

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**2065th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 18 October 1972,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 22: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)	1
Organization of work	16

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 22

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report
of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to
the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (con-
tinued)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I propose that the list of those who wish to participate in the debate on item 22 of the agenda be closed this afternoon at 6 p.m.

2. If there is no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts that proposal.

It was so decided.

3. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): That détente and co-operation will be the hallmark of international relations in the next few years is no longer in doubt after the statements we have heard here and elsewhere—statements which, for the most part, suggest optimistically that we have entered upon a new stage of peace and justice. It would be churlish not to share those views, particularly when, in all objectivity, we are aware that the world will always need more security, more confidence in itself, and a certain balance of interests essential to its survival. And it is easy to see that when the political and military security of one part of the world is assured the economic security of another part soon follows and full recognition of the natural rights of mankind that is still not free.

4. Thus, in the process opened to us, we have not had an opportunity to lay stress on our own priorities, the consideration of our interests has been marginal, and we note, without bitterness but with some disillusion, that in the chorus of self-satisfaction, suffering African humanity

has once again been relegated to the background. We do not claim that the problems of decolonization are the only ones of concern to our Assembly, and still less to the world as it is today. But we do ask for justice and the recognition in all decency that there can be no reconciliation of interests or coincidence of advantage as long as colonialism exists, as long as imperialism assists it, and as long as neo-colonialism is not eradicated from our system.

5. In certain quarters we are often reproached with irrational rhetoric, a predilection for futile debate and a tendency to rehash our dissatisfactions. These are facile and sometimes gratuitous accusations made by those who refuse to listen to reason, who peremptorily dismiss our arguments and who, nostalgic for a past which has long since gone and which was arbitrary in any case, would still have us bow to a predetermined framework of fallacious and outmoded reasoning.

6. The virtues of conciliation are preached to us as if they could by themselves wipe out the evils of more than five centuries of colonialism, practised in intolerance and injustice. To our requests for radical change after five centuries of patience and subjugation, we are offered reformism, in the hope perhaps that some stages of this process will be reversible. For 27 years we have been asking for a political and even a juridical commitment as indicated in Article 1, paragraph 2, Article 55 *a* and Article 56 of the Charter. What we get instead is bogus liberalism, sometimes bordering on a culpable and reactionary *laissez-faire*. We want peace and security in our continent and in other parts of the world which are groaning under colonialism; but, by votes carefully weighed and explained with consummate artistry, it is intimated to us that our dead and our prisoners, who have sacrificed their lives and their freedom for a cause dear to us, are perhaps not as important as some others. We say and we repeat that, in a system which is supposed to be democratic, the majority cannot bow to the whims of a minority, however powerful it may be; and we are insulted by having proposed to us political solutions which not only perpetuate the *status quo* but would actually give that minority a legal basis for its domination. We appeal for a recognition and a shouldering of responsibilities vis-à-vis our Organization and our Charter and the peoples supposedly under administration but we note, sadly, that from abdication to abdication this responsibility—sometimes claimed, sometimes disavowed at the bidding of opportunism and a covert community of interests—is gradually becoming smaller and smaller, and is assuming proportions such that one wonders whether the usurper is not going to leave it to others, like the cloak of the prophet Elijah.

7. We advocate the end of political and economic spheres of influence, an idea ostensibly accepted in certain quarters

but resolutely rejected by those who adhere to outrageous racist ideologies. The list of charges against colonialism and neo-colonialism could be prolonged indefinitely, but we shall always arrive at findings regrettable in themselves, for which we could all bear responsibility. What we are witnessing now is not the death-throes of colonialism, but rather the resurgence of a political, economic and cultural imperialism, which takes us back to the centuries of the worst obscurantism and prompts us to say once again that Africa is still a forgotten continent, as are the other Territories which, although not in Africa, none the less suffer the same rigours, the same arbitrary rule and the same insensate ambitions of colonialism and neo-colonialism, which bear the stamp of the basest self-interest.

8. After describing the views prevailing in certain circles which cling to outmoded ideas, honesty bids me speak of initiatives which we, the once-colonized peoples, have believed it our duty to take so that our brothers may glimpse the end of a system of terror and oppression which denies them their right to a free, independent life worthy of their own traditions.

9. Even before colonialism began to let go, our peoples placed all their hopes in the Charter in which—although it was perhaps not drafted with them in mind—they did find a reflection of their aspirations and a means of claiming their rights without alienating sympathies which, although liberal of course, were maintained by opportunist considerations of alliances and were doled out in the service of self-interest. That is why we remain faithful to the Charter and reject categorically the subtle distinctions between Chapters XI, XII and XIII, distinctions based on the conception which some people have of contractual obligations once their country has been admitted to membership in our Organization. Right from the start, before the admission of any given country to the United Nations, we believe that country should formally reject Chapter XI and thus spare us the arguments with one or more Members refusing to comply with the Charter. The Organization would have drawn the necessary conclusions and we would not be in the untenable position of having accepted in our midst one or more countries whose ambitions were and are contrary to our objectives.

10. In spite of these restrictions the African countries did not hesitate in 1963—when the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had hardly been born—to seek, together with Portugal, common ground with regard to the concept of self-determination within the meaning of the Charter, and not according to historical criteria whose authenticity is more than doubtful. We encountered a very civilized arrogance, which denied what history and circumstances can contribute to an understanding of true civilization, not that civilization which some would like to see prevail on behalf of some parochial culture, no matter how valid.

11. Later on when we realized that negotiation was impossible, since the premises on each side rested on concepts irreconcilable within the framework of what we hold to be justice and equity, nevertheless, through the Manifesto on Southern Africa,¹ we still held out the hand

of reconciliation, a hand which was rejected in the name of historical vested interests and of a civilizing mission which denies our own values to the detriment of others which, not being rooted in our traditional societies, must necessarily remain foreign to African aspirations. Recently, President Senghor of the Republic of Senegal spoke of a Luso-African community, thus hoping to put relations between Portugal and Africa on a footing of true friendship and co-operation. We all know what the answer was: first, the escalation of aggression and repression; then the promulgation of certain constitutional reforms, which was simply pouring new wine into old bottles.

12. Arbitration? We sought that at the International Court of Justice and we were told what our rights and obligations were vis-à-vis Namibia, a Trust Territory, a direct responsibility of the Organization, but whose administration has been usurped by South Africa. No attention was paid by the trusteeship Power to the advisory opinion of the Court of 21 June 1971.² Bantustanization is more entrenched than ever and self-determination for Namibia has, it seems, to bow to the interplay of monopolistic interests and satisfy the security requirements of a régime which is crumbling from within as a result of a racist policy and ideology rejected by the whole of humanity.

13. We have thus exhausted every normal recourse under the Charter, from negotiation to arbitration, at the risk of seeming naive in the eyes of some people, incapable of understanding the realities of power politics and pointlessly baring our good faith only to be taken by surprise more easily.

14. In 200 resolutions we have made appeals, issued invitations, offered recommendations and expressed regret, denunciation and condemnation. Who can now tell us that Africa has not been patient? Who can claim that it is right to wait indefinitely for a turn of events that would enable the colonialists to save face and thus compel our nationalists to accept “honourable defeat”, as it is called? Frustration is at its height; the voices calling for appeasement are becoming ever more urgent; and the conspiracy against Africa and the other colonized peoples continues to flout with impunity the obligations which, in a moment of euphoria, were solemnly assumed under the Charter. The principles, the goals and objectives of the Charter—nothing seems to mean much any more; yet people are surprised that Africa should turn to revolution, reserving its friendship for those who really want to help and treading cautiously with those who, deliberately or not, are hindering its progress towards liberation and freedom, by cultivating special or privileged relations with illegal racist and colonialist minorities.

15. International opinion, which is of its nature conservative, thus faces two alternatives: it can give its approval to an indifference which borders on cynicism and complicity, or it can recognize the justification for revolutionary action to recover our legitimate rights. We are already aware that an attempt has been made to channel and mislead

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

² *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, p. 16.*

world opinion, that it has been urged to take a stand against the liberation movements charged with terrorism, and that the real sympathy they enjoy has been eroded by propaganda, whose motives we denounce.

