

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1992nd
MEETING**

Wednesday, 1 November 1972,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Zdeněk ČERNÍK
(Czechoslovakia).

AGENDA ITEM 66

**Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) (A/8650,
A/8663, A/8664, A/8723/Add.1, A/8759 and Add.1)**

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. UPRETI (Nepal) said that the increasingly retrogressive and repressive steps taken by the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia to safeguard its position had aggravated the tension in that region to the point where it was a threat to the peace and security of the whole African continent. Since the so-called unilateral declaration of independence, the racist régime had completely disregarded United Nations resolutions, violated the fundamental human rights of the great majority of the population and focused its policy on racial segregation. The Land Tenure Act of 1969, the aim of which was to divide the land between three categories of inhabitants—Europeans, Africans and Asians—was a glaring example. Under that law, the Tangwena people had been evicted from the Gaersi Ranch and their dwellings had been destroyed. It went without saying that that policy brought untold suffering to the indigenous population.

2. The collaboration of the Smith régime with South Africa and Portugal was likely to cause a racial war in that part of the continent. The participation of South African troops in repressive operations against the Zimbabwe people was one of the many manifestations of that unholy alliance. The meeting held at Salisbury on 15 and 16 February 1971 between security officials from South Africa, Mozambique, Angola and Southern Rhodesia for the purpose of planning more concerted efforts to combat the activities of the liberation movements was another example. History would not fail to pass severe judgement on those who were reluctant to take action against the recalcitrant régime of Southern Rhodesia. Nepal had adopted a policy towards colonialism which was well known since it had been enunciated at various international gatherings sponsored by the United Nations, the non-aligned countries, and others. At the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries which had been held at Cairo in October 1964, His Majesty King Mahendra had said that his country gave its full support to all people fighting colonialism and that the United Nations resolutions on colonialism should be respected. Nepal had therefore always complied with the resolutions and

recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council and maintained no relations with Southern Rhodesia. The news media in Nepal disseminated information regarding racial discrimination and the policy of *apartheid* practised by a number of colonial Powers in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and human rights.

3. It was distressing to note, seven years after the unilateral declaration of independence, that the racist régime had managed to escape the consequences of the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 253 (1968). Foreign companies continued to provide technical and financial assistance for the development of a military-industrial complex. Trade was being carried on clandestinely despite the provisions of Security Council resolution 288 (1970) which reaffirmed the sanctions previously imposed and placed a further embargo on Rhodesian exports and imports. The decision taken by the United States Congress formally lifting the restrictions imposed on shipments of chrome and other strategic raw materials from Southern Rhodesia was likely to create a dangerous precedent. In its interim report,¹ the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council (resolution 253 (1968) had also expressed its grave concern at such action, which had been taken in flagrant violation of General Assembly resolution 2765 (XXVI). In November 1971, the Rhodesian Tobacco Association had reported that by 1973-1974 its production would be restored to the level it had been prior to the imposition of sanctions. The economic survey of Rhodesia published by the illegal régime showed clearly that the economic embargo had almost totally failed.

4. Nepal, which whole-heartedly supported the liberation movements, welcomed the decision which had been taken to accord observer status to the representatives of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Zimbabwe African People's (ZAPU). It fully recognized the legitimate aspirations of the African nationalists and valued the work 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 in this connexion; it would support any resolution directed towards overthrowing the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation endorsed the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 27 April 1972 and contained in paragraph 23 of chapter VIII of its report (see A/8723/Add.1). The Zimbabwe people could not compromise or accept anything less than complete independence based on

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement For October, November and December 1971*, document S/10408.

majority rule. For that reason it had not been able to accept the proposals for a settlement, the acceptability of which the Pearce Commission had gone to Salisbury in January 1972 to determine. Those proposals had been prompted by political and economic reasons which favoured the Europeans, as was shown by the letter dated September 1972 sent by the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, from prison, to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom. During their visit to Southern Rhodesia, the members of the Pearce Commission had been able to see that Africans categorically rejected the proposed settlement, a rejection which Mr. Smith had attributed to the intimidation exercised by the African National Council.

