

The Participation of OAU-recognised Liberation Movements at the UN (1972-1974): An Evaluation of the Implications for International Politics, Law, and Relations

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2050-4306/2025/14n3a7>

Seane Mabitsela

*Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education,
Department of Human Sciences, University of Venda
seane.mabitsela@univen.ac.za*

Abstract

This paper aimed to evaluate the implications of participation in the United Nations (UN) of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU)-recognised liberation movements. The end of the Second World War signalled the start of a new world. Specifically, there was a significant emerging participation in the global system of national liberation movements. Participation refers to the activities of the masses in politics, such as helping with a political campaign, among others. Although there are differences in defining the concept of participation, its activities are virtually infinite and include actions such as contacting public officials, signing petitions, and protesting. These activities make participation relevant to any political system and an indispensable feature or characteristic of democracy—a system of government in which supreme power vests in the people. The study contended that the participation of OAU-recognised liberation movements within the UN framework carried profound implications for international politics, international law, and international relations. A suitable starting point for evaluating the implications for participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements is examining the General Assembly (GA) decisions for securing liberation movements in its proceedings and deliberations, especially those adopted between 1972 and 1975. An analysis of these decisions is important because it reveals opposition by Western

European nations to the participation of the movements in the UN. Anchored in qualitative research methods, the study adopted a descriptive research design for the evaluation. It sheds light on the relationship between international politics, law, and international relations.

Keywords: *General Assembly, Implications, OAU-recognised liberation movements, Participation, United Nations*

I. Introduction

The end of the Second World War signalled the start of a new world. Specifically, the former colonies appear as independent and sovereign political units. This development compelled diplomats and academics to craft a new world order for international affairs. Concurrently, a notable development was the rising participation of national liberation movements in the global system. Scholars differ in their definitions of participation. For example, others refer to it as activities of the masses in politics, such as voting in elections, helping a political campaign, giving money to a candidate or cause, writing or calling officials, petitioning, boycotting, demonstrating, and working with other people on issues (Uhlamer, 2015). For others, it simply refers to citizens' involvement in activities that affect them (Van Deth, 2021).

Although there are differences in defining the concept of participation, its activities are virtually infinite and include actions such as voting, demonstrating, contacting public officials, boycotting, attending party rallies, guerrilla gardening, posting blogs, volunteering, joining flash mobs, signing petitions, buying fair-trade products, and protesting. These activities thus make participation relevant to any political system and an indispensable feature or characteristic of democracy. By democracy, we mean a system of government in which the supreme power vests in the people (Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2011). The extent and scope of participation are important—even decisive—criteria for assessing the quality of democracy (Van Deth, 2021). Tshoose (2017) writes that participation is also crucial in the context of judging socioeconomic rights. Currently, however, the dominant view of the concept of participation limits it to actions that might affect others, such as in the definitions offered by Huntington and Nelson (1976), Verba et al. (1995), and Milbrath (1965). By implication, there are various

definitional debates in the field of politics regarding the concept of participation.

Originating in the 1950s in American elections and inspired by normative theories of democracy, participation has grown into one of the most important subfields of political science. However, its conception has dominated the empirical field of participation studies (Theorell, 2006). Govender et al. (2011) write that the concept of participation is widely researched in development discourse and is often contested and has different meanings in contexts—making it multidimensional. For example, it could be viewed from the perspective of representative democracy or deliberate democracy, wherein the interests of the citizens are represented by elected officials and/or wherein the same elected representatives seek consensus on policy-related issues (Ibid). Thus, it is clear that the concept of “participation” holds various implications for various institutions, as it is multidimensional in nature.

Arguably, the participation of Organisation of African Unity (OAU)-recognised liberation movements within the United Nations (UN) framework carried significant implications for the fields of international politics, international law, and international relations. According to Mabitsela (2024), the fields of international politics, law, and relations are inherently linked. For example, in international politics, there are international relations, namely cooperation, unity, or bilateral treaty relations between or among countries, and in international relations, international law acts as a limit on each country's power. For him, international relations occur when two or more countries enter into an agreement or agreements, which are aspects of international law. Wibowo (2021) writes that in international relations, there is also international politics, which affects the state, and international political actors, therefore, compete in various aspects such as economic, social, philosophical, scientific, domestic, and geographical aspects. Thus, the relationship and connection between international relations and international law are crucial aspects of international politics. The relationship between international law and politics functions in three basic aspects: as *a goal*, *a means*, or *an obstacle*. First, politics defines certain legal values or institutions as its *goal*. Second, politics understands the law merely as *a means* for the fulfillment of certain political interests. Third, politics interprets law as *an obstacle* on the way toward the realisation of certain political goals (Cerar, 2009).

