



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 87: Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued) . . . | 1187 |

President: Mr. Frederick H. BOLAND (Ireland).

AGENDA ITEM 87

Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial
countries and peoples (continued)

1. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian) The debate on the question of the immediate and complete abolition of the colonial system which has been proceeding in the plenary General Assembly has shown how timely it was to place this question before the General Assembly, how essential it is that the United Nations should take action at once to ensure the freedom and independence of the countries and peoples which are still under colonial rule. Thanks to the initiative taken by Mr. Khrushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, in submitting the "Declaration on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples" to the General Assembly for consideration at its fifteenth session [869th meeting], the question of the abolition of the colonial order, of the immediate liberation of the colonial peoples, is being exhaustively discussed for the first time in the history of the United Nations, in the Organization's highest forum—the plenary General Assembly.

2. It has to be said that the colonial Powers have not entered into this discussion willingly, but have been compelled to agree to it by the mighty pressure of the anti-colonialist forces. For as everyone well knows, the colonial Powers have in the past, throughout the existence of the United Nations, always opposed any discussion of questions relating to the political development of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. Such Powers as Spain and Portugal have resorted to a variety of legal fictions to try to pretend that they have no colonies at all, and that there is absolutely no such thing as Spanish and Portuguese colonialism. The General Assembly's decision to consider the question of the abolition of the colonial system is in itself alone an important victory for the countries which are fighting against colonial rule.

3. The Soviet delegation expresses its gratitude to those representatives who have voiced appreciation of the step taken by the Soviet Government, and by Mr. Khrushchev in person, in raising the question of the abolition of colonialism before the General Assembly, and of the Soviet Union's consistent and energetic struggle, since 1917, for the emancipation of all colonial and dependent peoples. Life itself now

demands the full discussion and correct solution of this burning problem.

4. Some representatives of the colonial Powers, including the representative of the United Kingdom, have tried to assert that in calling upon the General Assembly to adopt the "Declaration on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples" the Soviet Union is pursuing "ulterior motives"; that the Soviet delegation is trying to exploit the debate on this question for its own private purposes, to fan the flames of the "cold war". But as all delegations have been able to see for themselves, it is actually the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, Belgium and other colonial Powers who have attempted to impose "cold war" polemics on the General Assembly and to divert its attention from any serious and practical discussion of the supremely important question of the immediate and complete abolition of the colonial system.

5. Of course, the purposes of the Soviet delegation are diametrically opposed to those of the delegations of the colonial Powers. In submitting its "Declaration on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples" to the General Assembly for its consideration, the Government of the Soviet Union is pursuing a single goal: that of putting an immediate and final end to colonialism, of bringing freedom and independence to all colonies. It is precisely for that reason that the Soviet Union is interested in a serious discussion of this question, and in the adoption of effective measures for its solution. The delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Portugal and the other colonial Powers, on the other hand, are trying to preserve the colonial system. Because of that, they would like to embroil the question in a wrangle conducted in the worst spirit of the "cold war". Naturally, it would be most convenient for the colonialists if they could succeed in disrupting any practical discussion and in preventing the General Assembly from adopting any measures on this question. That is why they have tried to inflame the atmosphere here by injecting "cold war" elements into our debate

[The speaker was interrupted by shouts from the public gallery]

6. That shows very well how serious debate on the question of colonialism is organized in the United States. It offers even better evidence of the fact that the United Nations cannot work tranquilly in United States territory, where patently provocative outbursts are organized during the General Assembly's discussions.

7. As the debate on the colonial system has shown, these manoeuvres by the colonialists have been a fiasco. The colonialists have not been successful in diverting the attention of the General Assembly from the essential problem of colonialism and in leading

it off into a discussion of matters having nothing to do with that problem. The overwhelming majority of those attending this session, expressing the demands of history in its objective advance, have supported the proposal for the abolition of colonialism at the earliest possible date, regarding the existence of the colonial system as a disgrace to humanity.

8. In the course of the discussion the representatives of the socialist countries, and of many African and Asian States, have voiced well-founded and convincing criticism of the colonial order, have cited actual examples and facts to show not only that the colonial system is a brake on the economic, social and cultural development of the colonial peoples, but that it crushes, tramples underfoot and oppresses millions of people, robs them of human dignity, humiliates them and inflicts countless sufferings upon the colonial peoples.

9. So great is the pressure of the anti-colonialist forces at this session of the General Assembly that even the colonialists do not dare to defend the colonial system openly. They try to do so in veiled form, and resort to tricks and manoeuvres of all kinds in order to justify the preservation of their colonial rule, to justify their attempts to keep the colonial countries in dependence for as much longer as possible. One of the so-called arguments in defence of colonialism advanced by the colonialists and their sympathizers is that colonialism has brought the peoples under their rule modern civilization, has enriched their culture, has encouraged the diffusion of the "creative genius" of man, as one speaker put it. Naturally, the purpose of such sophistries is to distort the historical reality and the causes of colonial usurpation and of the enslavement of entire peoples by foreign Powers. Those who indulge in arguments of this kind try to do everything possible to whitewash the history of colonialism and to pretend that the conscience of the colonialists is clear; that they have brought the colonies of the present and the past no sufferings but only benefits.

10. But the colonialists are well aware that the seizure of vast territories in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the enslavement of their indigenous peoples were carried out for purposes of profit and for the plunder of the natural and human resources of the countries concerned. The history of colonial usurpation in various parts of the world, and particularly in Africa, shows what injustices and what crimes have been committed by the colonialists against the peoples of those continents. As long ago as the first half of the nineteenth century, that was well described by William Howitt in his book Colonization and Christianity. Let me cite one sentence from that book:

"The barbarities and desperate outrages of the so-called Christian race, throughout every region of the world, and upon every people that they have been able to subdue, are not to be paralleled by those of any other race, however fierce, however untaught, and however reckless of mercy and of shame, in any age of the earth."^{1/}

That was written even in the nineteenth century.

11. The defenders of colonialism usually deny that any African civilization existed before the arrival of Europeans in Africa. Quite often it is asserted that even civilizations such as those of Ethiopia and Egypt

were founded and developed by members of the white race. All these theories have one aim and one alone: to justify colonialism. Their purpose is to convince Africans that they have never possessed any developed civilization; that they have given mankind nothing of value; that culture and civilization came to them only with colonization. This denial of the cultural past of the African peoples serves as an ideological weapon, used, firstly, to magnify the non-existent "services" rendered by the colonialists in spreading civilization on the African continent, and secondly, to induce the African peoples to renounce any national aspirations and to bend their backs submissively to the burden of colonialism, either in its old or, so to speak, "classical" form or in new camouflaged forms.

12. But these theories are false from beginning to end, and have nothing to do with the historical truth. In recent years a great deal of objective historical research has been published by scholars of various countries, research showing that long before the appearance of the first white man on the African continent the peoples of Africa lived an independent life, created States of their own, developed their native cultures, carried on trade. This research of course includes Basil Davidson's book Old Africa Rediscovered, published in London in 1960. The author, using the most recent archaeological data, throws considerable light on the history of a number of areas of Africa which have hitherto been little studied. For example, he describes the civilization of Kush, of the famous cities of Napata and Meroe, from which, as long ago as eight centuries before our era, there were diffused new tools and new methods of working metals. He tells us of the ancient States of the Western Sudan, Mali, Ghana and Songhay, which at their peak were the equals of many States of medieval Europe. The gold of these States did much to promote the development of the economy of Europe before the inauguration of the great geographical discoveries. He describes in detail the ancient city-States of the east coast of Africa, Kilwa, Gedi, Mogadiscio and others, which according to the reports of the Portuguese, yielded nothing to the most prosperous cities of Europe. Another author, Sheikh Anta Diop, points out in his book Nations nègres et culture^{2/} that even in the fifteenth century the African States were, in political and social organization, the equals, and in some cases indeed the superiors, of the European States.

13. The martyrdom of the peoples of the African continent began with the arrival of the European slave-traders. The first ship laden with Africans captured for sale into slavery arrived in Lisbon, the capital of Portugal, in 1441. For nearly four centuries after that, millions of slaves were exported from Africa, and vast numbers fell in inter-tribal wars caused by the slave-traders and in their armed raids. That was an incalculable disaster. The African continent was depopulated. Its economy and culture decayed. Dr. Du Bois, the well-known historian, whose great-grandfather was captured by slave-traders on the Guinea coast of Africa and carried off to America, writes:

"It would be no exaggeration to say that the slave trade cost Negro Africa 100 million souls. Yet today there are still people who seek the reasons for the stagnation in the development of Africa's culture!"