16. Again, because the alternatives facing international opinion are both delicate and uncomfortable, it is offered the middle course of dialogue without its being made clear exactly what the content or objective would be, to the point where we are made to appear as having deliberately rejected the diplomatic recourse of the so-called civilized world and committed ourselves blindly to the unreasoning exercise of violence. No one here has the right to offer an apologia for violence. We have no intention of doing so, but it is our duty to say that the sole responsibility for it rests with the colonialists and racists who take refuge behind what they describe as legitimacy and the defence of a world they call free, bringing to our continent the aftermath of a cold war which elsewhere is now being relegated to the archives.

17. In the end, the nationalism and the representative nature of the liberation movements are decried by misguided, ill-informed and ill-advised opinion. Let everyone among us search his own conscience and ask whether it is not more in keeping with the norms of international morality to persuade public opinion to espouse unreservedly the just cause of the liberation movements than to direct this same opinion against the aspirations of peoples of which these movements are the sole and authentic representatives. They get their representative nature first of all from the peoples, sometimes misled by paternalist propaganda and by the servility of political mercenaries. They derive it next from the courage they have displayed in the struggle. Finally, they derive it from another part of international opinion whose progressive philosophy has long since rejected the shilly-shallying of reaction. We believe that it is high time for our Organization to recognize that the liberation movements have not only the right to act but also the right to full representation and responsible participation, which we deny to those who have arbitrarily claimed that right for themselves.

18. It is in this context that my delegation addresses its congratulations to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to its Chairman, Mr. Salim of the United Republic of Tanzania, to whose perseverance we owe the fact that the liberation movements will no longer be occasional guests in our Organization but will rather be delegations together with which we shall decide on concrete and effective solutions which will serve the cause of the United Nations in the face of continuing arbitrary rule.

19. With the purpose of systematic vilification, the point is made that in the matter of decolonization the Special Committee has not achieved much in the way of results. Yes, we concede this point. The task of that Committee was not to decolonize, to take on itself the responsibilities which the trusteeship Powers should have been discharging under the Charter out of respect for the interests of the peoples which they should have led to self-determination and freedom. On the contrary, by its vigilance, by its objective studies and by its search for the most various

possible information, the Special Committee has understood and made others understand how essential it is that the Organization should renew its commitment to all freedom movements.

20. The denunciations of the Special Committee, however controversial they may have been, have at least this to their credit: they kept the peoples of the world on the alert, have aroused world opinion and have posed the problems of decolonization in terms of the objectives of the Charter, so that responsible peoples the world over may judge for themselves the delaying tactics and the denials of rights of which certain of their Governments might have been guilty, on their behalf but surely without their knowledge.

21. Finally, since the visiting missions, with a couple of exceptions, are considered by the administering Powers as an impugment of their stewardship, if not an actual interference in their national policy, the most recent initiative taken by the Special Committee in sending special missions to liberated Territories is of particular importance because it represents formal recognition of the struggle of the liberation movements, and gives them an additional reason to hope and to go on fighting. Let no one try to tell us, after the report of the Special Mission to Guinea (Bissau) [*A/8723/Rev.1, chap. X, annex I*], that the freedom-fighters are only interested in pillage and plunder, that they are incapable of constructive acts or of conceiving the future of their people in terms other than confrontation and anarchy.

22. For these reasons, and because we want to stress our continued dedication to the cause of decolonization, my delegation will support all the recommendations of the Special Committee. Certainly, these recommendations will give rise to reservations, because we must recognize differences of interests and situations, but the essential thing is that over and above these differences the Organization is reaffirming the constancy of its objectives: an end to the exploitation of man by man, of one people by another people in the name of false ideologies and of philosophies and imperatives which can hardly be justified or vindicated in the world in which we live today.

23. Colonialism, which is in full retreat, survives only thanks to the support of certain foreign monopolies, which allow the colonial Power to provide for the colonial Territories in its charge a selective economic and social development propitious to foreign domination and to the maintenance of privileges, profits and dividends. These monopolies passively go along with a diversion of the natural and human resources of the Territory to serve their own interests and accept the fact of recolonization, an anachronism based upon show projects. These projects directly benefit not the people but the régimes which make the most of them, both technically and financially, the better to secure their domination over the majority.

24. Advocating the economic integration of southern Africa, the minority régimes have in view only the constitution of a whole which, by the interplay of forces on the continent and helped by international imperialism, will inexorably serve to promote the policy of discrimination and subjugation.

25. Already we are witnessing the arbitrary relocation of the indigenous population, a modification of rural structures and the strengthening of a military presence designed, it would seem, to protect these projects. It is therefore not without reason that we have denounced the Cabora Bassa and the Cunene projects as political-military complexes which predetermine the economic future of the Territories concerned by making them strict tributaries of régimes which are determined to take account of none of the interests and aspirations of the nationals concerned and even less of their right to an economic identity.

26. These activities, like so many others, constitute, in our view, clear obstacles to the application of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV), and they must end because sooner or later they will be challenged by the people when it recovers its identity, its sovereignty, and its independence of action and judgement. We shall be told that such activities will have an immediate economic impact, but, over the long term, they will lead to the creation of a false economy at the mercy of a policy which runs counter to the permanent interests of the Territories and their populations.

27. We remain convinced that the interest of peoples as they understand it, and not as others seek to define it, must be paramount in our search for ways of speeding the application of the Declaration in resolution 1514 (XV). Our Charter provides for this, and no ephemeral and immoral alliances can justify a reordering of goals, presented with specious arguments stemming from the special logic of those who dare to defend it against all reason.

28. It is for us unthinkable that the sovereign will of a people, even though that people be enslaved, should be usurped by the arbitrary rule of another will, whose only purpose would seem to be the vain search for its own justification.

29. We reject the kind of appeasement which inevitably leads to the elimination of a sacrificed majority, whose rightful responsibilities are denied, and we shall continue to denounce this untoward solidarity designed to alienate whole peoples economically, politically and even culturally.

30. We shall maintain that it is the duty of the Organization, by all means open to it under the Charter, to ensure full respect for the rights of colonial peoples vis-à-vis the claims of the colonial Powers. If the intentions are clear, if the process of decolonization is well defined, if the conditions for a lasting reconciliation are fulfilled, co-operation will come of its own accord and will have a foundation which no one will have cause to regret later on. That is the path we invite all those to take who are not yet irrevocably committed to the course of obstinacy and blind prejudice, because we, too, envisage a future of liberty and justice for all, a future where for the first time the parties will come together to build and not to destroy.

31. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Since the adoption 12 years ago of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we have recorded with satisfaction the accession to sovereignty of a large number of new States, but we must nevertheless recognize that the process of decolonization is far from being completed. In various parts of the world

many other Territories have been kept aside from this great historic movement and even today remain under foreign domination.

32. Because most of these Territories are small and sparsely populated we should not show ourselves less attentive to the problem of their emancipation. The right of people to self-determination, freely and without foreign obstacles, is recognized as belonging to all countries, whether they be large or small. Nor should their geographical position, and the extent of their natural resources constitute an obstacle to their emergence to independence. The United Nations, therefore, should intensify and pursue its efforts in order to reach a point where the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is applied in full and complete terms, and help those Territories which are still under foreign domination. We should like to cherish the hope that the Powers which now are exercising colonial responsibilities will show a realistic attitude by agreeing to co-operate loyally with the United Nations in order to promote the self-determination of the colonial peoples under their administration.

33. In this connexion, we are pleased to pay a sincere tribute to France, which in the past has given us so much evidence of its goodwill and its enlightened policy in respect of decolonization. We are convinced that France, in which we retain full confidence, will not disappoint the international community and that it will be able to promote in its colonial Territories the necessary measures for the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

34. Whereas there are increasingly visible and increasingly numerous signs of a relaxation of tension in the relations between States which not too long ago were fiercely opposed to one another and between systems with unyielding ideologies everywhere else, Africa remains the region of the world which is still untouched by this fortunate development in international policy, where paradoxes and anachronisms are deliberately maintained, where tension is increasing to the point of becoming a serious threat to international peace and security. Large areas of the African continent are maintained forcibly under foreign domination, or are prisoners of racist minority régimes which have seized power to the detriment of the interests of the indigenous majority of the population. This is the case in particular in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, as well as in Rhodesia and in Namibia.

35. The Portuguese Government tries to convince people that it is defending parts of its national territory in Africa. The grotesque theory to the effect that Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique are Portuguese provinces is a pure figment of fiction which cannot deceive anyone and which calls into question the common sense of the victims of that aberration.