Indeed, the implications for international politics, law, and relations of participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements create a gap that has yet to be addressed. A suitable starting point for evaluating the implications for international politics, law, and relations of participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements is to examine the decisions of the UN GA for securing the participation of OAU-recognised liberation movements in the UN. Specifically, it requires examining the decisions adopted between 1972 and 1974.

An analysis of these decisions is important because it reveals the reasons for the opposition of Western European nations to the liberation movements' participation in the UN. For instance, the United States contended that its participation in the UN would hinder efforts aimed at advancing human rights in armed conflict (Shaw, 1983 & Mabitsela, 2024). Further, an analysis of the decisions is important, as it revealed that the liberation movements were not internationally recognised at the beginning since none of them were legitimate representatives of an established state. According to Graham (1975), the liberation movements did not have the basis for participation in forums aimed at formulating new concepts of international law.

In addition, an analysis of the decisions is critical because they reveal several political developments in recent years that have thrown into sharp focus the protracted role of national liberation movements and the legal character of a state (Asmal, 1983) and changes in legislating humanitarian law and the enhancement of the prospect of effective law (Forsythe, 1975).

Moreover, an examination of the decision is critical because it revealed the viability of the UN and the world character of its membership and brought about further changes in the nature of the subject of international law, and further revealed a pattern of diplomatic activity in the UN with reference to the nature of membership and varieties of accepted participation (Silverberg, 1977).

However, it must be noted that the decisions of the GA were mere recommendations but would constitute evidence of the existence of customary international law and help to crystallise emerging customary law or contribute to the formation of new customary law (Mastorodimos, 2016). What this means is that even if their decisions are not binding international organisations remain key

role players in the development of and crafting of multiple subjects of international law. The multiplicity of the subjects of international law could be summarised by what Yan et al., (2024) termed “legal pluralism” in the peace-building process from national and international perspectives.

This article employed a qualitative research method and a descriptive research design to evaluate the implications for international politics, law, and relations for participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements. It used primary and secondary data—resolutions, internet sources, academic journals, and monographs—to analyse the data. All these sources provided useful information on how the liberation movements recognised by the OAU came to take part in the UN during the period under review and the implications thereof for international politics, law, and relations.

The study adopted periodisation theory. Periodisation is important because it provides a framework for understanding the complex flow of events by dividing history into manageable periods with shared characteristics. These historical epochs not only impart meaning to the past but also determine the frame through which specific 'facets' of history become discernible to contemporary observers (Ebkeia & Haack, 2024; Holland, Rassuli, Jones, and Farlow, 2005).

This paper comprises four sections. Section one introduces the subject. Section two provides a context for evaluating the implications for international politics, law, and relations for participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements. The third section explores the decisions of the GA on securing the participation of representatives of the OAU-recognised liberation movements in the UN, especially those that were adopted between 1972 and 1974, to do that evaluation. The final section concludes the paper.

II. Contextualisation

Upon adopting its Charter, the UN began to see the participation of representatives of liberation movements of non-self-governing or non-independent territories, including those in Africa, in its deliberations and proceedings on colonial matters. Members and/or representatives of the liberation movements worked or took part as ‘petitioners’ or ‘private individuals’ within the UN system. However,

the UN General Assembly (GA) became dissatisfied with this approach (Shaw, 1983). Because of this, the UN GA authorised its committees to associate the liberation movements recognised by the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) with the Assembly's work in the capacity of observer and regular participants in its seminars and conferences organised under the UN auspices and recommended making the necessary financial provision to enable the representatives of those movements to do so (*Ibid*).

The OAU-recognised liberation movements of the non-self-governing and non-independent territories in Africa included the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) and Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) from Angola; PAIGC, (Guinea-Bissau); the National Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO); the Zimbabwe Peoples Union (ZAPU), Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), and African National Council United (UNAC) (Zimbabwe); the South West African Peoples Organisation (SWAPO); and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) and the African National Congress (South Africa) (El-Khawas, 1977).