5. His delegation fully understood the objections of the Zimbabwe people to those proposals: not only had there been no question of immediately handing over power to the majority, but no African had participated in the formulation of the proposals, the voting qualifications had been made too strict and the Africans had thought that the racist minority régime would not respect the terms of the agreement. According to *The New York Times*, Lord Pearce had even accused the Southern Rhodesian Government of infringing the provisions of the settlement proposals by detaining Mr. Garfield Todd, a former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, and his daughter Judith.

6. Convinced that half-hearted measures could only fail in the case of Southern Rhodesia, his delegation appealed once again to the United Kingdom to discharge its obligations as administering Power towards the Zimbabwe people. The policy of persuasion had only given the rebels the opportunity to consolidate their hold on the Territory. The United Kingdom Government, which had not so far fulfilled its obligations, must at last transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of universal adult suffrage and majority rule. The danger which that situation held for international peace and security could not be overlooked. It was high time that the United Nations acted and sought to put an end to the illegal racist régime of Ian Smith.

AGENDA ITEMS 64, 65 AND 66

Question of Namibia (A/C.4/749)

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (continued)* (A/8723/Add.3, A/8758 and Add.1 A/C.4/749)

Question of Southern Rhodesia (continued) (A/8650, A/8663, A/8664, A/8723/Add.1, A/8759 and Add.1, A/C.4/749)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

7. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the 1987th meeting, the Committee had decided to grant the request for a hearing from the representatives of the World Peace Council (A/C.4/749).

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Romesh Chandra, Mr. Emilson S. Randriamihasinoro, Mr.

* Resumed from the 1987th meeting.

Gordon Schaffer and Canon Raymond Goor representatives of the World Peace Council (A/C.4/749) took places at the Committee table.

8. Mr. Romesh CHANDRA (Secretary-General of the World Peace Council) said that the World Peace Council considered it a great honour and privilege to be able to discuss with the Fourth committee a question which was vital for the future of the United Nations and for the future of the whole world. The question was that of united action by the United Nations, on the one hand, and the World Peace Council and other mass movements of the peoples, on the other, for the ending of colonialism and racial discrimination, in solidarity with the liberation movements of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde which were fighting for freedom, independence and equal rights. On behalf of the World Peace Council and the millions of men and women in over a hundred countries in all five continents who supported the national and international organizations represented in the Council, he thanked the Chairman and members of the Fourth Committee for having agreed to give the Council a hearing at that important moment in the work of the Committee and of the General Assembly.

9. Ever since its foundation over 20 years earlier, the World Peace Council had a long record of action in favour of the independence of peoples, the liquidation of colonialism and racial discrimination, and total solidarity with the liberation struggles of the peoples enslaved by colonialism and racist régimes. The presence and participation of the topmost leaders of the liberation movements in the highest directing organs of the World Peace Council was the constant guarantee of the effectiveness of its mass actions. Among the members of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council—its highest leadership—were such outstanding leaders of the liberation movements as Mr. Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), the liberation movement of the people of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde; Mr. Agostinho Neto, President of the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA), the liberation movement of the people of Angola; Mr. Marcelino dos Santos, Vice-President of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), the liberation movement of the people of Mozambique; Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, the liberation movement of the people of South Africa; and Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the liberation movement of the people of Namibia. Leaders of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) were also among the principal figures in the Council. Similarly, the leaders of the liberation movements of all other Territories under colonial domination were members of the World Peace Council.

10. There was no other world-wide mass movement which had the privilege of having as members of its leadership all the principal leaders of the liberation movements. That was the guarantee of its steadfast devotion and dedication to the cause of the liberation

movements and its unconditional support for the liberation struggles conducted by them. It was also a proof, if proof were needed, of the great emphasis which the liberation movements rightly placed on the popular mass actions undertaken by the non-governmental international movements which were represented in the World Peace Council or which co-operated with it.

11. When the World Peace Council delegation had had the privilege of appearing before the Fourth Committee in 1971,² it had raised a question which had not been raised before. It had requested that Governments of Member States should ask themselves how it was possible to discuss the fate of the 28 million people still under colonial domination without the presence and participation of the representatives of those people. It had demanded forcefully that the liberation movements should be recognized and that their participation in the work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies should be accepted.

12. The World Peace Council had made that question of the recognition of the liberation movements a principal plank in its programme of action. It had raised the question in all its approaches to Governments and to the United Nations and all specialized agencies. It had found support for its point of view among the masses of people in all countries.

