

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1933rd  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 27 October 1971,  
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Skottsberg-Åhman (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**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*)**

1. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) extended a welcome to the four new Member States, Bahrain, Bhutan, Oman and Qatar, and expressed his conviction that their participation in the United Nations would help its efforts to secure the independence and freedom of all peoples of the world.

2. Although the common element linking the problems of southern Africa should not be forgotten, occurrences in 1971 such as the pronouncement of the International Court of Justice on the question of Namibia, aggression by Portugal against Guinea and Senegal and its brutality towards liberation movements justified the separate consideration of each question, and he reserved the right to speak on the problem of Namibia later.

3. The United Nations Charter should apply uniformly to all Members, yet exceptions seemed to be made for some States. Portugal, Israel and South Africa applied it to suit themselves, taking advantage of the benefits it gave them and evading all the obligations it imposed; they continued to violate it, with impunity, by denying their victims a fundamental right established by the Charter: the right to self-determination and freedom.

4. It might have been thought that the creation of the United Nations would have ended the age of colonialism for good and given all peoples the right to freedom and independence, but it seemed that racism, fascism and colonialism continued to be practised by the régimes of the countries he had mentioned.

5. Despite the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation

among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the fact that the principle of the prohibition of territorial acquisition by force had been reaffirmed and the principle of self-determination and freedom of peoples proclaimed, the racists recognized nothing but brute force.

6. As stated in the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970), the continuation of colonialism was a crime which violated the United Nations Charter. In addition, the programme reaffirmed the inherent right of colonial peoples to struggle against colonial Powers which suppressed their aspiration for freedom and independence. The legitimacy of that struggle was recognized by the General Assembly in resolution 2704 (XXV) of 14 December 1970. Member States had undertaken to render all necessary moral and material assistance to the peoples of colonial Territories in their struggle to attain freedom and independence.

7. However, the position was that entire Territories and peoples in the third world, and especially in Africa, were still subject to foreign domination and colonialism. Twenty million unfortunate human beings continued to suffer the military threats and economic exploitation of the racist régimes of southern Africa, in flagrant violation of human rights and the Charter. The seriousness of the situation had recently been pointed out by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/8401/Add.1, para. 57), where he said that if the problem was not solved, it would inevitably affect the future relationships between Africa and the rest of the world.

8. The problem persisted because the major Powers which were associated with the racist régimes, instead of implementing the United Nations resolutions on decolonization, gave those régimes military and economic support; and because the countries of the third world failed to act in unison against the racist régimes.

9. Why were the means contemplated in Chapter VII of the Charter not used against the aggressors and those who insisted on defying the Charter? Instead of exerting pressure against them, the Western nations, with the honourable exception of Sweden, had demonstrated their lack of interest by withdrawing 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. Why was Portugal allowed

to visit its ferocity on the indigenous populations of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)? Why was Ian Smith allowed a *de facto* illegal independence which was denied to the indigenous population? Why was Israel permitted to occupy Sinai and Gaza, which were territories of an African country? Why did the Members of the United Nations, who were fervent believers in the principles of the Charter, bow to these aggressions?

10. Both in north Africa, where the aggressor Israel was annexing occupied territories, and in the south, where South Africa was annexing Namibia, and again in the east and west, where Portugal held sway, the same methods were used and the same colonialist motives prevailed; they brought with them a barbaric and criminal rule of force, the law of napalm and the right of the strongest. Because of the lack of concerted action and joint effort, the danger now threatened not only Guinea, where the Portuguese colonialists were seeking to suppress the nationalist régime of the great African militant Sekou Touré, but also threatened Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania.

11. By failing to discharge its obligations to act with justice so as to ensure the application of the principles of the Charter, and to challenge the aggressor and protect the aggressor's victims, the international community left the African population no alternative but to resort to force in self-defence.

12. He praised chapter VIII of the Special Committee's report, dealing with the Territories under Portuguese administration (A/8423/Add.4) and endorsed the views expressed in the Secretariat's working paper on Portugal's economic relations with the Territories under its administration (*ibid.*, annex I, sect. 5). Those relations were characterized by Portugal's rapacity for African raw materials and its self-centredness in administering the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) in a manner detrimental to African interests. The Territories in question, far from benefiting from their economic relations with Portugal, or from the advantages of a unified monetary zone, found their balance of payments steadily deteriorating while Portuguese gold and foreign currency reserves steadily rose. As a remedy for that situation, Portugal had announced a constitutional reform which was to confer some administrative autonomy on the so-called overseas Territories, but in practice the condition of the Territories had not changed appreciably as they continued to form an indivisible part of the Portuguese State.

13. His delegation condemned schemes such as the Cabora Bassa dam and the Cunene River Basin project because their objective was to encourage the immigration of foreigners, with the consequent expulsion of Africans from their land. He was grateful to those countries which had responded to the appeal made to them the previous year and had withdrawn from those projects or secured the withdrawal of their firms.