The OAU recognised liberation movements through the African Liberation Committee—a ‘political body’ or ‘integral organ’ designed to serve the objective of African liberation—harmonising assistance and support from African States for the national liberation movements in the Portuguese territories (Angola and Mozambique), Zimbabwe, Namibia, and South Africa (Legum, 1975). The OAU criteria for recognition required a minimum level of effectiveness and representativeness of movement. This was “readily” and “incontestably” accepted by the UN, thus giving them legal status within its system (Mastorodimos, 2016).

In turn, the legal status within the UN granted liberation movements some protection under international law, the ability to buy weapons and other equipment, access to financial resources, and the ability to pursue claims for damages they may have suffered during the civil war (Czaplinski, 2016). Silverburg (1977) observed that these actions concurrently elevated the diplomatic standing of the liberation movements within the perception of the international community. In short, this provides a context for evaluating the implications for international politics, law, and relations for participation in the UN of OAU-recognised liberation movements.

III. GA Decisions for Securing Participation of Representatives of OAU-recognised Liberation Movements in the UN (1972-1975)

The first GA action to secure the participation of representatives of liberation movements recognised by the OAU in the UN was Resolution 2908 (XXVII) of November 2, 1972. This adoption was based on the Special Committee on Independence (set up in 1961 to implement the 1960 Declaration on Decolonisation)'s proposed arrangements relating to the representatives of those movements' participation in the work of that Committee (GAORC, 1972).

Under Resolution 2908 (XXVII), the Assembly noted with satisfaction the proposed arrangements relating to the participation in the proceedings and deliberations of the Special Committee of liberation movements and leaders concerning their territories. The GA urged all states, specialised agencies, and other organisations within the UN system to provide moral and material assistance to all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in colonial territories and to those living under alien domination, particularly to the national liberation movements of the territories in Africa—in consultation, as appropriate, with the OAU (A/RES/2908—XXVII, 1972).

Proposed by fifty-five powers, Resolution 2908 (XXVII) was adopted by a roll-call vote of ninety-nine to with twenty-three abstentions, as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mall, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia.

Against:

France, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Abstaining:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Uruguay (UNYB, 1972).

By another action taken on November 14, 1972, the Assembly further affirmed that the national liberation movements of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, and Mozambique were the authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the peoples of those territories, and recommended that, pending the territories' accession to independence, all governments, specialised agencies, and other organisations within the UN system and the UN bodies concerned should, when dealing with matters about the territories, ensure their representation by the liberation movements concerned in an appropriate capacity and consultation with the OAU. This action was in the form of Resolution 2980 (XXVII) (UNYB, 1972).

Resolution 2980 (XXVII) was adopted by a roll-call vote of 98 to 6, with eight abstentions. It was sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mongolia, Nigeria, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia (*Ibid*).

At its 1973 session, the GA adopted resolutions 3115 (XXVIII) and 3111 (XXVIII) on the questions of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. These resolutions were approved by the Assembly on December 12, 1973, with a recorded vote of 108 to 4, with 15 abstentions (UNYB, 1973).

Resolution 3115 (XXVIII) was put forward by Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Burundi, the Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria,

Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia (*Ibid*).

Under the resolution, the Assembly, among other things, reaffirmed the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Zimbabwe and stated that any settlement relating to the future of the territory should be worked out with the full participation of the genuine political leaders and representatives of the national liberation movements, who were the sole and authentic representatives of the true aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, and should be endorsed freely and fully by the people (A/RES/3115—XXVIII, 1973).

In Resolution 3111 (XXVIII), the GA, among other things, recognized that the national liberation movement of Namibia, the SWAPO, was the authentic representative of the Namibian people and appealed for the support of specialised agencies and other organizations within the UN system to render, within their respective spheres of competence, all possible assistance to the people of Namibia and their liberation movement (A/RES/3111—XXVIII, 1973). The same affirmation was made for the national liberation movements of South Africa (ANC and PAC) in GA Resolution 3151 G—XXVIII of December 14, 1974.

Sponsored by the following members: Afghanistan, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Dahomey, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia, Resolution 3111 (XXVIII) was approved by the Assembly with a recorded vote of 107 to 2, with 17 abstentions (UNYB, 1973).

Resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) was adopted by a recorded vote of 88 to 7, with 28 abstentions, as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican

Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mall, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia.