13. The World Peace Council wished to congratulate all Governments which had voted in favour of the proposal that the liberation movements of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde should be granted their place in the Fourth Committee. That was a great and historic step forward towards the achievement by the liberation movements of their just status. It was intolerable that Governments like those of South Africa and Portugal should continue to be allowed to pretend that they spoke in the United Nations for the peoples whom they enslaved.

14. That step followed three other important and historic steps which, in his view, had together resulted in an advance to a qualitatively higher stage in the United Nations efforts for decolonization: firstly, during its meetings in Addis Ababa the Security Council had been brought into direct contact with the leaders of the liberation movements on the soil of resurgent Africa in a manner which had never before been possible in all the history of the United Nations; secondly, the meetings of the Special Committee in Africa, which had taken place after those of the Security Council in Addis Ababa, had been another unprecedented occasion for the liberation movements to inform the United Nations of the realities of their struggles and of the great advances they had made; thirdly, the remarkable work of the Special Mission of the Special Committee which had visited the liberated areas of Guinea (Bissau) had enabled the United Nations to see the truth about the glorious victories of PAIGC and the existence of liberated zones, administered and guided by the libera-

tion movement, preparing to elect their own National Assembly and found their own State (see A/8723/Add.3, annex I).

15. The World Peace Council had asked to place on record the gratitude of the peoples of the world for the splendid achievements of the Special Committee during the last year, under the inspiring, energetic and dedicated leadership of its Chairman, Ambassador Salim Ahmed Salim.

16. All those events, crowned by the decision of the Fourth Committee to grant the representative of the liberation movements observer status (1975th meeting), had led to a qualitatively new stage in the United Nations efforts for decolonization. What was to be the next step? It was clear that there was much to be done before the shame and ignominy of the continuation of colonial government was ended. The world still had to witness the comic spectacle of the representatives of the Portuguese Government proclaiming in the General Assembly that no resolutions or decisions of the United Nations were binding on them and hurling defiance at the overwhelming majority of Governments which demanded that Portuguese colonial domination should be brought to an end forthwith.

17. What gave the Portuguese Government the belief that it could defy the world body with impunity? What gave the South African racist régime the confidence that it could continue to defy the United Nations by applying its *apartheid* policies and illegally occupying Namibia? What gave the illegal Smith régime of Southern Rhodesia the confidence that it could continue to oppress the African people of Zimbabwe with impunity, virtually spitting on the decisions of the United Nations?

18. The peoples of the world were full of righteous anger at the failure to implement the continuous stream of excellent decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations in regard to colonization and the ending of racialism. He was sure that the members of the Fourth Committee were aware that a certain lack of confidence had begun to develop among peoples everywhere regarding the capacity of the United Nations to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted in 1960 and hailed by millions in all lands.

19. The advances of the previous year in the United Nations efforts for decolonization would certainly help to give more hope to the peoples and to reduce the lack of confidence which had developed over the years.

20. It was necessary, however, for the United Nations to understand the strong feelings of the peoples of the world, who were justifiably shocked by the fact that certain States and certain multinational and national monopolies and corporations continued with impunity to collaborate with and aid the colonialist and racist régimes, defying the United Nations in the most shameless manner.

21. Delegation after delegation in the Fourth Committee and in the General Assembly had condemned those

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Fourth Committee, 1946th meeting.*

States. The draft resolution in connexion with agenda item 22 submitted to the General Assembly by a large number of delegations (A/L.677 and Add.1) strongly deplored the policies of the States which continued to co-operate with the Governments of Portugal and South Africa and with the illegal racist minority in Southern Rhodesia.

22. Despite those laudable statements and resolutions, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and certain other countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) were actually increasing their co-operation, direct or indirect, with the colonialist and racist régimes.

23. The World Peace Council had therefore constantly emphasized that all actions in solidarity with the liberation movements of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde must be directed not only against the colonialist and racist régimes themselves but equally against the Powers which supported them. It was not enough to condemn Portugal, South Africa and the illegal Salisbury régime if there was virtual silence about the key reason why the United Nations resolutions were not being implemented: namely, the criminal co-operation and collaboration of the imperialist and NATO Powers with Pretoria, Lisbon and Salisbury.