^{1/} William Howitt, Colonization and Christianity, London, 1838, p.9.

^{2/} Paris, éditions Brésence africaine, 1955.

14. The nineteenth century was the era of the territorial partition of Africa by the European colonial Powers, the era of colonial wars and the military seizure of African lands. So far as they were able, the Africans offered stubborn resistance to the European invaders. The colonialists met this resistance by sending entire armies to Africa, armies supplied with the best technical equipment of their day. For several decades, the earth of Africa was plentifully watered with the blood of its peoples. Hundreds of thousands of Africans defending their freedom fell in unequal struggle.

15. An example of the heroic resistance offered by the peoples of Africa to the foreign invaders, one which at the same time refutes the colonialists' assertions that the penetration of the African continent by the Europeans was a peaceful process, may be found in the struggle of the Matabele and Mashona peoples, inhabiting the region between the rivers Zambezi and Limpopo, against the seizure of their territory by the British company controlled by Cecil Rhodes. In the eighties of the last century, British colonialists were actively scheming to appropriate Southern African lands rich in gold, diamonds and other minerals, in the territory since named after its conqueror Rhodesia. Operating in that area at the time was one of the most powerful British groups of capitalists, represented by Rhodes, and in 1888 this group forced Lobengula, the king of the Matabele, to accept an agreement of far-reaching intention. In return for a small rent, the British won the exclusive right to exploit all minerals in the territories subject to the Matabele. That agreement was an outright fraud on the Africans, since their king, like his retainers illiterate, was entirely ignorant of the real significance of the document to which he had set his mark by way of signature. Nevertheless, the British Government used the agreement of 1888 to justify the outright annexation of the lands of the Matabele and Mashona peoples. In the wars which followed, the Maxim guns used by the British turned every battle between the colonialists and the Africans into a massacre. Rhodes himself estimated the Matabele losses at 3,000. The beaten Matabele were forced to surrender; their territory became a colony, and was given the name of Southern Rhodesia.

16. In the new British possessions, Africans were brutally exploited. All their best lands were expropriated. By decision of a land commission made up of representatives of the British Government and of Rhodes' company, the Africans were driven into reservations. Some idea of the nature of these reservations may be gained from the fact that they consisted partly of areas of endemic sleeping-sickness and partly of areas of drought.

17. Those are a few historic facts. For more than sixty years now, colonial oppression has persisted in this country, named after the man who drenched it in blood. Events during this period show that the successors of Cecil Rhodes are carrying on his black business. For what is the situation in Southern Rhodesia sixty years after? How has the United Kingdom promoted the development of this country in the "interests" of its indigenous, African population? Clearly, that can best be told us by the inhabitants of the territory themselves, and for that reason I venture to cite a few extracts from a brochure on Southern Rhodesia published in London in 1960 by the National

Democratic Party of Southern Rhodesia. According to this brochure:

"Thanks to the various methods devised to prevent Africans from taking part in elections, the Parliament of Southern Rhodesia has since 1923 enjoyed pure white representation.

"As a result, 1923 saw the initiation of a series of despotic and discriminatory statutes directed against Africans. There are, at present 70,000 European voters and less than 2,000 African voters.

"Since 1949, 82,500 African families have been resettled outside the so-called native lands, and 21,500 have been moved from the Zambezi River basin to special areas. It is anticipated that by 1962 all Africans living in native lands or in localities settled by Europeans will have been moved to these areas."

"Under the Masters and Servants Act, the African worker is entirely dependent on and at the mercy of the European. He is prohibited by law from leaving his work if he considers that his employer is treating him badly or sweating him. If he strikes, he is prosecuted like a criminal.

"Totalitarianism, oppression and intimidation have taken the place of the freedom and democracy which are supposed to be the traditional characteristics of the British people.

"The colour bar remains just what it was before 1953. Everywhere there are notices 'Natives Only', 'Europeans Only'. Africans are still not allowed to enter cinemas, shops and hotels. Africans are still discriminated against just as badly as they were ten years ago."

Those are all quotations from this brochure. This, I may say, is not Soviet propaganda—the colonialists' favourite catchword. It is the first-hand report of a political party of Southern Rhodesia.

18. Life itself confirms the truth of Karl Marx's comment that the profound hypocrisy characteristic of bourgeois civilization is revealed not in the metropolitan countries, where that civilization assumes respectable forms, but in the colonies, where it operates without the slightest concealment. The facts, both of history and of the present day, lend particular relief to the hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness of those who attempt to whitewash colonialism, to represent it as virtually the noblest enterprise of civilized Christian men—an enterprise which for some unknown reason is now coming to a close at the zenith of its glory, to quote some representatives at this session.

19. Mr. Ormsby-Gore, in his efforts to present United Kingdom policy in whatever favourable light he can, has tried to make out that for the last century, at least, Britain's only concern has been either to grant its colonies independence or to intensify its efforts, sparing no pains, to prepare them for independence. But the historical truth is that the colonialists themselves never voluntarily grant the peoples of the colonies independence, and have never done so. Did not the peoples of India, Burma, Pakistan, Ghana and other now independent States have to win their independence in stubborn struggle with the colonialists; were not the leaders of the national liberation movements in those countries incarcerated for long years in British jails; and were they not also subjected to other forms of repression? Did not the French colonialists crush the struggle for emancipation of the

peoples of Madagascar and Cameroun by the most savage and merciless means, just as they are at present trying to drown in blood the selflessly courageous struggle of the Algerian people for their independence and liberty?

20. The colonialists are compelled to agree to the grant of independence to their colonies only when the national liberation movement acquires such strength that the colonial Powers are unable to cope with it. For that reason, the principal factors in the liberation of the colonies are the struggle of the oppressed peoples themselves for their national freedom and independence and the support given to that righteous struggle by all progressive forces.

36.0-
-2:02.0

21. When one listens to statements such as that made by Mr. Ormsby-Gore, one can only wonder. For the entire history of Britain's colonial rule in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world abounds in examples of colonial wars and brutal violence against the indigenous peoples. Has Mr. Ormsby-Gore forgotten that in the last few years alone, British army and police units have exterminated thousands of Africans and cast tens of thousands into prisons and concentration camps in Kenya, Nyasaland, Southern and Northern Rhodesia and other colonies? The world knows that in 1952-1955 numerous Africans of Kenya were savagely beaten and shot down. Using as their pretext for crushing the national liberation movement in Kenya the myth of the terrorist activities practised by a secret society known as Mau-Mau—a myth invented by the British settlers—the British colonialists tried to make an end of the patriotic forces of Kenya once and for all. By 1955, thanks to punitive expeditions, mass round-ups and man-hunts, more than 11,000 indigenous inhabitants had been murdered and 62,000, including 14,000 women and 2,000 children, herded into concentration camps. Many inhabitants, entire tribes, were transferred to barren reservations in remote areas. The African political parties in Kenya, and then in Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia, were declared "subversive" organizations and banned.

22. The colonialists regard any struggle for freedom and independence as subversive, while at the same time hypocritically declaring that they are helping forward the emancipation of the colonies. One must really have lost all sense of shame to take up such an attitude in the General Assembly, where there are so many men who have felt in their own persons or seen with their own eyes the crimes of the colonialists, the oppression and repression, the prisons and concentration camps in their countries.

23. The tyranny of the British colonialists is not confined to the territory of the African continent. In other parts of the world, too, there are still remnants of the once spacious British Empire where independence movements are crushed by means of outright violence. One of these is British Guiana, in South America. In a petition dated 11 November 1960 addressed to the United Nations General Assembly, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, leader of the People's Progressive Party of British Guiana, cites numbers of facts illustrating the British colonialists' oppression of the local people. This document has been circulated in the United Nations. Refuting the colonialists' professions of their "lofty, civilizing mission", Cheddi Jagan writes:

"... the Guianese are tired and sick of being told that the metropolitan countries hold colonies in trust for their colonial subjects; that the policy of such countries is to lead step by step all colonies to the goal of independence. Bribery and corruption and intrigue and deception, and the constant threat of the use of force are the order of the day. Are the Guianese to believe that these are the means to lead them to freedom and democracy and to the building of a New Nation?"

