



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 102: Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1
Agenda item 23: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples ( <i>continued</i> ): (a) Report 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; (b) Report of the Secretary-General . . . . .	12

*President:* Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 102

**Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries (*continued*):\***

1. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt): We have always hoped to live in a world which sought peace based on justice—peace in its true meaning, not mere pacification. Equally, we believe in security—security for all nations, not the kind that is exploited to achieve expansion at the expense of the territorial integrity of Member States. Hence, the search for security in its true meaning would lead to the downfall of the rule of force and to the triumph of the rule of law.

2. We look forward to a world in which nations would not tolerate foreign occupation and State terrorism, a world which could no longer tolerate the brutalities and inhumanities inflicted on peoples for no other reason than that of race, colour, or religion, a world in which nations that achieved maximum development would feel bound and linked to those of the developing world. The gap between both would be bridged by a fabric of international co-operation rather than by insane spending on nuclear weapons. Such a world should not be beyond our reach. Thus, all mankind would benefit from disarmament, particularly the developing nations. This is one of the demonstrations of a real détente, a détente of universal application. Therefore the discussions which have been pursued both inside and outside the United Nations in order to achieve the basic goal of the maintenance of peace and security have led to some

initial steps being taken in the field of arms limitation, particularly with regard to strategic arms. However, no effective measures of disarmament have been implemented in the sense of preventing the threat to mankind posed by nuclear weapons and arms of mass destruction.

3. We have had the opportunity of paying a tribute to the Secretariat and the group of consultant experts who fulfilled their responsibility by preparing the report on the *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*, issued in 1972, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2667 (XXV).<sup>1</sup> According to that report, the world spent about \$120,000 million in 1961, and 10 years later the figure amounted to about \$200,000 million. In addition, this report estimated that, of the total of \$1,870,000 million which was allocated to military expenditures over the period 1961-1970, 10 per cent—somewhat less than \$200,000 million—was devoted to military research and development. This military research and development was highly concentrated in the six countries that account for more than four-fifths of total military expenditures. This amount could have been rechannelled to solve problems in developing countries such as the production of adequate food supplies, the improvement of health, the desalination of sea water, the production of energy and so forth. If annual military expenditures continue to absorb the present percentage of the world gross national product they could well reach the level of from \$300,000 million to \$350,000 million, at 1970 prices, by the end of this decade.

4. The military expenditures that cast the greatest shadow over the world are those of the major Powers, which between them account for the bulk of all such spending. As was stated in the preamble to General Assembly resolution 2667 (XXV):

“... a halt in the arms race, a reduction of military expenditures and concrete progress towards disarmament would greatly facilitate the achievement by nations of their economic and social goals and would contribute effectively to the improvement of international relations and the maintenance of world peace and security”.

5. Every effort to retard the arms race would help to release resources for peaceful uses, including aid and development financing. We earnestly hope that a substantial decrease in military expenditure will result in increasing aid to developing countries.

6. The group of consultant experts reached unanimous conclusions. They are *inter alia* as follows:

“(1) A substantial reduction in the military expenditures of all countries, particularly of those whose military

\* Resumed from the 2173rd meeting.

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.72.IX.16.

expenditures are highest, should be brought about as soon as possible. The sooner concrete measures of disarmament, particularly of nuclear disarmament, are achieved, and the arms race is thereby halted and reversed, the faster will be the progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

“....

“(3) A halt in the arms race and a significant reduction in military expenditures would help the social and economic development of all countries and would increase the possibilities of providing additional aid to developing countries.”<sup>2</sup>

We are gratified that these recommendations are on record and we support them.

7. According to the International Development Strategy, the success of international development activities will depend in large measure on improvement in the general international situation, particularly on concrete progress towards general and complete disarmament [*resolution 2626 (XXV), para. (5)*]. Funds released from disarmament measures could be channelled into economic and social development fields, particularly in the developing countries.

8. The debate on this item, so opportunely introduced by the delegation of the USSR, is an attempt to enforce the link between two pressing problems: disarmament and development. To create an organic interrelationship between disarmament and development financing, we believe that partial and transitional measures such as those proposed by the Soviet Union may pave the way for the future adoption of a comprehensive and lasting remedy. It is for this purpose that we see merit in the draft resolution on the “Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries” [*A/L.701*].

9. Mr. CAICEDO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The basic purposes of the United Nations are threefold: to maintain peace, to extend security and at the same time to promote international co-operation for economic, social, cultural or humanitarian development. Peace and security are indissoluble terms. Insecurity leads to conflict.

10. Accordingly, security and disarmament are also indivisible terms. The complex technology of today has divested the Roman principle “If you want peace, prepare for war” of all axiomatic significance. The arms race leads to an unstable equilibrium and to an exhausting effort for any kind of country. It converts the entire world into a potential market for surplus or obsolete weapons and increases the risks of conflict, so that confrontations take on larger proportions and use ever more overwhelming and frightening weapons.

11. Disarmament has been opposed by political reasoning or rather by the old mentality of self-sufficiency, of defending oneself, of guaranteeing one's own security in isolation,

and included in this mentality of isolation is the system of blocs and pacts characteristic of past conflicts.

12. The development of nations and men, which is the third fundamental objective of the United Nations, has not been able to make as much progress as human solidarity would require, but there are clear indications that the most acute statesmen and analysts realize that they should slow down the production and stockpiling of the means of attack and defence which every day become more and more sophisticated, costly and obsolescent. However, there is no agreed programme for the current Disarmament Decade, and this impedes the possibility of development.

13. Since complete and general disarmament subject to effective control is considered impracticable, efforts have been concentrated on partial measures—very praiseworthy in isolation but economically ineffective as a whole.

14. Like peace and security, disarmament and development are closely interlinked. But until recently they were considered in this very hall as entities that were not interdependent and could not be equated. Nevertheless, disarmament and development are of equal urgency and are complementary, because in doing away with the vast financial burdens of armaments peaceful promotion programmes inside and outside the countries with large-scale economies would arise. The Organization cannot achieve these two objectives separately, because of a lack of economic and technical resources on the one hand and, above all, because development implies the candid desire for peace.

15. Wealthy countries could do much along these lines and make their people richer in terms of housing, education and commodities and they could also help themselves by helping others. It would be stupid to imagine that any savings on military expenditures could be devoted to increasing the gap in the *per capita* income dividing one country from another. On the contrary, the developing countries could become better neighbours and stronger markets, on condition that these advantages are not tied to bilateral dependency arrangements.

16. What I have said is all the more urgent since the goals for the Second United Nations Development Decade have not been achieved, and there is every indication that it will be impossible for the developing countries to generate enough internal savings to meet what they require in productive investment to multiply their rate of growth.

17. This failure, although relative, is tremendous because of the magnitude of the human poverty involved and the increasing rate of growth of this poverty. And the picture of development should always serve to bring out the scandalous spectacle of unbridled warlike activity in the face of hunger, disease and illiteracy. On every possible occasion we must bring out the astronomical figures of armament vis-à-vis the real and deeply-felt needs of the common people of countries which would be supplied with a modest percentage of the death-dealing waste. But this has not trickled down to world public opinion, which apparently is resigned to the parade of warlike diets before an audience of victims of backwardness and eventual victims of the surplus of alien weapons.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 120.

18. The report *Disarmament and Development* states:

"World military expenditures in 1970 were roughly \$200 billion, i.e. 6.5 per cent of the GNP of the countries of the world. Military expenditures of the countries which provide aid for development are estimated to be approximately 6.7 per cent of their GNP, or 25 times greater than the official development assistance they provide. The major part of the world's military expenditure is made by a very small number of countries; the six main military spenders are responsible for more than four fifths of the total."<sup>3</sup>

The report *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures* states:

"If annual military expenditures continue to absorb their present percentage of world GNP, they could well reach the level of \$300-350 billion (at 1970 prices) by the end of the decade . . . ."<sup>4</sup>

This is what the experts have said.

19. On 15 October [2154th meeting], Mr. Malik, on behalf of the USSR, presented a draft resolution to the General Assembly recommending that the permanent members of the Security Council should reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent from the level of the current year and should continue to do so in the next financial years [A/L.701]. He called upon these States to set aside 10 per cent of the funds thus saved for the provision of assistance to developing countries. These would be funds saved by a reduction in their military budgets. This example is intended, of course, to encourage other powerful countries or countries in a continuing chronic state of conflict to reduce their military expenditure and join in a programme of universal development that would be equitable, which would establish priorities and rule out any possible discrimination—that is to say, that aid should not be made conditional upon any political motivation.

20. Obviously this proposal does not imply, nor could it imply by any means, a watering down of what was decided by resolution 2626 (XXV) which sets forth the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. That resolution states that:

"(42) Each economically advanced country should endeavour to provide by 1972 annually to developing countries financial resource transfers of a minimum net amount of 1 per cent of its gross national product at market prices in terms of actual disbursements . . . ."

21. Thus the Soviet proposal would do no more than give effect to the goals chosen for this Second Decade and provide a greater cushion for unforeseeable emergencies.

22. We would all hope that the Soviet proposal could have been spelled out in more precise terms as to the basic definition of what should be understood by military budgets, their verification, and the bodies to automatically collect the funds which would flow from this system; and it is to be hoped that this debate will help to shed light on these

specific, indispensable points without which the proposal might seem somewhat unrealistic or hypothetical. In any event, it sets down the principle and opens the way to dialogue between the rich countries and the placing of our cards on the table.

23. The documents of the group of experts and of the Secretary-General on disarmament and development also observe that the total net transfer of financial resources from the economies of developed markets to the developing countries as a proportion of the gross national products of these economies rose from 0.70 per cent to 0.74 per cent in 1971. But it continued to fall far short not only of the 1 per cent target, but also the level of 0.86 per cent reached 10 years earlier. Official aid to development, which is supposed to be given on favourable conditions and is, according to the majority of countries, the critical component in the net transfer of aid, only reached the insignificant figure of 0.33 per cent in 1970, rising to 0.34 per cent in 1971. While in 1961 it had been in the order of 0.50 per cent and the objective for that type of assistance is 0.70 per cent. In other words, we are going backwards because of the simultaneous and growing requirements of the poorer countries, and the gap between them and the financially powerful countries shows a tendency to increase.

24. We are now faced with a proposal which is surprising because of its content and origin, which has given rise to certain reactions of skepticism or even humoristic disdain and a weak response from the countries to which it is directed in the first instance.

25. If we look at the peaceful achievements of the United Nations, it would be much more appropriate to enumerate the many risks it has avoided and the fact that it is the best forum for hopes constructed by politicians throughout the history of mankind—and that is the line which separates him from chaos. It depends upon us whether we take this invitation seriously or whether we dispatch it in courteous terms as if it had been put forward merely to please the weaker countries. Let us bring about mental détente and let us have the merit and take the risk of believing. Against the wisdom and skepticism which were obvious in the recent past, which was fraught with regrettable incidents, let us give the great Powers not only the negative force of the veto but also the positive force of credibility.

26. Let us think that against the game of the foxes the best diplomacy is to use simple language. I sincerely believe that a great Power does not reach this level of public commitment for reasons of mere propaganda and cheap gestures. Nor does it come forward to this level either out of mere generosity but, rather, out of an over-all and very enlightened sense of the evolution of the world and its own risks and limitations. Moreover, it has not been possible to prevent Bismark's formula of "guns or butter" from continuing to have its grain of truth.

27. The vast burden which over-armament represents for the leading countries of the world is as tangible as the camel's hump, and this burden is reflected in all types of limitations and sacrifices known and described by technicians as the "dividends of armament". This is true of any great country, whatever its economic system.