36. Portugal is simply a colonialist Power which clings to a bygone past and an outmoded system in order to try to preserve what was its colonial empire. It would be vain and superfluous to repeat that Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique are African Territories; the truth of this has been demonstrated repeatedly, the reality of geography is there, untouchable and irrefutable.

37. If these African Territories, as Portugal alleges, had been provinces of its national territory, would the authorities of Lisbon have had the courage to wipe out their own compatriots under a hail of bombs and machine-gun fire? Would Portugal have had the heart to shower on its own sons napalm bombs, defoliants and other chemical products? Not only is this inconceivable, but we are convinced that this worst of policies would be criticized by the Lisbon authorities themselves as folly and a crime against mankind and would be vigorously combatted and brought to a halt within the Government itself. But as we are dealing with poor black people who are the inhabitants of barbarous, remote countries and areas, then Lisbon does not recoil at the horror of genocide.

38. However, the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique demand nothing of Portugal other than recognition of their right to self-determination and independence. These imprescriptible rights to dignity and freedom are recognized to all by the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But Portugal refuses to heed these just claims and, rather than sitting down at the conference table, Lisbon imposes the language of force, that is to say, war.

39. Portugal is not only conducting this war in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, but it has also carried the fight to the Territories of neighbouring African States. Acts of armed aggression by Portugal against Senegal, Guinea, Congo, Zaire and Zambia are too numerous to be counted. Repeatedly the Security Council has met and energetically and unequivocally condemned these acts of aggression that have resulted in destruction and loss of innocent lives in the independent countries of Africa. Only a few days ago Portugal, flouting international law and the sovereignty of States, once again attacked Senegal. Portuguese armed tanks penetrated into Senegalese territory, causing widespread destruction and loss of human life. The General Assembly should solemnly condemn this international banditry by Portugal, which persists in defying world public opinion in the most insolent fashion. Portugal should immediately put an end to its terroristic and unjustified aggression against independent African States. The behaviour of Portugal reflects not only its bellicose intentions towards African countries which are opposed to its colonialist policy, but also its determination to pursue the war in order to maintain its colonial domination over the peoples of the Territories that it occupies.

40. It is therefore Lisbon which is forcing the desperate people of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique to resort to armed resistance. In order to win their right to dignity, self-determination and independence, these peoples are accepting the heaviest of sacrifices by sustaining proudly, with courage and abnegation, an unbelievably unequal combat. They are determined to struggle until final victory is won and already their efforts have met with considerable success. Large areas of territory have passed into their control. They have set up an administration there, opened schools and established medical and social services.

41. The fact that this fighting has been going on for more than 10 years and that the nationalist forces have not been exhausted but, on the contrary, are increasing their

numbers and expanding the area of combat and their efficiency proves abundantly that the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique have unequivocally chosen armed struggle and are rallying *en masse* to the field of honour, independence and liberty.

42. In the statement he made to the General Assembly on 2 October, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal said:

“But, contrary to what has been widely said, Portugal does not reject the principle of self-determination. To reject the principle of self-determination would be tantamount to denying the essential dignity of man.” [2048th meeting, para. 42.]

Further on in his statement he said: “Contrary to what is so often said, Portugal is not opposed to decolonization” [Ibid., para 47]. Lastly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal launched an appeal to the African States by stating: “We are ready to start a dialogue with them concerning our concepts, our realities and our plans”. [Ibid., para. 61].

43. I wished to remind representatives of those statements of the Portuguese Foreign Minister in order to compare them with those made eight months ago at Addis Ababa by a true and courageous leader of the liberation movements in Africa. Speaking before the Security Council on 1 February last at Addis Ababa, Mr. Amílcar Cabral said: “We are not opposed to Portugal. We have already stated that time and time again. We are against Portuguese colonialism.”³ Later on he went on to explain:

“We should like to repeat once again that we are for dialogue, but heretofore the Portuguese Government wanted to have only the dialogue of arms. We repeat that we are ready to negotiate at any time. We should be very grateful to the Security Council if it could help us in that area.”⁴

44. Therefore eight months ago the leader of the resistance in Guinea (Bissau) stated that he was opposed to Portuguese colonialism; in other words, he was asking for decolonization. Today the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal confirms to us that his country is not against decolonization and self-determination. Eight months ago Mr. Amílcar Cabral called for dialogue at any time for the purpose of negotiations. Today the Minister of Portugal, speaking of self-determination and decolonization, proclaims that he is ready to begin a dialogue on the subject of his ideas and his plans.

45. That being so, what is it that separates the Minister of Portugal from the leader of the resistance in Guinea (Bissau)? Nothing, apparently, since they use the same words to talk about the same things.

46. That is why we say to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal that if the views he has set forth publicly before the General Assembly reflect a real desire for a settlement through negotiation, then nothing any longer stands in the

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, 1632nd meeting.*

⁴ Ibid.

way of the opening of a dialogue with Mr. Amílcar Cabral to discuss decolonization and self-determination and to negotiate the political future of Guinea (Bissau). If this courageous step were taken Portugal could count on the support of all because the way would thus be opened for a general statement of its serious and painful colonial problem.

47. The statements made eight months ago at Addis Ababa by Mr. Cabral were once again publicly confirmed by him in the important statement he made the day before yesterday in the Fourth Committee.⁵ Mr. Cabral not only reverted to the theme of the dialogue that he is prepared to open with Portugal, but presented precise and constructive proposals which testify to the realism and goodwill of this great and responsible African leader. Among these proposals I shall mention in particular the appeal made to us by Mr. Cabral for steps to be taken vis-à-vis the Portuguese Government with a view to the immediate opening of direct negotiations between Portugal and the PAIGC⁶ to decide the ways and means of leading the people of Guinea (Bissau) to self-determination and independence. Mr. Cabral added that if this proposal were accepted, the people of Guinea (Bissau), the PAIGC and its leaders would consider taking into consideration Portugal's interests in their country.

48. The hearing of the leader of the PAIGC has thus enabled us not only to know precisely what is happening in Guinea (Bissau) but also, and most important, to assess the good intentions and the realism of that country and its leaders about the best way of putting an end to the war which has been imposed on them by Portugal. The proposals put forward by Mr. Cabral open up new prospects for the future because of their constructive nature and their serious and well-thought-out approach. They will enable us to appraise the good faith of the Minister of Portugal, and the sincerity of his desire to put an end to the war and his stated determination to lead Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique to self-determination and independence.

49. The situation in Southern Rhodesia is just as explosive as that which obtains in the African Territories under Portuguese domination. Southern Rhodesia should have acceded to independence at the same time as did the two other Territories with which it constituted the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Unfortunately, this was not the case and today the Zimbabwe people are deprived of their rights to self-determination and freedom. Some 250,000 British settlers, aliens to the country, have seized power and are holding under the yoke of their régime 5 million indigenous blacks. Assisted by the Government of South Africa, the minority régime of Ian Smith has set up a police régime which exercises terrorist repression over the Zimbabwe people. All freedoms have been suppressed: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of opinion. The Ian Smith régime has taken over on its own account the policy of *apartheid* practised by South Africa, and the Zimbabwe people is expelled from its ancestral lands and settled in reserves which are in every way identical to the Bantustans of South Africa.

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Fourth Committee*, 1986th meeting.

⁶ Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.

50. The United Kingdom, the administering Power, is responsible for the deterioration of the situation in that part of Africa. In the same way as it restored their freedom to the other Territories in its colonial empire, so should it have guided Zimbabwe to emancipation and independence.

51. Despite the terror to which it has been subjected, the Zimbabwe people has none the less undertaken to struggle in order to win its right to freedom. We had an illustration of this a few months ago in connexion with the inquiry conducted by Lord Pearce in order to ascertain whether the blacks accepted the agreement reached between the British Government and the rebel Salisbury régime. The Zimbabwe people was not taken in by the masquerade which those agreements represented; it did not fall into the trap laid for it. Despite the pressures exerted on it, the arbitrary arrests, the ban on meetings and police brutality, the Zimbabwe people, ignoring the greatest dangers, said "No" to the test of acceptability and rejected the perfidious agreements which would have deprived it of its rights and perpetuated for all times the white minority rule of the rebel settlers.

