



Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

**AGENDA ITEMS 66, 67 AND 68**

**Question of Namibia (continued)**

(A/8388, A/8423/Add.1, A/8423/Add.3 (part I))

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

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

**GENERAL DEBATE (continued)**

1. Mr. KHAN (India) said that at its preceding session the General Assembly, basing itself on the 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, had adopted resolution 2652 (XXV) of 3 December 1970 on the question of Southern Rhodesia. That resolution had several salient features: it declared illegal all measures taken by the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia, including the purported assumption of republican status; it affirmed that negotiations with the illegal régime would be contrary to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960; it condemned the failure and refusal of the administering Power to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority régime; it called for "moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe" and drew the attention of the Security Council to the necessity of imposing sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, whose Governments had thus far refused to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council.

2. The Security Council had considered the question of Southern Rhodesia on two occasions during 1970. On the first occasion, on 18 March 1970, after the illegal proclamation of republican status by the racist minority régime of Southern Rhodesia, it had adopted resolution 277 (1970), which outlined several measures to be taken by States against Southern Rhodesia, including the severance of all consular relations and the immediate interruption of any existing means of transportation to and from Southern Rhodesia. It also asked the specialized agencies to give aid and assistance to those who were suffering from oppression by the illegal régime. It called upon member States, in particular those with primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and

security, to assist effectively in the implementation of the measures called for by the resolution.

3. On the second occasion, in November 1970, the Security Council by its resolution 288 (1970) had once again called upon the United Kingdom as the administering Power to take urgent measures to bring the illegal rebellion in Southern Rhodesia to an end and to enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

4. He had mentioned some of the important features of those decisions in order to show the contrast between United Nations decisions and recommendations, on the one hand, and the implementation of those decisions by the States concerned, on the other. For example, after the unilateral declaration of independence by the Ian Smith régime, the United Kingdom Government had suggested that economic sanctions, as opposed to force, should be used to undermine the illegal régime. The scope of those sanctions had later been expanded by the Security Council and a Committee had even been established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) to review their day-to-day operation. The task of that Committee had been hopeless from the outset, since South Africa and Portugal had blatantly refused to apply any sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee was now confronted with the fruitless task of plugging small loop-holes in the embargo on trade with Southern Rhodesia, while the major ones, which included trade with South Africa and Portugal, remained unaffected.

5. The reports of the Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) were revealing in many respects. That Committee had admitted that, despite the sanctions, mineral exports from Southern Rhodesia had increased. It was also reported that the number of cases of suspected violations of sanctions had increased considerably. A point of even greater concern was that, despite paragraph 8 of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), European immigration into Southern Rhodesia remained at a high level. That was a serious matter, not only because it had resulted from a lack of effective action on the part of several countries, in violation of resolution 253 (1968), but also because it was indicative of the continuing confidence of the average European immigrant that Southern Rhodesia in its present racist form would continue to be a viable entity in the foreseeable future. It was also a measure of the lack of confidence in the effectiveness of United Nations decisions.

6. To take another example, the United Nations had always emphasized the primary responsibility of the United Kingdom with regard to Southern Rhodesia and the

imperative necessity for that Government to take effective action, including the use of force, to bring to an end the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia. It was unfortunate that no effective action whatsoever had so far been taken. The administering Power had continued to emphasize that it was endeavouring to conduct negotiations, which would appear to be a reasonable course of action. Nevertheless, any negotiations undertaken by the administering Power should be with the true representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, and not with the illegal minority régime, which had shown no intention of instituting majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. Negotiations for bringing about majority rule in the Territory should be held, not with Mr. Smith, but with political parties representing the vast majority of the people of Zimbabwe.

7. Against that background the reports of a possible compromise between the illegal minority régime and the administering Power gave rise to concern. According to a report in *The Times* of London on 9 October 1971, Mr. Ian Smith had said that a settlement of the dispute with the United Kingdom over independence was closer than it had ever been, but that there were still basic and major differences between the two countries. According to Mr. Smith, if there was an agreement, the terms would be better than those offered by the United Kingdom Government at previous summit meetings; it was clear that with the passage of time Southern Rhodesia's position had improved and strengthened.