<sup>3</sup> See United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.IX.1, para. 56.

<sup>4</sup> See United Nations publication, Sales No. E.72.IX.16, para. 114.

28. We find very attractive the fact that the Soviet proposal explicitly recognizes that disarmament and development are priorities which concern all of us and that the most equitable and efficient channel for achieving them is the United Nations, as an instrument itself and not only as a forum for the expression of isolated efforts to reduce various weapons, prohibit others, denuclearize certain zones or attempt some type of regional disarmament which is always advisable for historic, cultural and economic trade reasons. My country supports this type of disarmament.

29. Some of these goals have been achieved and reflected in conventions or treaties which unfortunately, as the figures show, have not resulted in a decline in the world's expenditure on war; on the contrary, they show universal short-comings in achieving this vital goal.

30. Another advantage of the Soviet proposal is to be found in the fact that it brings together and associates two items, which are fundamental goals of the Organization, but which we had come to deal with separately and in discriminatory terms, forgetting what had been approved by resolution 2734 (XXV), entitled "Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" and which in paragraph 19:

"Affirms its belief that there is a close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries, so that any progress made towards any of these objectives will constitute progress towards all of them".

31. This document, in a large measure, was the creation of the Latin American group which made efforts and persisted in bringing it out. But what we are welcoming here is the fact that this thought and effort is beginning to win the support of the great Powers.

32. We should begin by giving words their true meaning and not use them as ploys for propaganda. During the years of the cold war, it became a characteristic of the time that the word "peace" should give rise to considerable doubts as an emblem of hostility; and the word "democracy" and the term "self-determination" had so many meanings that they were divested of all real content. This war of words is fatal because it challenges our capacity for communication and dialogue. We are now on the threshold of new hopes which are tinged with realism, but are also based on faith, so that together we can make a reality of what, for many of us, is still a dream.

33. For that reason Colombia will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation.

34. Mr. PALEWSKI (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation has studied with the greatest care the additional item on the agenda which was submitted by the Soviet delegation for the attention of the General Assembly and also the draft resolution accompanying it.

35. The idea of reducing by 10 per cent the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and channelling a part of the money thus saved for development purposes comes from a country with which France has excellent relations of co-operation. This in itself is a sufficient motive to arouse the interest of our country.

36. Need it be recalled that France is entirely won over by the idea that the maximum should be done to assist those countries which are victims of underdevelopment? In various bodies we are involved in work which is designed to adjust aid policies in order to improve the effectiveness of these efforts. We would be prepared also, if this were useful, to participate in studies and comparisons which the international community might wish to undertake in the field of military expenditure. However this may be, French assistance for development is accounted for and is easy to verify; its military budget is public, it can be verified. The ratio between these two sources of expenditure is very easy to establish. That, of course, could be done in various ways, either in absolute figures or in comparison with the gross national product.

37. In this connexion I should like to give the Assembly some indications. In 1972, the amount of military expenditure, which is part of our finance law, was 21,766 million francs, that is, 3.46 per cent of the gross national product of France, which amounts to 629,000 million. During the same year, the amount of official assistance given by France for development purposes, calculated according to criteria established by the Committee for Development Aid of the Organization for Economic and Co-operation Development, was 4,213 million francs, that is, 0.67 per cent of the gross national product. I am not even referring to the floods of resources coming from private sources, many of which are guaranteed by the State.

38. From the figures that I have quoted, it becomes evident that the French Government already channels into the development of the countries and Territories which are less developed sums which are equivalent to approximately one fifth, or 19 per cent exactly, of what it devotes to national defence. This proportion of approximately 20 per cent represents almost double the reduction which the Soviet Union is proposing in the case of military budgets and only part of which it suggests, a rather modest part, be devoted to development.

39. However, it should be noted at the same time that, while some countries are making an effort comparable to ours within the context of the Development Decade, others are hardly doing so. To refer only to the five permanent members of the Security Council, I do not believe that it could be said that they are all equally far from the objectives that our community has set. In fact, the situation in this field differs from country to country, and it would be extremely useful to make comparisons.

40. Other comparisons—more important ones—should be made to determine how military budgets are drawn up. This is an essential point, because if it were to be revealed that a State for various reasons accounted for only part of its military expenditures in its military budget, then the unequal nature of these figures, and the difficulty of determining what share of that budget should be devoted to development, would be quite obvious. I know that the definition of the various headings in national budgets is a sovereign prerogative of the States themselves. But if these definitions are obviously quite different, one can hardly ask the international community to take them as a basis without first having carried out the necessary comparisons involved. Private contracts, international agreements—all human



undertakings—start by necessarily trying to arrive at commonly agreed definitions.

41. I can only put forward these two questions to which I have referred, that is, the efforts that are already being made, on the one hand, and the question of definitions, on the other hand, for the delegations directly concerned to consider, starting with the Soviet delegation. A first result could be achieved if all concerned were prepared to provide the type of figures which I have just read out regarding the actual ratio that exists in my country between military expenditures and development aid. I think that data would show clearly that France is not behind but really leads the field in development matters.

42. The question of definitions would be equally important. I am afraid that this would involve a large number of technical difficulties, ones that cannot be tackled within the context of our general debate. It would be quite easy to give numerous examples of this.

43. The French delegation has other misgivings when we consider the practical implications of the proposal before us. What essentially is being suggested? If we have correctly understood the essence of the proposal, only one tenth of the one tenth saving in the military budgets of five countries would be devoted to developing countries. Hence, that being one tenth of one tenth, it would really be only one one hundredth, and that would only refer to one year, since the draft resolution refers to the budgets for 1974 and it does not provide for a follow-up. I do not know the sum that would be one one hundredth of the military budgets of the five States for one year—even if they are the budgets of Powers that are reputed to be important ones—but I would venture to express my doubt that the figure would correspond to what the developing countries expect from the great Powers. I would suppose that those countries would be more satisfied if the objectives set out in the International Development Strategy could be achieved, since that at least has the merit of setting forth a long-term objective and of being actually in accordance with their needs.

44. This brings me to the essential point at issue. Why undertake difficult studies, why set up a new special fund, why set up complicated machinery and control operations, all of which would be inevitable? The French delegation, which has given some thought to this problem, would like to recall that it was one of the first to propose such studies, and even suggested control machinery, at the “summit conference” held in 1955. However, we note to our great satisfaction, that the work of our Organization has progressed a great deal in the course of 18 years. We now have available instruments and institutions that make it possible to transfer to the developing countries the assistance that their situation needs. Hence, the question that we have to answer is the following: why not confirm and implement without any delay the objectives which have been determined by our Organization by using those instruments which are already available to us?

45. It will be said that a new political fact must be borne in mind, namely, the phenomenon of détente. Détente would mean, at least in a token fashion, that the major Powers would have less reason to fear each other and could decrease their military budgets and devote part of those savings for

one year to peaceful development. The French delegation has already explained what it thinks about such a considerable undertaking and about a target that appears to us to be so difficult to achieve. The least that can be said of it is that it is highly controversial and that it provokes among certain permanent members of the Security Council polemics which hardly augur well for the cause of the developing countries. Whether they be large or small, whether their economies be developed or not, States do not have the same opinion about détente. I state that with regret. France hopes that one day the signs of détente will appear in Europe, and it works for that end. We must note, however, that two of the major Powers have recently sent huge quantities of military material to the Middle East. We feel that the so-called Strategic Arms Limitation Talks [SALT] will not, in fact, lead to any substantial reduction of the considerable expenditures which these same major States make for their own strategic forces.

46. It is true that the present-day world is undoubtedly over-armed. It is super-armed. But this state of being over-armed is unequal. It derives from the competition which takes place not between five Powers, but between two of them.

47. The French delegation will avoid referring to matters which are of import only to the great Powers concerned. We shall not allude to any possible figures or reasonable estimates suggesting the amount of their actual military expenditures. We will confine ourselves to suggesting that the problem involved in the interesting suggestion of the Soviet Union would be practically resolved if two great countries restricted and held back their military rivalry, and if by common agreement they were to subscribe to the targets laid down in the Development Decade.

48. Let us imagine that the third world were regularly to receive, from the countries I am referring to, the contributions proposed under the Organization’s programmes which France is happy to carry out. Could we not say then that genuine détente had in that case appeared? Could we not then consider that peace was being reborn among us in its true form? I mean the harmonious development of all people, starting with the poorest among them.

49. As the Assembly can see, therefore, I have asked more questions than I have put forward ideas myself. The subject before us, I would repeat, is viewed with our entire sympathy in principle. As, however, the French delegation is neither sure of the relevance of the considerations nor the effectiveness of the measures proposed in the Soviet draft, its position remains reserved, because we strongly feel that other courses of action offer both more certainty and more guarantees.

50. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In his speech during the general debate at the current session [2137th meeting], the Chairman of the Chinese delegation already stated our principled stand on the Soviet proposal on reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. Now, I would like to state once again our views on this question.

51. The Soviet representative asked for the inclusion of his proposed item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly as an "important and urgent question" [A/9191] and loudly extolled it as a superb "masterpiece". As a matter of fact, this proposal of the Soviet Union is nothing but trash picked up from its own garbage heap of disarmament and is a cheap fraud. One may recall that in the past the Soviet Union had put forward proposals on the so-called reduction of military budgets on many occasions. Back in 1958, the Soviet Union put forward, at the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, a proposal that the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union reduce their military budgets by 10 to 15 per cent and use part of the funds thus saved to aid the under-developed countries.<sup>5</sup> In 1962, Khrushchev claimed that if 8 to 10 per cent of the total world military budgets were used to aid the "newly established national States", "it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within 20 years".

52. In the same year, the Soviet Union proposed, at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, that the funds saved from disarmament should be used to construct 30 or 40 new, major, power-based industrial centres of world significance in Asia, Africa and Latin America.<sup>6</sup> History has already proved all this to be sheer empty, nonsensical and deceptive remarks.

53. Now that more than 10 years have elapsed, has the military budget of the Soviet Union been reduced or increased? That state's military budget has not been reduced by a single ruble; on the contrary, continuous big increases have taken place. Even according to its own published figures, its military budget has nearly doubled. As is known to all, the military budget made public by the Soviet Union itself has been greatly reduced and is much smaller than the actual one. Khrushchev openly admitted that. Brezhnev also preached that "the question of national defence occupies the first place among all our work", and that "a large amount of funds must be used for national defence".

54. In recent years, the Soviet Union has been frenziedly engaged in an arms race on an unprecedented scale and at an unparalleled tempo. At present, the Soviet Union is not only developing new-type conventional weapons on a large scale and drastically expanding its nuclear arsenal, but it is also making desperate efforts to develop its ocean-going naval force. Why should the Soviet Union do all this? It thinks that the more weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, it has in its hands, the easier it can order other countries about, overwhelm and replace its rival and rule supreme in the world.

55. The Soviet Union has shouted loudest on the question of disarmament and put forth so many suggestions and proposals as though it could thus make people believe that the Soviet Union did have the kind heart of a Buddha or was a real "angel of peace". This reminds us of the words of the great Lenin. He said: "The vendor who shouts the loudest and calls God to witness is the one with the shoddiest goods

for sale". Is this not the best description of the Soviet intention in peddling its disarmament proposals nowadays? The facts have proved that the Soviet-advertised disarmament is a sham and that the real thing is the arms race. The reintroduction at the current session of the General Assembly of its proposal on the reduction of military budgets that it had dished up several years ago is but a smoke-screen for covering up its militaristic features of social-imperialism.

