



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

Requests for hearings (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a request for a hearing concerning Namibia had been received from Mr. Joel Carlson. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to circulate the request as a Committee document.

*It was so decided.*¹

AGENDA ITEMS 66, 67 AND 68

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

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

2. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) said that the situation in southern Africa had shown no signs of any significant improvement in recent years. Disillusionment and doubts as to what the United Nations could and should do at that stage were but a logical consequence of that state of affairs. Some limited progress had, however, been achieved. The discussions in the United Nations and the practical steps which had been taken or which were contemplated were keeping international public opinion informed about the situation. Moreover, a process of evolution had been started which the United Nations should continue to support, always with a view to the peaceful attainment of the goals of the Charter.

3. The common denominator of the three items under consideration was a denial of the right of self-determination. His Government considered that satisfactory solutions to the problems could be reached only on the basis of full recognition of that right, which was embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and which should be faithfully applied everywhere.

4. Regarding the question of Namibia, the General Assembly, by resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, had terminated South Africa's Mandate for the Territory and had stated that South Africa had no right to administer it. The Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice² was a logical sequel to the United Nations decisions by which the Organization had assumed direct responsibility for Namibia. The Court had confirmed the illegality of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, and the Security Council and the General Assembly should give very serious consideration to that Opinion.

5. The attitude of his Government in the matter was unequivocally shown by its vote in favour of resolution 2145 (XXI). Austria had no diplomatic, consular or trade representation in Namibia. His Government had co-operated with the United Nations Council for Namibia and considered the travel and identity documents issued by the Council valid within Austrian jurisdiction. In striving to attain the objectives of resolution 2145 (XXI) it was necessary to bear in mind the international community's attitude towards the matter and to adopt a realistic and cautious approach, never forgetting that, in accordance with paragraphs 122, 125 and 127 of the Court's Advisory Opinion, the main consideration should be the welfare of the people of Namibia.

6. In Southern Rhodesia, the current régime ignored international public opinion. The Constitution which had been adopted in 1969 deprived the majority of citizens of equal rights, on the basis of racial discrimination. His Government did not recognize the régime and had closed its consulates at Bulawayo and Salisbury immediately after the unilateral declaration of independence. His Government had no representation in the Territory. It had undertaken to apply the sanctions imposed by the Security Council in resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) and would continue to co-operate with the Committee established under paragraph 20 of resolution 253 (1968).

7. Despite the lack of progress, his delegation felt that consideration should be given to all methods which might contribute to a peaceful attainment of independence by the peoples of southern Africa.

8. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) said that colonialism and racialism had taken many forms in recent years and that all efforts by the United Nations had so far been unavailing in bringing about independence for the Terri-

¹ The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/735/Add.4.

² See *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971.*

tories subjected to colonialism and foreign domination. His country had always been a positive advocate of the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*. That position was due to its recognition of the inalienable right of the indigenous population to self-determination and independence, as also to his country's bitter experience of Italian Fascist colonialism.

9. Africa was witnessing the combined aggression of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, which, with the covert co-operation of various States, were trying to unify and strengthen their forces to enslave the indigenous peoples and to perpetuate colonialism and oppression in that part of Africa.

10. The question of Namibia had been before the Committee for more than two decades, but the many resolutions which had been adopted had proved sterile because their provisions had not been applied.

11. The policy of South Africa had been condemned at many levels. For instance, the Lusaka Conference had condemned the presence of South African forces in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe as a threat to human rights and fundamental freedoms; the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had vigorously condemned South Africa for its obstinate refusal to comply with the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and had reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the indigenous inhabitants in defending their inalienable rights. The international community must condemn the action taken by South Africa to oppress the indigenous population, in particular articles 10 and 29 of the General Law Amendment Act (1969) concerning the Bureau of State Security, which decisively contributed towards making South Africa a police State and which violated the first paragraph of article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

12. The South African Government's own reports on its prisons showed that the racist authorities of that country were imposing their systematic violence on millions of people. According to those reports, 500,000 people had been sentenced to imprisonment, some 26,000 people had suffered corporal punishment and 84 people had been hanged. South Africa and its supporters would claim that those figures were a result of "violence", but the violence that repressed should not be confused with the violence that liberated. The former had been condemned by the international community as a crime against humanity; the latter had been recognized as a legitimate means for restoring the inalienable right to self-determination.