24. It was no longer enough to speak of "certain States" defying the United Nations. It was necessary to name them and to call for world-wide pressure on those States, and on the international and national financial interests linked with them, to compel them to stop assisting the colonialist and racist régimes. It was also necessary to be clear that the Pretoria-Lisbon-Salisbury axis acted as an essential arm of the world strategy of the imperialist Powers and of their war plans. South Africa and Portugal were the essential links for the imperialist plans to set up a so-called South Atlantic Treaty Organization and for the establishment of a network of United States and United Kingdom military bases in the Indian Ocean.

25. The Territories dominated by the colonialist and racist régimes were used as bases to attack the independence of African countries—as had been seen during the recent acts of aggression committed against Guinea and Senegal, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia.

26. Thus the struggle to liquidate colonialism and racism and to implement the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly in 1960, was a vital element of humanity's struggle for peace and security.

27. It was in that context that the World Peace Council wished to emphasize with greater force than ever before the vital significance and necessity of co-operation between the United Nations and the principal mass movements which were working for the elimination of colonialism and racism. The United Nations could not succeed in any of its positive initiatives on

any issue of peace, security, disarmament, decolonization or development without the active day-to-day co-operation and participation of the peoples and of world public opinion. If those who violated United Nations decisions on decolonization were to be compelled to end their criminal and outrageous violations, that could be done only through the united action of the Governments and the peoples, which meant by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the mass movements of the peoples together.

28. The World Peace Council had had the privilege of working closely with the Special Committee. It had had the joy of receiving representatives of that Committee at the important assemblies and conferences of its Presidential Committee, at meetings of its National Independence Commission and at several conferences it had organized. The World Peace Council had been the principal organizer, with the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, of the Conferences of Solidarity with the peoples of southern Africa and the Portuguese Colonies, held at Khartoum in 1969 and at Rome in 1970, and the Namibia International Conference held at Brussels in 1972.

29. The World Peace Council was now preparing, together with many other international and national organizations, a world Congress for peace, security and national independence, to be held at Moscow in autumn 1973. The Congress would be the largest and broadest international gathering ever held on issues of peace and independence. At the heart of the problems to be discussed would undoubtedly be the question of decolonization. The appeal for the Congress, adopted by the last conference of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council, held at Santiago in October, emphasized the problems of colonialism and racism.

30. The leaders of the liberation movements would lead high-level delegations from their countries to the Congress—which would give a powerful impetus to the liberation struggles and to the movement for the recognition of the liberation movements as the sole representatives of their peoples. The World Peace Council was equally confident of the guidance and support for the Congress of the OAU, with which its co-operation had steadily grown.

31. One of the principal objectives of the present visit to the United Nations of the delegation of the World Peace Council was to inform all delegations of the proposal to hold the world Congress and to seek the advice and active participation and co-operation of the United Nations, the Special Committee concerned with decolonization, the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

32. World Peace Council action programmes for the coming year enabled him to state categorically that 1973 would be the year of the greatest advance in the field of action by non-governmental organizations in support of the liberation movements of southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde.

33. The World Peace Council invited the Chairman and members of the Special Committee concerned with decolonization to visit the headquarters of the World Peace Council at Helsinki, as its guests, at any time convenient to them, to discuss that programme of action in detail. The programme included the broadest observance of the Week of Solidarity, starting from Africa Liberation Day on 25 May, as proposed in the General Assembly by several Governments in a draft resolution in connexion with agenda item 22 (A/L.680 and Add.1 and 2) which he hoped would be adopted. The World Peace Council proposed to join with other non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and with all organizations specially concerned with decolonization in preparing for the observance of that week as one particularly devoted to the collection of material assistance for the liberation movements and to demanding the recognition of those movements.

34. At the Triennial Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council, held at Geneva in June 1972, the World Peace Council had been asked to present a keynote report on action by non-governmental organizations with regard to decolonization. The World Peace Council had proposed the establishment of a special committee of non-governmental organizations on decolonization and had been given the responsibility of preparing proposals in that connexion.

35. Several other meetings and actions were planned, including the next conference of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council, to be held in Poland in May 1973, and a meeting to be held at Berlin in December 1972 of representatives of all national movements, to discuss with the liberation movements such matters as preparations for the Week of Solidarity to be held in May 1973.

36. The World Peace Council extended its full support to the proposed International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, to be held at Oslo in 1973. Experts from the World Peace Council and from national peace movements looked forward to taking an active part in that important initiative.

