

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1934th
MEETING**

Thursday, 28 October 1971,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

Requests for hearings (continued)

**REQUEST CONCERNING TERRITORIES UNDER
PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA ITEM
67) (A/C.4/739/ADD.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.4/739/Add.1, containing the request for a hearing from Mr. Sharfudine M. Khan, of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO).

2. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to grant the request for a hearing.

It was so decided.

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)

3. Mr. DE SILVA (Ceylon) said that his delegation's views on the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia had not changed. It deplored Portugal's increasingly aggressive attitude towards African States bordering the Territories under its administration, as exemplified by its attacks on Senegal, Guinea, Zambia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In defiance of General Assembly resolutions 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970 and 2707 (XXV) of 14 December 1970, Portugal continued to oppress the inhabitants of the Territories under its domination. A small and poor country, it was able to continue its aggressive acts of war because of the assistance which it received from its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). If the people of the Territories under Portuguese administration were to be liberated, sterner action would have to be taken. The major trading partners of the colonial Powers in southern Africa and the members of NATO could undoubtedly take more effective action than they had done hitherto. A concerted effort should be made to prevent

Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia from practising racist tyranny in southern Africa.

4. His delegation had consistently supported strong United Nations action regarding the question of Namibia. The impotence of the United Nations, however, had prevented it from taking such action. South Africa was in physical possession of the Territory of Namibia despite the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 on the question of Namibia handed down by the International Court of Justice.¹ The continued presence of South African authorities in Namibia was illegal and South Africa had continued to flout the authority of the United Nations. There was no denying, however, that the United Nations was fully responsible for Namibia's immediate and unconditional attainment of independence. His delegation therefore hoped that South Africa would accept the Advisory Opinion and would prepare to implement the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

5. It was unfortunate that the régime in Southern Rhodesia had apparently assumed a cloak of legality. His delegation emphatically maintained its view that the Southern Rhodesian régime was illegal and that the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, still bore responsibility for the Territory.

6. His delegation deplored the increasing collaboration of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia in the policies of colonialism and aggression pursued in southern Africa. That it had increased during the preceding year was evident from the meeting of the security chiefs of those countries at Salisbury. The very concept of a minority maintaining complete political and economic power was reprehensible. The policies of racial discrimination practised by those Governments were based on their desire to preserve and maintain at all costs the privileges of their minority ruling groups. Such exploitation of the weak by the strong was the most despicable form of tyranny. It had been stated in the General Assembly that, as long as a minority Government continued to oppress the majority of the population concerned, those who fought for freedom had a legitimate right to continue their struggle. All States should therefore give increased financial and material assistance to those peoples in their struggle for the restoration of their inalienable rights. As an indication of its support for Namibia, his Government had decided to recognize the travel documents of Namibians resident outside the Territory.

¹ 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.*

7. In an effort to bring justice to those who were oppressed by racist régimes, all Governments should bear in mind the view expressed in the Lusaka Manifesto² that the forces of racism, *apartheid*, colonialism and imperialism continued to be an obvious, but in no way less dangerous, means of economic and political domination of the developing countries and that those phenomena of the present-day world tended not only to perpetuate the evils of the past but also to undermine the future; they retarded the liberation of many countries still under colonial domination and jeopardized the independence and territorial integrity of many countries—above all of the non-aligned and developing countries—hampering their advancement, intensifying tension and giving rise to conflicts.

8. Mr. SICLAIT (Haiti) said that the Committee was once again dealing with a problem that had been of concern to all Members of the United Nations for many years: the intolerable situation created in southern Africa by the presence of racist régimes which, in defiance of the principles of the Charter, continued to repress the peoples of the region, keeping them in a state of near-slavery. It might have been hoped that in the face of universal censure those régimes would have listened to reason, but the fact was that in Namibia, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) the situation had deteriorated.

9. His Government had made its disapproval of the situation quite clear; in his statement to the General Assembly on 5 October 1971 (1953rd plenary meeting), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Haiti had denounced the colonialism still surviving in large areas of Africa.

10. The indigenous peoples had tried, by peaceful means, to change the situation in which they were oppressed by a white minority, but their efforts had been to no avail. In Southern Rhodesia the racist Smith régime, after its illegal unilateral declaration of independence, had consolidated its position with the help of neighbours and allies, and had introduced the evil policy of *apartheid* into that country. Collusion between Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal had made the economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council ineffective. Negotiations were currently going on between Southern Rhodesia and the administering Power; in the absence of any specific information on that subject, he expressed the hope that the negotiations would be based upon the principles set out in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. If an agreement was concluded to the detriment of the legitimate interests of the majority of the Zimbabwe people, there would be reason to despair of the United Nations and to consider the promises made by the representatives of certain Powers to be deceptive.