Against:

Bolivia, Israel, Nicaragua, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Abstaining:

Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Spain, Swaziland, and Sweden (UNYB, 1973).

Furthermore, during its 1973 session, the Assembly adopted further resolutions that mandated increased participation—channeled through the **OAU**—for representatives of the liberation movements originating from the Portuguese-administered territories, Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Namibia, and South Africa, in its formal proceedings and deliberations. For example, it urged specialised agencies and other concerned organisations, in consultation with the OAU, to initiate and broaden contacts and cooperation with the colonial peoples of Africa, with the purpose of working out concrete programmes for assistance to the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, and Namibia, and especially to their liberation movements. These decisions were in the form of Resolution 3118 (XXVIII) of December 12, 1973.

Adopted by a recorded vote of 108 to 4, with 17 abstentions, it was proposed in the Fourth Committee by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Burundi, the Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, the

German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the Ukrainian SSR, the United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia (UNYB, 1973).

The participation, through the OAU, of representatives of liberation movements in the UN proceedings and deliberations increasingly manifested in 1973 when the GA adopted Resolution 3163 (XXVIII) of December 14, 1973. The text of the resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 104 to 5, with 19 abstentions, on the proposal of fifty-nine member states (*Ibid*).

The adoption of Resolution 3163 (XXVIII) was based on the Assembly decision of November 2, 1972, by which the Assembly had approved the Special Committee on Independence's arrangement, in consultation with the OAU, to invite representatives of the national liberation movements of the colonial territories in Africa to participate as observers in its proceedings relating to the movements' respective countries (GAOR, 1972).

Under the resolution, the GA, among other things, appealed to all states and the specialised agencies and other organisations within the UN system to provide moral and material assistance to all peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in the colonial territories and to those living under alien domination—in particular to the national liberation movements of the territories in Africa—in consultation, as appropriate, with the OAU (A/RES/3163—XXVIII, 1973). The Assembly further appealed to all governments, specialised agencies, and other organisations within the UN system, in consultation with the OAU, to ensure the representation of the colonial territories in Africa by the national liberation movements concerned, in an appropriate capacity, when dealing with matters about those territories (*Ibid*).

In adopting Resolution 3163 (XXVIII), the Assembly also considered the views expressed by the representatives of the national liberation movements and non-governmental organisations that participated, along with several member states of the UN, in the proceedings of the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa,

held from 9 to April 14, 1973, at Oslo, Norway (Stokke & Widstrand, 1973).

One of those views was expressed by the then president of the ANC (South Africa), Oliver Tambo, on behalf of all the liberation movements. An extract of Tambo' statement reads:

The keyword in the declared purpose of the Conference was 'support,' which should have been interpreted as the practical measure and material assistance that the world community was prepared to give to the liberation movements in their growing offensives against the racist regimes in Southern Africa (Sechaba, 1973).

In 1973 and 1974, the GA and, on occasion, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) also adopted recommendations and decisions on an *ad hoc* basis concerning the participation of national liberation movements in international conferences. Thus, at its twenty-eighth session, the Assembly followed up with Resolution 3102 (XXVIII) of December 12, 1973. This resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 107 to 0, with six abstentions, on the recommendation of the Sixth (Legal) Committee (UNYB, 1973).

By the operative part of the resolution, the Assembly, among other things, expressed its appreciation to the Swiss Federal Council for convoking the 1974 Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts (IHL) and urged that the national liberation movements recognized by the various regional inter-governmental organisations concerned be invited to participate in the Conference as observers, according to the practice of the UN (A/RES/3102—XXVIII, 1973).

In the following session, the GA adopted two key resolutions: For example, on November 29, 1974, the Assembly decided to invite all states and the national liberation movements recognised by the OAU and/or by the League of Arab States (LAS) in their respective regions to participate as observers in the UN Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organisations (UNYB, 1974).

These decisions were embodied in Resolution 3247 (XXVIII). Resolution 3247 (XXVIII) was adopted by 105 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions, on the proposal of Algeria, Botswana, Egypt, Ghana, Guyana, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Republic,

Mali, Nigeria, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yugoslavia (Ibid).

On December 10, 1974, the Assembly, in accordance with its decision of December 18, 1972, decided to invite all states and the national liberation movements recognized by the OAU and/or by the LAS to participate as observers, on a regular basis and in accordance with the earlier practice of the UN, to participate in the Conference of the International Women's Year (Ibid), which would be held in Mexico City in 1975, in the UN's response to the transnational women's liberation movement sweeping the globe (Valladares,<https://origins.osu.edu>).