52. We state without any ambiguity that the rebellion, the secession of the Rhodesian settlers cannot be accepted as a *fait accompli*. The United Kingdom, as the administering Power, is still vested with legal authority over the Territory and is therefore responsible to the United Nations, the international community and Africa.

53. Since the United Kingdom refuses to resort to force as it has done elsewhere in the past and is still doing to defend the rights of the majority, it has the duty to resort to other methods, to seek other approaches. In this connexion we think that there is only one way out of the Rhodesian problem, i.e. to organize a frank and honest consultation of the whole of the population to determine the political future of the country. To do this the United Kingdom should convene a constitutional conference, at which all the parties concerned would be represented by responsible leaders freely chosen. Pending the organization and the convening of such a conference, the United Kingdom, the Administering Authority, should take all necessary steps to put an end to the Rhodesian secession and should refrain from transferring the attributes of national sovereignty and legitimacy to the minority régime which has seized power in Salisbury.

54. Of just as much concern to us as the Rhodesian question is the problem of Namibia, an international Territory under the trusteeship of the United Nations over which the South African Government illegally maintains its administration. By its resolution 2145 (XXI) the General Assembly, confirming the international status of the Territory, decided to put an end to South Africa's mandate and to entrust direct responsibility for the Territory to the United Nations. That decision, which was also sanctioned by the Security Council, was finally confirmed by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971.

55. But South Africa, displaying complete contempt for the three supreme bodies of the United Nations, refuses to bow to the obligation laid upon it to withdraw from Namibia and continues to occupy the Territory and to maintain its administration there. What is more, the South

African Government has introduced and put into practice there its policy of *apartheid*. By means of the arbitrary and segregationist laws on which this system rests, the control of the Territory is completely in the hands of the white minority. The policy of "homelands" deprives the Africans of their lands and compels them to live in reserves. Education and adequate professional training is denied them, and in order to survive they must be satisfied with accepting the most painful and degrading types of work. Since they cannot form unions, nothing and no one can help them claim their rights and defend their interests. It is this miserable condition, this explosive situation which compelled 13,000 Ovambo workers, towards the end of 1971 and the beginning of 1972, to unleash a savage strike which struck a blow that was as unexpected as it was brutal to the South African economy in the Territory. There is every reason to fear that if the South African Government does not change its policy the situation in Namibia will become increasingly explosive. Accordingly, the Government of Pretoria should conform to the decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice and take measures likely to restore a climate of peace and confidence in that sensitive area of the African continent.

56. In the course of its historic meetings held at Addis Ababa last February, the Security Council in its resolution 309 (1972) once again restated South Africa's obligation to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and to encourage the accession of that country to self-determination and independence. Under that same resolution and for the purpose of setting in train the process of self-determination, the Secretary-General was entrusted with the mandate of carrying out a contact mission with the South African Government. The report, which the Secretary-General presented to the Security Council after his trip to South Africa and Namibia,⁷ did not provide the desired assurances. Moreover, the Secretary-General, in face of the meagre results obtained, considered that he would have to continue with his mission, and the Council was willing to go along with that. The special representative whom he has appointed is already on the spot in South Africa and in Namibia to resume the talks started by the Secretary-General. We are now awaiting the further report which is to be submitted to the General Assembly before 15 November.

57. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, in the statement he made to the General Assembly on 29 September last, speaking of the Secretary-General's mission regarding Namibia, said:

"I want again to reaffirm that, so far as South West Africa is concerned, the South African Government is firmly committed to the principle of self-determination and independence with all that this implies, and we shall continue to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in the search for a solution.

"In the meantime, South Africa is continuing to assist in the development of the Territory and the advancement

of its peoples in all spheres so that they may achieve the declared goal of self-determination and independence as rapidly as possible." [2046th meeting, paras. 19-20.]

58. What does the word "peoples" mean to the South African Minister? Is it that South Africa intends to lead the whole of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in unity, or rather does it envisage doing this on the basis of "homelands"?

59. So far as we are concerned it is clear that independence for Namibia should be achieved within the unity of its entire people and with full territorial integrity. It is this obligation which the South African Government should accept since it states that it is firmly committed to applying the principle of self-determination and independence "with all that this implies". There is no doubt that one of the implications which South Africa cannot evade is precisely the necessity for the unity and territorial integrity of the Namibian people. We will measure South Africa's good faith and goodwill at the end of the mission of the Secretary-General's special representative. We impatiently await that report, expressing the hope that it will give us proof of the desire and will of South Africa to do everything possible to set Namibia on the path which will lead it to independence with its people unified and its territorial integrity unimpaired.

60. We would, however, be wrong to display undue optimism and to imagine that Portugal and South Africa are going to alter their attitude radically from one day to the next. Therefore the United Nations should redouble its efforts to combat colonialism, discrimination and *apartheid* more effectively. In initiating this debate the General Assembly wished to emphasize the importance and the priority that it attaches to the problems of southern Africa. This action should be pursued and intensified through more and more meetings devoted to these problems. That is why we consider that the proposal for the convening under the aegis of the United Nations and the OAU of a conference on colonialism and *apartheid* next year in Oslo deserves our full consideration. We hope that the General Assembly will accept this idea and that it will authorize the Secretary-General to provide the technical services, the documentation and the professional services necessary for the holding of this conference.

61. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The Mauritanian delegation is particularly gratified by the decision of the General Assembly to give priority this year to colonial problems. We are gratified because this decision is, in our view, the logical conclusion of the process of growing awareness of the gravity of these problems, both for the progress and stability of Africa and for international peace and security. After the historic meetings of the Security Council in Africa last February, meetings devoted to southern Africa, and in the light of the particular importance attached by all the Heads of State of Africa at their last summit meeting in Rabat⁸ to the decolonization of that part of the continent, it is natural for the General Assembly in turn to give close attention to these problems.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972*, document S/10738.

⁸ Ninth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Rabat from 12 to 15 June 1972.

62. But we are above all gratified at this decision because we think that it is time to try to take stock of the situation 12 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)].

63. And what do we find? We find Portuguese colonialism in Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique. We find the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia. We also find illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria authorities.

64. While the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century saw France and the United Kingdom granting independence to their former colonial possessions, the poorest and the most backward country of Europe continues its implacable policy of domination and repression in African territories 20 times as large as its own. By refusing to understand or to accept the direction of history, Portugal, in defiance of the international community, holds the United Nations in profound scorn and treats its resolutions and recommendations with contempt.

65. It is true that for strategic, economic and political reasons Portugal enjoys active support from its allies in NATO or the indifference of other States, an indifference bordering on complicity.

66. If Portugal justifies its policy on the grounds of what a Portuguese Fascist newspaper *Scara Nova* calls the need for Portugal not just to be a geographical entity but a way of life which must continue, if Portugal justifies its colonial wars and the atrocities it commits in African Territories by slogans like "The defence of Western civilization", "The defence of Christian civilization", or "The fight against communism", if these pretexts seem to us at the very least ridiculous because they are shared only by the die-hards of colonialism and racial discrimination, today there are some things going on which suggest to us that these watchwords of Portugal are dictated to it, or at least determined, by the attitude of certain Western Powers. Whether it be military or economic assistance, Portugal does enjoy a whole range of resources afforded it by its Atlantic Alliance allies. Whether these resources are directly utilized in Africa against the African people, or whether they enable Portugal to free itself from some domestic constraints in order to get on with the job, the result is strictly the same. Be that as it may, Portugal has made itself the official champion in Africa of this way of life—if way of life it be—at the cost of indescribable suffering inflicted every day on the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, peoples whose only crime is the desire to recover their freedom and human dignity.

67. The Special Mission of the United Nations had occasion during its visit to the liberated regions of Guinea (Bissau) to see for itself the devastation and suffering caused by the actions of Portugal, particularly by indiscriminate bombing of villages and by the use of napalm to destroy crops. This policy of repression and intimidation is no longer confined to Portuguese colonies. It is being extended now to other neighbouring African States.

68. So, Guinea and Senegal, jointly and severally, have been the object of armed attacks in defiance of all the

standards of international life and every rule of international law. Their national sovereignty has been violated. Their territorial integrity has been flouted. Innocent citizens have been killed; officers have been murdered and mutilated. Just a few days ago Portuguese armed forces penetrated deep into Senegalese territory, destroying villages and killing and wounding civilians and soldiers. At the other end of Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Zaire and the Congo have repeatedly suffered similar acts of aggression at the hands of South Africa and Portugal.