11. The situation in Namibia was hardly more encouraging. Despite the United Nations decision to end the South African Mandate for Namibia and to place the Territory under the direct administration of the United Nations, and despite the recent Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, South Africa continued its illegal occupation and was openly introducing *apartheid* in the shape of

Bantustans established in the most barren parts of the country. Whole tribes were being uprooted from land that they had occupied for generations and made to live in so-called "homelands", in deplorable sanitary conditions, without water or light. The overwhelming majority of the Namibian people were deprived of their fundamental rights in order that a white minority might have the benefit of a pool of cheap labour. South Africa's trading partners pretended to be unaware of that situation. It was essential that all Member States, and particularly South Africa's trading partners, should implement the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions relating to Namibia without delay. Broader powers should be given to the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the United Nations should take the necessary legal steps to protect the rights of the Namibian people and the natural resources of their country.

12. Turning to the Territories under Portuguese administration, he said that, although Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) had been given the name of "overseas provinces", their status was still that of colonies. No real changes had been made in their administration in the political, economic, social and cultural conditions of the African people. It was hardly surprising that a large number of those people were now waging war against the administering Power in order to assert their right to self-determination and independence.

13. In the belief that all men were born equal, his delegation would associate itself with all measures designed to liberate the peoples of southern Africa from the colonial yoke.

14. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) welcomed the new Member States, Bahrain, Bhutan, Oman and Qatar, to the Committee and said that his country would continue to support the Arab countries in their struggle against the Zionist usurper of Palestine.

15. The problems of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration arose from the desire of a group of nations to maintain their domination of other peoples, in other words, from imperialism, colonialism and racism.

16. The United Nations had been discussing the problems of decolonization and racism for many years and each year the only result had been the adoption of hollow resolutions setting forth declarations and intention and pious hopes. It was time to take a fresh look at the problem in its true context, namely, the survival of colonialism.

17. In all the Territories under discussion, the aim of the authorities was to maintain white domination at all costs and to perpetuate the exploitation of the immense wealth of Africa. The argument of the European Governments that were selling arms to South Africa and Portugal was that those arms were intended to defend the seas against the Soviet navy, not to be used against Africans. The fact was that the Fascists of Pretoria and Lisbon were working hand in glove with the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

18. For 25 years the United Nations had been discussing the problem of Namibia and had heard a series of puerile

² Manifesto on Southern Africa. For the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

arguments in justification of the South African occupation of the Territory. Since the International Court of Justice had declared that occupation to be illegal, there should be nothing to prevent suitable action being taken to put an end to it. The United Kingdom and France, however, had not subscribed to the Court's Advisory Opinion and were siding with South Africa, which had rejected it. That was an essential point, which the Committee must take into account in its deliberations: Africa was opposing not only South Africa but also its accomplices, the United Kingdom and France.

19. The same factor arose in the situation in Southern Rhodesia. It was surprising that a handful of colonialists had been able to defy the administering Power and world opinion by unilaterally proclaiming the independence of a country that did not belong to them. The truth was that the United Kingdom was trying to mislead international opinion. The reason why it had not put down the rebellion immediately, as it had not hesitated to do many times elsewhere, was that the major concern of its capitalists was the maintenance of a white belt in southern Africa. The United Kingdom must be made to accept its responsibilities and to end the rebellion of its own nationals, so that the African peoples of the Territory could exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

20. His delegation would be reassured if the United States representative could confirm his Government's intention to oppose any attempt to end the sanctions against the Smith régime.

21. Turning to the question of Territories under Portuguese domination, he said that it had been demonstrated that Portugal was unable to carry on its wars in Africa without help from NATO members. The United Nations had repeatedly requested those States to cease supplying arms to Portugal. With the help of the very same countries that were allying themselves with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, Portugal was now extending its attacks to the independent African States bordering the Territories under its domination, which had several times had to complain to the Security Council concerning Portuguese violations of their national territory. His own country had suffered a full-scale Portuguese military invasion on 22 November 1970, the avowed aim of which had been to liquidate a popular, revolutionary movement by murdering its leaders and replacing them by a puppet government which would have carried out the orders of its imperialist masters. The people of Guinea, under the inspired leadership of their President, had roundly defeated the Portuguese. Portugal, however, had not learnt its lesson and was again preparing to attack the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Guinea. If such an attack should take place, the people of Guinea had sworn that it would be the Portuguese army's last act of piracy in west Africa.