8. There was all the more cause for concern in that the administering Power had decided to withdraw from the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (see A/8276) and had declined an invitation to attend its discussions on Southern Rhodesia, as could be seen in annex II B of chapter VI of the Special Committee's report (see A/8423/Add.2 (part I)). The continued participation of the administering Power would have helped the Special Committee in its work. He hoped that the comments of the United Kingdom representative on the question would dispel the concern felt by the Indian delegation.

9. The Security Council had been receiving complaints from southern African States with increasing frequency. During 1971 both Guinea<sup>1</sup> and Senegal<sup>2</sup> had lodged complaints against Portugal, and recently Zambia<sup>3</sup> had submitted a complaint against South Africa. It was essential to take a comprehensive view of relations between the Territories under Portuguese domination, South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, on the one hand, and the independent African countries, on the other. It was the duty of the Committee to emphasize at every opportunity the responsibility of the administering Power concerned.

10. There was little doubt that, as long as the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia were flouted by South Africa

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1971*, document S/10145.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1971*, document S/10251.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10352.

and Portugal, they would not have any appreciable effect on the illegal régime. It was therefore incumbent on the Security Council to consider serious action to compel those countries to honour their obligations under the Charter.

11. It was of the utmost importance that all moral and material assistance should be given to the brave patriots of Zimbabwe. It was estimated that 130 African nationalists were being held in detention, without trial, in Southern Rhodesia; one third of them had been held for more than six years, and some since 1959. Amnesty International, in an urgent appeal to the United Kingdom Government, had drawn attention to their plight. According to Amnesty International, some Southern Rhodesian prisoners recently released from gaol had immediately been held in preventive detention. It was not enough to render assistance to refugees from Zimbabwe, although in that respect the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was doing everything in his power. It was important for the world at large to recognize that it was only just to assist the liberation movements directly in their struggle. Even the Security Council, in paragraph 14 of resolution 277 (1970), had recognized the necessity of increasing "moral and material assistance to the people of Southern Rhodesia in their legitimate struggle to achieve freedom and independence". It was now incumbent on the permanent members of the Security Council, in particular, to ensure that there was no discrepancy between theory and practice.

12. Mr. MARTIROSYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was becoming increasingly urgent to eliminate colonialism and racism in the southern part of the African continent. The continued presence of colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa threatened not only the existence of the African peoples which they oppressed but the entire continent of Africa; it aggravated and cast a shadow over the international situation as a whole and created a threat to peace and security. The imperialists and racist colonialists would stop at nothing to maintain their position, as was shown by Portugal's recent armed attacks on Guinea and Senegal and South Africa's armed incursion into Zambia. Moreover, the imperialist countries were supporting the colonial régimes in southern Africa by supplying arms to Portugal and South Africa and providing political assistance, even within the United Nations, where they were trying to block discussion of questions relating to the fight against colonialism. The withdrawal of the United Kingdom (A/8276) and the United States of America (A/8277) from the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples should be viewed in that light. The situation in southern Africa continued to deteriorate because, with the connivance of several countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the racists and colonialists of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal blatantly and arrogantly flouted the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

13. In spite of numerous United Nations decisions calling upon South Africa to withdraw its administration from Namibia and to grant the people independence immediately, South Africa continued to rule that country. Approximately 100,000 white settlers occupied practically two thirds of the Territory, into which they had introduced

*apartheid* and racial discrimination. In accordance with the so-called Odendaal Plan, Africans were being herded into “homelands”, which served as a source of cheap labour for foreign companies which were stripping the country of its natural riches and accumulating enormous profits. The fear of the South African racists and their imperialist partners that they would lose those profits was the reason for their refusal to implement General Assembly and Security Council decisions on Namibia. That its people were deeply concerned by the activities of foreign companies was clearly demonstrated by the letter dated 3 September 1971<sup>4</sup> from Chief Clemens Kapuuo, which had been transmitted to the President of the Security Council by a letter dated 6 October 1971 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

