

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1944th
MEETING**

Thursday, 4 November 1971,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

AGENDA ITEMS 66, 67 AND 68

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/8388, A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.3 (parts I and II), A/8473, A/C.4/738 and Add.1, A/C.4/740)

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (*continued*) (A/8348 and Add.1, A/8403, chapter XIII (section A); A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.4)

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*)
(A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II))

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. ANDERSEN (Denmark) noted with regret that no substantial progress had been achieved in regard to the situation in South Africa, although there were some glimmers of hope. There had been some developments but unfortunately they did not signify any real change in the basic attitude of the régimes in power. When the Security Council had decided to impose economic sanctions, in the elaboration of which his delegation had played an active part, it had for the first time applied the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. It was regrettable that the sanctions had not produced the results anticipated; nevertheless they should not be abolished, for they symbolized the determination of the world community to put an end to the oppressive policies of the Smith régime. The task of the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) was difficult but it was more essential than ever, and it was the duty of all Member States to collaborate in it. His delegation attached great importance to the talks going on between the United Kingdom and the Salisbury régime. The Danish Government considered that any negotiated solution must be acceptable to the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole and must be based on racial equality, self-determination and majority rule.

2. There was little hope that Portugal would reconsider its colonial policy. It had not heeded the appeals of the free African countries and the Members of the United Nations. His delegation was convinced that unity was more necessary than ever and that a broad representative majority should support the relevant General Assembly resolutions in order to exert political pressure on the colonialist Governments. It was particularly important that all Member States should comply with the recommendations of the Security Council relating to exports of military equipment. Denmark, for its

part, was complying with those recommendations and would continue to do so. In 1970, the Security Council had adopted two resolutions on Namibia—the first setting forth a programme of action and the second requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Nordic countries, meeting at Copenhagen in September 1971, had expressed the hope that during the forthcoming deliberations on the question of Namibia in the United Nations, the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 handed down by the International Court of Justice¹ would provide an incentive to restore broad agreement on the approach to that question. That hope had been encouraged by the action taken thus far—the adoption of Security Council resolution 301 (1971) and the draft resolution submitted to the Council by Argentina,² which his delegation supported. There were three essential keys to any progress: imagination in finding new solutions to colonial problems within the framework of the Charter; a readiness to try previously attempted approaches when favourable circumstances arose, and unity among Member States. The primary consideration must be the future of the oppressed peoples, although their daily needs in the humanitarian and educational spheres must not be forgotten. Denmark had made substantial contributions in those areas and had played an active part in the Advisory Committee on the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. Such assistance, of course, only served to alleviate some of the needs and it was still essential that the General Assembly should continue to use with determination its chief weapon—public opinion—for the benefit of those peoples. His delegation was prepared to participate in a concerted effort to enable the oppressed peoples of southern Africa to exercise their right of self-determination.

3. Mr. DA COSTA LOBO (Portugal) expressed his delegation's customary reservations concerning the consideration by the Committee of the question dealt with under item 67 of the agenda. The purpose of his country's overseas activities had always been to establish a multiracial society based on the principles of equal rights and non-discrimination. There had never been any question of imposing Portuguese culture on another people; the object of Portuguese policy was to establish, by means of reciprocal influence, new, richer and more universal forms of culture, as had occurred in Brazil, for example.

¹ See *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971.

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10376/Rev.1.

4. Some delegations had referred to the "unitary" conception of the Portuguese State and had interpreted that term as meaning that the State was of a monolithic and rigid character. That interpretation was incorrect. It was only necessary to mention the recent constitutional reforms to show, on the contrary, the dynamism of the Portuguese constitutional system. The purpose of those reforms, which had been criticized and misunderstood, was to grant increased administrative, political and economic autonomy to the Portuguese overseas Territories. That dynamism was also manifested in the exercise of political rights, as a result of progress in education, since the sole requirement for the exercise of political rights was the attainment of a certain level of education. Thus the expansion of education paved the way to the universal attainment of political rights. In that respect, statistics showed that the purpose of Portugal's education policy in the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) was to enable the peoples of those Territories to participate more fully in the political life of the nation.

5. The accusations levelled against his country in the Committee were based not on evidence but on sheer fabrication, and were not worth refuting. It was the same in the case of the economic achievements of Portugal in the Territories: while acknowledging that those achievements were substantial, some delegations ascribed the most evil designs to Portugal. His delegation repeated once again that the sole object of the economic activities of his country was the development of the Territories themselves. Some also claimed that it was only through the assistance of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that Portugal could maintain its presence in Africa; that allegation, however, was based on an entirely false premise: namely, that the Territories were in a state of rebellion.