22. With the decision to admit the People's Republic of China to its rightful seat in the United Nations (General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971), the Organization had embarked on a new era in its history. At the current historic session of the General Assembly, the Fourth Committee must abandon the principles and methods that in the past had been used to camouflage the true solution. It had to act with the same resolution and

sense of responsibility as the General Assembly itself. It must vote in favour of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia so that the Namibian people could accede to independence within 18 months at the most. It must force the United Kingdom to put down the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, and must find effective ways of making Portugal leave Africa so that the peoples of its Territories might join the community of free and sovereign nations. It must denounce the complicity of the States whose selfish interests and desire for domination paralysed all action by the United Nations that might solve the numerous problems. It must encourage the liberation movements, both in Africa and throughout the world, and increase its assistance to them.

23. Freedom could not be taught; it had to be exercised. Freedom could not be bought; it had to be seized, for it was the prerequisite for progress and development. President Sekou Touré had said that all men had a primary and indispensable need for freedom and dignity. There must be no more talk of transitional periods for preparing peoples for independence.

24. Before the arrival of the colonialists on African soil, the African peoples had known how to govern themselves and to build flourishing empires. Those empires had been destroyed under the pretext of bringing Western civilization to Africa. Only a puppet such as the one that had addressed the Committee could affirm that a people preferred domination to national sovereignty. Assertions of that kind only strengthened his delegation's conviction that continued domination of one people by another, of one race by another, was a crime against humanity and must be ended.

25. Mr. AKATANI (Japan) said that, despite the renewed determination to achieve the goal of decolonization implicit in the celebration in 1970 of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, millions of people were still deprived of their inalienable right of self-determination. In southern Africa, in particular, some 18 million people, who were denied even their most fundamental rights, lived in conditions of undisguised racial discrimination and ruthless repression.

26. His delegation was seriously concerned about the situation prevailing in Namibia, particularly in view of the reported acceleration in the extension and enforcement of South African laws in the Territory. Such measures were designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia by means of a continuing process of racial and tribal segregation, and of incorporation of the Territory into South Africa. During 1970, for example, further steps had been taken to effect the transfer to South Africa, in accordance with the South West Africa Affairs Act of 1969, of a wide range of powers and functions previously entrusted to the territorial administration. Such steps were clearly inconsistent with the decisions of the United Nations.

27. At the 1584th meeting of the Security Council, the South African delegation had maintained that the South African Government was committed to the principle of self-determination for Namibia. His delegation had been

disappointed, however, by the South African delegation's statement that the South African Government felt obliged to take account of differences of language, history, heritage and group consciousness in applying self-determination in Namibia. In fact, the policy pursued by South Africa constituted a negation of the principle of self-determination because it denied the Namibian people freedom of choice.

28. His delegation was encouraged to note that the Security Council had recently adopted resolution 301 (1971), which represented an important contribution towards the peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia. It was significant that the Council had considered that question in the light of the Advisory Opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice. His delegation welcomed that Opinion, which, in effect, had confirmed the validity of the United Nations to terminate the Mandate of South Africa and to assume direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence. Japan had consistently supported those decisions: it did not recognize South Africa's authority over Namibia and it regarded South Africa's continued presence in the Territory as illegal. South Africa was therefore under an obligation to comply with the Security Council's demand that it should withdraw from the Territory immediately. Japan, of course, complied fully with the Security Council resolutions relating to Namibia.

29. Security Council resolution 301 (1971) was a further unequivocal enunciation of the position of the United Nations with respect to its responsibility to the people of Namibia. The draft resolution submitted by Argentina for consideration by the Security Council³ represented a practical step towards ending the impasse which had existed, for many years; it did not in any way constitute a change in the basic position of the United Nations as stated in resolution 301 (1971). The draft resolution should not be interpreted as indicating that the United Nations was weakening its position or that South Africa's defiance was in any way condoned. His delegation hoped that South Africa would take full advantage of the opportunity offered by the draft resolution if and when it was adopted.

30. The fact that there had been no tangible improvement in the situation in Southern Rhodesia was distressing. Admittedly, no State had so far officially recognized the independence of the Ian Smith régime and, with the exception of Portugal and South Africa, no State maintained even consular relations with Southern Rhodesia. Nevertheless, the comprehensive economic sanctions authorized by the Security Council had not yet succeeded in bringing down the illegal minority régime. Indeed, the sanctions had not led to any sharp decline in the Territory's economic performance. According to the preliminary estimates for 1970 reproduced in paragraph 57 of chapter VI of 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 (see A/8423/Add.2 (part I)), the over-all growth rate in real terms would amount to between 7 and 8 per cent. International trade with Southern Rhodesia appar-

ently continued to flourish, mainly because of the defiance of the sanctions by South Africa and Portugal. Nevertheless, Southern Rhodesia's exports, which had amounted £R164 million in 1965, still remained below pre-sanction levels and, by 1969 had risen to only about 70 per cent of the 1965 level. According to a paper submitted by France and the United Kingdom and considered recently by the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968), the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia had been compelled to resort to complicated and costly procedures to evade sanctions and continued difficulty was being experienced in attracting and retaining as many immigrants as were wanted. It was also pointed out in that paper that Southern Rhodesia's foreign exchange difficulties had remained acute and had probably worsened during 1970; difficulties in obtaining replacements for worn-out infrastructure had increased, and difficulty of access to the international capital market had also probably restricted the potential rate of development. Consequently, to say that sanctions had failed was erroneous and an over-simplification of their results.

31. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the view expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 300 of the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (see A/8401/Add.1) that it was the duty of all Member States to see to it that the sanctions imposed by the Security Council were enforced more rigorously, in particular by exercising greater vigilance in the prevention of clandestine trade. As soon as possible after the Security Council had decided to impose sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, the Government of Japan had adopted a series of measures to implement the provisions of the relevant Security Council resolutions. His Government had been applying those measures faithfully and would continue to do so. It consequently rejected any allegation to the contrary.

32. His delegation did not subscribe to the view that the United Kingdom should use force to bring down the Smith régime. In accordance with the Charter, all peaceful means of solving the problem should be fully explored in order to avoid violence and bloodshed. In its capacity as the administering Power, the United Kingdom had the primary responsibility and obligation to restore constitutional government in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure that the black majority were able to enjoy all political and economic rights. It was essential that any proposals relating to independence should be acceptable to the people of Southern Rhodesia as a whole. His delegation earnestly hoped that the Government of the United Kingdom would intensify its efforts to seek a satisfactory solution of the problem at the earliest possible moment.

33. His Government deplored the attitude of the Government of Portugal, which continued to deny the principle of self-determination in the Territories under its administration and to strengthen its domination over them. As the Secretary-General had pointed out (*ibid.*, para. 301), during the preceding year the Portuguese authorities in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) had further intensified their military operations against the liberation movements in those Territories. On two occasions in 1971 the Security Council had been called upon to consider complaints made by Senegal and Guinea against Portugal. Complaints of a

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10376.

similar nature had been made to the Security Council on a number of occasions in recent years. His delegation could well understand that African States bordering the Territories under Portuguese administration would feel constantly threatened by the Portuguese colonial presence in Africa. His delegation hoped that the Government of Portugal would soon realize the wisdom of granting the right of self-determination to the people of the Territories under its administration. Such a step would undoubtedly contribute to a relaxation of tension and the establishment of more friendly relations among all parties concerned.

34. The achievement of political independence by the peoples of southern Africa was a noble objective. Independence could not be considered complete, however, unless the groundwork was laid for the economic and social stability and development of newly independent countries. That was an area in which Japan could make a positive contribution. Its economic relations with the countries of Africa had grown closer year by year. Imports into Japan from African countries other than those of southern Africa had steadily increased at a more rapid rate than its exports to those countries and had more than tripled in the preceding five years. Its programme of official and private economic co-operation with the developing countries of Africa had been steadily expanded over the years. If Japan could thus contribute to the economic and social development of independent African countries, it would also be contributing indirectly to the struggle for independence of the peoples of southern Africa and would be helping to ensure their future stability once they had attained independence.

35. The situations in Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration were not identical in every respect, but there were two important features common to all those Territories—racial discrimination and denial of the inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Japan would continue its efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and colonialism and to help the people of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration to attain freedom and independence.

36. The Government of Japan exercised strict control over the economic activities of Japanese enterprises in southern Africa. Although it had taken some steps to liberalize direct overseas investment in general, southern Africa was specifically excluded from such liberalization and any firm which intended to invest in that region had to obtain government approval before doing so. No such approval had so far been given.

37. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) said that the fact that several agenda items concerned Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia showed the urgent need for speedy and effective action to solve the problems of southern Africa, as a decisive step towards the full eradication of the vestiges of colonialism. During the current session of the General Assembly, many delegations had indicated that the solution to the protracted problems of southern Africa was bound up with the political, strategic, economic, financial and other interests of the imperialist Powers. That was the main reason for the recent halt in the progress towards a solution.

38. His delegation therefore fully understood the deep concern felt by the independent African States over the continuing obstruction by the Western Powers of further progress in the struggle against colonialism and over the increasing aggressiveness of the colonialist and racist forces in southern Africa against the independent African States. In the communiqué prepared by the representatives of the non-aligned countries meeting in New York in September 1971, it was rightly stated that such action threatened the independence and stability of African countries and was a challenge to the whole international community. Furthermore, the recent meeting of the Security Council, convened to consider the acts of aggression carried out by units of the Portuguese colonial forces against the Republic of Guinea and against Senegal, and similar acts by the military and police authorities of South Africa against Namibia, had produced further such evidence. Hand in hand with the increasing number of United Nations resolutions condemning the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa, there was a growing number of cases of gross violation of the Charter and of United Nations decisions by the colonial and racist forces. That was all the more serious since General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) declared colonialism to be a crime. In paragraph 3(b), the General Assembly drew the attention of the Security Council to the need to continue to give special attention to the problems of southern Africa by adopting measures to ensure the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The provisions of resolution 2621 (XXV) had been further supplemented by resolutions 2678 (XXV) on Namibia, 2700 (XXV) on the Territories under Portuguese administration and 2652 (XXV) on Southern Rhodesia. His delegation fully supported those measures and was convinced that their further implementation by Member States would substantially accelerate the process of decolonization. Unfortunately, the actual situation gave no cause for optimism since, despite the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, which again stressed the illegality of the presence of South Africa in Namibia and which set forth the consequences of that illegality, the Territory remained in the hands of the South African white minority régime.