From its foundation in 1950, the People's Progressive Party led by Jagan has tirelessly agitated for the grant of independence to British Guiana. In 1953, the Party won eighteen out of twenty-four seats in the elections to the House of Assembly; but after a few months they were removed by force. As the petition states, battleships and British soldiers with the threat of bullets replaced the ballot box. For four years, from 1953 to 1957, the people of Guiana suffered under an authoritarian police régime. At the 1957 elections, the British authorities gerrymandered the electoral constituencies in order to ensure the defeat of the Party defending the interests of the people of Guiana. Yet even then the People's Progressive Party won a victory, gaining nine out of fourteen seats. Jagan, the leader of the Party, goes on in his petition to say that although his Party heads the present Government of British Guiana, his hands are fettered in colonialist shackles. He ends the petition with an appeal to the United Nations General Assembly to help the people of British Guiana: "British Guiana needs your help to free itself from the yoke of foreign rule, because like peace, political independence and freedom are also indivisible."

24. The colonialists also use other methods, whose goal, however, remains identical—to preserve their rule in the colonies, and prevent any transfer of real power to the indigenous peoples of the colonies. This policy is carried on under the false slogans of "racial harmony" and "peace and tranquillity" in the colonies. The representative of the United Kingdom has developed this argument here at some length. But let us see what this policy of "racial harmony" amounts to in actual fact.

25. So far as concerns East Africa, which Mr. Ormsby-Gore mentioned here, the obvious aim of the United Kingdom Government's policy is to create States or Unions on the lines of the Union of South Africa, that is, ostensibly independent States in which all power and all positions of control are in the hands of the European settlers who constitute a quite insignificant minority of the population. Instead of satisfying the just demands of the peoples of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and of Nyasaland, the British colonialists have in defiance of the wishes of these peoples set up the so-called Central African Federation, and have extended the power of the upper stratum of white settlers in Southern Rhodesia to cover Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia. By this means they hope to carry through their plan to establish in the centre of Africa yet another racist State on the lines of the Union of South Africa. The establishment of the so-called administrative union between the Trust Territory of Tanganyika and the colonies of Kenya and Uganda is intended to serve similar aims. The United Kingdom Government is doing everything in its power to crush and beat down the national liberation movements in Kenya and Uganda, to consolidate the positions of the

of being colonies in the policy of all colonies corruption tant threat ay. Are the ans to lead the building

Progressive ted for the In 1953, the seats in the after a few the petition th the threat four years, ffered under 57 elections, he electoral defeat of the e of Guiana. Party won a s. Jagan, the ition to say Government in colonialist appeal to the lp the people is your help rule, because freedom are

ethods, whose eserve their nsfer of real onies. This ns of "racial the colonies. dom has de- th. But let us " amounts to

frica, which vious aim of y is to create nion of South ates in which e in the hands quite insigni- l of satisfying ern and South- sh colonialists e peoples set tion, and have tum of white Nyasaland and hope to carry ntre of Africa of the Union of so-called ad- Territory of and Uganda is nited Kingdom ower to crush ovements in ositions of the

white settlers in Kenya and then to attach Tanganyika and Uganda to Kenya in order to place them in a position of subjection within the union thus created. In its territories in East Africa, the United Kingdom has carried out measures by means of which all political power and control has been placed in the hands of the European minority. Thus the "racial harmony" which the colonialists are attempting to ensure in Africa, where the population is 97 per cent African and only 3 per cent non-African, is one under which the 3 per cent of Europeans and other outsiders are to dominate the 97 per cent of Africans, within the framework of so-called independent States.

26. The European colonial settlers seize control not only over political life in the colonies, but also over their economies. With the help of the colonial authorities, vast areas of land belonging to the indigenous population are alienated to European colonists and foreign companies. We all know the story—a sad one for the Africans—of the "White Highlands" of Kenya, where the finest land in the country, the most fertile and the best-suited to agriculture, was transferred to the exclusive monopoly ownership of Europeans. In Southern Rhodesia, the centre of the colonialist Central African Federation, that process has gone so far that the Europeans, who make up no more than 9 per cent of the country's population, now own more than half of the total land area, while the Africans, or 90 per cent of the population, are crowded into 22 per cent of the territory's area. And it must be noted that those same Europeans work only 2.5 per cent of the land they have usurped. That is a practical example of how the colonialists "care" for the interests of the indigenous peoples, of how they develop the economies of the colonies in the interests of their peoples. In Tanganyika, the alienation of land belonging to the indigenous population has gone on for many years and has proceeded on such a scale that up to the present more than 2.5 million acres have been taken from the indigenous population and transferred to Europeans. And it must be remembered that, according to the report prepared by a British Royal Commission, the alienated lands are those best suited to crops of various kinds and are located in the areas having the best rainfall and climate.

27. Yet the United Kingdom representative has spoken to us here, in the plenary General Assembly, of the "racial harmony" and "co-operation" that exist in Tanganyika between Europeans and Africans! No wonder people in Africa now say: "When the white man came to us, they had the Bible and we had the land; now, they have the land and we have the Bible." The United Kingdom representative specifically mentioned Tanganyika, in his statement, as an example of a territory where "racial harmony" reigned. But what is the United Kingdom representative so pleased about; and what is it he is extolling under the guise of this celebrated "racial harmony"? The British colonialists have proclaimed this slogan in order to ensure the hegemony of the European minority over the Africans and thereby put off the day for the granting of independence to Tanganyika. At first, the British authorities tried to establish in Tanganyika the principle of so-called "parity of representation" between the three racial groups—Africans, Asians and Europeans. Under this system, Africans and Europeans would have been represented on a basis of "parity" in Tanganyika's legislative and administrative organs, although the country has 9 million Africans and only 20,000 Euro-

peans. The British authorities' attempts to impose the system of "parity representation" on the Africans of Tanganyika met with failure. But Britain did not give up its plans. Under the guise of reform, a system was introduced in this Trust Territory under which the Africans have one representative for every 180,000 inhabitants, whereas the Europeans have one representative for every 2,000 inhabitants. There is equality of rights for you! There you have the "racial harmony" and "equitable race representation" which were defended in such glowing terms by the United Kingdom representative!

28. The Administering Authority is doing everything it can to put off the day of Tanganyika's independence. It is a typical fact that only recently, at the Trusteeship Council's twenty-third session, held in 1959, the representatives of the Administering Authority refused even to entertain the idea of Tanganyika's being granted independence in the near future. They asserted that while Tanganyika would be granted independence as soon as possible, the Territory still had a long way to go before it could attain self-government. The Administering Authority to this day refuses to comply with the demands of the Trust Territory's largest political parties—the Tanganyika African National Union and the Tanganyika African National Congress—for the immediate grant of independence to Tanganyika. In a memorandum submitted to the United Nations Visiting Mission which came to the Trust Territory in 1960, the Tanganyika African National Union declared that:

"Events in Africa, other Trust Territories and the world at large, and within the Territory are such that Tanganyika has to attain independence immediately . . . We strongly believe that most economic and social development can only be accelerated and attained under conditions of political independence."^{3/}

Despite these clear and specific demands of Tanganyika's main political parties for the immediate grant to the Territory of independence, the United Kingdom, as in the past, is trying to put off to some later date what will, for all its efforts, inevitably have to be done; is trying to prolong its rule over Tanganyika until the last possible moment. Speaking at this session of the General Assembly, the United Kingdom representative has kept silence with regard to this paramount and crucial issue for the Trust Territory. Instead of naming a specific date for the proclamation of Tanganyika's independence, he has limited himself to an obscure statement to the effect that the United Kingdom proposes at this session of the General Assembly to submit a proposal for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for Tanganyika after the proclamation of the Trust Territory's independence. No one can be in any doubt that the Trusteeship Agreement will in fact cease to have effect after the proclamation of the Trust Territory's independence. But the whole point is, when will the independence of Tanganyika be proclaimed? We are confident that the people of Tanganyika will win their independence in the very near future despite all the obstacles placed in their path by the Administering Authority.