6. Portugal was also accused of rejecting the Lusaka Manifesto.³ But those who so accused Portugal seemed to overlook the fact that no country could accept some of the insulting accusations and allusions contained in the Manifesto, and the fact that Portugal had not rejected that document in its entirety. The most serious accusation levelled against Portugal was that it had violated the frontiers of the sovereign African countries bordering its Territories. Portugal would have every reason to protest about similar violations. Its good faith was borne out by the fact that in 1963, 1965 and 1971 it had called for the establishment of an impartial commission to supervise the frontiers in question. Despite all the criticism, the Portuguese Government, in the conviction that time was working in favour of the forces of *détente* and peace, and noting that some voices were speaking a more realistic and constructive language, was ready to hold a dialogue and took the occasion to point out that the dialogue could be the prelude to an agreement.

7. Mr. VENEGAS TAMAYO (Colombia) said that the statements by delegations and the various reports under consideration showed that the important questions before the Committee had common features: the refusal to respect the principles of international law, and the violation of the

Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. Colombia, which had always been a free country, would never cease to struggle against colonialism and all forms of domination. It respected the principles of non-intervention and of the peaceful settlement of disputes. It also supported the decisions adopted by the United Nations. It therefore censured South Africa for perpetuating a racist minority régime, denounced the régime in Southern Rhodesia and opposed the colonialist policy of Portugal.

8. His delegation, which was playing an effective part in the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, considered that the decision to enlarge the composition of the Council, if adopted, would yield useful results. It also supported the proposal which had been submitted by France to the Security Council and had been reproduced in an Argentine draft resolution.⁴

9. Colombia maintained no relations with South Africa, thus complying with the decisions of the United Nations and the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice, and categorically denounced the policy of *apartheid*.

10. His delegation was prepared to support any practical suggestion which would make it possible to find a solution to the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration, and it was in favour of sending visiting missions to those Territories. It was essential that all possible measures should be adopted to co-ordinate the activities of the three bodies dealing with the questions of southern Africa. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), of 14 December 1960, several countries of southern Africa had attained independence. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia had stated in the General Assembly (1952nd plenary meeting) on 5 October 1971, no one was in a better position than the neighbouring countries and the parties to the conflict to understand the problems which were impeding agreement. Decolonization was a historical and irreversible fact, and the United Nations might welcome the legitimate representatives of the sovereign peoples of Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) as Members before the end of the decade.

11. Mr. OCAMPO (Chile) said that he wished to explain his delegation's position regarding the question of Namibia, since in its first statement (1938th meeting) it had dealt solely with the situation in Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration. It was clear from information from the Territory and from statements by the South African authorities that the latter were still openly violating the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. At the same time, the industrialized countries continued to aid and abet the Pretoria régime, which was adopting legislation designed to turn Namibia into a fifth province of South Africa. The information received showed also that South Africa maintained more than 15,000 soldiers and police in Namibia. South African troops had attacked the zones in which guerrillas of the liberation movements had sought refuge, including the Caprivi Strip bordering on Zambia; moreover,

³ Manifesto on Southern Africa. For the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

⁴ See foot-note 2.

the latter country had protested in the Security Council against South Africa's repeated incursions into its Territory. The liberation movements appeared to have developed a degree of political and military organization and effectiveness which was worrying South Africa.

12. His Government had been following the development of the situation in Namibia with special interest and a new factor had now appeared in the shape of the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 handed down by the International Court of Justice. The Opinion was particularly significant in that it established that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa should therefore withdraw from the Territory; the Court also affirmed that Member States were under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia. With the Court's Advisory Opinion, the decisions of the General Assembly, in particular those adopted since 1966, assumed special significance and had acquired full validity. The Security Council, for its part, had acknowledged the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice in resolution 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971. It was deplorable, however, that two permanent members of the Council had abstained in the vote. The General Assembly should now draw up a co-ordinated programme of action for all the bodies concerned with the question.

13. The General Assembly should decide to enlarge the membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia in order to enable all sectors and currents of opinion to find expression in the Council and to take part in its activities and decisions. Everyone knew that the non-representative nature of the Council was one factor that was preventing it from carrying out its mandate. It was also necessary, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, to appoint a fulltime United Nations Commissioner, in view of the many activities that the responsibilities of the United Nations with regard to Namibia entailed. In that connexion, his delegation was highly satisfied with the way in which Mr. Stavropoulos and Mr. Hamid had in turn discharged their duties as Acting Commissioner.

14. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, Chile had been able to assess the extent of the solidarity shown by other States, particularly the Zambian Government with regard to Namibia. The Norwegian Government was to be congratulated on the contribution of \$2.3 million in addition to its regular contribution that it had announced at the Pledging Conference of the United Nations Development Programme, to be used for the benefit of the least developed among the developing countries. The Norwegian Government had stated on that occasion that it wished to be sure that special consideration would be given to the need to compensate the countries of southern Africa which bore the brunt of the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia and the racial policy practised in that region.

15. With regard to Namibians living abroad, his delegation welcomed the establishment at Lusaka, on the initiative of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of a regional office for Namibians in exile. The report of the Secretary-

General on the United Nations Fund for Namibia (A/8473) showed clearly the difficulties involved in establishing and operating a comprehensive programme of assistance both within and outside the Territory for the thousands of refugees scattered throughout the world. His delegation thought that, if the programme was to be effective, it should be financed directly from the regular budget of the United Nations.

16. Chile was that very day celebrating the first anniversary of the Chilean people's accession to power. He assured the peoples who were struggling for independence of the understanding of the Chilean people, for they too had had to struggle against neo-colonialism and imperialism in order to establish social justice and dignity in their country. Chile supported the claims of the peoples who wished to develop their natural resources themselves and to shake off foreign economic domination. Although it had been politically independent for 160 years, Chile had not won true and complete independence until one year earlier, when it had wrested control of its natural resources from the hands of huge foreign monopolies. During the past year, the Chilean popular Government had nationalized the large mining enterprises and had expropriated or nationalized the large textile factories, the food industries and the cement industry; communications, the telephone services and the electricity services had also been nationalized. Under its land reform programme, Chile had expropriated more than 1,000 large estates. It hoped that within a year, all the land would have passed into the hands of those who cultivated it. Most of the banks had been nationalized and were under government control. His delegation had wished to explain its country's policy in answer to the many attacks and the calumny of which the Chilean Government was the target, whereas it was merely in fact applying the principles of the Charter and promoting the purposes of the United Nations.

17. Mr. KASIM (Jordan) deplored the persistence on the African continent of colonialism and neo-colonialism, which had their strongholds in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration. South Africa had taken advantage of the apathy of the international community to introduce its racist practices in Namibia and of Israel's support to consolidate its forces of aggression. In an attempt to escape the pressure of world opinion, South Africa had drawn up a proposal for a plebiscite which was a sheer mockery. It was endeavouring to perpetuate its policy of racial discrimination and was introducing illegal measures in Namibia in order to dismember the Territory and to go on violating the decisions of United Nations organs. The decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council had recently been strengthened by the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice declaring South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal and calling for its immediate withdrawal.

18. In his delegation's opinion, it was essential, firstly, that renewed and intensified efforts should be made to exert pressure on South Africa and to persuade States to abandon their erroneous policies towards that country; secondly, that the Security Council should put an end to a situation which the whole world deplored; and, thirdly, that Member States should support the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

19. The Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia had also strengthened its position since the unilateral declaration of independence in 1965. Economic sanctions, which might have had some impact, had remained ineffective and the Zimbabwe people were still being exploited by the racist minority. The "talks about talks" going on between the United Kingdom and the Smith régime could not fail to arouse concern in view of the obstinacy with which the Smith régime was clinging to its policy.

20. Lastly, from the highly sophisticated weapons which had been seized on a number of occasions, it was evident that Portugal was receiving military assistance from its NATO allies. Moreover, the special mission of inquiry established under Security Council resolution 294 (1971) had concluded that Portugal had been responsible for the attack on Senegal that year. Consideration should be given to the adoption of immediate measures to reverse the current trend, and any initiative regarding a settlement should be taken in close co-operation with the oppressed people of the Territories.

21. Mrs. COLMANT (Honduras) expressed her delegation's condolences to the Indian delegation in connexion with the catastrophe which had just struck India.

22. Honduras had been espousing anti-racist and anti-colonialist ideals long before the establishment of the United Nations. Although Honduras did not think that the problems considered by the Fourth Committee could be solved through violence, it understood the impatience of certain African States in the face of the current situation. Her delegation did not think that the theory of economic development and the theory of the political liberation of peoples were necessarily contradictory. It considered that all means, in particular persuasion and propaganda, should be used to attain freedom.