56. The Soviet Union has proposed that the five permanent members of the Security Council should "without exception" reduce their military budgets, and asserted that they have a so-called equal responsibility on the question of disarmament. Superficially this proposal appears to be fair, but actually it harbours ulterior motives. As everyone knows, there is a great disparity in the armament and military budgets of the five permanent members. The military expenditures of the two super-Powers are the highest, and those Powers possess the greatest amount of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons. Both say that the power of their nuclear weapon arsenal has reached the strength of 15 to 20 tons of TNT for every person in the world and is capable of exterminating all life on the planet. Yet they are still making desperate efforts to develop these weapons, thus posing a serious threat to the security of the people of the world. Confronted with the Soviet armed threat, even the United Kingdom, France and the whole of western Europe feel inadequate in their defence capabilities. As for China, its defence capabilities are even less in comparison to those of the two super-Powers. With such a great disparity, how can one talk about the reduction of the military budgets by the same proportion? Does not the Soviet Union stress the need for the Soviet Union and the United States to adhere to the principle of equal security so that neither side will be put in an inferior position? Are you not violating the principle of equal security by forcing the other permanent members, which are obviously in an inferior position and subjected to your threat, to reduce their military budgets by the same proportion as the super-Powers? Evidently the true intent of the Soviet proposal is to cover up its own obstinate position of opposing genuine disarmament and to shift on to other countries the responsibility for what it calls rejecting disarmament. Either disarmament by all, or no disarmament by the super-Powers—this is "either all or nothing" in its true sense!

57. The Soviet Union has further demanded that a reduction in military budgets should be made by other States with a major economic and military potential. It even slanders the developing countries as being engaged in the arms race. This is even more preposterous. The establishment and building up of the necessary defence capabilities by the third world countries for the purpose of resisting foreign aggression and safeguarding their independence and sovereignty is, in essence, entirely different from the armaments race of the super-Powers, and the two should not be mentioned in the same breath. In unwarrantedly accusing the developing countries of being engaged in the arms race, the Soviet aim is to have these countries disarmed and thus leave them at the tender mercy of the super-Powers.

58. The Soviet Union has proposed to use part of the funds saved from the 10 per cent reduction of military budgets to provide assistance to developing countries and stressed that it should be provided, in the first instance, to those Asian,

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 750th meeting, paras. 55-58.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, *Seventeenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1127th meeting, para. 89.

African and Latin American countries which have been stricken by natural disasters. What a high-sounding declaration! But people with a discerning eye can tell at the first glance that it is a deceptive trick. As the Chinese saying goes, this is to "draw a cake to satisfy one's hunger". The Soviet Union has harped on such a hackneyed tune for more than a decade, but never has it reduced its military budget to assist others. The Soviet Union is now at the height of its intensified armaments race without the slightest sincere intention for disarmament. Yet it is talking glibly about using the non-existent fund to provide assistance to developing countries, particularly those countries stricken by natural disasters. Is this not a mockery of the afflicted countries and people? Some Asian, African and Latin American countries are suffering from poverty and backwardness in varying degrees, as a result of prolonged aggression and plunder by imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. However, the Asian, African and Latin American peoples have backbone, and they are confident about developing their national economies through their own struggle and labour. As pointed out at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in September at Algiers, they are resolved to oppose imperialist control and exploitation, reduce their dependence on the developed countries and develop their economies by relying on their own individual or collective strength. The developing countries certainly welcome outside assistance truly motivated by good will and based on the principle of equality and mutual benefit. However, the Soviet Union tries to peddle its fraud of sham disarmament by exploiting the temporary difficulties of the disaster-stricken countries which suffer from food shortage and the good desire of developing countries for peace and economic development. This is not only most ignominious and despicable but will eventually prove to be futile.

59. Did you not say that you were ready to reduce your military budget to provide assistance to the developing countries? If you are willing to correct your past record to prove that you really have the sincerity to mend your ways and turn over a new leaf, then you should first declare that the so-called military aid you provide to other countries is gratis, that you will waive all repayment and return all the filthy money you have made both in the past and at present through the sale of weapons at a high price to the Arab countries by taking advantage of their need to resist external aggression, and that in future you will no longer be a merchant of death, particularly that you will not seize upon others' difficulties to make extortions.

*Mr. Ibingira (Uganda), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

60. Did you not say that you were the "natural and surest ally" of the developing countries? This is likewise a cajolery. If you are willing to correct your past record to prove that you have the desire to repent and start anew, then you should declare that in providing aid to other countries in the future you will not attach any conditions that seek gains at the expense of others or ask for political, economic and military privileges, that you will no longer use the name of aid to subject the recipient countries to intervention, control, subversion, plunder and exploitation, and that all past so-called aid in violation of these principles should be fully reviewed and redressed. You will be showing some sincerity only when you can really do these things.

61. None of these are new questions. They are questions which many have repeatedly put to you over the past years. Immediately upon the production of your verbiage and fraud about the so-called reduction of military budgets at the current session of the General Assembly, the Chinese representative as well as some other representatives have raised these questions in varying degrees. Messrs. Soviet representatives: if you are not going to evade the questions with vituperation, please come to this rostrum to give a reply to these questions.

62. In view of the foregoing, the Chinese delegation firmly opposes the Soviet-proposed draft resolution on the so-called reduction of military budgets [A/L.701].

63. Mr. KARHILO (Finland): Disarmament and development are both areas for which the United Nations bears primary responsibility. Both are questions which in the long run are closely connected with the main task of the United Nations—the maintenance of international peace and security. Both continue to occupy a prominent place on the agenda of the General Assembly. Within the framework of the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade, we are committed to try to achieve progress both in the field of disarmament and in international development co-operation. The records of the United Nations contain many proposals submitted with the aim of linking disarmament and increased world security to development and increased world prosperity. Few tangible results have been achieved so far. This, however, should not lead our Organization to abandon further efforts to promote these goals.

64. It is in this general context that my delegation views the initiative of the delegation of the Soviet Union in proposing, for consideration at this session of the General Assembly, item 102. The idea of reducing military budgets as a collateral arms control measure has been advocated and discussed over the years within this Organization as well as outside it. An effort to take this idea under renewed consideration at present seems particularly appropriate against the dual background of steadily increasing military expenditures, on the one hand, and an actual decrease in the growth of funds to the developing countries, on the other.

65. While the 1960s have seen some limited progress in the efforts at arms control, the arms race and the expenditures it entails have continued to escalate both in absolute and relative terms. It is true that without the arms control agreements concluded in recent years military expenditures might today be even larger than what they actually are. It is also true that the arms limitation agreements currently under negotiation—be it at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, in Vienna, or in Geneva—may have an effect of at least restraining the continuous growth of military budgets. Yet a reduction of the military budgets themselves would deal in a more direct way with the problem of the burden of the arms race and the waste of economic and human resources it entails, while at the same time complementing current efforts at arms limitation and disarmament.

66. Admittedly the definition of "military budgets" is a complex one inasmuch as such budgets differ in their structure and, above all, inasmuch as there is no uniform practice in the allocation of public funds for military purposes.



67. Yet the concept of reductions in military budgets bears certain inherent advantages compared to other arms control measures. Once the scope of such reductions has been agreed upon the parties concerned would be responsible for their implementation in a manner which would avoid a number of the technical difficulties that are involved in negotiations dealing with specific weapons and weapons systems.

68. The Secretary-General has also touched on this subject in the report on "Disarmament and Development", prepared by a group of experts under the chairmanship of Madame Alva Myrdal of Sweden. This report says:

"One measure which might help the transition from partial measures to general and complete disarmament would be an agreement to limit and reduce military budgets".<sup>7</sup>

Only a few days ago we heard another high-ranking member of the United Nations executive branch, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], add his voice to those who advocate serious consideration of the potentialities which lie in a reduction of military budgets. Mr. Peterson, speaking on the possibilities for development co-operation inherent in arms reductions, said that given the increasing convergence of industrialized societies and the growth in military budgets the prospect for such a financial spin-off is more than the fanciful wish that existed only a few years ago.

69. The results so far achieved in the implementation of the Strategy for the present Development Decade have been disappointing. The flow of resources for international development co-operation have fallen short of the targets set. It is obvious that new, additional sources for development assistance must be found if we are to bring the Decade to a successful conclusion. We are today faced with such global challenges as mass poverty and unemployment, population programmes, environmental protection, world food security and assistance to disaster-stricken peoples and areas. These new challenges to the United Nations cannot be faced with confidence unless we find additional—and I stress the word "additional"—sources for funds for these purposes.

70. If agreement could be reached on the reduction of military budgets and on the allocation of part of the funds thus saved to economic development, this could well turn out to be one such new source of funds. It was said by the Administrator of UNDP that, if the military expenditures of six of the developed countries—which are at the same time already major donor countries—were reduced by 5 per cent, this could more than double the total amount available for development purposes. Furthermore, my delegation would concur with the view expressed that a reduction in military expenditures would lead not only to a quantitative increase in assistance but also to significant qualitative gains. I am here referring to the release of human resources, of scientific and technological know-how for peaceful purposes.

71. The recommendation in document A/L.701 is addressed to the permanent members of the Security Council.

This is quite appropriate in view of the very great military appropriations in their budgets, which correspond to between 60 and 70 per cent of the world's total outlay for armaments. Recognition of primary responsibility for peace and security, as defined in the Charter, entails a responsibility for taking constructive initiatives for improving the chances of peace.

72. Any effort in this direction merits careful consideration by the General Assembly. At the same time, it is obvious that a realistic pursuit of a proposal of this kind presupposes the support and co-operation of the Powers principally concerned. It is towards this kind of consensus that the efforts of the Assembly should be directed at this stage.

73. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor in exercise of the right of reply. If there is no objection, I shall now call on him.

74. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to reply briefly to some of the customary anti-Soviet attacks which have been made today by the Chinese representative in connexion with the discussion of the Soviet proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. There is nothing new in the statement made by the Chinese representative. There is still the same irritating and frenzied anti-Sovietism, and the same negativism with regard to questions relating to disarmament; we noted this negativism as long ago as the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly in the Chinese delegation's first statement.<sup>8</sup> We stated at that time<sup>9</sup> that, with regard to the convening of a world disarmament conference for example, the representatives at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly were hearing a Chinese-American duet of negativism, and it seems that this duet is continuing to the present day. One side sings less, and the Chinese have taken on themselves the main part of the negativist singer in this duet.

75. In the statement made by the Chinese representative there is still the same blind desire to do everything possible to counteract anything that might lead to the easing of international tension, to the strengthening of trust among States, to the limitation of the arms race, and to disarmament. The Chinese representative's speech is clearly aimed at gullible, naive people who are completely ignorant of the real facts. However, the objective facts show something quite different. The Chinese leaders allege that they are supporters of disarmament, but in fact they make every effort to block all genuine measures taken in the United Nations, and not only in the United Nations, to limit and reduce the arms race, thus challenging international public opinion; and they continue to pollute the earth's atmosphere with nuclear tests.

76. All representatives are well aware that in the United Nations China opposes, and votes with South Africa and

<sup>7</sup> See United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.IX.1, para. 10.

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1983rd meeting.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 1995th meeting.



Portugal against, the General Assembly resolutions on the non-use of force in international relations [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [*resolution 1653 (XVI)*], which obtained wide support among States Members of the United Nations and above all among the non-aligned countries or, as they are otherwise known, the countries of the "third world".