29. In Tanganyika, as in other colonial Trust Territories, colonialism is leaving behind a grim heritage:

^{3/} Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, twenty-sixth session, Supplement No. 2 (T/1532 and Add.1), Annex II.

an almost complete lack of any manufacturing industry, a highly backward subsistence agriculture, a deficient transport system, disordered finances and a chronic budget deficit, poor public health and an inadequate educational system, a low standard of living among the indigenous population—that is what the Administering Authority is bequeathing the people of Tanganyika after forty years of rule. If we turn to one of the territories under British administration in West Africa, we shall find there again another example of the tragic outcome of many years of colonial oppression.

30. Thus, in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons under British administration, official data indicate that in the southern areas of the country 90 per cent of the population are illiterate. The figure for the northern areas is 96 per cent. This information may be found in the report of the Administering Authority for 1958 (page 298). According to UNESCO figures for 1957, Africa had about 100 million illiterates, representing 80 to 85 per cent of the continent's total population. Only 4.7 per cent of the African population—and in Angola, for example, only 1.4 per cent—were receiving elementary education. These figures are literally an indictment of colonialism, which beneath the mask of trusteeship has for many decades doomed the population of Africa to darkness and illiteracy.

31. All these facts show that the goal of the colonialists has not been the development of the colonies in the interests of their peoples—has not, in particular, been the development of education. The colonialists have deliberately kept the colonial peoples illiterate, and are still doing so; they have barred their access to education and have prevented them from acquiring trained leaders and administrators of their own—and all this with the aim of keeping them in a state of colonial slavery on the pretext that they lack adequate numbers of trained personnel, of qualified and educated people. The same position was taken by the representative of Belgium, in trying to justify to us Belgium's colonial rule over the Congo. But the results of this colonial rule are today making themselves acutely felt in the events at present taking place in the Congo.

32. In the large and populous territories with well-developed national liberation movements, the British colonialists try to do everything possible to put off the day for granting political independence, and to ensure that the European minorities in these countries continue in the future to maintain their positions of dominance. In the small territories, however, they take a different line—that of trying to preserve them as strongholds of colonialism, of merging or "uniting" them with the metropolitan country. That is the general policy followed by all the colonialists. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Portugal are trying at all costs to retain such territories as the Panama Canal, Gibraltar, Singapore, Goa, Macao, West Irian, Belize, the Falkland Islands, the Azores and the Canary Islands, Fernando Po, Rfo Muni, Ifni and so forth as strategic bases and strongpoints for use in crushing the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples and in bringing pressure to bear on neighbouring independent States.

33. It is for this reason that the second point in the Soviet draft declaration [A/4502], which refers to the liquidation of strongholds and strategic bases, is of great importance for the solution of the problem of the abolition of colonialism as a whole.

34. In his statement of 28 November [925th meeting], Mr. Ormsby-Gore, the representative of the United Kingdom, took a position opposed in principle to the existence as independent States of small territories at present under the colonial yoke. He referred in this connexion to territories having a population of under one million. The people of these territories, he felt, should not sacrifice economic and social "progress" in order to "assume responsibility for maintaining the expensive apparatus of a modern independent State". What solicitude for the lot of the small territories! It would seem in order to ask the United Kingdom representative a question on this point—and the United States representative too, since he takes the same position. What is their attitude to the existence as independent States of such countries as Luxembourg, with a population of 300,000, or Iceland, with a population of 164,000? Or do the United Kingdom and United States representatives have two different sets of standards, one for Western countries and another for African and Asian countries at present in a state of colonial dependence?

35. We take a different view. We believe that all colonial peoples ought to be liberated.

36. It was not for nothing, we suspect, that the United Kingdom representative referred in his statement to the twelve principles approved by the Fourth Committee [See A/C.4/L.648 and Add.1] and particularly to that part of them relating to the association or integration of a colony with an independent State. Clearly, the association or integration of the colonies with the metropolitan countries would be most convenient to the colonialists. They would like in this way to retain their position in those territories while at the same time formally complying with certain "principles" by proclaiming, for appearances' sake, that the goal of full self-government or independence for the colonies had already been attained. But there is one not unimportant fact that must be mentioned in this connexion. When the principles to which the United Kingdom representative referred were being discussed, many African and Asian representatives in the Fourth Committee emphasized that the peoples of the colonies must be guaranteed full freedom to express their will by democratic means, without any obstacles or threats. As such a guarantee of the free exercise of the will of the peoples of the colonies, the delegations of Togo and Tunisia proposed, before the Fourth Committee [1043rd meeting], the adoption of a provision entitling the United Nations, whenever it felt that such action was necessary, to exercise supervision over the implementation of the right of the peoples of the colonies to free self-determination. The Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and most of the African and Asian countries supported that proposal. Yet the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other colonial Powers which hypocritically come forward here in the role of supporters of the free self-determination of peoples, opposed this proposal and voted against it in the Fourth Committee.

37. The United Kingdom representative devoted a considerable part of his statement to emphasizing the need of special care for the small territories. Let us see, then, how the colonialists actually care for the small territories and peoples. Let us take as our example, if you will, the tiny dependent territory of Nauru, an island under trusteeship, which has only

some few thousand inhabitants. As you know, trusteeship over this territory is the responsibility of three States—the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand. It may be wondered why trusteeship over so small an island had to be assigned to so powerful a combination of forces. The answer is very simple: virtually the entire island of Nauru consists of phosphates, and for that reason the Governments of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand came to an agreement on the exploitation of these phosphate deposits as far back as 1919. This agreement may with entire justification be called a colonial treaty for the robbery and apportionment of Nauru's natural resources. The agreement fixes the share of each party: the United Kingdom is to receive 42 per cent of the total output, Australia 42 per cent and New Zealand 16 per cent. Provision to this effect may be found in article 14 of the agreement signed on 2 July 1919. But even now that Nauru has formally been brought under the International Trusteeship System, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand are still as in the past despoiling the island of its natural resources and gradually turning it into a barren desert. It has been calculated that Nauru's remaining deposits of phosphates will last for about another thirty to forty years; and its population will then have to abandon their island, since it will no longer provide them with a livelihood. For that reason, the Administering Authority declares—verbally—that it is preparing the population of Nauru for the attainment of the goal of trusteeship, that is, self-government or independence. In fact, however, and by its practical actions, it is simply preparing for the removal of the inhabitants of Nauru from the island so as to prevent them from interfering with the continued looting of its natural resources. In a document submitted to the Trusteeship Council, the Administering Authority has plainly stated that the only real possibility for the Nauruans is to agree to be re-settled as immigrants in some country in the Pacific region. And it is a statement of this kind that the Administering Authority tries to represent as reflecting the freely expressed will of the population of this Trust Territory, as an expression of its care for a small people under its trusteeship.

38. Such is the face of the old type of colonialism—what might be called the "classical" type. But in present-day conditions that is not the only and not the principle form of colonialism. In our day the mightiest colonial State is not enfeebled Britain or France, not decrepit Portugal or backward Spain, but the United States of America, the greatest imperial Power.

39. The United States representative, who for some reason preferred to speak at the very close of this debate, tried in his statement to infuse new life into the cold war themes which the United Kingdom representative had so carefully attempted to insinuate into our discussion. However, the statements of all the speakers who followed him showed that Mr. Wadsworth's efforts were just as unsuccessful as Mr. Ormsby-Gore's. A suitable answer to these two representatives of the two existing variants of national oppression—"classic" colonialism and neo-colonialism—was given by many speakers. Even the representatives of countries such as Honduras and Panama were obliged to acknowledge publicly that a number of territories seized or, as it is euphemistically termed, leased by the United States are, in fact,

part of those countries. The statement made by the representative of Cuba completely demolished the hypocritical assertions of United States representatives that they have granted "freedom" to Puerto Rico and have no designs on the freedom and independence of other countries, the Latin American countries in particular.

40. Mr. Wadsworth's statement could easily have given some innocent the impression that the United States, the dominant colonial and imperial Power, is the best and most unselfish friend of the colonial peoples, that it is doing everything possible to bring about their liberation, and is moved to joy and ecstasy whenever a new independent State is born. In reality, however, the United States representative's remarks are made up partly of hypocrisy and partly of outright attempts to justify the preservation of colonial régimes indefinitely, on the pretext of preventing "chaos" and "violence" and of giving the colonies the training necessary to enable them to "stand on their own feet". Characteristically, the United States representative said not a word to us about when the United States proposes to grant independence to its own colonies—the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Samoa and Puerto Rico. Why is it that while New Zealand has agreed to terminate its trusteeship over Western Samoa in 1961, the United States still obstinately clings to its colony of Samoa and intends to keep that island in a state of colonial subjection? Why does the United States stubbornly refuse to grant independence to Puerto Rico, falsely and cynically asserting that the people of that country do not at present desire independence?