69. I take this opportunity of reaffirming to these fraternal African countries the active support and solidarity of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

70. If the countries neighbouring the Portuguese colonies, if those that are fighting the Portuguese colonialist forces, are being subjected to the most murderous and inhumane acts of repression in the history of colonialism in Africa, the situation of those living under Portuguese control is no better. A quick look at the facts will suffice to show the gravity of the situation these countries are in. Only one third of the active African population is playing any part in the economy, and 80 percent of them are employed in agriculture.

71. Forced labour persists in various forms: punitive labour for defaulting taxpayers, obligatory loans to the State—for work on road construction, for example—contracted labour for the white farmer for wages of about 15 cents a day, and compulsory crops, cotton growing for example.

72. Furthermore, racial laws divide the population into four distinct categories: first, the civilized (essentially whites); second, the coloured people (Asians); third, the assimilated; and fourth, the indigenous. Nine tenths of the population now belong to the last category, which enjoys practically no civil rights, not even the right to choose one's own home. In order to be assimilated, the black African must be Christian, must follow white customs, must speak Portuguese and, above all, must be regularly employed. All those conditions, which are difficult enough in any case, are required just to be assimilated, that is, to deny one's own identity. In other words, the African of the Portuguese colonies, on whatever side he may be, is the subject of grave moral or material repression, which must weigh heavily on many people's consciences.

73. But apart from hearing the weight of Portugal and those that support it militarily and economically within NATO, the Portuguese colonies are also groaning under the yoke of Pretoria, which is the natural and logical bulwark of Lisbon domination. Lisbon in practice no longer has the exclusive right to decide what happens in what it calls its African provinces. The whites of South Africa have drawn up emergency plans in case Portuguese colonialism should have its back to the wall at any time. Nothing could be more natural, after all, between régimes with identical methods of repression; nothing could be more natural when we realize that the economy in Mozambique and certain other Portuguese provinces owes its existence principally to South African capital.

74. This large-scale coalition from which Portugal profits, however murderous and therefore inadmissible it may be, in

no way detracts from the determination of the African people who are struggling for their freedom and independence. That struggle, under the skilful leadership of the liberation movements in Africa, will prevail over all obstacles because it is just, because it is in keeping with the objectives of the Charter and because it enjoys the active support of all peoples who love peace and justice.

75. Already vast areas have been liberated in Guinea (Bissau), where more than two thirds of the Territory is under the administrative, political and military control of the PAIGC, which has been waging a resolute struggle for nine years. Other regions have been liberated in Angola, while FRELIMO in Mozambique is inflicting crushing defeats on the Portuguese occupation troops.

76. In southern Rhodesia the people of Zimbabwe, in spite of the refusal of the United Kingdom to shoulder its responsibilities, has given proof of its political maturity by rejecting the abdication agreement concluded between the British Government and Ian Smith.

77. As for *apartheid*, it must be considered, this late in the twentieth century, as the most outrageous affront to the human community. From the political point of view, it is the death agony of colonial domination and the most hateful manifestation of subjugation. To break down and sweep away this obstacle, the shame of our century, is the grave historic responsibility of all those who believe in the right of peoples to dignity, of all those who believe in the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The illegal occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria, despite the opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, despite our various resolutions, should remain one of our principal concerns.

78. We understand perfectly well the stubbornness of Portugal and what is at stake in this alliance between the Pretoria, Southern Rhodesia and Lisbon régimes, and we also understand the motives of those within the Atlantic Alliance who, directly or indirectly, support those repressive régimes.

79. It is clear, indeed, that the persistence of Portuguese colonialism, as has been pointed out by Marcelino dos Santos, is not simply a matter of obstinacy of a dictator with outmoded ideas, but rather corresponds to certain structural requirements both of the Portuguese governing class and of the forces which internationally support the Lisbon Government. At a time when the Portuguese economy is attempting, under the direction of Marcello Caetano, to adapt itself to European integration and the modernization of industrial structures, the financial contribution of the colonies is becoming more and more important.

80. Apart from this, Portuguese colonial domination appears as a necessity for the archaic structures of Portuguese agriculture, which accounts for 50 per cent of the gross national product.

81. Within this context the colonies not only serve interests that are perhaps short-term but are certainly

short-sighted, but also serve to absorb the population surplus of the metropolitan country. It is against this background that we should see the Portuguese plan for establishing a million new settlers in the Sambesi valley, which is to be irrigated by the Cabora Bassa dam. This also explains the Portuguese policy of colonization, which is to settle peasant communities with no technical qualifications on the richest land of Angola and Mozambique.

82. For Portugal and particularly for its allies, these colonies are of the utmost strategic interest. The development of the struggle against domination and oppression throughout the world and particularly the closing of the Suez Canal make what is called the Cape route of the highest importance. Hence, Guinea (Bissau), Cape Verde, Angola and Mozambique constitute important strategic points for the conquest and control of this route both towards the south Atlantic and towards other areas.

83. Thus, what is at stake in this war justifies the substantial aid granted to Portugal both by its allies in the Atlantic Alliance and by the racist régimes in southern Africa. In spite of this large-scale coalition, the intensity of the struggle for national liberation is being stepped up every day.

84. It is the duty of the United Nations not only to increase its assistance to the freedom fighters, but also to do everything in its power to persuade the Member States directly or indirectly involved to abide by resolutions of the United Nations, resolutions to which they have freely subscribed. Indeed, the *apartheid* régime and the racial segregation practised by the Pretoria and Southern Rhodesia authorities, Portuguese colonialism and its methods have been denounced by our institutions. Resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly have laid down a very clear line of conduct with regard to Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia. Yet it is now a matter of public notoriety that Western countries, including some of the biggest countries, and apparently some of the greatest champions of international morality, are providing war *matériel*, armaments factories and economic assistance to the colonialist and racist régimes of Portugal and South Africa, either directly, or indirectly through private companies.

85. In other words, those who attribute the ineffectiveness of United Nations resolutions to our lack of realism are the very same people whose actions and ties to certain sordid interests are raising the biggest obstacles to the decisions of our Organization. The United Nations should not allow itself to be lulled by propaganda the motives behind which are becoming clearer every day.

86. Unfortunately, we are aware that, when a situation is prolonged indefinitely, international opinion shows signs of fatigue and its interest diminishes; and this may be the case in the face of the persistence of Portuguese colonialism and also in the face of the practice of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Yet these are situations which entail more than one threat to international peace and security and which may lead, quite naturally, to a general conflagration because what is at stake here is the freedom and dignity of peoples. The General Assembly must be aware of this and not allow itself

to be lulled into indifference, a state of mind which has often been responsible for many storms. It must, in particular, endorse all the recommendations made in the Special Committee's report, which my delegation firmly supports.

87. I am well aware that the themes I have been developing are those that come up regularly at all our meetings, but my insistence—and that of my colleagues from Africa—reveals the importance attached by us to a final solution of these problems in the interest of peace and understanding among peoples.

88. Mr. Médoune FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): On 14 December 1960 our Assembly in resolution 1514 (XV) adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In accomplishing that historic deed, the United Nations General Assembly thus wished to ensure the application of one of the most noble and fundamental elements of our Charter, namely, our faith in fundamental freedoms, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

89. The Declaration of 14 December prescribes, in its paragraph 5:

“Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.”

90. However, in the course of these past 10 years it seems that the provisions of that Declaration have been lost sight of. There is every reason to believe that the African peoples will still have to undergo a good many trials before they succeed in liberating their continent from the various forms of colonialism which continue to place their full burden on a large segment of our peoples.

91. Portuguese colonialism is still engaging in its base and bloody repression of the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), the Cape Verde Islands, Angola and Mozambique, while in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury are, day by day, strengthening the aberrant system of their policy of *apartheid*.

92. Our current debate thus tends to inject a discordant note in the concert of agreement which some—not without reason—have hailed as an obvious sign of the relaxation of international tension. For our part, we say that world peace and security will always continue to be precarious just so long as these citadels of oppression and racial discrimination continue to launch their standing challenge to the community of nations.

93. The illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia is an insulting provocation for the United Nations. Despite many resolutions of our Assembly and the Security Council on the question, despite the advisory opinion handed down on

21 June 1971 by the International Court of Justice declaring that its presence in that Territory still remains illegal, the Government of Pretoria with the same arrogant bad faith continues to defy the most highly esteemed and sacred organs of the international community, thus endangering the authority and even the prestige of the Organization itself.