14. Portugal still persisted in its refusal to apply the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning the implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to the Territories under its control. The claim of the Portuguese Prime Minister that the people of its colonial Territories wished to continue to live under the Portuguese flag and enjoy peace was no more than a mockery. What peace could there be when the Portuguese army, equipped with the most modern NATO weaponry, had been fighting a bitter colonial war for many years against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), applying the most savage measures against the freedom fighters, using scorched-earth tactics and employing napalm and poisonous substances? In addition, a constitutional attempt had been made to preserve Portugal's colonies in Africa by converting the “overseas provinces” into “autonomous regions”, although the Portuguese authorities themselves admitted that the change made no difference whatever to the situation of the colonial Territories. It was no secret that Portugal would have been unable to pursue the war against the national liberation movements without the help of the leading imperialist Powers, which were anxious to maintain a stronghold in southern Africa for launching attacks against the independent African States.

15. Despite the efforts of Members of the United Nations, the situation in Southern Rhodesia continued to deteriorate. The unlawful Smith régime had introduced into the country an inhuman system of racial persecution, modelled on that of the Republic of South Africa. For instance, in 1970-1971, acting under the Land Tenure Act, the Southern Rhodesian authorities had forcibly evicted the Tangwena people from their traditional home, compelling old men, women and children to escape their tormentors by taking refuge in the mountains. Starting in 1966, the Security Council had adopted a series of resolutions calling for the application of economic sanctions to Southern Rhodesia with a view to securing the liberation of the people of Zimbabwe and the creation of an independent State. That policy had been unsuccessful, however, since the sanctions had been violated, in the first place by South Africa and Portugal, and subsequently by numerous Western countries and their monopolies. The reports of the Committee on sanctions against Southern Rhodesia in-

stanced many cases in which the sanctions had been evaded, sometimes with the direct agreement of Western Governments. On 6 October 1971, for example, the United States Senate had approved legislation by which the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia was authorized. As a result of the many violations of the decisions of the Security Council by the imperialist monopolies and the Western Powers, the sanctions had proved ineffective. The only way of rendering them fully effective would be by extending them to the Republic of South Africa and Portugal, but the United Kingdom and the United States of America had blocked that proposal in the Security Council with a “double veto”. Furthermore, the United Kingdom Government, which bore the chief responsibility for the situation in Southern Rhodesia, was reported to be conducting talks with that régime with a view to recognizing it and thereby perpetuating the rule of a white minority in Southern Rhodesia.

16. The support given by the Western Powers to the régimes of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonialists was no accident, but was dictated by monopoly groups which had enormous investments in southern Africa and derived fabulous profits from the exploitation of its natural and human resources. At a later stage in the debate his delegation would expatiate on the role of monopolies and economic circles in preventing implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in southern Africa. For the time being, he merely wished to point out that, according to a Johannesburg weekly, *Financial Mail*, approximately 69 per cent of the R3,500 million of foreign investment in South Africa in 1969 had come from the United Kingdom and 17 per cent from the United States. It should be noted that more than 30 Members of Parliament in the United Kingdom were directors of companies having branches in South Africa, while the “South Africa lobby” in the United States Congress was equally influential.

17. It was not merely the economic interests of the imperialist monopolies, however, that encouraged the Western Powers to support Pretoria and other racist régimes in southern Africa; the Republic of South Africa was the main military and political staging area and stronghold of imperialism in southern Africa. The armed forces of South Africa were the largest and best equipped in sub-Saharan Africa. Nevertheless, the Western Powers, in gross violation of the decisions of the Security Council, continued to supply the Pretoria régime with the most modern weapons and to strengthen its military potential. As soon as it had assumed power, the Conservative Government of the United Kingdom had announced its intention of resuming the sale of arms to South Africa, whose military personnel received training in NATO countries. Work was going ahead in South Africa on nuclear armaments and on missiles. In June 1970 the Pretoria authorities had announced construction of a new experimental plant for the enrichment of uranium ore. An agreement on nuclear energy had been signed with Portugal. South Africa also supplied military equipment to Southern Rhodesia and Portugal.