41. The United States representative yesterday enlarged at some length on the importance of ensuring that the dependent peoples are given the opportunity of freely and democratically expressing their will. Why, then, did the United States representative in the Fourth Committee vote at this session of the General Assembly against the African countries' proposals for United Nations supervision to ensure the free expression of the will of the colonial peoples, with a view to preventing the intrigues which the colonialists engage in with such alacrity? That in itself alone demonstrates the hypocrisy of United States "care" for the fate of the colonial peoples, and exposes that country's real colonialist policy.

42. While United States colonialism is in many respects similar to the colonialism of the old European Powers, it has an even more dangerous and sinister side. The history of United States colonialism, too, is full of wars and armed expeditions organized with a view to the seizure of foreign territories and the oppression of other peoples, or with a view to repressive action against "recalcitrant" native peoples. As we know, the Spanish-American War of 1898 was the first imperialist war fought for the repartitioning of an already partitioned world. As a result of that war the United States was able to take over the Philippines and Puerto Rico and to subjugate Cuba. The United States still holds some of these territories as outright colonies. But the inhabitants of these colonies, like the other colonial peoples, are legitimately demanding their freedom and independence, and consider that the time has come to put an end to American colonialism.

43. Let me cite as an example the statement made by two inhabitants of the Marshall Islands, Mr. Bolkain,

Magistrate of Kwajalein Atoll, and Mr. Amata Kabua, a former President of the Marshall Islands Congress, at the Trusteeship Council's twenty-sixth session. The petitioners declared as follows:

"Our complaints are simple. Our standard of living under United States rule has gone down. Our land has been taken for sixteen years and no payment was offered us until thirteen years after it was taken from us. Our island home has been made an atomic testing ground. Our people have suffered radiation sickness and burns and other serious damages.... Our ancient ways are being destroyed. We fear for our future as the Marshallese race....

"Many, many years ago we protected ourselves without help from any other nation. Then came the Spanish who protected us, and we became a colonial possession. Next the Germans came to protect us. This was more colonialism.... Now the United States is protecting us. We are still a part of colonialism. We think we can protect ourselves better and much more cheaply. We are willing to learn democracy. We believe that democracy is a good way. But we do not believe the way we are being treated is a good example of democracy.

"...Maybe it would be better if we were given our ancient freedom. The people of Africa and Asia are getting their freedom. We think we can do as good a job of governing ourselves as do these new countries."^{4/}

That is what these petitioners declared. That is the voice of the indigenous population of the American colonies—a voice which the United States, for all its efforts, will certainly never succeed in stifling.

44. In speaking of American colonialism, however, it has to be borne in mind that this type of colonialism is expressed not only in the form of the open seizure and possession of foreign territories, but also in the concealed—and therefore more dangerous—form of the subjugation and control of even formally independent territories and countries. The economic penetration of American monopolies into the countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa has resulted in the creation of an outwardly "invisible" United States colonial empire.

45. The main features of American colonialism which have taken shape in this way were described some years ago very expressively by Mr. Nehru, in a letter to his daughter dated 3 January 1933—at which time, of course, he was not his country's Prime Minister. This is what Mr. Nehru wrote to his daughter:

"Do not imagine that the Empire of the United States is confined to the Philippine Islands. Outwardly that is the only empire they have got, but, profiting by the experience and troubles of other imperialist powers, they have improved on the old methods. They do not take the trouble to annex a country, as Britain annexed India; all they are interested in is profit and so they take steps to control the wealth of the country. Through the control of the wealth it is easy enough to control the people of the country and, indeed, the land itself.

^{4/} This statement was made at the 1061st meeting of the Trusteeship Council, the official record of which was published only in summary form.

And so without much trouble, or friction with an aggressive nationalism, they control the country and share its wealth. This ingenious method is called economic imperialism. The map does not show it. A country may appear to be free and independent if you consult a geography or an atlas. But if you see behind the veil you will find that it is in the grip of another country, or rather its bankers and big businessmen. It is this invisible empire that the United States of America possess."^{5/} 2:22-3:35

46. The history of the years which have followed the writing of these words has only confirmed their truth. Since the Second World War, the characteristic feature of United States colonialism has been its drive to secure for itself the undivided dominion of the economically under-developed and colonial countries, to dislodge its competitors—in the name of the battle against "world communism"—from their positions, to take over their former colonial possessions, and to crush the national liberation movements in the countries of Asia, Latin America and Africa. Particularly active in recent years have been United States efforts to penetrate into Africa. While the commanding positions in Africa's economy are still, as in the past, in the hands of the United Kingdom and France, these countries are more and more being crowded out by American colonialism. This is well illustrated by the single fact that in 1959 United States private and public investment in Africa had already reached more than \$2000 million, or more than twenty times the figure for the pre-war period. During the same period, American private investment in Africa rose by about 1100 per cent—which means that it had more than doubled the over-all rate of growth of United States private investment abroad. As a result, the tentacles of American monopoly capital have already fastened onto many African countries.

47. The United States is not in the slightest interested in the peoples of the colonies achieving full and genuine independence, for in that event the American monopolies would lose their privileged positions in the colonies, would lose the sources of their self-enrichment. The United States cannot be present in the ranks of those who fight for the liberation of the colonies and for the abolition of colonialism, since it takes a direct and active part in the spoliation of the colonies. American imperialism has become the dominant international exploiter, the main bastion of present-day colonialism.

48. Headed by the United States, the imperialists are making desperate efforts to continue by new methods and in new forms the colonial exploitation of the peoples of the former colonies. The monopolies are trying to retain in their hands the levers of economic control and political influence in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Their aim in these efforts is to preserve their old positions in the economies of the liberated countries and to gain possession of new positions under the cloak of economic "assistance", to inveigle the liberated countries into military blocs, to plant military dictatorships and set up military bases in them. The imperialists are trying to emasculate and subvert the national sovereignty of the liberated countries, to distort the meaning of self-determination, to impose on them,

^{5/} Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, Allahabad, 1935, pp 748 and 749.

friction with an
l the country and
ethod is called
oes not show it
d independent li
s. But if you see
is in the grip of
ankers and big
empire that the
5/

ave followed the
med their truth,
n has been its
ded dominion of
and colonial
rs—in the name
sm"—from their
r colonial posi-
beration move-
in America and
years have been
to Africa. While
's economy are
United Kingdom
nore and more
nialism. This is
it in 1959 United
it in Africa had
illion, or more
pre-war period.
ivate investment
it—which means
over-all rate of
ment abroad. As
nonopoly capital
rican countries.

ghtest interested
g full and genu-
t the American
ged positions in
s of their self-
be present in the
beration of the
nialism, since it
spoliation of the
as become the
e main bastion

the imperialists
ontinue by new
nial exploitation

The monopolies
e levers of eco-
in the countries
t. Their aim in
old positions in
tries and to gain
he cloak of eco-
erated countries
ry dictatorships
The imperialists
ert the national
ries, to distort
impose on them.

ory, Allahabad, 1955

under the guise of "inter-dependence", new forms of colonial rule, to place imperialist puppets in power in the liberated colonial countries, to bribe part of their national bourgeoisie, and to exploit the poisoned weapon of ethnic discord in order to sap the strength of these young and still feeble States. For these purposes they make active use of aggressive military blocs and bilateral aggressive military alliances.

49. The main colonialist bloc is NATO. One of its fundamental purposes is to set up a system of collective colonialism and to organize collective measures for the repression of the national liberation movement in the colonies. For direct proof of this one need look no further than the fact that NATO includes in its ranks such colonial Powers as the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Portugal. This indicates that the colonial Powers, faced with the extraordinary drive of the national liberation movement and unable to meet it in isolation, are endeavouring to find the necessary strength in common. The United States has repeatedly and openly formed a united front with the old colonial Powers in combating the national liberation movement. It has interfered flagrantly in the internal affairs of many countries and tried to turn them into bases for attacks on other countries.

50. Convincing evidence of the fact that the United States is now assuming the role of main bastion of the colonial system may be found in the "Eisenhower doctrine", a doctrine of patently imperialist character based on the policy of "negotiating from strength". In the past, the function of policeman in the Near East was carried out mainly by the British and French imperialists; today, the United States is trying to step into that role. The United States-United Kingdom intervention in Lebanon and Jordan in 1958 showed the whole world what the "Eisenhower doctrine" means.