39. The situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration made it impossible to expect a speedy end to the colonial war against the African population. The colonialists had begun with a scorched-earth policy and the systematic use of anti-personnel bombs and napalm. Strategic settlements had then been constructed for the indigenous population, followed by the socio-psychological “processing” of certain sectors of the population. More recently the colonialists had resorted to the extensive use of defoliants and the destruction of crops. According to doctors’ findings, fish caught in waters contaminated by defoliants had given rise to genetic anomalies among newly-born children. That was an indication of the lengths to which imperialism would go in the pursuit of profits.

40. The situation in Southern Rhodesia, which had already lasted for seven years, was the result of the policy of the administering Power, which was failing to fulfil its obligation to enable the people of Zimbabwe to achieve self-determination and independence. His delegation, like many others, did not interpret the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples and the numerous resolutions on Southern Rhodesia to mean that the administering Power—the United Kingdom—should try to negotiate with the Southern Rhodesian racists. As the Zambian Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated in the General Assembly, at the current session (1945th plenary meeting), such a so-called settlement would leave the African majority under the ruthless control of the white minority.

41. Furthermore, the non-observance of the sanctions by certain imperialist Powers encouraged the racist régimes and strengthened the links between Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon. But the greatest act of defiance to the United Nations in its efforts to liquidate the vestiges of colonialism was the provision by certain Western Powers of military and other assistance to those régimes. His delegation understood the concern of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which in its resolution 241 (XVII) of June 1971 had severely condemned the members of NATO for refusing to co-operate with the United Nations in its efforts to bring about decolonization and for supporting the Portuguese colonial régime.

42. His delegation fully agreed with the view expressed in the consensus adopted on 4 March 1971 by 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/8423/Add.2 (part I), para. 31) and transmitted by a letter dated 5 March 1971 from the Chairman of the Special Committee to the President of the Security Council,⁴ in which that Committee had deplored the fact that the United Kingdom Government had decided to continue the sale of military equipment and spare parts to South Africa in violation of a number of Security Council resolutions. Such assistance, which facilitated the violation of obligations under the Charter, ran counter to the principles of international law. In 1970, the Security Council had requested all States to review their contracts and agreements relating to Namibia to ensure that South Africa was not provided with economic assistance.

43. Despite the protests of the international community, several imperialist Powers continued to supply arms to the colonial and racist régimes in southern Africa. Such a development merely encouraged the expansionist ambitions of the increasingly powerful Pretoria régime, which on the one hand tried to quell the opposition of the African countries to the policy of *apartheid*, while, on the other, it sought external markets to boost its industrial development. Furthermore, it was increasing its non-violent activities in regard to the independent African States, with a view to showing its "benevolence": it offered those States benefits such as capital investment and technological data; and it spoke of softening—but without promising to renounce—its policy of *apartheid*. As several delegations had stated in the Committee, such attractive proposals were designed not only to preserve the interests of South Africa itself but to prevent any possibility of unity among the chief opponents of the Salisbury and Lisbon régimes. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia had rightly stated in the General Assembly (1943rd plenary meeting) that the

type of trade agreements likely to be set up externally under the dialogue umbrella would be typically colonial arrangements which would encourage the production and export of low-priced raw materials in exchange for higher-priced manufactured goods. He had further stated that the betrayal of the millions of Africans under colonial and racist domination should not be undertaken at any price.

44. In the view of his delegation, the strategy of the national liberation struggle was not the form which the colonial peoples would have chosen, but it was the only effective means open to them. The United Nations had acknowledged the right of people of the colonial and dependent Territories to continue their struggle by all means available.

45. The United Nations could significantly assist the process of decolonization if every Government fulfilled its obligations to comply with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. His Government, for its part, had always been aware of its obligation to provide moral, political and material assistance to the national liberation movement both within the United Nations and in its bilateral relations.