37. The World Peace Council also strongly supported the proposal, made in paragraph 193, chapter I of the report of the Special Committee (A/8723 (Part I)), to convene a conference of all international and national non-governmental organizations working for decolonization. The World Peace Council itself had made that proposal to the Special Committee at a hearing in September 1971 and would like to offer its full co-operation to the Special Committee in preparing and holding that important conference.

38. In conclusion, he wished to inform the Committee that the World Peace Council had recently decided to award its highest distinction, the Joliot-Curie Medal, to Mr. Amílcar Cabral, the leader of the liberation movement of Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde. It was

hoped that the ceremony for the presentation of that award would be held in the liberated zones of Guinea (Bissau) and in the presence of the new National Assembly. The Council believed that it would be presenting that award to the head of the new independent State of Guinea (Bissau). Another award just announced by the World Peace Council was that of its highest distinction for courage and valour, the Lambrakis Medal, which went to the striking workers of Namibia, through the liberation movement SWAPO.

39. The liberation movements were growing ever stronger—that was the significance of the awards. The Governments and the peoples which stood for peace and independence were solidly behind the liberation movements.

40. The World Peace Council earnestly hoped that the Security Council would throw its full weight behind the proposal, which it fully supported, that the Government of Portugal should immediately open negotiations with the liberation movements to secure the independence of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau).

41. The horror of the violence perpetrated by the colonialist and racist régimes, with their use of chemical weapons and other dastardly forms of genocide, must cease. The Security Council would have the full support of the World Peace Council and the peoples of the world in any steps it could take to compel the colonialist and racist régimes to begin negotiations with the liberation movements forthwith.

42. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius), supported by Mr. ABDULLEH (Somalia), proposed that, with due regard for the financial implications, the statement just made by Mr. Chandra, Secretary-General of the World Peace Council, should be reproduced *in extenso*.

*It was so decided.*³

43. Mr. Emilson S. RANDRIAMIHASINORO (World Peace Council) said that he would deal only briefly with the problems inherent in the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau), the Cape Verde Islands and Mozambique, since the representatives of the liberation movements had described them in detail to the Committee.

44. A State was being established in the areas which had been freed by the national liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau); indeed, PAIGC, FRELIMO and MPLA were the only legal authorities in those areas. Nevertheless, Portuguese colonialism continued outrageously to defy world public opinion, by perpetrating its crimes against humanity and deliberately seeking to internationalize its colonial war of aggression. It was quite obvious that without the economic, military and political aid constantly lavished on them by the NATO imperialists the Portuguese colonial fascists could not continue that policy. In addition to mercenaries, Portugal received modern and efficient arms from the imperialists. The Secretary-

³ See paras. 8 to 41, above.

General of NATO had stated before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Netherlands Parliament on 30 June 1969 that NATO needed Portugal more than Portugal needed NATO. The Portuguese military authorities had on several occasions proposed the establishment of a South Atlantic defence organization and to that end the Portuguese Minister of Defence had suggested at the Lisbon meeting of the NATO Military Committee in October 1970 that the Portuguese naval and air bases in the Cape Verde Islands and in Angola should be placed at the disposal of NATO.

45. In pursuance of the strategy designed to maintain the stranglehold of the racist minority on the African continent, Portugal had strengthened its ties with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The purpose of the imperialists' collusion with the Portuguese colonialist régime was to try to combat the national liberation movements and the independent African countries. South Africa refused to relinquish its illegal occupation of Namibia, a Territory from which it launched attacks against independent countries. In Southern Rhodesia, Ian Smith was setting up a whole military machine.

46. Moreover, it was perfectly clear that the imperialist Powers were trying to internationalize the colonial war, as could be seen from the attack launched against the Republic of Guinea in 1970 and from the repeated incursions and attacks against the United Republic of Tanzania, the People's Republic of the Congo, Zambia and Senegal. International peace and security were thus seriously threatened.