51. The position taken by the United States is creating serious difficulties for Indonesia in its struggle for West Irian. The United States prefers West Irian to remain in the hands of the Netherlands, which with time it may be able to edge out of this area—as occurred with France in South Viet-Nam.

52. Under the banner of the "Monroe Doctrine", the United States has declared Latin America its own preserve and sphere of influence. But the days of tranquil and undisturbed United States hegemony in Latin America are past. A new day has dawned—the day of growing national self-consciousness among the peoples of the American continent and of their emancipation from United States spoliation.

53. As the principal colonial Power, the United States gives active assistance to its decrepit and senile partners, the other colonial Powers, in order to preserve their rule over the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. The United States helped the French colonialists in their unsavoury war against the people of Viet-Nam. Now it is giving the French militarists arms and financial and economic assistance in their efforts to crush the revolt of the people of Algeria. It must be said plainly that the colonial war in Algeria would be impossible, and the Algerian people would long ago have won their freedom and independence, if the American imperialists and colonialists had not given the French colonialists all possible assistance. And is it not a fact that the collective aggression of the NATO States in the Congo is being

carried out with the direct help of the United States? I do not, of course, propose to embark at this point on a detailed analysis of the situation in the Congo; that is a special item on our agenda. But I think it desirable that I should draw attention to those general aspects of the question which are bound up with the problem of colonialism as a whole.

54. Events in the Congo have shown that the North Atlantic bloc, headed by the United States, has openly taken the field against the people of the Congo, who have united around the Government of Patrice Lumumba and the Congolese Parliament. The purpose of this aggression is to destroy the independence won by the Congolese people in a tenacious struggle. What is going on in the Congo at present is a redistribution of influence as between the colonial Powers—the United States, Belgium, the United Kingdom and France. This redistribution, as in similar cases in the past, is taking place on the basis of the new balance of forces and of changes in the appetites of the colonialists for the wealth of other peoples

55. The PRESIDENT: I hope the speaker at the rostrum will adhere to the statement of intention which he himself made just now and refrain from going into the question of the situation in the Congo in any detail. As he knows, this question is at present under discussion elsewhere, and it is also an item on the agenda of the Assembly, an item on which the Assembly has decided to adjourn debate. I hope, therefore, that he will not try to go into the question in any detail now. As he knows, other speakers who have seemed to do so have been asked to refrain from discussing the question of the Congo. I must ask the representative of the Soviet Union to do the same.

56. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): As I said when I took up this point, it is not my intention to go into a detailed discussion of the problem of the Congo as such. My intention is to deal with it in its relation—and solely in its relation—to the problem of colonialism, and that is what I have largely done already. For the colonialists are as one man trying to exploit the example of the Congo as a "lesson" to the peoples of Africa, and trying to prove their theory—a theory they themselves invented—that the young African States which have won their independence will be unable to live and develop without the aid of those who for many decades and even centuries have crushed all attempts by the African peoples to win their freedom and independence. I am convinced, however, that the lessons which the peoples of Africa, Asia and the whole world will learn from the tragic example of the Congo will be different ones.

57. It is hardly necessary to show that a weak and backward country like Portugal could not possibly preserve its rule over eleven million Africans without assistance from the United States and its other NATO allies. Portugal has dared to defy all the African peoples and countries and to deny independence to Angola, Mozambique and its other colonies only because it feels itself to be supported by the other colonial Powers. I entirely agree with the following statement made by Mr. Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana, in his address to the General Assembly at this session, on 23 September:

"In regard to Portugal, my view is that a particular responsibility rests on the NATO members who

are also Members of the United Nations . . . " [869th meeting, para. 47].

58. But after all, how can the United States fail to help its Portuguese friends when the Portuguese colonies are dominated by American banks and companies like Standard Oil, the Chase National Bank, the National City Bank of New York and the Gulf Oil Corporation, which control most of the Portuguese diamond, petroleum, rubber and other companies? Thus, the colonialists form a mutual guarantee system—a system which reflects their moral and spiritual affinity. As the proverb has it, dog does not eat dog. Naturally, the United States cannot now come forward publicly in the United Nations and declare to the whole world, as it did at the close of the bilateral conversations between the United States and Portugal, that it supports Portugal and that there are no differences of opinion between the two States. At this session the United States representative prefers to keep silent on that point. It must nevertheless be pointed out that the question of the Portuguese and Spanish colonies has been discussed in some detail at this session in the Fourth Committee and that that discussion made it clear that Portugal is in a position of almost complete isolation.

59. Many delegations from African, Asian, socialist and other countries have sharply criticized the brutal colonialist practices established by Portugal in its colonies. They have cited many facts and a great deal of evidence, which the Portuguese representative was unable to refute. In addressing this plenary session [934th meeting], the Portuguese representative found no better way than to deny indiscriminately all the facts and arguments advanced by other delegations. But is it not a fact that a brutal system of racial discrimination and forced labour exists in the Portuguese colonies? Neither in the Fourth Committee nor in the plenary General Assembly has the Portuguese representative even attempted to deny that in the Portuguese colonies all the inhabitants are classified as "civilized" (assimilated) or "uncivilized". And that in the twentieth century! So far as legal form is concerned, Africans in the Portuguese colonies may raise themselves to the status of "assimilated", but to do that they must prove that they know the Portuguese language, are Catholics, possess specified means, and are willing to renounce local custom and their own culture and traditions and to live in European style. In actual fact, however, only three out of every thousand Africans have been able, after five centuries of Portuguese occupation, to acquire "assimilated" status; the rest are still as in the past called natives and denied all civil and political rights. They have no representation in any single administrative organ or in the metropolitan legislative organs; they enjoy no legal protection of any kind. They can be arbitrarily expelled from lands which have been theirs from time immemorial; the authorities can have them flogged or sent to do forced labour without trial for any misdemeanour. The only thing that is prohibited in the Portuguese colonies is the overt enslavement of the indigenous inhabitants; all other forms of servitude are not only not prohibited but sanctified by law.

60. In Mozambique, for example, systematic trade in Africans still goes on, under the guise of the contract system. Under the so-called Mozambique Convention of 1928, which is regularly renewed, 100,000 Negroes are exported every year from Mozambique to the Union of South Africa and about the same number to

Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In addition, there is a special Government organization whose function it is to recruit labour for the gold-mines and coal-pits of the Transvaal. Most of the contracted workers, according to bourgeois observers, die on the journey, from sickness, hunger and epidemics, or perish on the job itself.

61. I should like to cite the issue for 8 April 1960 of The Guardian, an English newspaper. According to this newspaper, the use of forced labour in the Portuguese colonies has constantly expanded over the last twenty years; and the practice has now become so widespread that forced labour is the predominant form of labour both in Mozambique and in Angola. And allow me also to quote from a memorandum circulated to representatives attending the fifteenth session of the General Assembly by the Union of Peoples of Angola:

"The basic feature of Portuguese colonialism is Fascism of the worst type, bearing the stamp of the most inhuman racism. Racist policy is in practice carried out with brutal ferocity in the spheres of culture, economics and social affairs."

Later in the same document it is stated that:

"Since the beginning of 1959 a veritable policy of bloody intimidation has been carried on. Mass murders in so-called Portuguese Guinea, the arrival of military reinforcements in Angola, arrests, tortures and the exile of patriots in Angola, the distribution of arms to the colonialists, who are converted into militiamen authorized to destroy any suspicious individual. Our compatriots are subjected to every imaginable form of punishment and torture. Examples which can be cited are those of the patriot Alfred Bengé, who was left dumb and paralyzed, and Ramos Lundila, who lost his reason after torture with electricity and is now in a psychiatric institution . . . the patriots José Manuel Martins, Domingo João and Manuel Francisco were executed at Ramal de Bengo."

62. Can the Portuguese representative deny this testimony to the tortures, repressions and hardships inflicted on the indigenous population? Is it not a fact that in Mozambique about one out of every two new-born infants dies in the first days of life? Is it not a fact that 99 per cent of the indigenous population of Angola, Mozambique and other Portuguese colonies remain illiterate after five hundred years of "enlightened" administration and "civilization"?