13. The forced removal of sectors of the African population by South Africa which had taken place in 1968 in the Caprivi Strip of eastern Namibia, as also the "cleaning-up" of that area, were elements of genocide. The violations of trade union rights and the system of recruitment of African workers by the South West Africa Native Labour Association reflected a labour system which was akin to slavery.

14. Since the International Court of Justice had issued its Advisory Opinion, the United Nations must face its

historical responsibility. It must not disappoint the hopes of the people of Namibia. Sanctions must be enforced against South Africa and the necessary steps must be taken to ensure compliance with the call to States to sever all relations with South Africa.

15. The Portuguese colonialists were still practising their systematic policy of oppression of the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) in contravention of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Moreover, they had started to collaborate with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia to perpetuate colonialism and oppression in southern Africa. Portugal was using new methods in its struggle against the liberation movements; in the liberated areas of Angola, it was destroying crops with herbicides and defoliants and causing deaths from poisoning.

16. A poor country such as Portugal would be unable to sustain that war of extermination were it not for the support of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which, in spite of the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the non-aligned countries and the United Nations, still offered Portugal their moral and material support. The convening of a meeting of the NATO Council of Ministers at Lisbon could not but afford political and moral encouragement to Portugal's colonialist policies. The obvious collaboration of some members of NATO should be strongly condemned.

17. Portugal was continuing its systematic aggression against the sovereign African States of Guinea and Senegal. The only reason for the aggression, which had been condemned by the Security Council, was that those States bordered on the occupied Territories where the liberation movements were fighting. The Government of the Libyan Arab Republic fully supported the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) and strongly condemned all the criminal acts of Portugal in those Territories. It also condemned the activities of the financial interests which were exploiting the material and human resources of the Territories.

18. Since 1962 the United Nations had sought to bring about a régime in Zimbabwe which would be truly representative of the indigenous inhabitants, who outnumbered the white minority by 20 to 1. Ian Smith's régime had been condemned as illegal by the international community from the very beginning. The United Kingdom was fully responsible for the situation; it had implanted a racist and illegal régime, as it had done in Palestine in similar circumstances. History would not forgive the United Kingdom for the alien oppression of the indigenous peoples of Palestine and Zimbabwe.

19. Recently the United States Senate had taken action which, if adopted by the Congress, would permit the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, seriously violating the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 253 (1968). The Libyan Arab Republic fully applied the sanctions imposed by the Security Council and supported all measures designed to

bring down the illegal racist régime and restore to the people of Zimbabwe their inalienable right to self-determination.

20. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) said that the disintegration of the world colonial system, hastened by the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, was one of the main characteristics of modern times. Since 1960, 54 million people in former colonies had achieved independence and 23 newly independent States have been admitted to the United Nations, bearing witness to the irreversible progress of decolonization. That process was, however, far from completed. The vestiges of colonialism were still offending the conscience of mankind and threatening the peace, security and progress of peoples. Such was the case in southern Africa, where the South African racists, the Portuguese colonialists and the white minority in Southern Rhodesia dominated more than 15 per cent of the region and were oppressing more than 18 million indigenous inhabitants, in blatant defiance of the authority, objectives and purposes of the United Nations.

21. The Fascist leaders of South Africa were not only continuing their inhuman policy of *apartheid* but were also extending that criminal régime to Namibia, for the obvious purpose of appropriating the wealth of the Territory. South Africa, a State Member of the United Nations, had ignored General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), in which its Mandate for Namibia had been terminated, and rejected the decision of the International Court of Justice, which, in its Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971, confirmed the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia.