23. Her delegation urged the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to be more effective in their action and take economic factors into account in pursuing their objective of decolonization. Honduras was prepared to consider any draft resolution which would open the way to a valid solution of the problems at issue aimed at restoring social justice, ensuring that natural resources were at the service of the population and guaranteeing freedom for all.

24. Mr. TEMPLE (United Kingdom) replied to the points raised by several delegations who had been seeking information concerning the current status of the United Kingdom Government's efforts to find out whether there was a basis on which substantive negotiations might be opened with the Smith régime in Rhodesia. On 9 November 1970, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs had announced that the first step had been taken in the process of trying to establish whether a realistic basis existed for a negotiated settlement within the framework of the "five principles", while making it clear that sanctions would continue in the meantime (see A/8423/Add.2 (part I), paras. 28-31).

25. That first stage had not yet been completed. It had proved impossible to proceed by written exchanges alone,

and it had been decided that the initial probe should be deepened. Lord Goodman, as special representative of the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, had paid several visits to Salisbury in that connexion. The United Kingdom Government had made clear at the outset the need to keep the content of those exchanges confidential until there was something of substance to report, and that had so far not been the case.

26. His Government had often been asked what the chances were of establishing a basis for negotiations, and, if that basis were established, of reaching a settlement. He was unable to answer, but what he could say was that his Government was hopeful of success, that it would be guided by the principles which it had always upheld, and that it would keep constantly in mind the interests of the people of Rhodesia as a whole, to whom any settlement must be acceptable. The current impasse benefited no one, least of all the African population. A settlement within the framework of the five principles would undoubtedly enhance their political, social and economic prospects, which could only deteriorate under the existing conditions. The objective of such a settlement would be to set Rhodesia on a new course which would help to reduce tension in southern Africa as a whole. Were a settlement to be reached the co-operative attitude of Member States would assuredly have been a major factor in achieving that end.

27. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, wondered whether the Egyptian delegation would be so ardent in attacking South Africa were it not for the opportunity thus offered it of attacking Israel at the same time. However, was it not a fact that Egypt, now championing the African cause, had before 1967 allowed ships flying the South African flag to pass through the Suez Canal and had collected millions of dollars in dues, while expressing strong support in the United Nations for the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa?

28. However, Israel would not fall into the trap of trying to reply to ridiculous charges and thus appear to acknowledge their validity.

29. As to the statement by the representative of Jordan concerning self-determination for the populations of the occupied territories, he suggested that Jordan would do better to concern itself with the right to self-determination of the Palestinians in Jordan, who would certainly be grateful to have that principle applied to them also.

30. Mr. KASIM (Jordan), supported by Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) and Mr. OUCIF (Algeria), declared, on a point of order, that Israel was not entitled to raise an internal question concerning the Kingdom of Jordan; the Israeli intervention was out of place in the Committee's debate.

31. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) had taken note of the United Kingdom reply, but found it incomplete as far as explanations were concerned. While it was not his intention to refute the arguments put forward by the Portuguese representative, there were two points he wished to make, seeing that his country had been called in question. How could the Portuguese representative possibly affirm that there had been no revolts in its Territories when he had also

said that arms had been distributed to the population so that it could defend itself? Portugal had set up an army more than 6,000-strong in its Territories, from which it was attacking independent States, including Guinea. The Security Council had established the validity of Guinea's complaint concerning the November 1970 aggression. A distinction had to be made between the Portuguese Government and the Portuguese people: Guinea bore no enmity towards the Portuguese people, but it was opposed to the colonialist policy of the Fascist Portuguese Government and condemned the Portuguese army's attacks on Member States.

32. There had never been any question of a dialogue with Portugal concerning its Territories, for that was an African problem which was being debated within an African organization. In any case, it was with the populations themselves in the first place, and not with the other African States, that Portugal should initiate that dialogue. The whole move was an attempt to divide Africa which the latter would vigorously oppose.

33. The friends of Portugal should try to persuade it to modify its policy and to withdraw from Portuguese Territories, instead of supplying it with arms. Since the action of those countries was even more important, in practice, than that of Portugal, it was they who should be the subject of the Committee's draft resolutions.

34. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) saw nothing new or convincing in Portugal's argument that its policy of developing education in the African Territories proved that it was not applying a policy of domination. That argument had been used by other European Powers which had developed education in their colonies, but which, having later discarded the fiction of a multiracial society, had embarked on the process of decolonization. As for the figures quoted, their value was relative. The important thing to know was not the school population in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), but whether those Territories had proportionately the same number of students for each branch of study as the metropolis.