18. The “unholy alliance” between the colonial and racist régimes of southern Africa was not limited to suppressing the national liberation movements, but took the additional

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10356, annex.

form of measures designed to lull world opinion. Such manoeuvres included concocting the notion of a “dialogue” with South Africa, an announcement by the racists of their intention to hold a “plebiscite” in Namibia, and the alleged “liberalization” of Portuguese colonial policy—all of which were intended to disrupt the unity of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist forces. The African States, however, had unmasked the true intentions of the colonialists and had categorically denounced the notion of opening a “dialogue” with Pretoria.

19. The struggle against colonialism had always been at the heart of the Soviet Union’s foreign policy. His country fully supported the African peoples in their just struggle for freedom and independence, and it endorsed and strictly applied all General Assembly and Security Council decisions concerning southern Africa. The problem was to make all States comply with those resolutions. At the XXIVth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Secretary General of the Central Committee, L. I. Brezhnev, had stated that the USSR was in favour of implementing in their entirety the United Nations decisions concerning the elimination of the remaining colonial régimes and that manifestations of racism and *apartheid* should be universally condemned and boycotted. In order to achieve the goal of eliminating colonialism and racism in southern Africa, it was essential to bring about the total political and economic isolation of those régimes, to cut off unconditionally all sources of assistance and supplies of weapons, and to take steps to put an end to the anti-African activities of imperialist monopolies in southern Africa. The programme of action adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session had provided for many important measures, which, if put into practice, would effectively contribute to the speedy liberation of the African peoples of that area and remove the threat to peace and security for the peoples of Africa. The task facing the United Nations was to ensure that all those measures were carried out, with the active participation of all Member States, without exception. The success of the struggle against colonialism and racism called for a united effort by all anti-imperialist forces and the anti-colonial organs of the United Nations, and the organization of a world-wide campaign against colonialism and *apartheid*.

20. Miss DE VINCENZI (Brazil) said that it was reassuring to note that the extent of the problems which had confronted the Fourth Committee during the first 15 years of its existence had been considerably reduced. Nevertheless, the last vestiges of an odious system of racial discrimination were still entrenched in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia.

21. Since 1969 the Brazilian Government had expressed whole-hearted support for General Assembly and Security Council resolutions relating to Namibia and had adopted all the necessary measures for the implementation of Security Council resolution 283 (1970). Her delegation had been pleased to note the proposal made by the French delegation in the Security Council to the effect that South Africa should negotiate with the United Nations the establishment of an international régime which would enable Namibia freely to choose, within a reasonable period, the course which would appear to it to be in greatest harmony with its interests, including independence. That proposal, which had just been submitted to the Security Council by the

Argentine delegation in the form of a draft resolution,<sup>5</sup> seemed to be the last chance for South Africa to escape from the impasse in which it now found itself. It could immediately be put into effect in the form of a trusteeship agreement under Chapter XII of the Charter. In supporting that proposal, her delegation once again categorically condemned the odious policy of *apartheid* which the South African authorities were imposing on the people of Namibia. It also condemned the refusal of South Africa to comply with the decisions of the United Nations and the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice.<sup>6</sup> It not only refused to recognize the right of South Africa to exercise any kind of authority over Namibia but regarded the presence of South Africa in the Territory as arbitrary and illegal.

22. A similar illegal situation prevailed in Southern Rhodesia. The immediate objective of the United Nations should be to find a solution to the problem, without the use of force, which would be acceptable to the population as a whole. Her delegation’s primary concern would always be to avoid bloodshed, the first and tragic victims of which would be the very people which the United Nations was seeking to protect.

23. Her Government was strictly applying the policy of sanctions against the illegal Salisbury régime, thereby complying with the provisions of Security Council resolution 253 (1968). All trade between Brazil and Southern Rhodesia had been suspended since the adoption of that resolution. Her delegation could not, however, conceal its feeling of frustration, which was undoubtedly shared by most members of the Committee, at the mediocre results achieved through the measures adopted against the illegal Government of Southern Rhodesia. Her delegation hoped that the United Kingdom Government, which had been tireless in its efforts to achieve a satisfactory settlement, would find a new basis for successful negotiations with the Southern Rhodesian Government.

