

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1836th  
MEETING**

Tuesday, 21 October 1969,  
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda items 64, 65 and 102:	
Question of Namibia <i>(continued)</i>	
Question of Territories under Portuguese administration <i>(continued)</i>	
Question of Southern Rhodesia <i>(continued)</i>	
General debate <i>(continued)</i> . . . . .	141
Agenda item 64:	
Question of Namibia <i>(continued)</i>	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.934 and Add.1 and 2 <i>(concluded)</i> . . . . .	142
Hearing of petitioners <i>(continued)</i> . . . . .	144

**Chairman: Mr. Théodore IDZUMBUIR**  
(Democratic Republic of the Congo).

**AGENDA ITEMS 64, 65 AND 102**

**Question of Namibia *(continued)***  
**(A/7623/Add.2 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.934 and Add.1)**

**Question of Territories under Portuguese administration**  
***(continued)* (A/7623/Add.3 and Corr.1, A/7694)**

**Question of Southern Rhodesia *(continued)***  
**(A/7623/Add.1)**

GENERAL DEBATE *(continued)*

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the delegations which had asked to exercise their right of reply to statements made in the general debate on agenda items 64, 65 and 102 to speak.

2. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal), exercising his right of reply in connexion with item 65 of the agenda concerning Territories under Portuguese administration, wished to make his delegation's usual reservations with regard to the inclusion of that item in the Committee's agenda. Several allegations had been made in the course of the debate concerning the political, social, economic and military situation in Portuguese Territories; however his delegation had noted that many delegations had recognized that the problem existing in Portuguese Territories was not a racial one.

3. Replying to certain specific charges made during the debate, he said that Portugal did not deny the existence of neighbourly relations between its Territories and adjoining lands established there as a result of historical or geographical factors. Those relations were a reflection of what Portugal considered international relations should be. His

country made no distinctions and other countries of southern Africa besides South Africa and Rhodesia could certainly bear witness to the fact that Portugal desired to co-operate with them and that it did in fact collaborate with them. The allegations that an "alliance" or a "pact" existed between Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia and that foreign military personnel were present in Portuguese Territories were completely untrue. Everyone had a right to enjoy neighbourly relations; other African countries adjoining the Portuguese Territories benefited from such relations and each one respected the internal policies of the others. It was regrettable that some countries did not seem to want to have such relations with Portugal.

4. The question of foreign investments in Portuguese Territories had also been raised and his delegation was surprised at the remarks that had been made on that subject. Portugal considered that all investments, whether domestic or foreign, should be welcomed, since they promoted the development and well-being of the population without discrimination of any kind. Investments were a recognized and approved means, at the international level, of raising the people's standard of living, and Portugal saw no reason why the population of its Territories should be deprived of the opportunity to achieve economic and social progress. Foreign investments in no way implied any political interference in the conduct of Portuguese internal affairs.

5. It had also been alleged in the course of the debate that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was participating in the exclusively defensive action that Portugal was obliged to take against those who were attacking it from outside. Portugal challenged anyone to prove that the arms supplied to it as a member of NATO were used outside the geographical limits of that alliance. On the other hand, there was no doubt as to the source of the armaments supplied to those who were attacking Portugal: only three days ago one delegation had formally recognized in the Committee the important part its country was playing in supplying armaments to groups infiltrating into Portuguese Territories, thus publicly confirming the complicity of its Government in the acts of violence perpetrated in Portuguese Territories.

6. Mr. MUEMPU-SAMPU (Democratic Republic of the Congo), speaking on a point of order, protested against the use by the Portuguese representative of wording to the effect that some countries were supplying arms to groups which were infiltrating into the Territories administered by Portugal.

7. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal), continuing his statement, said that the same delegation had thus confirmed that the attacks against the populations of the Portuguese Terri-

tories were planned outside the Territories, in accordance with the well-known tactics of subversion from abroad. Was such military aid from the Soviet Union to be regarded as altruistic, based on brotherly love for the African peoples and devoid of all ideological, economic, political and even strategic interest? Portugal itself had already drawn the obvious conclusions.

8. Many accusations had also been levelled at his delegation by those who refused to see that the defensive action conducted by Portugal was successful because of the collaboration and loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the peoples in its Territories. In response to such loyalty it was Portugal's duty to continue to defend the lives and property of those populations against armed infiltration and at the same time to pursue its work of development and progress, in the conviction that all men were equal and had equal rights to dignity and to respect of the human person, without distinction as to colour, race, creed or sex.

9. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) wished to reply to the statement made by the Soviet representative at the 1834th meeting, in which he had endeavoured to refute the facts mentioned by the Albanian representative on 17 October (1833rd meeting) concerning the treacherous policy pursued by the Soviet leaders against the movements of national liberation of oppressed peoples. The Soviet delegation's attitude supporting the racist Government of South Africa in the vote on the draft resolution calling for the expulsion of South Africa from an organ of the United Nations was a well-known and irrefutable fact, which could be verified from the documents of the General Assembly.

10. He could mention other facts showing that the Soviet revisionists had betrayed the legitimate aspirations of the struggle of colonized peoples. On 2 May 1967 a petitioner from Namibia had stated in the Committee that the Soviet Union, instead of helping to unite the people of South West Africa in its struggle against South Africa, had engaged in activities designed to divide the liberation movement of South West Africa and to destroy the South West Africa National Union (SWANU) as an organization. The peoples of dependent territories were not deceived by the evil plans to divide and dominate the world nurtured by the Soviet revisionists and American imperialists.

11. Mr. TOURE (Guinea), exercising his right of reply, emphasized the importance of the problem of decolonization in Africa. Portugal, by its deeds, was continually attacking the freedom of the peoples of Africa, though the Charter clearly laid down the right of peoples to self-determination. It should be noted that had it not been for the aid given to Portugal in order to quell the resistance of the populations of its African territories, those populations would already have gained their independence. His delegation called on all those who supported the Portuguese régime to change their attitude.

12. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the fabrications uttered by two delegations against the Soviet Union, one fact stood out—namely, that the two delegations concerned had found it possible to be united on the matter; that in itself was extremely significant.

13. The Soviet Union had helped and was helping the liberation movements in southern Africa, and would continue to do so. The Soviet delegation considered Portugal's refusal to comply with the numerous United Nations resolutions on the Portuguese colonies in Africa as a defiance by Portugal of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The Soviet delegation also wished to say that anti-Sovietism had never brought honour to anyone, and would not do so now.

14. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) said that the Soviet delegation's reaction only served to bear out his own delegation's charges. As further evidence of the collusion of the Soviet revisionists and the imperialists against the liberation movements, there was the statement made by the President of the Palestine Liberation Organization on 19 July 1969 to the effect that the Palestinian people had rejected the conclusions reached during the discussions between the four great Powers and the bilateral discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union because they were inconsistent with its wishes and aspirations. The Soviet revisionist representative's insinuations against Albania were typical of the Soviet revisionists—that league of renegades and traitors to the peoples' cause and to the cause of the Soviet people itself.

#### AGENDA ITEM 64

##### Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/7623/Add.2 and Corr.1, A/C.4/721/Add.2, A/C.4/L.934 and Add.1 and 2)

##### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.4/L.934 AND ADD.1 AND 2 (*concluded*)\*

15. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the delegations of Japan (A/C.4/L.934/Add.1) and of Argentina, the Dominican Republic and Somalia (A/C.4/L.934/Add.2) had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. A few delegations had asked for the floor in order to explain their votes before the voting.

16. U AUNG MYAT KYAW (Burma) said that it was the responsibility of the United Nations to ensure that the peoples still under the yoke of colonialism and *apartheid* attained their full status as free peoples. Unfortunately it had to be recognized that in that matter the prestige of the United Nations had suffered a severe setback. Those who counselled patience in other areas could not in good conscience do so in the case of Namibia. His delegation considered that it was the duty of the permanent members of the Security Council to ensure that the resolutions adopted by the United Nations on the question of Namibia did not remain a mere expression of intention but became effective instruments for carrying out the will of the whole membership of the United Nations.

17. Mr. ARIAS SALGADO (Spain) observed that the United Nations had exhausted all the peaceful means offered by the Charter in its efforts to find a way of settling the situation prevailing in Namibia. The principal organs of the United Nations had used every possible political, moral and legal argument to induce South Africa to recognize the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and

\* Resumed from the 1834th meeting.

independence. His delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and had supported Security Council resolutions 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969 and 269 (1969) of 12 August 1969. It was still convinced that the best way to solve the complicated problem was to endeavour to achieve the objectives and principles set forth in the United Nations resolutions, which reflected the will of the international community. His delegation took the opportunity to welcome the Manifesto on Southern Africa adopted at Lusaka,<sup>1</sup> which it had studied with great interest and which could be of the utmost importance in seeking peace and harmony in southern Africa.