35. If Portugal maintained that there was no rebellion in its African Territories, it could only be because it did not listen to the petitioners, did not see the films shown to the Committee, had no knowledge of the proportion of budget expenditure devoted to defence, and had not read the issue of *L'Express* which contained an interview with General Arriaga, in which he acknowledged the state of revolt of the Portuguese territories.

36. With regard to the incidents involving the neighbouring African countries, the Portuguese representative had said that his country would like to have an impartial commission set up to supervise the frontiers; however, the report of the Special Mission of the Security Council established under its resolution 294 (1971)⁵ makes specific mention of Portugal's refusal to co-operate in that direction.

⁵ Document S/10308. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 3*.

37. Reference had been made to the role which the countries friendly with Portugal could play in helping it to initiate the process of decolonization, but the Governments of those countries, in their discussions with the Portuguese Government, should adopt the same position as in NATO. The Portuguese representative, for his part, had referred to what he described as more realistic voices that had been raised in Africa: but one thing that could be taken for certain was that there was no division among the African countries as to their views on the struggle being waged by their brothers to achieve the right to freedom.

38. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) compared the situation in Israel with that in South Africa, quoting from an article which had appeared in *The New York Times* in April 1971, in which it had been stated that the South African Prime Minister had gone so far as to say that Israel was also faced with the problem of *apartheid*. Israel was, in truth, a racist State, as was also evidenced by its attitude towards decolonization. Its position with regard to the liberation movement in Kenya had been a case in point. Israel, in fact, was the champion of anti-liberalism in Africa, and if it had recently donated £10,000 to OAU, it was solely in order to infiltrate into Africa in order to get the latter to support Zionism.

39. The Israeli representative had claimed that before 1967 Egypt was benefiting from the passage of South African ships through the Suez Canal. According to the terms of the Treaty of Constantinople of 1888, that canal was an international waterway and had to be open to all ships without distinction. Egypt could not refuse access to it. Indeed, it was Israel which had drawn considerable material and strategic benefit from its aggression against Egyptian territory in 1967, which had resulted in the closing of the Suez Canal. Egypt had broken off all commercial relations and all other forms of co-operation with South Africa when the United Nations and OAU had adopted resolutions to that effect, while Israel, although hypocritically declaring itself to be the champion of African nations, was trading with South Africa and supplying it with arms. If Israel really had the interests of African countries at heart, it should immediately break off cultural, commercial and diplomatic relations with South Africa. It should cease collaborating with it in the military sector, as it had done for example by supplying South Africa with plans of Mirage jet engines. However, relations between the two countries were becoming not looser but closer: the airline El-Al, for example, was currently providing two flights per week to South Africa. South Africa was granting loans to Israel. Trade between the two countries had increased between 1960 and 1969: according to South African statistics, imports from Israel into South Africa, which had stood at R1,152,000 in 1960, reached R4.8 million in 1969, while South African exports to Israel had increased from R2.8 million in 1960 to R3.4 million in 1969.

40. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq), quoting paragraph 23 of annex II to document A/8086,⁶ emphasized that a parallel could be drawn between the situation in South Africa and that in the Middle East. In both cases, a cancerous enclave was present.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 23B*.

In the same way that a cancer was an abnormal growth which interfered with the functioning of healthy cells, the presence of South Africa in Namibia prevented the latter from developing normally. For its part, Israel must be regarded as a country which in fact practised colonialism. Uganda had narrowly avoided becoming one of those cancerous enclaves when the British Government offered that country for the Zionists to settle.

41. With regard to the Suez Canal, he requested the Israeli representative to quote the provisions of the General Assembly or Security Council resolutions which Egypt was accused of violating before 1967. Finally, it was surprising that Israel should be speaking of the right of Palestinians to self-determination, when 23 years previously it had driven them from the lands they occupied, and when it had voted in 1970 against a draft resolution affirming the Palestinians' right to self-determination.

42. Mr. AL-JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that according to the Israeli news agency, the Israeli Consul in Johannesburg had recognized that the Israeli Government did not expect the South African Government to approve of its gift of £10,000 to OAU; nevertheless, he hoped that the South African Government would understand that Israel was attempting in that way to buy African votes at the United Nations.