94. During its meetings in Addis Ababa last February, the Security Council by its resolution 309 (1972) invited the Secretary-General of the United Nations

“... to initiate as soon as possible contacts with all parties concerned, with a view to establishing the necessary conditions so as to enable the people of Namibia, freely and with strict regard to the principles of human equality, to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

The Secretary-General, who was to submit a report on his mission before 31 July 1972, has asked that the time-limit should be extended to 15 November next.

95. My delegation really wonders whether a mission undertaken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations is useful in “establishing the necessary conditions to enable the people of Namibia freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence”. There are not several conditions to be attached to this; there is only one, and that is the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibian territory, as prescribed in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

96. In this connexion my delegation feels that it must remind the Assembly of the historical realities of this matter, for, contrary to what has been stated from this rostrum during the general debate at the current session, the Africans who met in the capital city of Ethiopia never induced the Security Council to entrust the Secretary-General with a contact mission to South Africa. Security Council resolution 309 (1972), which was the originating resolution on this matter, did not stem from an African initiative. Our representatives at the Security Council session in Addis Ababa accepted it only in order to give our partners further evidence of our political willingness to overlook no course which might lead to a favourable outcome, although, once again on that occasion, we entertained no illusions.

97. The difficulties encountered on the question of Namibia do not derive from the fact that we are unaware of the facts involved in a solution of the problem. The truth—the sad truth—is that a goodly number of the Members of this Assembly refuse to accept the factual reality. The arrogant and cheeky behaviour of the authorities of Pretoria vis-à-vis the United Nations has always been the only obstacle to the settlement of the question of Namibia by means of peaceful negotiations with South Africa.

98. Every effort made heretofore in this direction has so far ended in failure. In 1950 resolution 449 (V) set up a committee of five members, made up of Denmark, the United States of America, Syria, Thailand and Uruguay, to

proceed to consultations with South Africa on the question of Namibia. That committee negotiated with Pretoria without success for four years. The responsibility for the failure of those negotiations lies with South Africa.

99. The Good Offices Committee on South West Africa, made up of representatives of Brazil, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, was set up in accordance with resolution 1143 (XII) of 25 October 1957, with the following task:

“... to discuss with the Government of the Union of South Africa a basis for an agreement which would continue to accord to the Territory of South West Africa an international status”.

That Committee also ran headlong into South Africa's intransigence in the course of the negotiations held in May and June 1958. Resolution 1568 (XV) of 18 December 1960 authorized the Committee on South West Africa to go and make an on-the-spot investigation of the situation prevailing in the Territory and urged South Africa to facilitate the work of the Committee. South Africa not only refused to co-operate but even prohibited the Committee from entering the Territory.

100. In its resolution 1596 (XV) of 7 April 1961, the General Assembly, within the framework of the powers entrusted to it by the Charter, once again requested the Committee on South West Africa to visit the Territory. This time, not only did South Africa again refuse to collaborate but it even threatened to use force to prevent the Committee from entering the Territory of South West Africa.

101. In the lengthy list of developments we can also speak of the failure of the Carpio mission, headed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee for South West Africa in May 1962, a mission authorized by General Assembly resolution 1702 (XVI), the purpose of which was to attempt once again to open the way for a negotiated settlement with South Africa of the question of Namibia. That mission also failed and it brought out in its report two considerations which particularly require our attention. The first of these considerations notes

“That the policies and methods, as well as the objectives, followed by the South African Government in its administration of the Mandated Territory has consistently been; and continues to be, in utter contradiction with the principles and purposes of the Mandate, the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the enlightened conscience of mankind.”¹⁰

In the second consideration, the Mission affirmed

“That short of the use of force or other compulsive measures within the purview of the Charter, there seems to be no way of implementing General Assembly resolution 1702 (XVI), nor even any hope of finding a solution to this question which would be acceptable to the South

African Government other than virtual or outright annexation of the Mandated Territory.”¹¹

102. With respect to the Secretary-General's mission, no one is unaware of the difficulties that he has encountered in the selection of his special representative, South Africa having systematically engaged in rejecting most of the persons chosen for this purpose to such an extent that ill-intentioned people went so far as to ask whether the person finally chosen was not the candidate of South Africa rather than that of the Secretary-General.

103. I know that some maintain that this beginning of a dialogue with South Africa will encourage it somewhat to relax its policy of *apartheid*. Thus a newspaper—which is considered to be very serious—last week published an article which it highlighted, and the contents of which should be brought to the attention of the Assembly. The article read:

“Relaxing of *apartheid* at the Johannesburg Zoo. Starting from 8 October, young black children will be entitled to take rides on donkey back in the Johannesburg Zoo. This decision was taken after the municipal council noted that the young blacks were enviously watching the young whites riding these animals. The latter have the right to ride on elephants, donkeys or ponies, but the blacks will be authorized to use only four donkeys and here again they will have to use a different track from that followed by the whites.”

That is what is said in the article. Here we have what is undoubtedly a concession that is considered particularly important in the country of *apartheid*.

104. At the current stage of affairs, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has been given the mandate to make one last attempt with South Africa. We hope that this approach will succeed; otherwise our Organization will be covered with ridicule unless there is an immediate and firm response to the challenge thus flung at the international community.

105. In any event, my delegation thinks that the Secretary-General's mission on Namibia should not be prolonged beyond 15 November unless South Africa undertakes the formal commitment to recognize without ambiguity the right to self-determination of the Namibian people within the framework of respect for its territorial integrity and to withdraw without delay its administration from Namibia in accordance with the provisions of the advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 handed down by the International Court of Justice.

106. As you must have suspected, it would be difficult for any delegation to intervene in this debate on the right of peoples to self-determination without laying stress on the situation created in Africa by Portugal, which has heretofore refused to accept any policy of decolonization.

107. Ever since the signing of the Charter at San Francisco, hundreds of millions of human beings of all continents have regained the right to govern their own destiny. Whereas in most of these countries which have regained

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 12*, para. 19 (42) (b).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, para. 19 (42) (e).

their human dignity, ties of co-operation freely negotiated and accepted have replaced the ties of dependence characteristic of the colonial era, Portugal even today is one of the last European States to remain deaf to the echoes of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and bases its ridiculous obstinacy on a manifestly silly fiction which tends to consider African Territories as an extension of the Iberian peninsula.

108. Despite many resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, the Lisbon Government still stubbornly maintains its domination over Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and the Cape Verde Islands. Thus, the peoples of those Territories no longer have any alternative other than to engage in armed struggle for their national liberation. For that matter we should point out here that the problem of Portugal is not only a question of colonial occupation. Our Organization daily witnesses acts of aggression committed without interruption by Portugal against African States that are neighbours of the Territories it calls its "overseas provinces".

109. The Government of Zaire has twice come before the Security Council—in 1966 and in 1967—to denounce the violation of its territorial integrity by Portuguese troops. For the same reasons, Zambia put the matter before the Security Council in 1969. Despite the condemnation issued by the Council in its resolution 290 (1970) against Portugal after the aggression it had carried out on 22 September 1970 against the Republic of Guinea, the latter country returned to the Security Council, again in 1971, for the very same reason. And all of this does not take into account the criminal incursions into Congolese and Tanzanian Territories.

110. Senegal, for its part, approached the Security Council as far back as 1963 because its villages had been the victims of repeated attacks by Portuguese troops. Since that time, not a year has passed that my country has not had to denounce before world public opinion violations of our territory by Portuguese forces. Again this week, my Government was compelled to call for an urgent meeting of the Security Council following upon a violation of its Territory by a regiment of tanks of the Portuguese armed forces.¹² I must furthermore point out that, this time, the Government of Lisbon has admitted its crime but has attempted to excuse it by alleging that:

"... this is a case involving a mental disturbance on the part of the commander of the group, since he acted outside his area of authority and against the instructions of his superiors".

That is taken from a dispatch emanating from Lisbon itself. As I have told the Assembly, my Government has put this matter before the Security Council but prior to that our security forces administered to the aggressive enemy forces the corrective lesson that they deserved.