46. Mrs. AASEN (Norway) said that the problems of colonial subjugation and racial discrimination still existed in southern Africa and constituted a flagrant denial of the basic rights enshrined in the Charter and a defiant challenge to the international community, which required appropriate and effective action. Those problems could be solved only by means of a determined attack on the consistent refusal by those in power to respect the fundamental right of the subjugated peoples to self-determination and independence. As the Secretary-General had rightly stated, the basic problem derived from the perpetuation of colonial systems under which a racial minority arrogated to itself the authority to prevent the realization by the majority of their right of self-determination and the enjoyment of fundamental freedoms and sought to exploit them both politically and economically. It was therefore fitting that the questions of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration should be discussed simultaneously.

47. The Norwegian Government had consistently maintained that decolonization was a historical process which should be brought to a successful conclusion in as rapid and orderly a manner as possible. Experience had confirmed its belief that it was possible for the process of decolonization to be concluded peacefully. The African countries had shown that willingness to co-operate in seeking a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa, based on the fundamental principles of self-determination and the dignity and equality of the individual, regardless of race, colour or creed. The Lusaka Manifesto was an eloquent expression of the desire of the African countries to co-operate in bringing about a peaceful transfer of power. It was regrettable that the willingness of African States to co-operate in an effort to achieve a peaceful solution had not been reciprocated by the other side. The lack of any substantial progress towards a peaceful solution would naturally increase the feelings of frustration and impatience among the African peoples who were directly engaged in the struggle for the liberation of their countries from

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1971, document S/10147.

minority rule and foreign domination. Her delegation shared the disappointment expressed by the Secretary-General that the vestiges of colonialism remained a stubborn reality.

48. If the rulers of the régimes in southern Africa did not heed repeated appeals to abandon their present repressive policies, the African peoples under their domination would be left with no alternative but to struggle for the attainment of their legitimate rights by adopting a more militant course of action. If the road to a peaceful settlement continued to be effectively blocked, other methods would be adopted by the oppressed peoples to achieve the goal of self-determination. The responsibility for preventing the peaceful emancipation of the remaining colonial Territories in southern Africa must be borne by those who stubbornly refused to grant the peoples concerned the opportunity to exercise their right of self-determination. The President of the United Republic of Tanzania had aptly summarized the problems and dangers inherent in the situation when, in 1970, during the commemorative session of the General Assembly, he had said that no one who genuinely believed in human equality had the right to demand that the peoples of southern Africa should refrain from making war on racialism. He had added that fighting would be unnecessary if the United Nations, acting in concert, succeeded in exerting sufficient pressure on the States of southern Africa to force change, and that it was simply a question whether the preservation of peace by the removal of injustice was sufficiently important to the United Nations. The Norwegian delegation believed that it was still possible to achieve a peaceful solution which would safeguard the legitimate interests of all concerned and it was prepared to co-operate in the pursuit of such a solution.

49. Her Government had greatly appreciated the opportunity to discuss questions of great importance to Africa afforded by the recent visit to Norway of a high-level delegation from the Organization of African Unity. The delegation had been informed that the Norwegian Government was ready to provide humanitarian and economic assistance for the peoples of southern Africa who were struggling for national liberation, and that the Norwegian Government intended to increase its efforts in that respect both through the United Nations and through direct contact with national liberation movements in southern Africa. Practical guidelines for increased humanitarian and economic assistance in that area would shortly be submitted to the Norwegian Parliament. A world conference in support of victims of racialism and colonialism would be convened in Oslo in May 1972 under the auspices of OAU. Her delegation hoped that the conference would reach constructive and practical conclusions.

50. Although the major concern of the United Nations must continue to be to provide assistance to the dependent peoples of southern Africa, the economic difficulties experienced by some of the independent countries in that region should not be overlooked. In particular, it was essential to solve the problem of compensation to the countries in southern Africa which were suffering economically as a result of the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia and the racial and colonial situation in southern Africa. Her Government was actively considering practical steps in that direction which would be announced later in the session.

51. The Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice had brought a new element into the question of Namibia and marked a new point of departure for common efforts to secure for the Namibian people the right to decide their own future. The refusal of the South African Government to recognize the validity of the Court's Opinion was another reflection of its persistent opposition to any change which would imply an alternative to Namibia's present subservient status or give the Namibian people the option of freedom and independence. The South African definition of self-determination for the Namibian people was completely unacceptable and was a camouflage for the enforcement of *apartheid* in Namibia. Only within a national framework could the Namibian people's right of self-determination be exercised. South Africa's "homelands" policy represented the system of *apartheid* pushed to its ultimate extreme.