63. The Portuguese representative prefers to remain silent on these matters and merely to assert gratuitously that some delegations engage in "propaganda" and make unjustified attacks on Portugal. He even goes so far as to assert that those delegations which are trying to bring about the abolition of the colonialist order in the Portuguese colonies are interfering in Portugal's internal affairs; that in any event, Portugal has no colonies at all, but only overseas provinces. The falsity of such assertions is quite obvious. For the mere fact that on 11 June 1951 the Portuguese Constitution was amended by proclaiming the Portuguese colonies to be overseas provinces in no way altered the situation of these territories, and the colonial system has continued in them quite unchanged. No one, I need hardly say, will be deceived by legal sophistries or chicaneries of that kind, and the demand voiced by all freedom-loving peoples that the shameful phenomenon of colonialism be brought

to an end applies fully and without qualification to the Portuguese colonies too. And if the Portuguese colonialists stop their ears to the voice of reason and fail to understand the historical inevitability of the collapse of the colonial order, then they will ultimately be swept from the face of Asia and Africa by the mighty surge of the national liberation movement.

64. We have not cited all these facts merely for the sake of criticizing the colonial Powers: this has not been criticism for the sake of criticism. The Soviet Union, with other peace-loving and freedom-loving countries, tirelessly opposes the colonial system, because it is vile, because it means depriving entire peoples of elementary rights and freedoms, because it is a mockery of human dignity, because it means the humiliation and suffering of the many millions of inhabitants of the colonies.

65. The total collapse of the system of colonial slavery under the pressure of the national liberation movement is inevitable; it is an irresistible and irreversible process. A sharp intensification in the struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation took place under the impetus of the great October Socialist Revolution, which awakened the East and swept the colonial peoples into the general tide of the world revolutionary movement of emancipation. History is confirming the truth of the prophecy made by the great Lenin that:

"The period of the awakening of the East to the revolution of our times will be followed by a period in which all the peoples of the East will take part in deciding the destinies of the whole world, will cease to be a mere object of exploitation; a period in which all peoples will decide the destinies of all mankind."

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, the establishment of the people's democratic system in a number of countries of Europe and Asia, the triumph of the socialist revolution in China, the formation of a world socialist system have enormously accelerated the development of this process.

66. The heroic struggle of the colonial peoples and the support given them in that struggle by the socialist and other freedom-loving countries—those are the basic factors ensuring the collapse of the colonial system. But for the existence of the world socialist system, the imperialists would by their united efforts have crushed the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. But the world balance of forces is now such that the colonialists can no longer, even by force of arms, stave off the disintegration of the colonial system. The special feature of the situation in our day is that the imperialists, under pressure from the peoples and given the existence of a mighty camp of peace and socialism, are compelled in many cases to withdraw "peacefully" from their colonies, although they strive to enmesh them in inconscionable agreements of various kinds. With the representatives of the colonial Powers in mind, Mr. Khrushchev, the head of the Soviet Government, in a statement made to the General Assembly at this session, said:

"We cannot, of course, expect that our proposals for the liquidation of the colonial system, consistent though they are with mankind's vital interests, will meet with sympathy on the part of those who are

still clinging to the colonial order of things. I can hear in advance the criticism of those who defend the colonial system. But to those accustomed to build their prosperity at the expense of the oppressed peoples of the colonies we say this: Think, look carefully at what is happening around you. If not today, then soon, very soon, will come the final collapse of the colonial order, and if you do not get out of the way in time, you will be swept away just the same. The life of the doomed colonial system of government cannot be lengthened either by plots or even by force of arms. Such efforts will merely intensify and embitter the struggle of the peoples against this utterly decayed system."

[869th meeting, para. 221].

67. The Soviet Union fights consistently and as a matter of principle for the immediate liquidation of the disgraceful colonial system. We openly criticize the colonial Powers and do not fear their slanders or insinuations, for we are fighting for a just cause—the freedom and independence of the colonial peoples. Our present statement is a reply not only to those representatives of the colonial Powers who have spoken from this rostrum in the course of this debate, but also to the representatives of France, Spain and the Netherlands, who have preferred to keep silent. We regard that as a ruse on the part of colonialists who are waging war in Algeria and are maintaining their occupation of various territories in Africa and Asia. We say bluntly to the representatives of the colonial Powers: Understand the historical necessity and inevitability of the liquidation of colonialism; quit the colonies of your own volition and with whole skins. Otherwise the peoples of the colonies will throw you out of their countries. At this moment you are being called upon in the United Nations to agree to grant the colonial peoples their independence peacefully. But if the colonialists refuse to take this course and compel the oppressed peoples to take up arms to expel their discredited oppressors, then it will be the duty of all peace-loving countries to give assistance of every kind in the righteous cause of the national liberation of the colonial peoples.

68. The debate on the colonial system at this fifteenth session of the General Assembly puts the United Nations to a serious test. Colonialism will be destroyed whatever may happen, with or without the help of the United Nations, for the collapse of the colonial system is part of the objective march of history, which no one can arrest. But the issue for the United Nations is this: either that Organization will hasten progress, or, remaining indifferent to the destinies of millions of oppressed people and allowing itself to be controlled by the colonialists, it will stand aside from this progress, or, what is worse, will be an obstacle to the speedy abolition of the despicable colonial system.

69. The broad discussion which has taken place on the subject of the draft declaration on the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples has shown that world public opinion is so strongly in favour of the immediate and complete abolition of colonialism that it cannot be ignored by the colonial Powers. As the debate has shown, most delegations take their stand on behalf of a genuine struggle against colonialism. The Soviet delegation has listened with great attention and interest to the statements made by the representatives of Ceylon, Saudi Arabia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, the United Arab Republic, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Iraq and other countries of Africa

and Asia, and is gratified to note the community of aspirations and goals in the struggle against colonialism which was manifested in those statements.

70. At the same time, it has to be noted that some delegations, while paying lip-service to the cause of anti-colonialism, in actual fact came to the defence of colonialist interests and argued in favour of putting off the inevitable end of the colonial system. For example, the representative of the Philippines [933rd meeting], despite the fact that at the last moment he even joined the original co-sponsors of the African-Asian draft resolution [A/L.323 and Add.1-6], made it clear that he interpreted the purposes and intentions of that draft resolution in a way completely different from the purposes and intentions of the overwhelming majority of its co-sponsors. He gave a mistaken interpretation of paragraph 5 of the African-Asian draft resolution, asserting that it did not imply the immediate transfer of all powers to the peoples of the colonies. It would appear that the representative of the Philippines set himself the task of subverting the meaning of the African-Asian draft resolution and castrating it for the benefit of the colonialists. That, essentially, was also the position taken by the Argentine representative [927th meeting], who, in effect, opposed the immediate liberation of the colonies and appealed to us not to precipitate artificially the process of decolonization, which, in his view, is going ahead at a rapid pace. He also opposed the establishment of a time-limit for the grant of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is clear that statements of this kind merely encourage the colonial Powers in their refusal to grant the colonies freedom and independence. The representative of Honduras went even further. He has submitted a draft resolution [A/L.324/Rev.1] which amounts to a colonialist proposal. The Honduran draft resolution can be regarded only as a diversionary manoeuvre directed against the desire of the great majority of Members of the United Nations to put an end to colonialism. The Soviet delegation will of course vote against the Honduran proposal, which, while it puts up a show of opposition to the colonial system, actually implies the continuance of that system. We are confident that the General Assembly will not allow itself to be diverted from dealing with historically important issues, whatever tricks and manoeuvres the colonial Powers and their myrmidons may resort to.

71. The debate in plenary Assembly has also shown that there are a number of delegations which for various reasons either will not or cannot put the question of the abolition of colonialism in sharp and decisive form; which are aiming at some sort of "compromise" on the question with the colonial Powers. They apparently do not realize that on a matter of principle as vital for millions of people as the abolition of colonialism, efforts at compromise with the colonialists can only harm the anti-colonial struggle, can only operate to the advantage of the foreign oppressors. Any concession to the colonialists will prolong the sufferings of the colonial peoples. Surely that has been proved by the fourteen years of unsuccessful search for a compromise with the Government of the Union of South Africa on the question of South West Africa. The outcome of such concessions to the South African colonialists has been the preservation of colonial slavery in South West Africa and the de facto annexation of that territory.

Further evidence of the pernicious results of concessions to the colonialists and of efforts at compromise with them is provided by the present tragic situation of the Congolese people.