111. After the last session of our General Assembly, the liberation movements in the Territories under Portuguese

domination requested the United Nations to dispatch a mission to visit the Territories already liberated by the freedom fighters. Accordingly, a Special Mission visited Guinea (Bissau) from 1 to 8 April 1972 and was able to observe on the spot that the PAIGC, under the leadership of its Secretary-General, Mr. Amílcar Cabral, was effectively assuming control over vast liberated zones and that the various sectors of the nation's life were being organized and functioned to the great satisfaction of the people concerned.

112. As many eminent personalities have stated in the course of the general debate in our Assembly, the United Nations also has special responsibilities to assume in Rhodesia, at a time when the Administering Authority continues steadily to evade its own responsibilities. For that matter, we must recognize that in this matter of Rhodesia the United Kingdom has never ceased to play a double game. Everyone remembers the famous note that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Harold Wilson, sent to the racist leader Ian Smith, in which he advised Smith against unilaterally proclaiming the independence of the colony while at the same time assuring him that if he disobeyed no punitive measures would be taken against Rhodesia. We must agree that events have shown that those encouraging suggestions did not fall on deaf ears. We are, however, compelled to note that the United Kingdom had not accustomed us to such quiescence. We still recall the speed with which the "formidable" British army "courageously" put down the revolt of the leaders of the little island of Anguilla. True, those leaders were guilty on two counts: they were both rebels and blacks. Gandhi, Nehru, Kenyatta and Nkrumah—to cite only those few names—have also paid very dearly for their love of freedom and their desire to regain the rightful identity of their peoples. It is true that they too were not of British origin like Smith and his accomplices.

113. A few weeks ago, under the fallacious pretext of "Olympic peace", cascades of insults and sarcasm were directed against the African peoples and their leaders, and this only because the blacks refused to participate in Munich in the same games with those who refused everything to them, on their own continent, including the simple quality of being human. In the course of those events, the Africans had to note with bitterness how hypocritically racist concerns could lead to the most dishonest and monstrous initiatives.

114. In this connexion we should reaffirm here—as we have had repeated occasion to do—that if the African countries oppose the régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury with such force, it is not because those régimes are controlled by whites, but rather because they find themselves under the authority of an oppressive minority, and their systems rest primarily on an inequality of men based solely on the fact that they belong to a given race.

115. On 1 December 1971 the United Kingdom submitted to the Security Council a text¹³ containing constitutional, electoral and administrative provisions which were to be submitted for the approval of the Rhodesian people before

¹² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1972*, document S/10807.

¹³ *Ibid.*, *Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10405.

it was put into effect. A Commission, the so-called Pearce Commission, set up to sound out the feelings of the black population of Rhodesia, concluded its mission in these terms: "In our opinion the people of Rhodesia as a whole do not regard the Proposals as acceptable as a basis for independence."¹⁴

116. The events which occurred in conjunction with the activities of the Pearce Commission are known to us: there were uprisings in all of the communities, shots fired, arrests and intimidation of all kinds. The Zimbabwe people has certainly paid a very heavy price for its fleeting right to freedom of expression.

117. Less than a month ago at the Security Council's 1666th meeting the United Kingdom cast a veto in the vote on a draft resolution concerning Rhodesia,¹⁵ a draft resolution which only reaffirmed the principle universally accepted by our Organization of the right of peoples to self-determination. This behaviour by the United Kingdom is, to say the least, scandalous. The peoples of Africa, and particularly those of Zimbabwe, will long remember this.

118. If I have felt in duty bound to make these few comments on various outstanding points concerning the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960, I do so primarily to express my delegation's pessimism about the current situation. The system of repression of the racists of Pretoria and Salisbury and of the Portuguese colonialists has never been so ferocious and powerful as it is now because it is strongly supported and encouraged by certain NATO Powers and by those who represent world capitalism. Thus we consider that the United Nations should take positive steps to support the struggle of the national liberation movements. The freedom fighters are determined to resort to armed force because they have despaired of convincing their oppressors.

119. Our Organization would be betraying its most sacred principles if it were to deny the liberation movements the moral and material support which they are entitled to expect from us. In this connexion my delegation would like to recall that such support would meet with the unanimous approval of all of the African countries whose Heads of State and Government met at Rabat last June and solemnly decided to support the freedom fighters without reservation.

120. It was also this approach to the problem which was endorsed a few weeks later at Georgetown by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, whose Declaration emphasized

"the importance of working out a specific programme calling for material aid and practical political solidarity so as to make a decisive contribution to the total and

immediate eradication of every vestige of colonialism in the African continent".¹⁶

121. Let us note furthermore that anti-colonialist and anti-racist resistance has always enjoyed the constant and positive support of the socialist countries of all continents.

122. Finally, we should point out that the peoples of Africa generally speaking, and the freedom fighters in particular, gratefully accept the effective and unselfish aid which they are constantly receiving from the Scandinavian countries of Western Europe. Africa will never forget this either.

123. Thus, as can be seen, the cause that we are defending has evoked sympathetic echoes everywhere, even if the methods and means for giving material effect to this sympathy sometimes take different forms.

124. The United Nations has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the national liberation movements, but it should couple that recognition with positive and effective measures. For the immediate future our Assembly should first of all facilitate to the utmost contacts between the national liberation movements and the United Nations, both in New York and in any other place where an organ of the United Nations family is located. The freedom fighters should no longer roam the corridors of this House like tragic and fugitive shadows. They should feel at ease in our midst and consider the United Nations as their adopted family until they can return to their usurped homeland. Only such an attitude would be in conformity with the ideal of our Charter and in harmony with the trend of history. The United Nations has no right to remain deaf to this solemn appeal made by the Governments and peoples of an entire continent.

125. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Twelve years have already elapsed since the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. If we were to sum up the results achieved so far we would have to admit that we cannot be satisfied with the present situation, although since that time a large number of colonial Territories have achieved freedom and independence and have become Members of the United Nations. Thus, the Declaration on decolonization and, subsequently, the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration adopted at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations two years ago [*resolution 2621 (XV)*] should have put an end to colonialism as an anachronistic and sinister heritage of the past. Actually, at a time when people are becoming increasingly aware of the unity and interdependence of the entire international community, and when the first important manifestations of détente and co-operation among the great Powers are becoming visible, colonialism and the policy of racial discrimination and supremacy—with their essential characteristics of slavery, oppression, inequality and foreign interference—constitute the principal support of imperialist, neo-colonialist and hegemonistic forces.

¹⁴ See *Rhodesia: Report of the Commission on Rhodesian Opinion under the Chairmanship of the Right Honourable the Lord Pearce*, Cmnd. 4964 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972), p. 112.

¹⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972*, document S/10805/Rev.1.

¹⁶ Declaration adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown (Guyana) from 8 to 12 August 1972, para. 18.

126. Therefore it is more necessary than ever to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism as well as the policy of racial discrimination and oppression. At present the existence of colonialism not only threatens international peace and security in the narrow area in which it holds sway, but it is also in direct conflict with the basic trends of contemporary developments and the objectives and ideals of the international community.

127. That is not all. The continuance of colonial oppression in various Territories, especially in the heart of Africa, constitutes not only a threat to the existence and further fate of the enslaved African populations but also a dangerous hotbed of international conflict and war. We must not forget that the Africa of today is not the same as the Africa of yesterday and that the independent African countries which have gained their independence through arduous struggles cannot watch with indifference the suffering of their brethren on the other side of the border. Precisely because of this, the colonialists, endeavouring to suppress the liberation movements, are threatening to resort to intervention and to launch armed attacks against the neighbouring independent African countries and thus to create new and dangerous sources of war and aggression.

128. We must note with regret not only that the colonialist and neo-colonialist forces have revived their activity and gained strength during the past years with a view to bringing the process of decolonization to a halt, but that open attempts have been made at the present, twenty-seventh, session of the General Assembly to equate the legitimate struggle of colonial peoples—which has so often been recognized by the United Nations—with the phenomenon of international terrorism and banditry. Such an approach and such views must be rejected and condemned not only by the General Assembly but by the whole international community as well. In this connexion we are most gravely concerned at the situation prevailing in the southern part of Africa, where the peoples of the Territories concerned are victims of the most brutal violence, racial discrimination, and the policy of *apartheid*, while colonial wars have been raging in the Territories under Portuguese domination for more than 10 years.