52. Her delegation had noted with satisfaction that the Security Council was giving active consideration to the question of Namibia. It hoped that it would prove possible, through concerted efforts, to establish the necessary conditions to enable the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

53. Despite the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, Ian Smith still maintained complete political and military control over the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Without the support given by South Africa and Portugal, the present régime in Salisbury would not be in a position to defy United Nations and world public opinion. Nevertheless, the lack of any real breakthrough in the situation in Southern Rhodesia must not lead to a gradual erosion of the sanctions imposed by the Security Council. No Member State should take any step which would represent a violation of its obligations under the Charter to implement the mandatory decisions of the Security Council.

54. Her delegation's views on Portuguese colonialism in Africa were well known. In April 1971 the Norwegian Parliament had unanimously adopted a resolution requesting the Government to raise the question of Portugal's colonial policies in Africa in suitable international bodies. A particular effort should be made to dissuade Western Powers from giving Portugal military and economic assistance. Norwegian Members of Parliament had repeatedly rejected the short-sighted and dangerous policy pursued by Portugal and had appealed to the Portuguese Government to allow the people of its colonies to exercise their right of self-determination. Norway had actively participated in the formulation of a Security Council resolution calling on Member States not to supply Portugal with weapons which could be used to promote its colonial policies. Norway gave no form of military or financial support to Portugal.

55. At the meeting of NATO Powers, held at Lisbon in June 1971, the Norwegian Foreign Minister had stated that the policies pursued by Portugal with regard to the Territories under its administration were not in conformity with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. He had added that the Norwegian Government was aware of the Portuguese Government's view that that matter fell within Portuguese domestic jurisdiction, but that neither Norway nor the great majority of Members of the United Nations could accept that view. Guinea (Bissau),

Angola and Mozambique were dependent Territories within the meaning of the United Nations Charter; that view had been supported by numerous United Nations resolutions adopted by great majorities. Against that background and in the light of the basic principles underlying the North Atlantic Treaty, the Norwegian Foreign Minister had appealed once more to the Portuguese Government to reconsider its present policies in Africa.

56. Mr. LONCAR (Yugoslavia) said that there was no reason to be satisfied with the process of decolonization during the preceding year. Not only had there been a total slow-down in the liberation of the peoples of southern Africa but wider reprisals had been taken and systematic pressure was being applied against the newly liberated countries in the area. The attacks against the sovereignty of Guinea and Senegal by Portugal and aggressive acts against Zambia and other neighbouring countries by South Africa constituted a violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter and were a component part of the attempts of the racist and colonialist régimes to extend their domination.

57. By their violations of the fundamental principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as also of the numerous resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, Portugal, South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia were creating widespread instability on the African continent and thereby threatening world peace. The Western circles, which for the sake of their narrow and selfish interests were extending various forms of support to South Africa, Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, were also contributing to the situation. Their actions conflicted with the interests of the international community and the contemporary world. The situation in southern Africa, where the right to self-determination was denied, constituted a violation of basic human rights and dignity and could not be considered simply in terms of conventional colonial relations.

58. The United Nations had a special responsibility with regard to the unique problem of Namibia. The highest legal organ of the international community had confirmed that the question was that of the illegal occupation of a Territory which had for years been under the direct jurisdiction of the United Nations. Recent discussions in the Security Council had clearly shown that the policy of South Africa continued to threaten international peace and security in the southern part of Africa and compromised the very authority and prestige of the United Nations. By carrying out the Odendaal plan and setting up Bantustans, South Africa was revealing its real intention of violating the territorial integrity of Namibia and annexing the Territory.

59. It was the obligation of members of the Security Council to adopt specific measures designed to secure the immediate and complete implementation of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 301 (1971), especially those relating to the establishment of direct United Nations control over the Territory and the withdrawal of the administration and military forces of South Africa. Only then would the people of Namibia achieve self-determination and exercise their inalienable right to freedom and independence. In spite of its limited competence,

the Council for Namibia had proved, through the results it had achieved, that it could assume the role of the United Nations organ responsible for the Territory. The General Assembly should extend and define more clearly the competence of the Council and the role it would be expected to play in its new capacity. The General Assembly and the Security Council should consider enlarging the United Nations Council for Namibia, to include the permanent members of the Security Council. It was also necessary to appoint a permanent United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and to adopt specific measures for the establishment of the special United Nations Fund for Namibia.

60. In Southern Rhodesia there had been no positive change in the attitude of the illegal minority régime of Ian Smith towards the African majority. Certain developments had in fact given cause for concern. If the decision of the United States Senate to permit the import of chrome from Southern Rhodesia was applied, it would constitute an open violation of the sanctions and a direct blow to the efforts of the United Nations. It would represent, fresh support for Portugal and South Africa, which had refused to comply with the decisions of the Security Council. His delegation failed to understand the efforts being made to permit the so-called Southern Rhodesian olympic team to participate in the forthcoming Olympic Games at Munich, despite the protests of world public opinion. The decision of the United Kingdom Government officially to renew substantive negotiations with Ian Smith without his being ready to accept the "five principles" was equally incomprehensible. Such steps would only encourage the Salisbury régime to continue to defy the entire international community.