22. Portugal's colonial policy was becoming entrenched in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The Portuguese colonialists, who devoted 27 per cent of their budget to military expenditure, maintained an army of 140,000 men there. The methods they used to carry out their policy of genocide, such as the use of napalm, defoliants and herbicides, were well known.

23. The situation was similar in Southern Rhodesia, where the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith continued to deprive the Zimbabwe people of their legitimate rights.

24. It might be asked how it was possible for the three reactionary régimes to act contrary to the will of the whole world and to turn a deaf ear to the decisions of the United Nations. It was obvious that a handful of racists could not continue their diabolical work if they did not enjoy the support of powerful allies whose imperialist interests coincided with those of the colonial régimes. As could be seen from various United Nations documents, countries members of NATO were still giving moral, political and material assistance to the régimes of southern Africa. Despite the embargo imposed by the United Nations, those countries supplied arms to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and consolidated the economic power of those régimes by their investments. In 1970, investments of imperialist monopolies in South Africa had reached \$1,000 million. The recent NATO meeting at Lisbon had been a demonstration of the support which the members of that aggressive treaty were giving Portugal in its war against the African patriots.

25. Notwithstanding the many decisions of the United Nations supporting the right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination, the Government of the United Kingdom, far from adopting measures to bring down the Ian Smith régime and transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe, continued to support the illegal régime. Recently the United States Senate had decided to lift the ban on the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, in contravention of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council.

26. Such aid from Western imperialists encouraged the colonialist régimes in their refusal to respect the Charter of the United Nations, the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, as also the other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council. At its twenty-fifth session, the General Assembly had adopted a most important document: the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (resolution 2734 (XXV) of 16 December 1970), which in paragraph 18 called upon all States to desist from any action which deprived peoples under domination of their inalienable right to self-determination and to render assistance to the United Nations in order to bring about the speedy elimination of colonialism.

27. The existence of colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa and the policy of providing assistance to such régimes represented a grave threat to the peace and security of the whole world. The aggressive acts committed by Portugal and South Africa against the territorial integrity of the sovereign States of Guinea, Senegal and Zambia had been considered by the Security Council. An active role had been played in that discussion by a delegation from OAU, led by Mr. Ould Daddah, the President of Mauritania and President of the Eighth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU. The Bulgarian delegation fully supported the position adopted by the African States on that occasion. It was useless for the South African racists to try to destroy African unity by launching the concept of a "dialogue": that concept, which amounted to a reconciliation with imperialism, had been rejected by OAU.

28. The United Nations could not remain impassive in the face of the existing situation. Bulgaria did not share the opinion of those who maintained that the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs were ineffective. The defect lay, not in the resolutions, but in certain Member States which refused to apply them. The refusal of South Africa and Portugal to apply the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations called for the application of the measures provided in Chapter VII of the Charter.

29. The Bulgarian delegation thought highly of the work of the Special Committee and whole-heartedly supported the decisions and recommendations in its report to the General Assembly (A/8423 and addenda). The recommendations designed to increase assistance to the peoples struggling against the colonial yoke were of particular importance. Bulgaria welcomed the successes gained by the national liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Namibia and Zimbabwe. Their just struggle would finally be crowned with success.

30. As in the past, Bulgaria would continue, within the limits of its capabilities, to extend moral and material assistance to all the peoples of Africa suffering under the colonial yoke and fighting for their liberation. That position had been solemnly reaffirmed during the Xth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party. Furthermore, his country would participate actively in all initiatives of the United Nations designed to achieve the complete and definitive liquidation of the colonial system.

31. Mr. GUAY (Canada) observed that there had been no improvement in the situation in southern Africa during the preceding year. Despite the many appeals by the international community, the Governments of southern Africa were still pursuing anachronistic policies. His delegation was aware that such arrogance made it tempting to resort to violence in order to force those Governments to respect the standards of the civilized world. Canada, which would spare no effort to eliminate racism, did not believe that violence could provide a realistic and lasting solution to the problem. It would be tragic if, in pursuing an ideal of justice, a period of bloodshed were to begin in Namibia, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau).