47. The struggle of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe for national independence and general social progress must be supported more intensively by all those who valued justice and peace. It was important to take much more energetic action to prevent the collusion of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia with the imperialist Powers. The World Peace Council, for its part, was trying to alert world public opinion and to urge it to support the efforts of the independent African States which had pledged themselves to liberate all the remaining colonial Territories. To that end, those States were determined to secure the application of all United Nations resolutions and decisions on decolonization to the liberation of the peoples of Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

48. Mr. Gordon SCHAFFER (World Peace Council) emphasized the necessity for such organizations as the World Peace Council to alert public opinion concerning the decisions taken by the United Nations on decolonization, particularly with regard to Southern Rhodesia. For example, resolution 318 (1972) whereby the Security Council had decided last July, by 14 votes to none, to maintain sanctions against the illegal Smith régime and had condemned all acts violating those sanctions had received hardly any publicity in the United Kingdom, although a number of manoeuvres had been undertaken to end the sanctions and although the deadline for their annual renewal by the United Kingdom Parliament was approaching. Failure to renew the sanc-

tions would leave the way clear for those who wished to secure recognition of the white minority racist régime and would be a grave blow to the prestige of the United Nations, a breach of its resolutions against colonialism and *apartheid* and a betrayal of the people of Zimbabwe.

49. The situation in Southern Rhodesia was becoming worse and the Smith régime was intensifying its persecution. The African National Council had been forbidden to receive any help from abroad, scores of its supporters had been arrested and political detainees were being held in inhuman conditions.

50. It had been claimed that the so-called "settlement", which had been clearly rejected by a majority of the population, offered the most favourable conditions which could be obtained and that the only other solution would be the introduction of *apartheid* on the South African model. In fact, the settlement was not intended to offer conditions acceptable to the African majority but to appease the opponents of sanctions. Some people claimed quite wrongly that sanctions harmed the blacks more than the white minority, but the fact was that they were doing the Smith régime considerable harm. For that reason, the United Nations should not only maintain them but intensify them. It would be assisted in its task by the World Peace Council and by other non-governmental organizations which were striving to keep world opinion informed of United Nations decisions.

51. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to Miss Judith Todd, who had been appointed by the African National Council as its United Nations representative, for the courage she had shown during her imprisonment by the Smith régime and wished her success in her task.

52. Canon Raymond GOOR (World Peace Council) said that in his statement he proposed to discuss the problems of decolonization from their moral and spiritual aspects only. Political, economic and social questions could not be correctly considered except within the framework of moral and spiritual progress. He recalled that Pope Paul VI, during his visit to the United Nations on 4 October 1965, had stated that the Organization's task was not to confer existence upon States, but to grant to each national sovereign community a recognition of high moral and juridical value and to guarantee it an honourable international citizenship.⁴ That was, of course, true in the large majority of cases, since it was the people themselves who conferred existence and sovereignty upon their State, but in order to achieve that, some countries were obliged to undertake a struggle which was often long and difficult, and sometimes even bloody. The United Nations should help such countries to achieve political emancipation and recognition in international law. The Fourth Committee had a fundamental role to play in that respect, a role which was not always immediately apparent but which was decisive in the long run.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. I, 1347th meeting, para. 27.

53. It was impossible to ignore the fact that the States which refused to implement United Nations recommendations and resolutions were generally regarded as Christian States, and sometimes even prided themselves on that fact. Needless to say, that should not lead Christians to become their accomplices, but should encourage them to denounce vigorously abuses of power in the States concerned, which resorted to force of arms in order to maintain their domination, thus violating not only the Charter of the United Nations but also the fundamental rules of international morality and the precepts of the religion which they professed. Indeed, they sometimes went so far as to attack openly priests and Christian laymen who were engaged in national liberation struggles.

54. In those wars of liberation, the stakes were huge: the task of the United Nations was, again in the words of Pope Paul VI, to establish all peoples in a juridical status which would entitle them to be recognized and respected by all and from which there might derive an ordered and stable system of international life⁴—and hence of universal co-existence, security and peace. In working towards that goal, the United Nations was

following the desire for justice, freedom and peace with which the peoples of the globe, and above all young people, were becoming increasingly imbued. Both the United Nations and the non-governmental organizations had an interest in achieving that common objective and it was to be hoped that there would be increasingly close and fruitful co-operation between them. The World Peace Council had solemnly pledged its assistance to the United Nations. All churches, and especially Christian churches, should do likewise. Indeed, they were likely to lose their influence if they did not use it to further the great cause for which the United Nations strove, thus working for the establishment of a new era in human history, a peaceful era in which mankind would be united in the independence and sovereignty of all peoples.

55. The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Chandra, Mr. Randriamihasinoro, Mr. Schaffer and Canon Goor for taking part in the Committee's discussion.

The petitioners withdrew.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.