61. With even greater stubbornness Portugal was waging its colonial wars against the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau). The liberation movements of those Territories were, under extremely difficult conditions, striking back at the technically superior enemy. The Portuguese colonialists were seeking a way out by intensifying the war and were openly violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African countries. The United Nations should act more resolutely by extending greater assistance and protection to the peoples of the Territories, by demanding the cessation of all oppressive and military operations and by forcing Portugal to abide by the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

62. The complexity of the problems of southern Africa, the increasingly visible community of interests among the colonial régimes and their growing partnership and co-operation made it imperative to strengthen the association of all anti-colonial forces. The co-ordination of the work and actions of individual United Nations organs concerned with the problem was also becoming more urgent. The first Joint Meeting 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, the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the United Nations Council for Namibia had marked the initial step towards creating a homogeneous and coherent unit within the United Nations and adapting United Nations organs to the current exigencies. The consensus reached

(see A/8388) indicated the course to be followed in order to obtain those objectives. The non-aligned countries attending the consultative meetings held in New York in September 1971 had stated in their communiqué that the participants renewed their pledge to continue to render material and moral support to the liberation movements and once again called upon the international community to do likewise. They equally emphasized the urgent need for implementing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, and other relevant United Nations resolutions.

63. There was evidence of a relaxation of tension in major areas where only recently there had been confrontation. Peaceful coexistence and the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence were becoming the cornerstone of peace and the generally accepted goals of the international community. With the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, the United Nations was experiencing a renaissance and its decisive step towards total universality was revitalizing it as the irreplaceable instrument for international co-operation, emancipation, equality and peace. At such a time, the situation in southern Africa represented an untenable absurdity. The international community's actions should be firmly based on the requirements and realities of the age, whose objective was freedom and peace for all.

64. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, recalled that when the Committee had heard the petitioner from the Seychelles (1927th meeting), the representative of the United Kingdom had stated that his delegation would make its statement during the substantive debate on the item. While he did not wish to question the credibility of the United Kingdom delegation, he was somewhat surprised that it had not yet seen fit to inform the Committee of developments in Southern Rhodesia, a Territory under its administration, during the substantive debate on the item. The United Kingdom delegation should give the reason for its silence or inform the Committee when it intended to make its long overdue statement.

65. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) recalled that the United Kingdom representative had already spoken in reply to a question put on a point of order earlier in the general debate (1923rd meeting). It had nothing further to add at that stage.

66. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) said that ever since the United Kingdom had withdrawn from the Special Committee (A/8276) it had not taken part in the work of that Committee or expressed its opinion on the continued existence of the illegal régime. The Fourth Committee should be informed how, in the light of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and General Assembly, the United Kingdom Government intended to handle the

situation in Southern Rhodesia and what its intentions were with respect to the Smith régime.

67. Mr. GODWYLL (Ghana) said that the Fourth Committee had for a long time followed the useful practice of hearing the views and policies of the administering Power during the substantive debate relating to a given Territory, in order to help the Committee to formulate constructive conclusions. It was unfortunate that the United Kingdom delegation had no statement to offer. He appealed to it to inform the Committee of the developments which had occurred since the Conservative Government had taken office.

68. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that members had no intention of trying to force the United Kingdom delegation to make a statement, but merely wished to request it to provide any information which might be of use to the Fourth Committee. He therefore suggested that the Chairman should exert his influence in an appropriate manner and request the United Kingdom to accede to the wishes of the Committee.

69. Mr. HINCHCLIFFE (United Kingdom) noted the Committee's interest in the question of Southern Rhodesia. While he could not state categorically that his delegation would not speak later in the debate, it had nothing to add at that stage.

70. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) pointed out that the list of speakers for the general debate had already been closed. Under the rules of procedure, members not already inscribed on the list could no longer request permission to speak in the general debate. It would therefore appear that the representative of the United Kingdom had no intention of addressing the Committee on the substance of the item under consideration. His delegation could not be satisfied with the possibility of the United Kingdom's speaking in connexion with consideration of draft resolutions. It had expected the United Kingdom to show the Committee the courtesy of intervening on the question of Southern Rhodesia, a Territory for which it was still responsible. It deplored the attitude of the United Kingdom and the lack of co-operation which it had shown.

71. Mr. AHMAD (India) endorsed the views of the representative of Iraq, but hoped that, in a spirit of co-operation, the United Kingdom would assist the Committee in the drafting of resolutions.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with the suggestion made by the representative of Guinea, he would use his good offices with the delegation of the United Kingdom and suggest, for its consideration, that it might wish to speak. He hoped that the necessary co-operation would be forthcoming.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.