77. How can China call itself a peace-maker but vote with South Africa and Portugal against the resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and then accuse others of aggressive intentions? There is no logic between these two positions.

78. Today, at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, China is also opposing and objecting to the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent, and, consequently, is also opposing and objecting to the utilization of part of the funds thus saved to meet the needs of the developing countries, that is, the needs of the "third world" countries. Needless to say, this Soviet proposal is widely supported among States Members of the United Nations and above all among the developing countries. Gentlemen of the Chinese delegation, prick up your ears, open your eyes and you will see and hear the opinion of the majority of representatives from the non-aligned countries. They are not with you; they support our proposal. It is a realistic, practical and feasible proposal, if you would only agree to it, and not oppose it merely because it is a Soviet proposal. Consequently, opposing this proposal means opposing something in which all the "third world" countries without exception are genuinely interested.

79. The Chinese representative has clearly been spreading false ideas that we are allegedly proposing that the developing countries should disarm. That is nonsense, an invention, a falsity. We have nothing of the sort in mind. We are proposing that the five permanent members of the Security Council and those developed countries with a major economic and military potential should reduce their military budgets. We did not contemplate any appeal or any proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of the developing countries. The Chinese representative is ascribing this to us. It is sufficient to cite this fact to see the utterly primitive and contrived nature of the argument which the Chinese delegate is putting forward from this rostrum.

80. In this connexion, I should like to recall that the Declaration of the countries of the third world, to which the Chinese representative also referred adopted at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in September at Algiers—and which has been cited by many other representatives—drew attention in particular—and I stress, in particular—to the enormous benefit to the well-being of all peoples and to the economic and social development of the third world countries that could ensue from the release of resources resulting from disarmament.

81. This is the position of the third world; and the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government, the Central Committee of our Party and Comrade Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev himself keenly and attentively follow the development of international life, and take into account this view, this mood, these

decisions, and these declarations of the third world countries which declare that disarmament, the reduction of military budgets, and the release of funds from the arms race would be of considerable help for the purposes of the development of the developing countries.

82. China is deaf and blind to these desires and aspirations, these decisions and declarations of the countries of the "third world".

83. These are the real facts.

84. Consequently, it is becoming absolutely clear to all of us present here, and to the General Assembly as a whole, that, in questions relating to disarmament, the release of funds resulting from disarmament, and the utilization of these funds for the purposes of development and providing assistance to developing countries, China takes a position which is diametrically opposed to that of the non-aligned countries, or, as they are otherwise known, the developing countries or the countries of the "third world". Consequently, the Chinese delegation in the Assembly is opposing not only the Soviet Union and its proposal, but also the position and proposals of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, which constitute the countries of the "third world", and the decisions of the Algiers Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.

85. This is the truth, this is the actual situation, this is the reality, and no anti-Soviet fabrications or slander of the Soviet Union put forward in the Chinese representative's statement from this rostrum can conceal this naked truth, the real situation as it is today.

86. In the light of these facts, it is quite obvious that the Chinese representative's demagogic jabber about the Soviet proposal, alleging that it is a "fraud", was necessary simply in order to conceal China's scornful attitude towards the needs of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. He has no other arguments against our proposal. To call it a "fraud" is tantamount to the situation several years ago, during the worst years of the cold war, when the imperialists termed all Soviet proposals "propaganda". That was the strongest and most constant argument of the imperialist forces against Soviet proposals. Now, following the same tactics, the Chinese representatives have devised the word "fraud". But this is an indication of the poverty of their arguments. There are no arguments for the rejection of such a proposal, and they have therefore devised the word "fraud".

87. In this connexion, we must express our gratitude to Mr. Rahal, the distinguished head of the Algerian delegation, who, in his statement from this high rostrum [*2171st meeting, para. 101*], reminded the General Assembly that disarmament and development are two interrelated problems running through the entire activity of the United Nations. Today this idea has been repeated and confirmed by a whole series of speakers: the representative of Colombia, the representative of Finland and others. The General Assembly and other United Nations bodies, particularly the Economic and Social Council, have adopted a number of resolutions on this subject of the interrelationship between disarmament and development, and, of course, the Chinese representative is well aware of this, he cannot fail to know

about it—this is now the third year that he has been here at the United Nations and has been taking part in the work of United Nations bodies, including the Economic and Social Council. However, he ignores these United Nations decisions and this position taken by the developing countries. Consequently, speculating on the word “fraud” for anti-Soviet purposes, the Chinese regard as a “fraud” even the decisions already taken in the United Nations on the interrelationship between disarmament and development and on the provision of part of the funds saved from disarmament to the developing countries for the purposes of development. This is the position of the United Nations, the position of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. Only one country, China, is against it. And we take note of this. Thus, in this question, too, China is ignoring the position and wishes of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, of the non-aligned and socialist States.

88. You, the Chinese, cry “fraud”. But you, like all of us here, in this hall, understand very well that the best way of verifying whether it is a fraud or not is by the living reality and practice. Let us adopt a decision that the five States permanent members of the Security Council should reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent. Let us adopt a decision that these States, including China, should allot 10 per cent of the funds saved from the reduction of military budgets to a development fund.

89. That is a sizable sum. By some estimates it is more than \$1,000 million, by others, \$1,300 million, and according to figures published recently in the American press, \$1,500 million. And those who have spoken before me have rightly stressed that this would be a substantial contribution over and above the sum which is now being provided for development purposes.

90. I address myself to the Chinese representative. Let us do this—let us see who approaches this question, this proposal, sincerely and whole-heartedly, and who is dissembling, dodging and deceiving.

91. That is how this question has been posed by history, and how it stands at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

92. In this connexion, it is appropriate to remind the Chinese representative of the following statement which was adopted this year at the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council. It is contained in the “Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade”, paragraph 60 of that report, document A/C.2/L.1287 of 26 September 1973. I will repeat the number of the document so that the Chinese representative can write it down correctly: paragraph 60, document A/C.2/L.1287 of 26 September 1973; the title of the document is “Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade”. What does this document state? I quote:

“Taking into account the evident link between the process of détente and the creation of better conditions for international co-operation in all fields, all countries

should actively promote the achievement of general and complete disarmament through effective measures. The resources that may be released as a result of effective measures of actual disarmament should be used for the promotion of economic and social development of all nations. The release of resources as a result of such measures should increase the capacity of the developed countries to provide support to the developing countries in their efforts towards accelerating their economic and social progress.”

93. This, members of the Assembly and representative of China, is the real position of the overwhelming majority of States members of the Economic and Social Council. It, too, is not a fraud, but the opinion of many States in the United Nations, and it is the opinion of not only the Soviet Union that disarmament should be linked with development, that effective measures should be taken in the sphere of disarmament and that part of the funds saved should be utilized for the purposes of development. Is this what you call a “fraud”? Step up to this rostrum—I will yield my place to you—and call this decision of the United Nations Economic and Social Council a fraud! Fifty-three out of the 54 States members of the Economic and Social Council supported this fraud and gave their consent to it. Fifty-three out of 54, I repeat. They unanimously agreed with this statement.

94. And who in the Economic and Social Council objected to this proposal on the link between disarmament and development and on the need to utilize the funds saved from disarmament for the purposes of development? Only one delegation, namely the delegation of China. And this is a well-known, evident and genuine fact, which shows what China’s real position is. This position—we would stress again—is directly and completely contradictory to the positions of both the developing and the socialist countries in the United Nations. The scornful attitude of China and its representatives in United Nations bodies towards the needs and concerns of the developing countries is evident here.

95. Therefore no anti-Soviet fabrications expressed by the Chinese representatives either in the Assembly or in other United Nations bodies can conceal China’s unseemly position or divert attention from it.

96. In the light of these well-known facts, it becomes even more apparent and understandable to every unprejudiced person that the pathological anti-Sovietism and slander of the Soviet Union and of its Leninist peace-loving foreign policy were needed by the Chinese representative in the Assembly for one purpose, and one purpose alone—in order to conceal and disguise China’s indefensible and totally unjustifiable position directed against the majority of States Members of the United Nations.

97. Such a position taken by China and the anti-Soviet speeches of the Chinese representatives which have now irritated everyone in the United Nations are advantageous only to those who are trying to counteract the easing of international tension, wreck any measures on disarmament in the United Nations, sow the seeds of discord; enmity and hatred among peoples, and justify their passive attitude towards aggression and those who support aggression.

98. The recent discussion of the question of the Middle East in the Security Council in connexion with the armed conflict which has broken out in the Middle East was a striking confirmation of how China's anti-Sovietism is advantageous to, for example, the Israeli aggressors and those who support them. During the discussions in the Security Council, the Chinese representative—or rather representatives, since two of them spoke—vied in their pathological anti-Sovietism and hatred of the Soviet Union—which is giving aid to the Arab countries, the victims of aggression—with the Zionist representatives, who also spoke in a similar vein of anti-Sovietism and slander of the USSR. And, in this connexion, it was evident and clearly apparent to everybody that in the realm of anti-Sovietism Maoism and Zionism are brothers, and the palm of supremacy in this unsavoury affair has been won by Maoists, a victory on which we congratulate them.

99. Here again, on the Middle East question, China's position is useful and advantageous only to the aggressor and to those who support the aggressor. In the Security Council, when resolutions aimed at protecting the Arab countries which are the victims of aggression are put to the vote, the Chinese representative hides his hand under the table, trying to present that position as so-called assistance to the Arab countries. And, in order to disguise this position on the question in the Security Council, a position which is advantageous only to the aggressor, he spares no words in slandering the Soviet Union.

100. But we have warned the Chinese representatives: you will not go far in the United Nations and in international relations with anti-Soviet slander, on the creaky old cart of anti-Sovietism. This cart will collapse, as has been the case with all those who have tried to travel on the creaky old cart of anti-Sovietism and make capital out of anti-Sovietism. Throughout the existence of the Soviet State, for over 50 years, we have seen many slanderers who have spoken against us, both before and after the war, from this rostrum and from many other rostrums. But they have all passed into oblivion, and we are proceeding resolutely and confidently along our Leninist path in the struggle for peace, the strengthening of international security, and the development of friendly relations with all countries and peoples which wish to co-operate with us and to have friendly relations with us. This was once again confirmed in the well-known historic statement made recently by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, which was attended by many more representatives, from the whole world, than are present in this Assembly. They represented 120 international and more than 1,100 national organizations and movements from 143 countries. This was the authentic voice of the peoples of the world.

101. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the representative of the Soviet Union but I should like to remind him that rights of reply are limited to 10 minutes.

102. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): This meeting is taking place for the discussion of our item, and I should like to have the opportunity to answer the very long statement made by the Chinese representative.

*The speaker continued in Russian (translation from Russian).*

103. And that historic international forum supported the Soviet Union's proposals on disarmament, including the proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent.

104. This is how the matter really stands. And this is the value of the anti-Soviet statements made by the Chinese representatives. All this shows absolutely clearly that China is against the easing of international tension, against disarmament, against the convening of a world disarmament conference, against the reduction of the military budgets of the five states permanent members of the Security Council, against the utilization of the funds saved from disarmament to provide assistance to developing countries, against any measures to strengthen peace and international security, and against the vital interests of the developing countries, the countries of the "third world". It was precisely with this policy pursued by China in mind that Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, speaking at the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, said:

"Such a policy, of course, in no way contributes to the strengthening of peace and security. It introduces an element of dangerous instability into international life. The possibility of changing this policy depends entirely and wholly on the leaders of China themselves. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I repeat again, we would welcome any constructive contribution by China to the improvement of the international climate and the development of loyal and equitable peaceful co-operation among States."