32. His delegation had found the statement made by Mr. Ould Daddah, President of the Eighth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, in the Security Council debate on Namibia (1583rd meeting) extremely interesting. Canada supported the proposal that the Security Council, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, should take at once the necessary steps to create the conditions which would enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination. His delegation considered that such an initiative would be in accordance with the Opinion of the International Court of Justice. It therefore hoped that the Security Council would adopt unanimously the second draft resolution currently before it.

33. In accordance with Security Council resolution 283 (1970), Canada had stated early in 1971 that it did not recognize the jurisdiction of the Government of South Africa over Namibia. Furthermore, Canada had decided to double its contribution for the current year to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, so that its contribution would amount to \$50,000. That contribution did not include the scholarships that Canada offered each year to students from those Territories. More than 550 young people from southern Africa had received scholarships since the inception of the Programme. He appealed to all Member States to contribute generously to that fund.

34. With regard to the Territories under Portuguese administration, Canada regretted that the indigenous people of those Territories were denied the right to self-determination, which was enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Since 1960 Canada had prohibited any export to Portugal of arms or military equipment that might be used in southern Africa or of materials which might be used for the manufacture of arms. His delegation appealed once more to Portugal to abandon a policy that ran counter to its own interests and endangered the political stability of the region.

35. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/8401/Add.1, para.300), the Secretary-General noted that the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had so far survived the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council and that, according to the régime's own statement, the volume of the Territory's external trade had increased in 1970. Distressing as that fact might be, it should be borne in mind that the mandatory sanctions had had and were continuing to have an effect on the whole of the Southern Rhodesian economy. It was worth continuing that action, if only for the sake of the isolation in which the sanctions placed Smith's illegal régime. His delegation once again appealed to all States Members of the United Nations, and particularly to South Africa and Portugal, to respect their obligations under the Charter. He reaffirmed his country's adherence to the principle of majority rule, as stated in General Assembly resolution 2379 (XXIII) of 25 October 1968. Canada was prepared to accept reasonable solutions but it held that, in order to be effective, such solutions must first be acceptable to the people of Southern Rhodesia.

36. Despite certain setbacks, Canada remained optimistic, because it knew that the ideals of the new generation of free men would necessarily prevail.

37. Mr. TOWO ATANGANA (Cameroon) said that the questions before the Committee had been considered and reconsidered so many times and for so long that it seemed difficult to discover from what fresh angle they could be presented so that those to whom the innumerable appeals by the United Nations were addressed would finally heed them.

38. When, two years earlier, Mr. El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, Head of State of Cameroon, speaking in the General Assembly on behalf of all Africa, had drawn attention to the realistic approach set forth in the Lusaka Manifesto,³ all peace-loving men had believed that a solution free from all passion and violence would finally be found for the problem of colonialism and *apartheid* in southern Africa. Nevertheless, those hopes had gradually dissolved in the face of the disdain and arrogance with which the Lisbon Government, the Pretoria régime and the white minority at Salisbury had received the peaceful proposals of the spokesman for the Organization of African Unity, and of the hypocrisy of certain Powers which, while expressing solidarity with those who deplored colonial exploitation and the policy of *apartheid*, had continued to support them by the provision of arms and capital.

39. In spite of the attempts of Vorster's representatives to present to the world a picture of a South Africa and Namibia which were enjoying an unequalled economic and social prosperity and where the African majority rejoiced in the well-being ensured them by their white masters, the testimonies which managed to escape the control of the Fascist dictatorship in Pretoria, as also the statements of petitioners in the Committee, showed clearly that that régime could well claim parity with the one which, some 30 years earlier, had plunged the world into a tragedy that no