These decisions were embodied in Resolution 3276 (XXVIII). This resolution was approved by 124 votes to two, with two abstentions. Resolution 3276 (XXVIII) was based on a proposal by Australia, Belgium, Iran, Nepal, Norway, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Senegal, and Sweden (UNYB, 1974).

By the close of the twenty-ninth session, the GA formally enacted a more comprehensive decision that addressed the increasing integration of national liberation movements into its procedural work. This was in the form of Resolution 3280 (XXIX) in December 1974. With this resolution, the Assembly decided to invite, as observers on a regular basis and by earlier practice, representatives of the national liberation movements recognised by the OAU to participate in the relevant work of the Assembly's main committees and its subsidiary organs concerned (A/RES/3280—XXIX, 1974).

The GA also invited representatives of those movements to participate in the same capacity in conferences, seminars, and other meetings held under the auspices of the UN that were related to their countries, and requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the OAU, to ensure that the necessary arrangements were made for their effective participation, including the requisite financial provisions (Ibid).

Therefore, it recommended to the other UN organs concerned, in consultation with the OAU, to ensure that the necessary arrangements were made to facilitate the effective participation of these national liberation movements in their relevant proceedings, and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the GA at its thirtieth session a report on the implementation of the resolution and the development of co-operation between the OAU and the organisations concerned within the UN (Ibid).

Resolution 3280 (XXIX) was sponsored in the GA by 42 member states of the OAU, namely, Algeria, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, and Zambia (UNYB, 1974).

Conclusion

As discussed, the participation of OAU-recognised liberation movements in the UN took place in the context of the world body's adoption of its Charter at the end of the Second World War (WWII). The world began to see the participation of representatives of liberation movements of non-self-governing or non-independent territories, including those in Africa, in its deliberations and proceedings upon adopting the Charter. Initially, as highlighted, the members of the liberation movements took part as petitioners of private individuals within the world body system. The UN General Assembly eventually became critical of the prevailing approach, leading to its decision to mandate its committees to integrate the liberation movements, which were formally acknowledged by the OAU, into its operational work. These movements, as illustrated, were, among others, FNLA and MPLA from Angola; PAIGC from Guinea-Bissau; FRELIMO from Mozambique; Zimbabwe's ZAPU, ZANU, and UNAC from Zimbabwe; SWAPO from Namibia; and PAC and ANC from South Africa. The UN GA accepted the representatives of the liberation to take part (participate) in its proceedings and deliberations, first in the capacity of observer and as regular participants in its seminars and conferences organised under the UN auspices, and made the necessary financial provision for that—thereby acknowledging the liberation movements' enhanced legal, political, and diplomatic status within the global system. Clearly, as highlighted, the acknowledgement of the liberation movements' legal, political, and diplomatic status within the global system became evident during the period between 1972 and 1975, when the GA decided by majority of votes to robe in the representatives of the OAU-recognised liberation movements of the non-self-governing or

non-dependent territories, including those in Africa, in its proceedings and deliberations on colonial matters. Indeed, the inclusion of representatives of OAU-recognized liberation movements in the UN discussions on global matters revealed the relationship between international politics, law, and international relations.

References

A/RES/2908—XXVII. 1972. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 210th Plenary Meeting, <https://sanctionsplatform.ohchr.org>.

A/RES/3102—XXVIII. 1973. Respect for Human Rights in Armed Conflicts, 2197th Plenary Meeting, <https://digitallibrary.un.org>.

A/RES/3111— XXVIII. 1973. The Question of Namibia, 2198th Plenary Meeting, <http://www.worldlii.org>.

A/RES/3115— XXVIII. 1973. The Question of Southern Rhodesia, 2198th Plenary Meeting, <http://www.worldlii.org>.

A/RES/3118—XXVIII. 1973. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and People, 2198th Plenary Meeting, <https://digitallibrary.un.org>.

A/RES/3151 G—XXVIII. 1974. Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid, 2201st Plenary Meeting, <https://digitallibrary.un.org>.

A/RES/3163—XXVIII. 1973. Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 2202nd Plenary Meeting, <http://www.worldlii.org>.