105. I should like to touch on two more questions in connexion with the Chinese representative's statement. He recalled that the Soviet Union has on many occasions put forward proposals in the United Nations on the reduction of military budgets. Yes, and we are proud of the fact that we initiated those proposals. But the situation was different then. Who prevented the adoption of those proposals? Imperialism. I repeat once more, for the benefit of the Chinese representative—during the years of the cold war, in 1958 and in the years which followed, imperialism wrecked the adoption of our proposals on the reduction of military budgets. Moreover, the fact that they were rejected then is not an original argument by the Chinese representative to justify rejecting a similar proposal now. Sir Alec Douglas-Home, during the general debate [2128th meeting], spoke from this rostrum of rejecting the Soviet proposals on the reduction of military budgets. Thus, the Chinese representative has borrowed this flimsy argument from the British Foreign Secretary. This is a new duet of negativism taking place here—this time a Chinese-British duet of negativism against the Soviet proposal on the reduction of the military budgets of the five States permanent members of the Security Council. Who is now trying to prevent the adoption of our proposal? The same imperialist forces plus imperialist Maoism. These twins, these two brothers, these two friends are speaking from this rostrum and in the First Committee against the Soviet proposal. And the Chinese representative is surely well aware that not all the proposals which were rejected in the United Nations during all the years of the cold war and for over 20 years, are still being rejected now. China itself is a graphic example of this.

106. For over 20 years, for nearly a quarter of a century, the Soviet Union, all the socialist countries, and many

peace-loving countries from the "third world" fought for the admission of China to the United Nations. Each time the imperialist Powers rejected those proposals. But, finally, we achieved victory at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly and China was admitted. Consequently, the argument that any proposal that has not been adopted in the United Nations for 20 years should be forgotten and not be put forward again is the most flimsy of arguments.

107. Representative of China, just think about that. You have no other arguments. Yes, we confirm the fact that our proposals on this matter were rejected in the past. By whom? By imperialism. The situation has now changed. There is an easing of international tension. We all recognize that. Let us now try together: let us adopt the decision on the reduction of military budgets, let us implement it and release over a thousand million dollars for aid to the developing countries. Let us try. It may work out, just as the admission of China to the United Nations worked out. This is now the third year that China has been taking part in the work of the United Nations together with all of us. Consequently, what was rejected before has now been accepted. Why can we not do the same thing with regard to the question of the reduction of military budgets? Yes, for 25 years the proposals have been rejected. Let us adopt them now: the situation is favourable.

108. Such is the groundlessness of the arguments which the Chinese representative puts forward here. He also said that the USSR has a large military budget. I have the figures. Our budget, the military budget of the USSR for 1973, which has been confirmed by our parliament—the Supreme Soviet of the USSR—amounts to some \$24,000 million. We have announced this to the whole world. According to figures published in the press, the Chinese military budget for this same year amounts to \$16,000 million. The difference, as you can see, is not great: only \$8,000 million, but if the size of our territory is taken into account—and it is more than twice the size of China—then we need more armed forces, particularly in view of China's hostile policy towards the USSR. But we propose that China and the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom and the United States and France should all reduce their military budgets proportionately by 10 per cent. And we consider this to be a fair approach. Why should the Soviet Union reduce its military budget, and not China? Why should there be privileges? Both China and our country are permanent members of the Security Council, and so are France and the United Kingdom and the United States. There should be a uniform, proportionate approach. You have a smaller budget, and you will reduce it by less, by \$1,600 million. We have a larger budget, amounting to \$24,000 million, and we will reduce it by \$2,400 million. That is fair. What other criterion could be used? What privileges are you demanding for yourselves? It is impossible to agree to such an approach.

109. This is the essence of the Chinese representative's statement, if it is properly examined in depth and analysed in the light of the facts and of the reality of the present-day situation. It is not difficult to see the whole groundlessness and falsity of his arguments against the USSR proposal. The fact is that China, which has embarked on a policy of hegemony and great-Power chauvinism, dreams of becoming

the leader of the world, on the basis of its large population, and shudders at the thought of disarmament. China fears the word "disarmament", and as long as it continues to take such a negative attitude towards questions of disarmament, the reduction of arms, the reduction of military budgets and the convening of a world disarmament conference, the distinguished representatives in the Assembly and the Assembly as a whole will continue to hear anti-Soviet speeches made by the Chinese representatives from this rostrum and from many other rostrums in the United Nations.

## AGENDA ITEM 23

### Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued):

- (a) Report 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;
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General

110. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): My delegation would wish to express its appreciation for the work done by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and for making available to us a comprehensive report [A/9023/Rev. I].

111. Arguments justifying the persistence of colonial rule in certain parts of the world today have either been legal or humanitarian. The legal arguments have ceased to have any validity. This is because it has now been universally accepted that it cannot be regarded as a principle of equity in either domestic or international law that any party should be held bound by any agreement of which it was in no way party to, or where it could be demonstrated that, at the time of its conclusion, one party to it was in no position to comprehend the implications of that agreement or treaty. It was in recognition of this that the Assembly, in its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, solemnly proclaimed the necessity of bringing colonialism in all its forms and manifestations to a speedy and unconditional end. The significance of this Declaration is that, on 14 December 1960, the General Assembly declared colonialism, in any form or guise, illegal and contrary to the supreme law of the international community: the Charter of the United Nations.

112. After this Organization, in its wisdom, had recognized that the colonial system is illegal, Portugal, in its efforts to perpetuate the system, resurrected the constitutional fiction employed some time ago and long given up by other colonial Powers, that its colonies were no longer colonies, but integral parts of metropolitan Portugal. My delegation does not believe that there is any Member State in this Organization which now accepts this sophistry. As this argument becomes less and less credible and tenable, Portugal has sought to deceive this Organization by another argument, namely that its rule in its colonial Territories is more efficient than those in independent former colonies, and more capable of improving the circumstances of its colonial peoples. Thus, in his statement to the current ses-



sion of the General Assembly, on 3 October of this year, the Foreign Minister of Portugal said:

“Whoever will take the trouble to study the facts in depth will reach the conclusion that in the over-all balance of economic and financial flows, the positive balance belongs to the African part and the negative to the European.” [2138th meeting, para. 158.]

113. In other words, Portugal is carrying in its colonial Territories in Africa the proverbial “white man’s burden”. If this is so, a legitimate question one may ask is, why is Portugal unwilling to relieve itself of this burden when it is being asked by the international community to do so?

114. The answer is probably that Portuguese altruism, based on Christian principles, prevents it from doing so. If this is so, we would like to say to Portugal, without fear of contradiction from any African delegation, that Africa has no need for its altruism. If we should go to the devil, we promise, on our honour, that we shall testify to God that Portugal had no part in our misfortunes. Portugal will only have to answer to God for atrocities towards the black men they claimed to hold in trust to God, and towards the human beings of their own race and religious persuasion whom it keeps muzzled by inhuman laws in the interest of State security.

115. What the peoples still under colonial system in Africa and elsewhere are telling Portugal and those countries which still remain their allies is that they reject the thesis once formulated by that generous lover of the negro, Albert Schweitzer, that:

“The negro is a child and with children nothing can be done without the use of authority. We must, therefore, so arrange the circumstances of daily life that my natural authority can find expression. With regard to the negroes then, I have coined a formula: ‘I am your brother, it is true, but your elder brother’.”

This is what we reject.

116. The issue, as my delegation sees it, is one of a conflict of objectives. In the words of a political scientist, whom I respect, if only for sentimental reasons:

“The only criterion capable of public defence for the granting of independence is this: are the new rulers less corrupt and grasping, or more just and merciful, or is there any change at all, the corruption, the greed and the tyranny merely finding victims different from those of the departed rulers?”

Africa’s answer to this, in the words of Nkrumah, the late President of Ghana, is: “We prefer self-government with danger, to servitude in tranquillity”.

117. Even if we should accept a value assessment as the only justifiable validity for the grant of the right to self-determination and independence, it seems to my delegation that we should then also accept the thesis often advanced that independence should be preceded by careful preparation, and on no account should independence be conceded till there is absolute certainty that the resultant national government would be capable of offering a stable and

humane alternative to the Government of the ruling alien Power.

118. Assuming that this is a desirable criterion, my delegation would like to seek answers to a number of questions, if only for clarification, or as a means of ascertaining both the content and dimensions of this prerequisite. This we consider necessary even if it is only to ensure that the promise of independence shall not become a prize held out to the colonial peoples, but which they can never enjoy because at no time will they be seen to have fulfilled the conditions for that award.

119. Given the fact that the Territories or groups of people seeking self-determination and independence in the twentieth century are late starters in acquiring modern technological and scientific know-how and developing modern political and governmental institutions, my delegation would wish to ask the following: what level of political maturity, in relation to developed countries, should these Territories or groups of people reach before a demand for self-determination and national independence could be considered justifiable? By what yardstick should such political maturity be measured? Who should decide whether the requisite level of political maturity has been reached, the colonizing country or a body outside it?

120. If these questions cannot be answered satisfactorily, then it is the view of my delegation that the most workable criterion would be the one offered by a United Kingdom representative to the United Nations. In defence of the decision of the United Kingdom Government to end its Mandate in Iraq, he said: “Nobody would think of excluding the Gypsy Moth aeroplane from an international exhibition merely because it is not so powerful as, say, a three-engined Fokker . . .”.

He continued:

“Similarly, I submit, it would not be right to attempt to argue that Iraq is not fit to function independently merely because the machinery of government may not run as smoothly or as efficiently as in some advanced or more highly developed States.”

121. In the view of my delegation, no argument on the issue of colonialism, however ingenious, is tenable, except the will of the people expressed freely and without interference or threat. When this consent is withdrawn, in the view of the African people and that of other peoples still under colonial domination, the only validity for the persistence of colonialism ceases to exist. The evidence provided by struggles for liberation in Africa and elsewhere demonstrates beyond doubt that whatever consent existed for alien rule has been withdrawn by the people subjected to that rule.

122. Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde and others have indicated beyond doubt by their determined struggle, which no one can fail to see, that they no longer wish to be governed by alien Powers. Why is this so? For an answer, I shall borrow the words of a famous writer:

“For the African, self-determination and independence became a supreme value, particularly since with

self-determination they would no longer suffer the stigma of a child race dependent on others for guidance.”

And he continues:

“This value and all the resentment its denial awakened must be seen as an essential constant in the analysis of the forces set in motion by the emergence of a politically independent Africa.”

123. This is why my delegation is dismayed that, 13 years after adopting resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, this Assembly continues to discuss the item. We believe that if, after this period, there still remain issues for discussion relating to it, they should be on problems created by the incidence of colonialism; they should be on ways and means of solving the economic and political problems for which the whole system of colonialism has been largely responsible.

124. But after 13 years what do we find? We find Portugal, the last bastion of colonialism, struggling desperately to maintain its hold on its colonies in Africa. In this effort it has spared no available means; it has bombed, burned and strafed innocent women, children and men because they dared to ask for what this Organization has confirmed is their right; yet the international community does not only look on, but in some cases supplies the means for making these inhuman atrocities possible. After 13 years we still find an open conspiracy by a section of the international community to render inoperative the legality which this Organization has confirmed, and which we are all under an obligation to maintain. My delegation, for fear of wasting the time of this august Assembly, is reluctant to remind members of their obligation under resolution 1514 (XV) but, lest we have forgotten, we would wish to draw attention to paragraph 4 of resolution 2979 (XXVII), in which the General Assembly declared, once again:

“... that any administering Power, by depriving the colonial peoples of the exercise of their rights, ... violates the obligations it has assumed under Chapters XI and XII of the Charter of the United Nations.”

