on the draft resolution before the Committee, said that as the Secretary-General had stated, a great deal remained to be done in the effective implementation of the rights of peoples to self-determination.

Referring to the work on this subject undertaken by the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-seventh session, she stated that various aspects of the question required more extensive study, not further dogmatic assertions. An abuse of words could only be a backward step; the flood of words in the United Nations could not substitute for effective studies, she added.

(more)

She said that the United Nations itself contained sources of tension and this frequently led to contradiction and confusion being manifested in resolutions which were adopted without the complex nature of solutions being taken into consideration.

The United Nations had accepted different definitions of self-determination as applied to individual peoples and individual States, she observed.

It was true that destinies were interlinked, but each individual country had the right and the freedom to evolve solutions to their problems, she stated. Self-determination was not as clear a concept as many delegations might wish it to appear.

The Portuguese Government, she stated, was not opposed to the principle of self-determination, but saw its implementation being fulfilled within a particular socio-economic situation.

She said that increased autonomy for various overseas Territories had been granted by the Portuguese authorities. Each Territory would have certain administrative and economic autonomy with financial independence.

Stating that Portugal accepted that it had made mistakes in the past, she added that it requested acceptance of its pledge not to repeat those mistakes while pursuing an individual path amid the plurality of nations.

RICARDO ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba) said the efforts of the international community had not been effective in supporting the quest for self-determination of all peoples, peoples right to self-determination, resulting in an impasse in the process of decolonization in recent years.

The attitudes of many countries had been expressed either in violations of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and Security Council or in attempts to reduce the scope of the Declaration on decolonization, which clearly consecrated the right to self-determination as a "principle of universal value" applied to all peoples, he stated. This morning the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, had pronounced itself in opposition to the recent action by the United States Congress to allow imports of chrome from Rhodesia, he said.

(more)

Turning to the draft before the committee, he said it stressed the "universal character of the principle of self-determination for all dependent peoples and condemned colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". This position was shared by his delegation and he urged the United Nations to take all possible means to ensure that all people subjected to foreign and colonial rule be given the proper conditions to be "masters of their destiny without intrusion".

Referring to the situation in Puerto Rico, he said that country had never been in a position to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination. The United States exerted control over the island in all forms, he added, and this form of colonialism should be studied by the United Nations.

In this connexion, he referred to the number of Puerto Rican people serving during the Viet-Nam conflict. Although they served, they were not allowed the vote, he stated.

He reaffirmed his country's belief that States which pursued anti-colonial policies had a duty to affirm the principle of the right to self-determination and to take measures to make it a reality for all peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

He expressed his support for the resolution and amendments before the Committee and reaffirmed his support for all struggles against colonialism "without exception".

COSTAS PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) said Cyprus had seen a long struggle for its eventual independence in 1960, and had always supported struggles for self-determination and independence.

It was anachronistic, sad and dangerous to world peace that, today, people still suffered the brutal oppression of colonialism and alien domination, he said.

He expressed support for all peoples struggling for their freedom.

Begum INAYATULLAH (Pakistan) said the process of decolonization was based on the principle that peoples must define their own destiny, and it was on that principle that East and West Pakistan were joined in a shared history and aspiration.

Pakistan believed that the right of people to self-determination must be upheld, she added.

(more)

Expressing satisfaction at the progress made so far in the implementation of that right, she stated that the world was still a long way from complete realization. The state of affairs in southern Africa was untenable and might result in a conflict involving the world in a racial division.

Active support was required primarily from certain Powers which supported racist regimes by violating the United Nations arms embargo, she said. It was hoped that the United Kingdom and France would support that embargo and that economic sanctions would be enforced.

Grave consequences could flow from placing national interests above the interests of the international community, she stated.

Referring to the situation in the Middle East, the representative of Pakistan said that the heart of the problem lay in Palestine and in the rights of a people to self-determination. The conflict there was a result of the denial of that basic right, and the conflict could not be eliminated until and unless that right was recognized and implemented within the context of a Middle East settlement.