A/RES/3280—XXIX. 1974. Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity, 2312th Plenary Meeting, <https://digitallibrary.un.org>.

Almuth Ebke, A. & Christoph Haack, C. 2025. Periodization and modernity: an introduction, *History of European Ideas*, 51:2, 307-320, DOI: 10.1080/01916599.2024.237354.

Cerar, M. 2009. The Relationship Between Law and Politics, *Annual Survey of International and Comparative Law*, Volume 15, Issue 1, Article 3, <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/cgi>.

Concepts and Principles of Democratic Governance and Accountability: A Guide for Peer Educators. 2011. Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Uganda Office.

El-Khawas, M.A. (July) 1977. Southern Africa: A challenge to the OAU. *African Today*, Volume 4, N.3, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4185705>.

Forsythe, D.P. (January) 1975. The 1974 Diplomatic Conference on Humanitarian Law: Some Observations, *American Journal of International Law*, Volume 69, Issue 1, p. 77.

Govender, J. & Reddy, P.S. 2011. The imperative of participation in South African local government, <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC22705>.

Graham, E.D. 1975. The Diplomatic Conference on the Law of War: A Victory for Political Causes and A Return To the 'Just War' Concept of the Eleventh Century", *Washington and Lee Law Review*, Volume 32, Issue 1, pp.31-32.

Hollander, S., Rassuli, K., Jones, B. and Farlow, L. 25. Periodization in history, *Journal of Research into History*, 25(1).

Huntington, S.P. & Nelson. J.M. 1976. *Political Participation in Developing Countries*, Harvard University Press.

Legum, C. 1975 (April). The Organisation of African Unity-Success or Failure. *International Affairs*, Volume 51, No.2, pp.208–219

Mabitsela, S. 2004. Effects for Representation of African National Liberation Movements in the United Nations, 1974-1975. *Journal of African Foreign Affairs* (JoAFA), <https://doi.org/10.31920/2056-5658/2024/v11n1a2>.

Mastorodimos, K. 2016. "National Liberation Movements: Still a valid concept (with Special Reference to International Law)? Armed Non-State Actors in International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law: Foundation and Framework of Obligations, and Rules on Accountability", *Oregon Review of International Law*, Volume 17, No.1, p.82.

Milbrath, L.W. 1965. *Political Participation*, Harvard University.

Report of the Fourth Committee. 1972. Document A/8957, Agenda Item 64, *Official Records of the General Assembly Annexes*, Twenty-Seventh Session, New York, p.2.

Shaw, M. 1983. The international status of national liberation movements. *Liverpool Law Rev* 5, <https://doi.org/>.

Silverburg, S.R. 1977. The Palestine Liberation Organization in the United Nations: Implications for International Law and Relations, *Israel Law Review*, Volume 12, No.3, p.382.

Stokke, O. & Widstrand, C. 1973. *The UN-OAU Conference Oslo 9-14 April 1973: Volume I: Programme of Action & Proceedings*, Scandinavian Institute of Africa Studies, Uppsala.

Tambo, O.R. (August) 1973. Solidarity in Deeds and Actions, *Sechaba: An Official Organ of African National Congress South Africa*, Volume 7, No. 8, p.6.

Theorell, J. 2006. Political participation and three theories of democracy: A research inventory and agenda, *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 787–810, Lund University, Sweden.

Thoose, I.C. 2017. The Role of Public Participation viewed in the Context of adjudicating Socio-Economic Rights, <https://doi.org/10.25159/2522-6800/3560>.

Uhlanner, C. 2015. Politics and Participation, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.93086-1>.

Valladares, G. A Postcard from Mexico City, <https://origins.osu.edu>.

Van Deth, J.W. 2021. What is Political Participation? In book: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, Oxford University Press, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.68>.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. & Brady, H. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.

Wibowo, M.R. 2021. The Relationship Between International Relations and International Law in The Aspects of International Politics. Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah, Indonesia, <https://researchgate.net/publication/351127540>.

Yan, C.O. Benhima, M. 2025. The Role of Legal Pluralism in the Peacebuilding Process, *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Global Studies*, Volume 20, Issue 1, <https://doi.org/10.18848/2324-755X/CGP/v20i01/43-71>.

Yearbook of the United Nations. 1973. New York, pp.721-739

Yearbook of the United Nations. 1974. New York, p.171.

Yearbook of the United Nations. 1972. New York, p.550.