In paragraph 9 of the same resolution, the General Assembly:

“Requests all States to take effective measures to end the supply of funds and other forms of assistance, including military supplies and equipment, to those régimes which use such assistance to repress the peoples of the colonial Territories and their liberation movements.”

In spite of these undertakings, the illegal racist and repressive régimes of southern Africa have never lacked the support, financial or otherwise, from foreign economic interests which have tended to subject the natural demands of the peoples of the Territories to the overriding interests of profits and yet more profits.

125. Profits realized from investments in southern Africa have been of such proportions as to surprise even the wildest dreams of the investors. In 1972, the American-owned Gulf Oil Company realized a profit of \$30 million from its investments in Angola alone. In 1969, only a few of the

foreign companies engaged in Mozambique earned an estimated profit of 2,679.1 million escudos. Since then, profits have soared to dizzy heights and opened the flood-gates to indiscriminate exploitation.

126. The financial benefits which have accrued to Portugal from these profits have been fantastic. Last year, Portugal received the huge sum of 61 million escudos from Cabinda Gulf Oil alone in income taxes and royalties. Within the 14-year period 1958-1972, this same company has paid as much as \$96.7 million to the Portuguese operations in Angola. The Argo Petroleum Oil Company, also of the United States, had to deposit as much as 50 million escudos as security before the Portuguese would sign a contract granting them a concession. By 1981, it is estimated that Portugal will have received an additional 54 million escudos from this company apart from an annual contribution of 2 million escudos which will increase to 5 million in three years from now. There is little room for doubt that it is the availability of such huge sums that has helped the war efforts of Portugal and made it so much more resolved to continue its repressive measures against the peoples of its colonial Territories in defiance of the whole international community.

127. Apologists for continued exploitation of the resources of dependent countries have claimed that:

“In addition to the economic advantages, foreign investment carries with it important benefits in the transfer of technology and in the training both of workers and managers.”

If this were true, it would hardly be necessary for newly independent countries to go through the trauma of finding large sums of money, mostly by borrowing from international sources at high interest rates, to finance the training from scratch of large numbers of managers and administrators, teachers, engineers and accountants, to mention only a few, to ensure the effective administration of an independent country.

128. As regards technology, the common experience of all former colonial peoples is that the so-called transfer of technology rarely takes place in a dependent Territory, especially if its people belong to the dark races. Transfer of technology, when it takes place in any meaningful way, does so only after the attainment of independence and at the request and expense of the newly independent country itself. Indigenous peoples of dependent Territories are almost invariably made to assume the role of suppliers of cheap labour. In southern Africa especially, wages paid to Africans are between 12 to 16 per cent of those paid to non-African workers doing practically the same jobs.

129. The simple truth underlying foreign economic activities in southern Africa, to quote from the report of the Special Committee, is that:

“... international monopolies and other foreign economic interests have a special interest in the countries of southern Africa because their operations in the region yield higher profits than capital invested in other industrialized or developing countries”. [*A/9023/Rev.1, Chap. IV, para. 6 (3).*]

130. Ghana's support for paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of resolution 2979 (XXVII) does not derive from any hidebound principle of permanent opposition to foreign investments *per se*. Our revulsion to foreign economic activities in dependent territories stems from our own experience of the terrible damage they do to the peoples of those territories. They effectively discourage trade unions and any political activity at the same time as they depress wages. By keeping the indigenous peoples in a state of chronic illiteracy, they make it impossible for them to acquire any skills which would enable them to rise above their degrading role of a reservoir of cheap labour.

131. In the face of this gloomy picture, my delegation has been happy to welcome the independence of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. My Government had the honour of sponsoring resolution 3051 (XXVIII) which admitted that country to membership in this Organization.

132. We are also happy to learn that, following the visit last year of a United Nations Mission, a definite time-table has been agreed upon between the people of Niue Island and the Government of New Zealand for the exercise by the people of their right of self-determination and that a new constitution will soon be drafted and presented for consideration by the Legislative Assembly of Niue. The future of the people of the Tokelau islands is yet to be determined, but we are sure that the co-operation which the United Nations has so far received from the New Zealand Government will never be withdrawn whenever the need arises.

133. We wish, again, to note the welcome news [A/9023/Rev.1, Chap. XIX, para. 8 (7)] that Papua New Guinea will attain self-government next month. Over the years we have watched with great keenness the gradual progress that the peoples of these Territories have been making, with the active assistance of the administering Power, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia. It is our understanding that not long after attaining self-government the peoples of Papua New Guinea will attain full independence. We look forward to the day when we shall have the pleasure of welcoming that country to membership of this Organization.

134. It is, however, reported that the extremely difficult terrain of the Territory and the disparate nature of the peoples and their languages will pose extreme difficulties to the government of an independent Papua New Guinea. An article in *Newsweek* magazine of 19 November 1973 paints a rather gloomy future for the Territory. Under the title "Birth (Reluctant) of a Nation", it states, among other things, that

"Scattered among the many islands making up Papua New Guinea are more than 1,000 separate tribes speaking 500 distinct languages. . . . Some tribes have never even seen a wheel. Some . . . Australians are convinced that they are incapable of governing themselves. These whites return home proclaiming that Armageddon is at hand in the Territory."

The Ghana delegation would like to take this opportunity to remind this Assembly that such depressing assessments are not original; they have been made before. Predictions of this nature were made whenever an African country was

due to become independent, especially in the early 1960s. Naturally, like all newly independent countries, Papua New Guinea will have its share of problems in governing its peoples, but unless it accepts the challenge now it will never grow up and feel confident enough to take responsibilities. Ghana became independent in 1957 and fully accepted the implications of independence. In spite of difficulties we can claim to have done much better for ourselves within 16 years than our former colonial masters did for us in a hundred or more years. This is the message we convey to the people of Papua New Guinea.

135. While we congratulate New Zealand and Australia on the ready co-operation which they have given to this Organization in regard to information concerning the Territories under their administration, we cannot but deplore the refusal of certain other colonial Powers to co-operate. The August-September 1973 issue of the *UN Chronicle* indicates that the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, and, of course, Portugal and France refused to co-operate with the Special Committee because those countries continue to regard the colonial Territories of Bermuda, Brunei, United States Virgin Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Angola and Mozambique, among others, as their own internal affair. It is the hope of my delegation that at least three of these countries, which are responsible members of the Security Council, will henceforth comply with Article 73 *e* of the United Nations Charter.

136. When people demand the right to independence they do not do so out of any conviction that they possess a superior ability to govern themselves. To quote the Commissioner for Foreign Affairs of Ghana when he addressed this Assembly on 10 October 1973:

"What they are demanding is a right to be human beings and to be respected as such. We no longer wish to be fed and nurtured by benevolent foster mothers; we demand the right to order our own destiny, make our own mistakes, suffer their consequences and learn from them." [2148th meeting, para. 62.]

137. I shall now address myself briefly to the draft resolutions on the item, which have been circulated, namely, those in documents A/L.707 of 19 November 1973, A/L.708 of the same date and A/L.709 of 20 November 1973.

138. Draft resolutions A/L.707 and A/L.708, which my delegation has the honour of sponsoring, should not, in the view of my delegation, present any difficulty to any delegation which supports the aims and aspirations of this Organization. The former draft resolution restates the facts as they are and as they have been recognized to be in previous resolutions of this Assembly. It further suggests action by the General Assembly which we believe would be merely consequential to resolution 1514 (XV). The latter draft resolution proposes action in the field of information regarding the issue with which the Declaration is concerned. What it seeks to do is merely to outline steps which should be taken to disseminate information on the question of the granting of independence to colonial countries and territories. Unless some of us regret our support of that resolution, this, again, should present no difficulty of acceptance.

139. My delegation sees draft resolution A/L.709 as a complement to the two draft resolutions already referred to,

in that it calls for action by this Organization on behalf of those who, through no fault of their own, continue to labour under the pernicious system of colonialism. Unless there are some among us who are so callous as not to see the plight of those people, that draft resolution should present no legitimate difficulty to any delegation, and my delegation is happy to add its name to the list of the draft's co-sponsors.

140. In conclusion I should like to reaffirm the unwavering support which Ghana has given in the past to all the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], the Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the recent Oslo Conference<sup>10</sup> and to resolutions of the United Nations and its agencies on matters relating to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Ghana rededicates itself to that support. If some have been benevolent to us, we thank them; if they have carried our burden, we are grateful to them; if they have starved while we fed, we are appreciative of their gracious mercies; if they have pined while we laughed and made merry, we now say to them, "Take away your hands; we want now to totter by ourselves, even though we should fall in the process".

141. Mr. RASOLONDRAIBE (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): I should like, as others who have spoken before me have done, to offer my particular thanks to the Special Committee and above all to its Chairman, Mr. Salim, for the excellent work they have done, which has enabled our Assembly to have a substantive discussion on the question of decolonization. I should like also to thank our colleague, Mr. Lusaka, the Chairman of the United Nations Council for Namibia, who has provided us with interesting information [2174th meeting]. The statements of those two African ambassadors and the one we have just heard from the representative of Ghana have enabled us to frame our statement on somewhat different lines than had previously been intended.

142. When resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, the whole world understood that the death knell of colonialism had sounded. The presence in the United Nations for the first time of a considerable number of newly independent countries had made possible the vote on that resolution, which enabled us then to cherish the hope that we would see the process of decolonization become intensified and reach a rapid conclusion. That hope was all the more widespread since the principles of self-determination and liberation of the colonial peoples were not and could not be called into question by any delegation.

143. Since the adoption of that important resolution, our Assembly, unfortunately, has been constantly split at each of its sessions between the joy, many times repeated, of welcoming in its midst newly independent Members, and the frustration of an acrimonious debate which was necessary then, and is still necessary, because of the persistence in certain regions of the colonial phenomenon of racism and *apartheid*. This year we have not found ourselves in a different situation because we have had the pleasure of welcom-

ing the admission to our Organization of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas and to record with joy and pride the independence of the new State of Guinea-Bissau.

144. During the same session, we find ourselves confronted again with the same problems which, even though they have been discussed in the same context in the course of previous meetings, have not lost their intensity or their emotional response.

145. Despite the progress made, we should note that the list of countries coming under Article 73 *e* of the Charter is still quite lengthy. Together with the Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Salim, we regret that certain administering Powers are reluctant to collaborate with that Committee. We note with satisfaction, however, that Australia and New Zealand have shown goodwill on this point, which pleases us. We are particularly gratified at the news that the Territory of Papua New Guinea is in the process of attaining the stage of self-government, the last stage before acceding to full international sovereignty. We welcome the attitude of the former administering Power, which enables us to hope that in certain regions, in certain circumstances, and by the exercise of goodwill, the colonial situations are likely to evolve in a satisfactory manner and in terms of common sense.

146. Unfortunately, we cannot say the same regarding the situation in southern Africa. In that region, the chain of events that occurred in the past year demonstrates that we are proceeding inexorably towards violent confrontations and that a similar situation to that of Indo-China could easily occur there. However, the dawn of this year was marked by negotiations.

147. An opportunity was offered to the Portuguese to negotiate with the liberation movements which our Organization rightly considers to be the authentic representatives of the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. At the time—last year—all delegations had primarily in mind the fact that Portugal should negotiate with the party of Amílcar Cabral, the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde [PAIGC]. Instead of availing themselves of this opportunity, of this chance, the Portuguese preferred to take refuge behind their fantasies and their illusions.