Referring to the principle of territorial integrity of States, she observed that intrusion upon that principle by extension of the right of self-determination could cause anarchy and ceaseless strife capable of destroying international peace and order.

She expressed Pakistan's conviction that full adherence by all Member States to the principles of the United Nations and in particular to the precept of non-interference in the affairs of other States, would remove any danger of conflict in the present situation involving Pakistan.

DIDIMO RIOS (Panama) recalled the statement of the Panamanian Foreign Minister at the start of the present General Assembly in which he said that "we reiterate our solidarity with all people striving against the vestiges of colonialism".

Once again, he stated, his delegation voiced its "condemnation and repudiation of all forms of colonialism which are degrading and offensive to all people".

In speaking of colonialism he included all forms -- political, economic, racist, ideological -- which had enslaved people throughout history, he said.

(more)

He said the United Nations had a duty to strengthen and fight for the right to self-determination and remove this principle from its status as a "rhetorical phrase".

His delegation opposed "all forms of foreign interference in domestic affairs, as well as imperialism and all new forms of oppression", he said.

He appealed to the international community to channel the "astronomical resources" put into armaments into combating all systems based on the superiority of one people over another.

Rights of Reply

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI (United States), in exercise of his right of reply, said that the status of Puerto Rico of a commonwealth had been decided by a public vote. The United States was prepared to grant statehood, he added.

He observed that many of the people had emigrated to the mainland of the United States.

Turning to the statement made this morning by the Soviet Union, he stated that the United States was not intending to be in any position except that of communication with the Soviet Union. Expressing his personal interest in the history of the Soviet Union, he noted that "rewriting" occurred in the Soviet text books by eliminating reference to leaders who were no longer in favour.

He added that after the collaboration between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany which began the last world war, the Soviet Union had occupied the Baltic States, deporting people of those States, imposing collective farming, and "brain-washing" children. All that was wrong, he said, no matter how it was done or why or by whom.

MUSTAFA NYANG'ANYI (United Republic of Tanzania), in exercise of the right of reply, said Portugal's intervention constituted "contemptuous statements".

He said that the Portuguese representative's statements stressing peace and justice implied she was an "ardent believer in peace and justice". Yet the representative had never addressed herself to the relevant parts of the United Nations Charter, he said.

(more)

"Why has Portugal never implemented the United Nations resolutions calling on her to restore the rights of the people she controls"? he asked. "What is the obstacle she finds to grant independence"?

He stated that Portugal was "stifling the cries of the people" while trying to convince the people she was working towards the establishment of self-determination through the Portuguese constitution.

He said he refused to "be a party to Portuguese hypocrisy as a peace-loving nation on one hand and an aggressor on the other".

He urged Portugal to rectify the situation immediately and said that no matter what Portugal did or did not do, "struggle in her colonies will continue. It is time for her to heed the cries".

Mr. ALARCON QUESADA (Cuba), replying to the United States, said that Puerto Ricans did not have the full rights of United States citizens. It was also illegal for Puerto Ricans to enter Cuba. The formal granting of citizenship in 1917 was given to gain extra troops for the First World War. It was true that Puerto Ricans lived in New York, but they lived in the ghettos, condemned to lowly work, with no governmental representation.

He observed that the United States representative had not spoken of the approval of the United States Congress for the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia. At the time of that vote in Congress, the United States representative was seated in the Third Committee.

V.M. ZENKYAVICHUS (Soviet Union), in exercise of the right of reply, stated that the United States representative "apparently needs the publicity for his constituents so he is making slanderous statements against us".

He confirmed his statement of this morning that the United States delegate did not have the right to speak for the people of Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia and "no right to interfere in their internal affairs".

He said these nations freely chose the path of socialism to development and no one could dissuade them from that path.

HISHAM AL-SHAWI (Iraq), replying to the United States, asked whether the United States Government would uphold the principle of opposition to mass deportation in regard to areas such as Palestine and the occupied territories of the middle East.