129. We must never forget that the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe and Namibia are still prevented from enjoying fundamental human rights and from realizing their inalienable right to freedom and independence while the South African policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination is becoming an ever-more present factor in those Territories. The policy of *apartheid* means in fact that the peoples of those Territories are second-rate citizens in their own country and that they are subjected, ever more frequently, to mass expulsion and resettlement outside their traditional homes, and this policy sometimes also assumes the form of genocide. Faced with the dilemma of whether to meet force with force or to reconcile themselves to and accept the policy of colonial oppression, the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe and Namibia have been compelled to opt for resistance and armed struggle in the same way as other peoples have done in similar situations in the past.

130. In view of the fact that the policy of oppression and terror threatens international peace and security to an

increasing extent, the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations have been obliged to deal with this problem ever more frequently, while the failure to solve it is slowing down and jeopardizing the general trend of growing international co-operation and détente.

131. The Security Council during its meetings held in Addis Ababa this year—meetings which were devoted to these questions which are of such great importance for Africa and for the whole world—adopted significant decisions, but owing to the veto of a colonial Power it was not in a position to contribute to the solution of the present grave situation in Zimbabwe. It is necessary to persevere in the efforts in which the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations should be constantly engaged in the search for ways and means finally to liquidate colonialism.

132. The African peoples have often extended the hand of reconciliation and co-operation to their former colonial oppressors. With respect to the remaining colonial Territories on the African continent, they have repeatedly reaffirmed their preference for a peaceful process of decolonization. This found particular expression at the time of the adoption—by the Organization of African Unity and later by the United Nations—of the historic Lusaka Manifesto,¹⁷ which constitutes an African charter for a policy of non-violence and interracial co-operation. Wishing to set back the clock of history the colonialist and minority régimes, blinded by their selfish interests and objectives and amply supported by all the imperialist and neo-colonialist forces in the world, have opposed this initiative as well as other initiatives taken by African and other peace-loving countries. Upholding the fiction of the non-existence of colonial and racial problems while applying the most brutal force and violence and opposing, with all the forces at their disposal, the right of the peoples under their domination to self-determination and independence, those régimes increasingly pose as vociferous champions of dialogue and the so-called peaceful solution of disputes. While doing this they fail to see that a lasting and peaceful solution of disputes on the international plane is possible only under conditions of full equality and without the imposition of arbitrary solutions; it is not possible where there are oppressors and oppressed. Therefore, so long as the colonial régimes fail to recognize the right of non-self-governing peoples to equality, self-determination and independence, as well as their right to dispose of and use freely the natural and other riches of their country, these people will continue to fight for the achievement of their inalienable rights.

133. Consequently, the attempt to perpetuate white supremacy and the colonial rule of oppression in the southern part of Africa is one of the most serious problems of our time and constitutes a threat to peaceful progress in the world.

134. Recognizing the broader international significance of the colonial issue, the non-aligned countries accorded a high priority to this problem at the Ministerial meeting they held

¹⁷ Manifesto on Southern Africa. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

recently. May I be allowed to quote some of the most pertinent parts of the Georgetown Declaration relating to colonial problems in the southern part of Africa:

“The Conference reaffirmed its solidarity with the struggle of all peoples who are still subjected to colonial rule or who have fallen victim to the brutal policy of *apartheid*. . . .

“In the face of the adamant refusal by the colonialist and racist powers for peaceful change the Conference agreed on the urgent necessity of assisting the legitimate armed struggle of the Liberation Movements in Southern Africa. In this context the Conference emphasized the importance of working out a specific programme calling for material aid and practical political solidarity so as to make a decisive contribution to the total and immediate eradication of every vestige of colonialism in the African continent. All participating members agreed to go on working actively together in order to revitalize the decolonization drive of the United Nations Organization, and to aid and support the action of the Special Committee for the implementation of Resolution 1514 (XV), to strengthen the existing links with the Organization of African Unity, and to launch a resolute, concerted drive to render material aid to all African movements of national liberation, speed up the emancipation process of these territories, mobilize world public opinion in favour of their cause, and unmask and isolate those powers which continue to give their support to Portuguese colonialism and the racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury.”¹⁸

135. The debate in the Fourth Committee on the situation in the Territories under Portuguese domination, which has just been completed, has shown that the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and their national liberation movements is drawing ever closer to a victorious end. In Guinea (Bissau) elections have been held recently, under the leadership of PAIGC, for regional councils and for the first National Assembly, while the supreme executive organs—that is, the government—are to be elected in the near future. In Angola and Mozambique, the areas under the control and influence of FRELIMO and MLPA¹⁹ are being extended every day, and the constitution of the first legal and legitimate legislative and executive organs in these Territories may also be expected soon. We are convinced that international public opinion as a whole will welcome this course of emancipation and the establishment of organs that enjoy the confidence of the peoples of these Territories and that it will lend them all-out assistance with a view to securing their recognition and promoting their further self-assertion.

136. Thanks precisely to this positive process, of particular significance are the statements made in the Fourth Committee by the Secretary-General of PAIGC, Mr. Amílcar Cabral, and the Vice-President of FRELIMO, Mr. dos Santos,²⁰ as well as their proposals calling upon Portugal to

start negotiations with a view to putting an end to the colonial war and to effecting a peaceful transfer of power to the legitimate representatives of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). We are deeply convinced that this is the only proper and reasonable course to be pursued and that Portugal could accept in its own interest, if it wishes to find—even at this late hour—a way out of its hopeless colonial war, which has been condemned by history.

137. My delegation welcomes with particular satisfaction the decision of the Fourth Committee to grant observer status to the representatives of the liberation movements of southern Africa whenever questions relating to their Territories are discussed.²¹ I believe, however, that this is only the first step towards their full recognition by our Organization. We believe that all specialized agencies and other international organizations should also extend observer status to the representatives of the liberation movements and that they should be provided with adequate opportunities to address all other United Nations bodies as well. We are deeply convinced that this will be an important step forward and the first phase in their being definitely recognized as authentic representatives of the peoples of these Territories. As a result of their bringing the process of liberation to a victorious end and the proclamation of their full independence, we shall have the opportunity to see them in our midst as full-fledged Members of our universal Organization. This is the road that many of the present Members of the United Nations have traversed.

138. The process of decolonization and the attainment of self-government and independence is somehow more favourable and rapid in the case of Non-Self-Governing Territories situated outside the African continent, in spite of the difficulties and trials which still stand in the way of the attainment of full independence. Some results have been achieved with regard to some of these Territories. We have primarily in mind Papua New Guinea, where the elections for the Third House of Assembly, held this year, resulted in the establishment of the first National Coalition Government of Papua New Guinea. This Government has already worked out a concrete programme for the attainment of self-government and, later, of independence. In view of a certain degree of co-operation by the administrative Power, we are convinced that we shall be in a position to welcome the admission to our Organization of an independent Papua New Guinea in the very near future.

139. A similar process has been going on in another Trust Territory in the Pacific region. The Congress of Micronesia, in its capacity as elected and legitimate representative of the people of Micronesia, is insisting, at this very time, on increasing emancipation from the United States and more rapid attainment of full self-government and independence.

140. In the Caribbean region, too, the process of the emancipation of the local populations has been accelerated and an awareness of the necessity of radically changing the present non-self-governing status has been growing. May I commend, in particular, the decision of the electoral body of the Bahamas that the new Assembly should proclaim the independence of the country in the course of the forth-

¹⁸ Declaration adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown (Guyana) from 8 to 12 August 1972, paras. 17 and 18.

¹⁹ Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

²⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Fourth Committee, 1987th meeting*.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1975th meeting.

coming year. We believe that the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories of that region will also embark upon the same road leading to emancipation and mutual association.

141. This positive process of the final liquidation of colonialism in two regions, the Pacific and the Caribbean, which are geographically widely apart, confirms once again our conviction that, in order to safeguard world peace and security, one of the fundamental tasks of the United Nations is to set in motion this process in southern Africa as well. With this aim in mind, it is necessary, with all the means at the disposal of the international community and our Organization, to overcome the stubborn resistance of colonialist and racist régimes and to enable the peoples of those African territories, too, to make use of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

Organization of work

142. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the decision taken by the Assembly at its 2035th plenary meeting, statements in the exercise of the right of reply should be delivered at the end of a meeting or at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day. I should like to propose also that, following the precedents established at the last three sessions, from now on statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to that proposal?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.