14. In the military sphere, Portugal was pursuing its policy of repressing the African population with the help of the support it received from members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In June 1971, the Special Committee had deplored the fact that the States members of NATO had held meetings of the NATO Council of

Ministers at Lisbon; to his mind, that was proof of NATO collaboration with Portugal (see A/8423/Add.4, para. 31). Portugal had increased the share of its budget devoted to defence and arms purchases by some 10.5 per cent and was continuing to strengthen its links with South Africa with a view to mutual collaboration for the defence of southern Africa. However, the liberation movements were scoring further victories in Angola, Guinea (Bissau) and Mozambique, and much of those Territories was under their direct control.

15. The problem of Southern Rhodesia, the seriousness of which had grown with the intensification of repressive measures by the white minority against the people of Zimbabwe, seemed another question destined for neglect by the United Nations.

16. His delegation condemned the encouragement which the racist régime of Ian Smith received from South Africa, through the latter's support, and from the United Kingdom, through the recent secret negotiations it had begun with that régime, thus contravening the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The fact that since the breakdown of economic sanctions the United Kingdom had refused to use force, as authorized by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, suggested that it supported the Ian Smith régime. Mention should also be made of the decision of the United States Senate approving the import of chromium from Southern Rhodesia. His delegation appealed to the United States Government to refrain from encouraging the racists to perpetuate their oppression, as it would by strengthening the economy of a country where 250,000 whites held down 5 million Africans under a severe régime of *apartheid*.

17. The economic progress of Southern Rhodesia, whose gross domestic product had increased by 11 per cent from 1968 to 1969, testified to the collapse of economic sanctions and was a convincing reason why the United Kingdom should use force to bring down what its Minister of State for Foreign Affairs had described in 1970 as an illegal and disloyal régime.

18. Would the United Nations, at the current session, witness Portugal, South Africa, Ian Smith and Israel repenting of the crimes they had inflicted on humanity and re-embracing the principles of the Charter, so as to dispel the shadow of war? Was there some hope that the major nations involved in those crimes would strictly observe the resolutions of the United Nations and Article 25 of the Charter? The future of the United Nations as an effective organization depended on the respect its Members showed for the Charter and human dignity.

19. In conclusion, his delegation asked that 1972 should be declared a year of concerted action to organize a common front against oppression and colonialism, foreign occupation, and racism. That would represent a step forward and justice would be restored in southern Africa after three centuries.

20. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho) said that during his country's five years of independence, its foreign policy had always been inspired by principles of peace and justice. The Lesotho Government categorized racial discrimination as

the most unjust of all injustices, because it was based on false premises and on factors which its victims could not control or change. That was the source of Lesotho's unwavering opposition to the current situation in Namibia and other southern African Territories. The Lesotho Government had repeatedly questioned the sincerity and purpose of the Committee's annual resolutions, which expressed deep indignation but lacked any positive outcome. To some extent they had aroused false hopes in the suffering people of Namibia, who were naturally beginning to show signs of frustration and lack of confidence in the United Nations.

21. It was obvious that the Namibians would not attain independence without the participation of South Africa. In his statement to the General Assembly (1946th plenary meeting), the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had said that his Government was convinced that the people of South West Africa wished his country to continue to administer the Territory until it had achieved self-determination under South African guidance. The Namibian people certainly needed guidance, but it should be guidance towards genuine independence, which was quite different from the tribal fragmentation which South Africa was undertaking with the Bantustans. What the Namibians wanted was the self-determination defined in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

22. The Prime Minister of Lesotho had recently announced that his country would accept the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice on Namibia.<sup>1</sup> That historic Opinion could form the basis of negotiation between the United Nations and the South African Government with regard to the granting of independence to Namibia. South Africa should accept the idea of an independent Namibia because that Territory had never been an integral part of South Africa, because the Namibians wished to retain their identity and, above all, because it would not be in South Africa's long-term political interests to incorporate the Territory. If South Africa decided to grant independence to Namibia, it would win the goodwill of the Namibian people, who would then devote themselves to the social, economic and political development of their vast country and in no way constitute a threat to the security of the South African Government. On the other hand, should Namibia win its independence by violent means, the violence might spill across its frontiers and set off a chain reaction of revolts, rebellion and bloodshed throughout southern Africa.

23. It was well known that Lesotho must maintain economic relations with South Africa in order to survive. However, it had no kind of relations, either economic, diplomatic or consular, which implied tacit recognition of South Africa's authority over Namibia. In fact, like many other States Members of the United Nations, Lesotho regarded the authority exercised by South Africa over Namibia as illegal.

<sup>1</sup> For the text of the Advisory Opinion, 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.

24. It was very significant that in 1971, for the first time, South Africa had decided to participate in the debates on Namibia in the Security Council. His delegation would be encouraged if at the current session the Committee could adopt a resolution designed in the main to initiate talks between South Africa and the United Nations on the transfer of power to the Namibians, as contemplated in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice. His delegation also supported the idea that the Secretary-General should visit Namibia to obtain first-hand information on the situation in the Territory.