24. It must unfortunately be admitted that the natural trend towards acceptance of the principles embodied in equality of opportunity for all men had encountered apparently insurmountable obstacles in southern Africa. Her delegation, which had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), was fully aware of the obstacles which had yet to be overcome. It nevertheless remained convinced that the United Nations would achieve the goal which it had set itself in a manner that would be all the more satisfactory since it would have respected the principle of non-violence. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Ivory Coast had aptly observed in his statement on 4 October 1971 at the General Assembly (1950th plenary meeting), the best interests of Africa lay in risking peace rather than war.

#### *Requests for hearings (continued)*

25. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing from Mr. Paul Touba and

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement October, November and December 1971, document S/10376.

<sup>6</sup> 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.*

Mr. Raymond F. Mbala of the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile. In accordance with previous practice, he suggested that the communication should be circulated as a Committee document and considered at a subsequent meeting. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to follow that procedure.

*It was so decided.*<sup>7</sup>

*Organization of work (continued) (A/C.4/734)*

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he had been informed by the United Kingdom representative that Mr. James Mancham, the Chief Minister of the Seychelles, was present in New York and was willing to address the Committee concerning the Territory, which he could do within the context of agenda item 23, if the Committee so wished. Since Mr. Mancham would be in New York only until the end of the week, he suggested that, subject to the agreement of the Committee, the general debate should be suspended in order that Mr. Mancham might speak at the following meeting. As soon as the Committee had completed its consideration of matters emerging from Mr. Mancham's statement, it should resume the general debate on agenda items 66, 67 and 68. It would be understood that that procedure in no way prejudiced any decision that the Committee might take concerning the modalities for the consideration of the remaining items on its agenda.

27. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that Mr. Mancham's request for a hearing was not unexpected. Mr. Mancham believed that certain information should be placed before the United Nations and had accordingly addressed the following communication dated 10 August 1971 to the Secretary-General: "May I present my compliments and inform you that your Committee of Twenty-Four is outdated. Their resolutions on Seychelles unjustified and unwarranted. They are not based on facts and do not take into account wishes and interests of people of Seychelles. Sinon views are that of a bitter defeated politician". The communication had been transmitted in connexion with a discussion of the Territory in the Special Committee, which would be the most appropriate forum for any observations which Mr. Mancham might wish to

make. Nevertheless, if a majority of delegations were prepared to grant Mr. Mancham's request for a hearing by the Fourth Committee, his delegation would respect their wishes. Unfortunately, however, the Committee was currently considering a very important question which had deliberately been placed at the beginning of its agenda in recognition of the serious threat which the situation in the Territories under consideration posed to the peace and security of southern Africa. Nevertheless, if Mr. Mancham wished to address the Committee during the current week, he proposed that the Committee should briefly suspend its debate on southern Africa and should inscribe on the agenda the question of the Seychelles, which would be formally introduced by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee in order that the Committee might thus conclude its consideration of the Territory.

28. He hoped that Mr. Mancham would recognize the seriousness of the question now under consideration by the Committee and that he would appear before the Special Committee. If that was impossible, however, his delegation would not oppose a decision to allow Mr. Mancham to address the Fourth Committee.

29. Mr. VASILYEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. DAO (Mali) supported the Tanzanian proposal.

30. After a brief procedural discussion in which Mr. KOUAME (Ivory Coast), Mr. TEMPLE (United Kingdom), Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. DAO (Mali) and Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that it was the desire of the Committee that the general debate should be suspended at the following meeting in order to enable Mr. Mancham to address the Committee; as soon as the exchange of views arising from Mr. Mancham's statement had been completed, the Committee would resume the general debate on agenda items 66, 67 and 68. Further, it was understood that that procedure would in no way prejudice any decisions that the Committee might take regarding the modalities for consideration of the remaining items on its agenda.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.*

<sup>7</sup> The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/739.