43. Mr. SAMBA N'DIAYE (Senegal) said that he protested against the shameless claims of the Portuguese representative. If education was being extended in the Portuguese Territories in Africa, it was for the children of the colonists. Why were Portugal's allies in NATO, which had been formed to defend the free world, contributing with military aid to the maintenance of the Portuguese yoke over peace-loving countries? In addition, his delegation wished to state that, when it had advised Portugal to negotiate with Guinea (Bissau), the Portuguese authorities had replied to the sensible advice by dropping bombs on Senegalese territory. After that, it was difficult for Portugal to pose as a victim.

44. Mr. ISHAN (Nigeria) wished to refute the argument of the Portuguese representative that the racial harmony in Brazil was evidence that his country was not racist. Brazil had been independent for more than 150 years, and therefore Portugal could not make inferences from the situation in that country as proof of its own intentions. The so-called policy of "assimilation" was in fact based on racism, and it was in vain that Portugal was trying to throw dust in the eyes of the international community by speaking of racial harmony in Brazil.

45. Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia) pointed out that there was a very great similarity between *apartheid*, racism and colonialism. Nazism, for example, was based on a philosophy which postulated the superiority of one race over others. South African *apartheid* was also based on the principle of racial superiority. The establishment of Bantustans, where large numbers of people were forced to live in the desert where they died of hunger, represented a form of genocide. Zionism was a similar philosophy.

46. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that he was sure that Portugal had no intention of withdrawing from its occupied

Territories, despite a condemnation by all the Members of the United Nations and in defiance of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and in violation of the Charter. Portugal did not bring colonialism to those Territories out of a sense of altruism and charity as it claimed, but because those "dependencies" provided it with foreign exchange and gold. It claimed to spread culture, as if Africa was devoid of culture; but the African civilization had flourished more than 8,000 years earlier, well before the emergence of European civilization. Colonialism had destroyed African civilization and reduced Africa to barbarity, thus allowing its inhabitants to be treated as savages. To try to impose one's own culture was the worst form of colonialism. It was well known that Portugal was sending workers from Angola and Mozambique to South Africa where they worked to fill the coffers of the colonizers.

47. Mr. EILAN (Israel) pointed out that it was not Israel which had introduced extraneous questions to the debate. Referring to the Iraqi representative's statement, he said that he was not alluding to the resolutions adopted before 1967 on measures taken by the United Nations concerning South Africa, but to the concern of Egypt, which had strongly advocated that such measures be taken. His delegation explained that the United Kingdom had indeed offered the Zionists Uganda, but that they had rejected the offer.

48. Mr. OULD HACHEME (Mauritania) objected to the statement made by Portugal, which called itself non-racist and boasted that it observed United Nations decisions loyally, but which had recently committed acts of aggression against Senegal and Guinea.

49. Did the Israeli delegation think that those present were unaware of such well-known incidents as those occurring in the occupied territories? Mr. Ben-Gurion himself had pointed out to the South Africans that if they had adopted the same system as Israel, they would not be in the situation they were today. According to Mr. Ben-Gurion, they should have expelled the indigenous inhabitants and replaced them with people from outside the country.

50. It was no accident that some delegations had found a similarity between the South African policy of *apartheid* and the policies practised by Israel. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories⁷ accused Israel of judaizing the occupied territories and of trying to destroy the Arab character of Palestine. That Committee had also recommended the setting up of a body to see that the interests of the Arab population in the occupied territories were protected.

51. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that they were supposed to be discussing the three items on the agenda and not the question of the Middle East, which was the business of other United Nations bodies.

52. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt), referring to the answer given by the representative of Israel on refusing Uganda as a home for Zionism, explained that if the Zionists had refused

⁷ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, document A/8089.

Uganda, which had been offered by the British Crown, it had been due to the fact that Zionists were frightened to live among Africans, whom they considered as wild.

53. Mr. SAMBA N'DIAYE (Senegal), speaking on a point of order, urged Egypt and Israel to await the result of the negotiation mission sent to the Middle East to discuss that question.

54. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) explained that he was not talking about the Middle East but of the role played by Israel in Africa. That came under the heading of the questions being examined by the Committee. If the Israeli representative was sincere in what he said, he should

announce immediately that his country was breaking off relations with South Africa.

Expression of sympathy following the catastrophe in India

55. Mr. MAHMOOD (Pakistan) expressed his deepest sympathy to India on the catastrophe suffered by that country.

56. The CHAIRMAN also expressed his condolences to India in the name of the whole Committee.

57. Mr. AHMAD (India) thanked the Pakistani representative and the Committee for their expressions of sympathy.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.