18. There had been no change in the attitude of South Africa since the adoption of Security Council resolution 269 (1969), which had called upon the South African Government to withdraw from Namibia not later than 4 October 1969. The South African Government had done nothing whatever to that end. It was inadmissible that a Member of the United Nations should refuse to comply with the provisions of a resolution which had not been adopted arbitrarily but had been the outcome of extensive discussions. The refusal to respect the time-limit set for South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory dealt a serious blow to the prestige and authority of the Security Council and the United Nations. The least that the Organization could do was to denounce that attitude strongly and consider recourse to all the means provided by the United Nations Charter to ensure respect for its resolutions. His delegation considered that the only way to restore the authority of the United Nations was to implement its resolutions in good faith. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.934.

19. Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece) said that the draft resolution seemed to him to be moderately worded. That was an important point, for the resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly should do nothing to impede the dialogue advocated in the Lusaka Manifesto, which was the only means whereby Namibia might be freed from the South African régime in accordance with the principles of the Charter. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

20. Mr. POLDERMAN (Netherlands) said that his delegation had always considered that the withdrawal of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia had been justified and that the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia was contrary to law. It was the duty of the United Nations to induce South Africa to leave Namibia by methods that were in keeping with the Charter and that took account of the political facts. The resolutions adopted by the United Nations should therefore take those considerations into account, for otherwise they could not be implemented and that would impair the prestige of the United Nations.

21. His delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.934, but it reserved its position with regard to any other resolutions that might be adopted on the subject in the future should those resolutions recommend measures that it considered impracticable.

<sup>1</sup> The text of the Manifesto was subsequently circulated as document A/7754.

22. Mr. KIRWAN (Ireland) said that his delegation had consistently condemned South Africa's occupation of Namibia and its application of a policy of *apartheid* there. At the same time it had urged that the responsibility for carrying out General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) should rest with the Security Council, which had the authority and power to do so.

23. In the case under consideration, a Member State—South Africa—was in illegal occupation of a Territory for which the international community had special responsibility. It was therefore clear that the Security Council and the General Assembly should act with a sense of urgency.

24. In resolution 269 (1969), the Security Council had decided that the continued occupation of Namibia by the South African authorities constituted an encroachment on the authority of the United Nations, a violation of the territorial integrity and a denial of the political sovereignty of the people of Namibia. His delegation consequently considered that the Security Council should be requested to review the position which had arisen through the failure of the South African authorities to comply with the resolution in question. In his delegation's opinion, the draft resolution before the Committee met the needs of the situation.

25. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.4/L.934 and Add.1 and 2.

*At the request of the representative of Ecuador, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Norway, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria.

*Against:* Portugal, South Africa.

*Abstaining:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Botswana, France, Ivory Coast, Malawi.

*Draft resolution A/C.4/L.934 and Add.1 and 2 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.*

26. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution adopted by the Security Council as resolution 269 (1969) because that resolution had set a time-limit for the withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia. The United States thought that South Africa should leave Namibia but it considered it better not to set a date. It had been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/L.934 because that resolution merely drew the attention of the Security Council to the situation.

27. His delegation reserved its position with regard to any later decision that the Security Council might take on the question.

28. Mr. MULLER (Finland) said that his delegation whole-heartedly supported the objectives of the draft resolution and had accordingly voted in favour of it. His delegation hoped that when the question was once again considered by the Security Council it would be possible to come to an agreement with regard to the means to be used to induce South Africa to comply with the decisions of the United Nations.

29. Mr. SHAW (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's position had been stated on numerous occasions since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). The United Kingdom, which had not supported that resolution, had abstained for the same reasons in the vote on the draft resolution which had just been adopted by the Committee.

30. Nevertheless, he wished to pay a tribute to the efforts at conciliation made by the sponsors and he hoped that those efforts would facilitate the future work of the Committee.

31. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but stressed that it was for the Security Council to adopt sanctions.

32. Mr. ALDEGHATHER (Saudi Arabia) said that he had not been in the room at the time of the vote. He asked if it would be possible to include his delegation among those which had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

33. The CHAIRMAN replied that his request would be noted in the summary record of the meeting.

34. Mr. SAVAGE (Sierra Leone) said that he, too, had not been in the room at the time of the vote, a fact which he regretted all the more since his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Like the representative of Saudi Arabia, therefore, he asked that his country should be included among those which had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

35. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Sierra Leone that his request, too, would be noted in the summary record of the meeting.

36. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) said that he did not understand why some delegations had thought that they should abstain in the vote on a draft resolution which, as the representative of Greece had pointed out, was drafted in moderate terms and which dealt with a problem on

which all Members of the United Nations should be in agreement. Nor did he understand why some other delegations, resorting to evasive tactics, had explained that although they had voted in favour of the resolution they reserved their position with regard to any decisions which might subsequently be taken by the Security Council. Such an attitude was strangely reminiscent of what had occurred in the League of Nations in connexion with another specific problem, the results of which were common knowledge.

37. It was important to know whether those reluctant delegations intended to shoulder their responsibilities as Members of the Organization. Those responsibilities were defined in the Charter, some Articles of which dealt expressly with measures to be applied against a Member State which violated the principles set forth in the Charter.

#### HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

*At the invitation of the Chairman Mr. Geingob, Mr. Sheepo and Mr. Gurirab, representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), took places at the Committee table.*

38. Mr. CLARK (Nigeria) said that he would like to ask the petitioners three questions. First, he asked what role the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees played or could play to help Namibians who had left the Territory.

39. Secondly, he asked how effectively the United Nations Council for Namibia had been able to act so far and what kind of assistance it could give to the indigenous people before being able to discharge its functions in Namibia itself.

40. Lastly, since Mr. Geingob had said that it would be desirable for Namibians to be represented on the Council, he asked whether the petitioner would be in favour of establishing, through the good offices of the United Nations, a permanent office which would enable Namibians resident in New York to carry out their task more effectively.

41. Mr. GEINGOB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that, before replying to the questions put by the representative of Nigeria, he wished to thank the members of the Committee who had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

42. With regard to the first question, he said that the Zambian Government had had occasion to seek the assistance of the High Commissioner for some 700 refugees from the Caprivi region and that a sum of \$14,000 had been provided for that purpose. The Zambian Government, for its part, had helped to meet the needs of the refugees and to rehouse them. The situation of the Namibians was particularly alarming, as was shown by a letter received two days previously from Dar es Salaam in which the petitioners had been asked to collect funds, medicines and food. He therefore expressed the hope that the Office of the High Commissioner would be able to increase its assistance.

43. In reply to the second question, he said that at the time the United Nations Council for Namibia had been set

up, SWAPO had hoped that it would be able to play a very useful role, but that obviously its efforts were at present paralysed. The Council could, however, help representatives of the liberation movements to come to plead their cause at the United Nations, where they could not always make their voice heard owing to a lack of the necessary financial resources. SWAPO would also like to have an opportunity to draw the attention of public opinion to the situation in Namibia to a greater extent. For that, too, funds were essential.

44. He fervently hoped that his organization would be permanently represented in New York. The United Nations would thus be kept constantly informed of developments in the situation in Namibia. It would indeed seem natural that Namibians should participate in the work of the Council and help directly in the solution of the problems which concerned them most of all.

45. Mr. ABDULLA (Southern Yemen) said that he would like to know which foreign companies had branches in Namibia and what the activities of the foreign interests had been since South Africa's mandate over the Territory had been terminated.

46. He also asked the petitioners to explain how the United Nations Council for Namibia could perform its task more effectively.

47. Mr. GEINGOB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) gave the names of a number of foreign companies established in Namibia, including Caltex

Oil Ltd., Etosha Petroleum Co. Ltd., Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. Ltd., Mobil Petroleum Co., Newmont Mining Corp., Eastman Kodak Co. and California Texas Oil Corp.

48. He added that a number of concessions had been granted to various companies subsequent to the decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate. In September 1968, SWAKOR had granted concessions to the following international companies: Shell, the British Petroleum Co. Ltd., De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd., Gulf Oil Company and a number of others. In March 1968, Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa Ltd. had been on the point of concluding an agreement with Saltex Exploration Company.

49. Mr. SHEEPO (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that, although the United Nations Council for Namibia had not in fact been able to go to the Territory and carry out its functions, it had shown perseverance and had made great efforts to do so. The Council could count on the co-operation of representatives of liberation movements who would help them in a very thankless task. It was clear that some Member States could facilitate the Council's task by discontinuing their support of South Africa, but, as the members of the Committee knew, the means to persuade them to do so had yet to be found.

50. The CHAIRMAN thanked the petitioners for the replies they had given.

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*