25. Mr. AL HADAD (Yemen) said that many countries had attained independence since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; it was regrettable, however, that some colonial Powers were still unwilling to recognize the realities of history. The Portuguese colonialists continued to deny the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) their fundamental rights to self-determination and independence as laid down in the United Nations Charter. If the Lisbon Government continued to disregard the wishes of the indigenous population in that part of Africa, more blood would inevitably be shed. The international community should begin collective action to assure the peoples of those Territories their right to freedom.

26. In Namibia, the South African Government continued to violate all internationally recognized standards of conduct. The United Nations had adopted several resolutions in support of the rights of the people of Namibia under the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in particular, General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which terminated the Mandate of South Africa in Namibia, and Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia. Furthermore, the International Court of Justice, through its Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971, had just confirmed that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa should withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately. It was distressing that the Organization should maintain the membership of an arrogant and criminal Government which violated the principles of the Charter by subjugating the people of Namibia to savage measures reminiscent of Nazi practices in the Second World War. The Pretoria Government could defy the authority of the United Nations because it enjoyed the collaboration of other régimes of racial character. It was a well-known fact that Israel was co-operating fully with South Africa: the Israeli authorities had granted South Africa a licence to manufacture Uzi sub-machine guns. An Israeli army colonel had visited South Africa in 1970 to give a series of lectures on counter-insurgency and had recruited South African Zionist women for the Israeli army.

27. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, Security Council resolutions 232 (1966) and 253 (1968) had expressed grave concern at the situation and described it as a threat to international peace and security. His delegation believed that the existence of the illegal racist régime of Salisbury was due to the attitude and behaviour of the United Kingdom. In 1946, when the General Assembly had approved the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the United Kingdom had asked that Southern Rhodesia be

omitted from that list on the ground that Chapter XI of the Charter was not applicable to it. The United Kingdom had therefore assumed responsibility for its administration. As early as 1962, the United Nations had affirmed that the United Kingdom, as the administering Power was solely responsible for events in Southern Rhodesia. The unilateral declaration of independence by the illegal minority régime in 1965 had forced the United Kingdom to bring the issue before the Security Council. His delegation was convinced that the United Kingdom should assume responsibility for putting down the rebel régime of Ian Smith and transferring power to the people of Zimbabwe through free elections which would guarantee majority rule.

28. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Egyptian and Yemeni representatives, at the current meeting, and the Syrian representative, at the previous meeting, had misused the discussion for propaganda purposes. The inclusion of attacks on Israel in every debate was like the commercial advertising which constantly interrupted television programmes. That technique, which was now considered unproductive on television, made no contribution to the work of the Fourth Committee and might eventually exhaust the patience of its members.

29. In the questions they had asked Miss Rogers at the 1922nd meeting, the Syrian and Egyptian representatives had vainly tried to force statements from her implicating Israel in the problems of southern Africa. Israeli action with regard to the problem of decolonization in the region was well known and needed no defence. To refute the ridiculous accusations against Israel would be to confer on them a legitimacy they did not deserve.

30. Mr. ALDEGHATHER (Saudi Arabia) said that the comparison between Israel and the racist régimes of southern Africa was pertinent to the discussion. The representative of Israel had no right to say that the statements by the representatives of Syria, Egypt and Yemen were propaganda.

31. Mr. AL-JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the statement he had made at the preceding meeting on some aspects of the close co-operation between Israel and South Africa was based on facts recorded in United Nations documents. Rather than use the Committee's time for propaganda, the representative of Israel should have told the Committee whether his Government intended to cease its support for South Africa.

32. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that it was the Israeli representative who had been guilty of propaganda and used the sensation-mongering techniques of television, which were out of place in the United Nations.

33. Mr. EILAN (Israel) said that he thought some representatives would be less interested in the problems of southern Africa if the Arab-Israeli problem did not exist. If the Egyptian representative wished to become a protagonist of freedom and social justice, he should start with the problems of the students of Alexandria and the poor peasants in his own country.

34. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Israel had no right to refer to the internal affairs of his country. Egypt had nothing to hide. Anyone could go there and see that the statements of the Israeli representative were nothing but calumnies. Israel, on the other hand, had refused to receive the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

35. His statements on the relations between Israel and the régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were based on facts to be found in United Nations documents. He reserved the right to refer to the matter again.

36. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the questions of the relations between Zionism, racism and fascism and of the co-operation between Israel and South Africa were very pertinent to the Committee's work. The Government of South Africa could not remain in Namibia unless it received economic and military support from the imperialist Powers, including Israel, which supplied sub-machine guns and aid in the form of training for military personnel. He agreed with the Syrian representative that the representative of Israel should inform the Committee whether his Government intended to cease its co-operation with South Africa.

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

37. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that a request for a hearing had been received from Mr. Sharfudine M. Khan, representative of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), concerning the Territories under Portuguese administration. In the absence of any objection, she would take it that the Committee wished to circulate it as a Committee document.

*It was so decided.<sup>2</sup>*

*The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.*

<sup>2</sup> The request was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/739/Add.1.