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

one would forget. If Pretoria's allegations were sincere, United Nations observers would be more welcome there; the reports of the Secretary-General and of the Special Committee, however, showed that South Africa was not prepared to co-operate with the United Nations. That was proved by its rejection of the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice, which, by an overwhelming majority, had stated that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and that the Pretoria Government should withdraw immediately from that international Territory. South Africa had replied to the United Nations that it could not agree that the reasoning of the majority was convincing. Given the Fascist concept of law and democracy held by the white minority of Pretoria, it had been predictable that, after defying the General Assembly and the Security Council for more than two decades, South Africa would give the decisions of the Court the same reception. It would never have been thought, however, that, apart from that one exception, the authority of the supreme international tribunal would be questioned by other States, least of all by some of the great Powers, which continued to invoke its authority in order to justify the injustices they themselves inflicted on other small States. It was clear that for some members of the Security Council the submission of the question of Namibia to the International Court was no more than a delaying tactic.

40. Nevertheless, there was now a unique opportunity to show that the world Organization merited respect, and the example should come from the States which, by reason of their power, had special privileges and which, by virtue of those privileges, should assume special responsibilities.

41. The United Nations could not evade its obligations to the people of Namibia. All available means must be considered, including the use of force, to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence as soon as possible. It was therefore deplorable that the Security Council, convened at the express request of OAU for the purpose of analysing the consequences of the Advisory Opinion of the Court, had once again confined itself to the adoption of vague resolutions which were in no way binding on the usurpers who were continuing to exploit the people of Namibia.

42. The pseudo-judicial arguments advanced by certain countries in order to prevent any action by the United Nations could not blind anyone to the nature of their alliance with the racist régimes, which was based on sordid economic interests. It was only because of that complicity that the rebel Smith could continue to impose his tyranny on Zimbabwe. After their initial hypocritical recriminations, the legal authorities of a certain country had entered into secret negotiations with the white minority régime.

43. The Government of Cameroon categorically rejected any dialogue or negotiation in which the true representatives of the African minority did not participate as the

chief spokesmen. Any attempt to maintain the colonialist and racist occupation in Zimbabwe was doomed to failure.

44. Those who, while paying lip service to the basic principles of the Charter, were continuing to support the inhuman policy of racial discrimination and colonialist oppression should fear lest history turn against them. The need for colonial domination seemed to have blinded certain European countries to the point where they had lost all awareness of their own interests. For example, Portugal, the first colonizer of the African continent, would be the last to leave it—only to find itself with under-development within its own frontiers. Portugal's true friends were not those which encouraged it to wage a ruinous war, but those which advised it to exchange the master-slave relationship it was imposing on Africans, with the assistance of NATO, for ties of co-operation, on a footing of equality. It was time that Portugal opened its eyes to the realities of the modern world and abandoned antiquated illusions. There was no Portuguese territory outside the Iberian peninsula. Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Cape Verde belonged to peoples who, like others, loved their freedom and would fight to the death to regain it fully.

45. Nowhere in the world were there régimes so shameful as those in southern Africa: racial oppression, brutal subjection of the majority by a minority, denial of equality among men, the supremacy of the white man, the perpetuation by force of privileges inherited from an infamous past. Nevertheless, in spite of innumerable condemnations, no real progress seemed to have been made towards a peaceful settlement. On the contrary, the Pretoria and Lisbon régimes were becoming steadily more aggressive and had become a threat to peace, as was shown by the experiences of Guinea, Senegal and Zambia.

46. It was time that the countries which were blinded by their selfish short-term interests finally shouldered their grave responsibilities and reconciled their declarations of principle with the acts of their Governments. Otherwise, the time was not far off when, prompted by desperation, the African peoples would have recourse to violence in order to recover their natural and legitimate rights.

47. The oppressed peoples of southern Africa knew that, in their struggle to cast off colonialist oppression by all means at their disposal, the Government of Cameroon would always be at their side.

48. Mr. BLANC (France), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the morning meeting the representative of Guinea, speaking of France's attitude in respect of Namibia, had made certain assertions which it was not worth while to refute. Instead, he referred the members of the Committee to the statement made by the representative of his Government in the Security Council on 27 September 1971.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.