72. For that reason, the Soviet Union's view is that the question of the abolition of colonialism must be raised in consistent and decisive form, and that a radical solution to it must be found within the framework of the United Nations. Such a solution means that the General Assembly would have to express quite definitely, at this session, its support for the immediate and final abolition of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The Soviet delegation considers that the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union for consideration at this session [A/4502] most fully meets the demands of the colonial peoples, since it calls for their immediate and complete liberation from foreign rule. That is a demand made by life itself. Such a decision would have enormous historic—and immediately practical—significance. It would hasten the hour of liberation of all peoples from foreign oppression, and would enable us to end the shameful phenomenon of colonialism for good. We are convinced that all countries which are sincerely interested in the grant of freedom and independence without delay to all colonies and Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories will support the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet Union.

73. In accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Soviet draft declaration should be put to the vote first, since it was introduced for consideration first. The Soviet delegation formally proposes that that procedure, which is provided for in the rules of procedure, should be followed.

74. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the African and Asian States [A/L.323 and Add.1-6], the Soviet delegation applauds the desire shown by the overwhelming majority of African and Asian delegations that measures should be taken at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly to advance the realization of that lofty goal—the complete liberation of the peoples of all colonies and dependent countries. We remember that as long ago as 1955, the representatives of twenty-nine Asian and African States proclaimed at Bandung that colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should be speedily brought to an end. We also remember that in 1960, at Addis Ababa, the representatives of ten independent African countries and of a number of African territories which had not yet obtained their independence, addressed an urgent appeal to the colonial Powers to fix dates in conformity with the will of the people for the attainment of independence by all non-independent countries, and to communicate those dates to the people concerned.

75. The Soviet delegation reserves the right to speak at a later stage and explain its views on the specific provisions of the African-Asian draft resolution.

Mr. Hasan (Pakistan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

76. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) [translated from Spanish]: The discussion in this Assembly of item 87 entitled "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" unquestionably constitutes a landmark of decisive importance in the history of mankind. The mere fact

that an item whose object is a solemn proclamation that colonialism should once and for all be considered a thing of the past has been included in the agenda of this Assembly without reservations or objections, is evidence of the vast progress being made in this second half of the twentieth century in regard to the recognition of human dignity.

77. The history of colonialism is almost as old as the history of the world itself. It is the history of the desire of the stronger to dominate the weaker. By whatever title the process is graced and on whatever pretext it is carried out, it is always the history of the exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. Everywhere and at all times, a colonial system has invariably begun with an act of force, the imposition by force of a system contrary to the legitimate and natural aspirations of the human being. It is therefore not surprising that in all times and places there has always been a violent reaction to this system. History is full of examples of so-called colonial wars; both wars of conquest and wars to preserve conquests already made.

78. Underlying any colonial system—and I do not think this is an over-simplification—there have always been two factors: a belief in the racial, cultural or intellectual superiority of certain peoples over others, and a desire to exploit the natural resources of some peoples for the benefit of others. In certain cases there has also been a desire for territorial expansion as a solution to problems of over-population.

79. Human relations being a complex and subtle matter, other factors have also entered into the phenomenon of colonialism, and for that reason the balance sheet of colonial régimes has not been entirely negative. Many peoples have attained higher levels of culture and material progress under the influence of the colonizing country, but that is not a sufficiently cogent argument to justify the evil inherent in all colonial régimes. Except for the missionaries who went to foreign lands in a spirit of selfless devotion to preach their faith and whose goal was to win souls for God, I doubt whether any colonial undertaking could be said to be free of ulterior motives.

80. Nevertheless, the fact that Spain's colonial endeavour in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was marked by that spiritual quality gave it special features which we do not find in the colonialization of the twentieth century. Throughout the period of the Spanish colonial régime in America in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Spain and its American colonies were gradually forging a common identity. The children of the "conquistadores" were children of America and the American territories became an extension of Spain. That is why the American peoples, who on acquiring a sense of their own individuality, struggled for long years to win their independence from Spain, nevertheless retain for it the love of children for their mother—we even call Spain the mother country—since Spanish blood flows in our veins and our language and religion are also a legacy of Spain.

81. Racial discrimination is unknown to Spanish America and the concept of a superior race or people is completely alien to us. It is for that reason that the process of colonialization in Asia and especially in Africa, despite the benefits which the peoples of the colonies may sometimes have derived from it, has

always been repugnant to our consciences and has stirred us deeply.

82. Venezuela was called upon to play a leading part in the process of the emancipation of America, and it is to the genius and perseverance of Simón Bolívar that six nations of our continent owe their independence. That is why there exists in my country a profound antipathy to colonialism and a lively sympathy for the cause of the peoples who are still struggling for their independence.

83. The Charter of the United Nations unquestionably marked a great advance towards the solution of the problem of colonialism and brought hope to those peoples still subjected to that régime. Clearly, the existence of the colonial régime is incompatible with many of the principles embodied in our Charter, and the provisions of Chapters XI and XII, viewed in the spirit of the Charter, can be considered only as the last compromise between the interests of the colonial Powers and the powerful movement in favour of the sacred principles of self-determination of peoples and absolute equality among men.

84. The system established by the Charter has yielded excellent results and, thanks to the increasing acceptance of its guiding principles by the peoples, we have witnessed the emergence since 1945 of a large number of newly independent States which are today Members of the United Nations. Millions of human beings are, however, still living under the colonial régime and, in their interest, more rapid progress must be made. The declaration on the independence of those countries and peoples, which we are discussing in this year 1960, will meet this requirement and fulfil that legitimate aspiration. This declaration will be the instrument which will make possible the adoption of measures directed towards the final eradication of colonialism. The United Nations must continue to play a vital part in this process, by providing the newly independent nations with the technical assistance they need and by protecting them from economic dependence on the former colonial Power, or on any other Power.

85. Political independence does not by itself constitute real independence; it needs to be accompanied by economic independence. That is why the principle of the right of peoples to the use of their natural resources is of such importance; in other words, this right is an integral part of the right of self-determination. Natural resources should be used for the advantage and benefit of the country owning them, subject of course to the obligations stemming from economic co-operation among nations and from international law.

86. The course of events is the same with nations as with individuals. A human being cannot develop his talents to the full or be truly free unless, in addition to enjoying all the civil and political rights which freedom implies, he has reached a certain level of economic well-being which enables him to make effective use of that freedom. In the field of domestic law, we can trace this process of liberation from the French Revolution, which established the principle of equality before the law and abolished class privileges, to the enactment during the past and especially the present century of social legislation specifically designed to protect the worker and the economically weak classes. This process of evolution which has taken place in domestic law in relation

to the individual is the same as is now taking place in international law in relation to nations, and in this process the existence of the United Nations has unquestionably been, and will continue to be, a dominant and decisive factor. The declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, which this Assembly will adopt, will constitute a major landmark in this process of evolution.

87. Although the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples refers specifically to those countries and peoples which the United Nations Charter defines as Non-Self-Governing or Trust Territories, it must in fact have a much wider application, as it once again endorses the principle of self-determination of peoples, which includes the right of every people to choose its own form of government, to enjoy its spiritual and material patrimony without restriction, to live freely in accordance with its most cherished traditions, and to be exempt from any form of subjection to any other more powerful nation or people.

88. This point underlines a characteristic which any declaration on the abolition of colonialism must possess, namely, universality. Such a declaration is, in effect, based on universal principles which cannot be limited to any particular time or place. These are the principles underlying the dignity of the human being and the undeniable right of peoples to freedom:

freedom to become independent nations; freedom to choose the political system which most closely corresponds to their traditions and ideals; freedom of education; freedom of religion; in short, freedom to live their own lives, subject only to respect for the same rights of other peoples. The declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples must, therefore, apply to all countries and peoples in all continents who remain subject to the colonial régime or who do not enjoy such independence, and it must also apply not only to the past and the present, but also to the future in the sense that independent countries must be prevented from again falling victims to colonialism.

89. It is in this broad sense that my delegation interprets any declaration against colonialism, and it is from this standpoint that it will vote on the draft resolutions submitted for the consideration of this Assembly. In voting in favour of a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the Venezuelan delegation will merely reaffirm the position it has consistently taken and endorsed by its votes and its statements in the United Nations in favour of the independence of all peoples and the implementation in all continents of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter.

The meeting rose at 5:30 p.m.