148. In the same way, the Secretary-General entered into conversations concerning Namibia with the Pretoria authorities. But the latter came to the negotiating table with the intention of losing nothing and winning everything, to the extent that the United Nations Council for Namibia, followed in this by the Heads of State and Government of OAU<sup>11</sup> and the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries,<sup>12</sup> came to the point of asking the immediate breaking-off of these contacts.

149. We do not speak of negotiations in the case of Zimbabwe because Ian Smith has practically slammed the door in the face of a powerless Great Britain.

<sup>10</sup> International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held from 9 to 14 April 1973.

<sup>11</sup> Twenty-first ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 17 to 24 May 1973.

<sup>12</sup> Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers from 5 to 9 September 1973 (A/9330 and Corr.1).



150. One can only regret that the racist and minority authorities of southern Africa have thus sabotaged all the opportunities to negotiate which have been offered to them.

151. Those are lost opportunities, and we shall never be able to regret their loss sufficiently. They will be particularly regretted by those of you that had dared to hope once more to spare African blood and to find a non-violent solution to the problems of southern Africa.

152. To those who dared to hope, the Pretoria and Salisbury minority racists and the Portuguese Government have crudely indicated that they prefer the language of violence, of which the massacre of Wiriyaumu, in Mozambique, is the most hateful illustration. The language of violence was also illustrated by the assassination of Amílcar Cabral, an assassination the political repercussions of which are still being felt. Ten years after the barbarous act of Sharpeville, South Africa has shown this year that it is capable of recidivism. It has done it again in Carletonville, where unarmed miners were savagely struck down. In Rhodesia, as in Namibia, torture and police persecutions are used as a political instrument against nationalist leaders.

153. One would be wrong to consider that all this violence is perpetrated gratuitously for the mere pleasure of committing it. It corresponds to a purpose which is in accordance with the will to stifle the personality of the African man. It also corresponds to a purpose which is in accordance with the denial of the right of blacks to self-determination and above all their right to govern their own country. If we believe the South Africans, this violence is committed to defend the interests of Western Christian civilization in Africa! We have there a crude mislabelling which the examination of the economic situation in the countries of southern African makes more evident than ever.

154. Dealing with the economic situation in these countries, we can state forthwith our agreement with Mrs. Joka-Bangura, the representative of Sierra Leone and Chairman of Sub-Committee I studying the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the exercise of self-determination by colonial peoples. In a statement before the Fourth Committee, Mrs. Joka-Bangura stated:

"We strongly believe that foreign economic exploitation and other interests are at the root of the perpetuation of colonialism and racism in African and other countries."<sup>13</sup>

155. How does the economic situation, which we deliberately choose to distinguish from the situation of other small Territories, look in southern Africa? The three main characteristics of the economy of these countries seem to us to be the following: first, the extreme vulnerability of the African as an economic factor vis-à-vis the other components of the system—the Government, management and capital. We should add to that list the trade unions reserved for white workers. Secondly, these economies are foreign-based and do not have as their primary purpose the socio-economic well-being of the black population. Thirdly, foreign eco-

conomic interests of European-American or Japanese origin are dominant there.

156. I should like to elaborate on these three points and deal with them in some detail.

157. The vulnerability of the African is a necessary prerequisite of the domination and the prosperity of the whites. Recognizing this fact, the latter have as their aim the political objective of maintaining our black brothers in this state of weakness and vulnerability. Deprived of their ancestral lands and compelled to live in reserves where the quality of the soil does not allow them to produce sufficient to meet their needs, the Africans have become socially uprooted in their own countries. They therefore constitute a vast reserve of cheap labour which the capitalist enterprises are quick to exploit. It is not uncommon to find, in books published abroad by political refugees from southern Africa, detailed descriptions of the life of individuals who, from the age of 13 or 14 until their old age, have experienced only forced labour, a salary at a poverty level and mistreatment and insults in their place of work. Some of them have had the sad privilege of dying with their heads held high and their fists raised on the picketing lines of strikes.

158. Of course this state of affairs profits only the white capitalist businessmen and the white workers to whom certain professions are reserved and who find it normal that that should be the situation. It is therefore not surprising to note that the social immobility of the black man has become for the profit-takers a political objective in itself, as is evidenced by their refusal to recognize the right to strike, the right to have trade unions and the right to be promoted to specialized and managerial posts. Nor is it surprising to note that even the education offered to these coloured persons is conceived in terms of keeping them in a state of non-citizenry.

159. In the course of the debates in the Fourth Committee on the activities of foreign interests, certain delegations put forward the idea that foreign investments—particularly in the context of southern Africa—cannot be harmful to the Africans and that, while there is no good reason to encourage them, they should certainly not be discouraged. It was also pointed out that these investments, which were considered good for the independent countries of Africa, could not be bad for the colonial territories.

160. We respect this line of reasoning, but we should like to point out that it takes account of all the factors except the most important. In the independent countries of Africa, development laws—and therefore investments—are conceived so that they may benefit the African man whose socio-economic well-being is the end purpose of any action. That is not the case with regard to the black people of southern Africa.

161. In other words and in the present context of this region, foreign investments cannot benefit directly any other person than those who carry out the investments and the racist governments that derive additional resources from these investments to strengthen their grip on the countries. At the very most, these investments serve to create low-level jobs which are reserved for the blacks. The Marxists would say that these were so many blacks which were falling under

<sup>13</sup> This statement was made at the 2059th meeting of the Fourth Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form. Quoted in English by the speaker.

direct capitalist exploitation. This analysis, although it is very seductive, would be sterile if we did not draw the political conclusion inherent in it: we must change the rules of the game in these countries; the situation must change in a revolutionary and radical way.

162. Indirectly it was said that economic development would create such a shortage of skilled labour that the rules of *apartheid* would have to be relaxed. That is a specious argument which implies that in their own countries Africans should wait for the crumbs. In other words, that additional jobs, in the best of cases, would never be provided in sufficient number to absorb all available talent. This argument implies above all—and this is a serious admission—that in these countries there is no intention yet of working out an employment policy for the Africans and for the benefit of their social advancement. At most, such an argument means that the economy of these countries is not the concern of the Africans and that they should wait for the foam to flow over the glass before it is their turn to drink.

163. Such an attitude is hardly different from that of the white colonialists of southern Africa who have built up a foreign-based economy without taking into account the social progress and well-being of the black man who is only good enough to be used and exploited in the process of production. Let us remember Eduardo Mondlane, a man we all respected and who wrote: "We had to work on the tea but we did not know what it tasted like. Tea never came to our homes."<sup>14</sup> He also wrote: "The time of cotton growing was a time of great poverty".<sup>15</sup> How can one plant cotton and then derive a great deal of poverty from it? The reason is that not only is the cotton bought at a very low price but that, above all, a man is not allowed to plant anything but cotton on his own land, and in any event cannot grow foodstuffs that he needs. By multiplying these examples the black Africans can say: we mine the gold and the diamonds but we never had the pleasure of admiring them for ourselves. These examples could be multiplied many times over and it would be difficult to imagine the despair of our brothers in the face of the ruthless exploitation of the resources of their sub-soil. These are the paradoxes of these foreign-based economies. These economies, I repeat, are not made for the Africans and, instead of profiting from them, the Africans suffer from the impact of them.

164. In dealing with foreign economic interests, the documentation provided by the Secretariat and the Special Committee gives a description which enables one to have an idea of their overwhelming preponderance. We would hasten here to reaffirm our deep solidarity with all delegations that have made statements on the negative aspects of the activities of these multinational corporations in the present situation as it obtains in southern Africa.

165. We were surprised to see these same corporations, which are sensitive to considerations of "political risk" in the independent countries of Africa or of other conti-

nents, continue to channel a considerable flow of investments into these countries of illusions. Knowing something of the psychology of these investors, we believe that we can state that, as soon as they have understood that the racist and minority régimes of southern Africa are in the process of vacillating, not only will these investors no longer put their money there but they will try to withdraw the investments already made.

166. Of course one asks why this moment of decision has not yet dawned. We ask ourselves, of course, why the Governments of the capitalist countries—which in the last analysis are responsible for these investments—have not yet come to the point where they find themselves compelled to choose between the sincere friendship of the African countries and the short-term interests of certain investors greedy for exorbitant profits.

167. We cannot know the answers to these questions unless we ask ourselves another question, namely, has the United Nations so far provided an adequate answer to the challenge of the racist and colonialist minorities of southern Africa? The answer to this question is, unfortunately, mostly negative. Our reply—the reply of the United Nations—remains inadequate because we give the impression of lacking determination in our decisions and in our resolutions. That is proved in reverse terms by the attitude of the very persons that we want to bring to reason.

168. Our response is inadequate because we have underestimated our persuasive powers and have not counted on the bad faith of those who are across the table from us. Our response will continue to be inadequate as long as we have not succeeded in translating into action and reality the generous principles of the Charter which we have all accepted. Our response is inadequate as long as we are powerless to obtain strict compliance with the sanctions imposed against the Ian Smith régime, and just as long as certain Powers systematically refuse to heed our resolutions.

169. That is a situation as serious as it is sad.

170. It cannot be otherwise, indeed, as long as we are content to use euphemisms and to declare that the situation in southern Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Peace does not exist in that region, just as justice and security do not exist there for the blacks. Peace will not exist there as long as there remains within the spirit of a single black man the drama of his own liberation vis-à-vis the oppression of whites. Peace will not exist there as long as prisons exist where people torture and stifle nationalist leaders. Peace will not exist there as long as the blacks have no possibility of enjoying fully the fruits of their labours.

171. The response of our Organization in the face of the challenge of the South Africans will remain inadequate as long as certain of those among us here fear words and do not want to say that the national liberation movements can use the "feeble" means at their disposal to try to reconquer their rights. This response will remain inadequate so long as our Organization hesitates frankly to side with the liberation movements, following the example of the World

<sup>14</sup> See Eduardo Mondlane, *The Struggle for Mozambique* (Harmondsworth, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., n.d.), p. 97.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

Council of Churches. In any event our reply will remain inadequate so long as we devote ridiculous resources to the questions of decolonization and *apartheid*. The secretariat department concerned has available to it a sum less than \$7 million for 28 million persons still living under the colonial yoke. That is barely 25 cents a year for the liberation of each one of those people.

172. We have heard it said that the African group of States is weakening the United Nations by the extremism and intransigence of its demands. We have heard it said that, because of the "automatic majority" available to us, we have rendered the diplomatic game of the United Nations less interesting for certain Powers. Those are serious affirmations, and we should like to repudiate them in energetic terms. First of all, we are not the first countries or groups of countries that have been accused of trying to use the United Nations for partisan purposes. Other Powers have done so, and in this connexion we need only remind ourselves of the Korea adventure. In the matter before us, the motives of our Group are clear and precise. So long as the illegal authorities of Pretoria, Lisbon and Salisbury continue to block the situation, it is our duty to exert firm and continuing pressure on world public opinion and other Governments. This attitude may be expressed in a manner displeasing to certain persons, but we have no choice, and people would not be well advised to accuse us of trying to kill the United Nations, at the very time when we are showing by our gestures that we need the Organization.

173. Our major concern is nothing other than to restore the credibility of the United Nations, which we know has been seriously damaged. The situation in southern Africa offers it an occasion to do so, if it chooses to demonstrate more determination than hesitation. The African peoples and other peace-loving and justice-loving peoples will only be grateful to the Organization for this.

174. Mr. TAYLOR-KAMARA (Sierra Leone): I should like, on behalf of the Sierra Leone delegation, to congratulate the Chairman and members of the Special Committee for the very valuable work they have done during the course of the year. I should equally like to thank and congratulate the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, Mr. Garvalov, for his very comprehensive report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in document A/9023/Rev.1.

175. We are happy to note that once again the Special Committee this year had its full complement of 24 members. It is especially gratifying to note that Australia, one of the administering Powers which has been often commended for its co-operation with the Special Committee, is now a member of the Committee also.

176. Many speakers before me have mentioned the fact that the process of decolonization, especially in the 1960s, has been painfully slow.

177. In the Portuguese Territories, Portugal, the administering Power, continues to be as intransigent as ever. It has refused to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions and even Security Council resolutions asking it to

enter into negotiations with the representatives of the peoples of the Territories with a view to putting an end to the armed struggle that exists in the Territories under its domination and to allow the people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. Instead of heeding these resolutions calling for negotiations with the representatives of the people, Portugal has introduced into the Territories constitutional changes intended not to lead to the exercise of self-determination and independence but to perpetuate Portuguese colonial domination.

178. It has also intensified armed repression of the people in the Territories, and this year especially the confirmed report of massacres was brought to world attention. We commend the Special Committee for the way the Wiriyamu massacre report [A/9023/Rev.1, Chap. IX, pp. 131-134] was handled and we endorse the Special Committee's consensus [A/AC.109/429] on the matter. It is a matter of regret that, even before the General Assembly could pronounce itself on a Fourth Committee draft resolution [A/C.4/L.1035] calling for an international investigation into these atrocities, Portugal should reject that draft resolution outright, arguing that this would be tantamount to interference in its internal affairs. We firmly believe that as long as those Territories fall under Article 73 e, which makes Portugal responsible to the United Nations for those Territories, the United Nations has every right to institute an inquiry into any report of atrocities against people in dependent Territories by the Administering Authorities.

179. Portugal has continued to receive from its allies arms and other military assistance within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and bilaterally, in spite of General Assembly resolutions asking them to cease from rendering any assistance which would enable Portugal to prosecute its colonial wars in the Territories. In addition to military assistance to Portugal there are also a very large number of foreign economic and other interests which have directly or indirectly assisted Portugal in its colonial wars and have obstructed the realization of the legitimate aspirations of the peoples to freedom and independence.

180. In Rhodesia, after the overwhelming rejection by the people of Zimbabwe of the settlement proposals, the Smith régime has embarked on the enactment of legislative and other measures aimed at coercing the people into accepting the proposals. There has been the enforcement of collective punishment and the creation of so-called "tribal trust" homelands which are a replica of "Bantustans", thereby creating *apartheid* conditions in the Territory. Conditions have greatly deteriorated in the Territory, so that the national liberation movements in Zimbabwe have now entered into open conflict with the illegal racist régime.

181. Regrettably, the United Kingdom Government, as the administering Power, has continued in its failure to take effective measures to terminate the Smith régime and to discharge its primary responsibility as an administering Power by enabling the people of Zimbabwe to exercise freely their right to self-determination and independence. The Government of Portugal and South Africa continue their collaboration with the racist illegal régime, with South African troops actively involved in crushing the members of

the liberation movements and other members of the population. Sanctions against Rhodesia have continued to be ineffective because certain Governments, including some permanent members of the Security Council, have continued to violate them.

182. The situation in Namibia continues to be one of profound concern, as it has become extremely dangerous as a result of South Africa's adamant refusal to live up to its international responsibilities towards Namibia and its increasing resort to coercion and oppression. The Government of South Africa, by its continued defiance of United Nations resolutions and by obstructing the efforts of the United Nations to discharge its responsibility to the Territory and its people, has created a situation which seriously undermines the authority of the United Nations. The situation in the Territory has been further worsened by South Africa's extension over the Territory of its criminal policies of *apartheid*, including the creation of so-called "self-governing homelands", or "Bantustans", aimed at destroying the national unity and territorial integrity of the Territory. The efforts and contacts undertaken by the Secretary-General in accordance with Security Council resolutions have proved a failure and, in our view, ought to be terminated, as we believe that South Africa has used the occasion to trap the Security Council into granting some kind of legitimacy to its illegal occupation of Namibia and into giving a semblance of approval to its "Bantustan" policies in Namibia. We firmly believe that continued contacts will be detrimental to the people of Namibia.

183. Foreign, economic and other interests have continued, especially in southern Africa, to impede the implementation of the Declaration and also the efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in the area. Many of these activities based in the United Kingdom, the United States, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and South Africa are helping to strengthen the colonial régimes, enabling the non-African minorities to dominate southern Africa. These monopolies have continued to be guided mainly by their own interests, manipulating and developing only those sectors of the economy which would benefit themselves, thus reducing the Territories to the role of suppliers of primary commodities.

184. In the smaller Territories, where there is little or no scope for mineral exploitation or agriculture, the development of land for tourism is in the hands of foreigners. The administering Powers have introduced tax relaxation schemes which have tended to encourage an intensification of foreign involvement in the economy of these Territories, making the prospect of self-determination and independence more remote.

185. In spite of the dismal figure we have painted in taking a brief survey of the colonial situation, there have been some positive developments over the last few years in the field of decolonization. These developments, we believe, have formed the basis for broader and far-reaching action.

186. The General Assembly, having repeatedly reaffirmed the inherent right of colonial peoples to struggle by all necessary means at their disposal against colonial Powers which suppress their aspiration for freedom and independence, finally recognized the legitimacy of armed struggle.

This in turn has led to the recognition by the General Assembly [*resolution 2918 (XXVII)*] of the liberation movements as the authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the peoples of their Territories. A further development was the recommendation by the Fourth Committee to grant observer status to the liberation movements during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.<sup>16</sup> By that same resolution, the General Assembly requested that all Governments, specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system and the United Nations bodies concerned should, when dealing with matters pertaining to Territories, ensure the representation of the liberation movements concerned in an appropriate capacity.

187. The recognition of the liberation struggle inspired the now famous Oslo Conference, which was a result of General Assembly resolution 2910 (XXVII) requesting the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, "to organize at Oslo in 1973 an International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa . . .". At that Conference, members of the liberation movements took an active part, acting as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of the Conference. The outcome of that Conference is the now famous Oslo Programme of Action [*A/9061, para. 49*] many aspects of which have been adopted by the Special Committee, the United Nations Council on Namibia, the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, and the United Nations.

188. Again, during the twenty-seventh session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2911 (XXVII) entitled "Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of Southern Africa and Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights". Paragraph 2 of that resolution recommended:

" . . . on the occasion of the Week, meetings should be held, appropriate materials should be published in the press and broadcast on radio and television and public campaigns should be conducted with a view to obtaining contributions to the Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and *Apartheid* established by the Organization of African Unity".

We note with gratification the success of the celebration of the Week of Solidarity beginning on 25 May, African Liberation Day. We are also pleased to note the active participation by organizations all over the world.

189. The Special Committee has also been active during the past year, especially in contacting not only the specialized agencies but non-governmental organizations as well. Such contacts, we note, have revealed the existence of widespread concern with, and interest in, problems of colonialism among leaders of a broad range of international and national non-governmental organizations. Their positive attitudes towards, and indeed their primary enthusiasm for, United Nations actions and objectives in the fields of decolonization and human rights leads one to conclude that the possibilities for enlisting their active support for the work of the Special Committee are far greater than had been hitherto established.

<sup>16</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Fourth Committee, 1975th meeting*.



190. It will be pertinent here to mention that activities of non-governmental organizations, such as those of the Angola Committee of Amsterdam, have led to a final boycott of Angolan coffee by the Netherlands. Similar activities are taking effect in Australia, in Canada and even in the United States, with a view to enlisting public opinion about the evils of investments in the colonial Territories. Church groups, some of which are shareholders, have also been active in trying to redress the appalling working conditions in the colonial Territories.

191. The support, both moral and material, given to the national liberation movements by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, has been responsible to a great extent for the impressive progress they are making towards freedom and national independence. We are particularly pleased by the progressive steps taken by PAIGC, first in the establishment of a National Assembly and then in a proclamation of independence after the democratic process of general elections. The recognition of the State of Guinea-Bissau by more than 60 States and the demonstrations in certain Western cities for recognition by their Governments of the new State is a testimony of the international community response to the United Nations appeal for support of the liberation movements.

192. One of the aims of the Special Committee has been to isolate the Governments of Portugal and South Africa. In this connexion, the General Assembly has, on the recommendation of the Special Committee, made repeated appeals to specialized agencies, *inter alia*, to discontinue all collaboration with the Governments of South Africa and Portugal until they renounce their policies of racial discrimination and colonial oppression. The International Civil Aviation Organization has succeeded in excluding Portugal from regional meetings of that body. South Africa had been excluded sometime earlier. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] and the International Labour Organisation [ILO] have also taken similar steps and have gone further in admitting the liberation movements as participants in their deliberations. This, we believe, is a move in the right direction and we hope that Member States will continue to exert pressure in other specialized agencies and international organizations with a view to excluding and thereby isolating these two States by all means at their disposal.

193. Another development in the field of decolonization has been the emergence of liberated areas. Here we have been made aware of reconstruction work being carried out by the liberation movements, by the members of the liberation movements themselves, and reports of the Special Mission of the Special Committee and other foreign visitors. We are pleased with the massive material support being given by States Members of the United Nations and by certain specialized agencies, especially UNESCO and ILO.

194. Another important aspect of these developments is the question of publicity. This year in particular the close

co-operation between the Special Committee and non-governmental organizations has gone a long way to make them aware not only of the evils of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid* but also the work of the liberation movements and the existing conditions of the liberated areas. The Office of Public Information of the United Nations, the Council for Namibia and the unit on *apartheid* must be commended on their efforts to bring the public in close contact with the work of decolonization. We are also grateful to the *Guardian* for the publicity it gave to the terrible working conditions in southern Africa; we know the far-reaching repercussions those articles have raised. Equally we are grateful to *The Times* of London of 10 July 1973 for the publicity it gave to the Mozambique massacres which have become a household topic of discussion throughout the Western world. We can only hope that other leading newspapers of the West, especially, would be bold enough to shed the light on the evils of colonialism.

195. During this session every delegation has welcomed the new independent State of the Bahamas which last year was a colonial Territory. We congratulate the United Kingdom Government for fulfilling its duties as administering Power by finally leading the people to independence.

196. We are looking forward also to attainment soon, of internal self-government of Papua New Guinea and the Island of Niue. We should like to pay tribute to the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, respectively, as administering Powers. We appreciate their co-operation with the Committee and hope that other administering Powers will emulate such fine examples.

197. In spite of the difficulties encountered in the field of decolonization, including the contravention of United Nations resolutions by Member States of the United Nations, in spite of the intensification of investments which in the colonial Territories have led to the intensification of repression, we believe that decolonization has taken an irreversible course. We have mobilized world public opinion by involving the specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations; there is a general wide support both for the liberation movements and for the liberated areas. It is incumbent on each Member of the United Nations to keep this trend alive not only by positive votes on resolutions on decolonization but by adherence to the provisions of United Nations resolutions and by encouraging the full and unreserved participation of governmental and non-governmental organizations with the United Nations in the field of decolonization in the work and struggle of the liberation movements and the specialized agencies.

198. In conclusion, my delegation endorses the recommendations of the Special Committee in its report. My delegation will fully support any appropriate resolution dealing with this particular agenda item.

*The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.*