



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 65: Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: 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 (<i>continued</i>) General debate (<i>concluded</i>)	1
Agenda item 64: Question of Namibia (hearing of petitioners) (<i>continued</i>)	2

Chairman: Mr. P. V. J. SOLOMON
(Trinidad and Tobago).

AGENDA ITEM 65

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*) (A/7200/Rev.1, chap. VIII)

GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

1. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) said that, in its desperate efforts to stem the tide of African nationalism, the Portuguese Government was resorting to the most brutal and barbaric methods. In defiance of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, Portugal still refused to recognize the right of the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence. Both the words and the deeds of the Portuguese Government indicated its firm intention to remain in Africa. The Head of that Government had stated categorically that the civilization which had been adopted in the Territories under Portuguese administration could not be handed over to the anarchy of liberation movements.

2. Various factors had contributed to the deterioration of the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration. Firstly, an increasing amount of investment was pouring into Angola and Mozambique. As was clear from the report of the Special Committee (A/7200/Rev.1, chap. VIII, annex 1, para. 54), the Government of Portugal was using economic development as a means of sustaining the defence effort necessary for the nation's survival. The report (*ibid.*, para. 51) showed that Portugal was encouraging its allies to invest in Portugal and the Territories under its administration with a view to strengthening its military capacity.

3. Secondly, there was increasing co-operation between Portugal and the racist régimes of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. The Government of Portugal openly admitted that South Africa and Portugal had many interests and problems in common, and shared the same system of values, which they were both equally determined to defend. Commenting on relations between Portugal and Southern Rhodesia, the so-called Rhodesian Minister of Education had stated that recent events had brought the two countries even closer together and had expressed the hope that the Portuguese, together with their South African friends, would never leave Africa. A South African Minister had said that South Africa's defence of its frontiers was greatly facilitated by the strength and resolution of its Portuguese neighbours in Angola and Mozambique. It was obvious that the three racist Powers were determined to establish a European empire in the heart of Africa, but that would be resisted by every African, whatever the cost.

4. Thirdly, Portugal was encouraging European immigration into the Territories under its domination. Tens of thousands of Africans had been evicted from their homes in order to make room for the Europeans. The average European *per capita* occupation of land was sixty times that of Africans. Worse still, ex-soldiers were being settled on the borders of the Territories to prevent the return of the Africans to their homes. The Middle East had had bitter experience of such colonialist and racist policy. The racist régime of Tel Aviv had evicted the indigenous population of Palestine from their homes and had established European settlements.

5. Fourthly, Portugal, with the help of its allies, was intensifying its military operations and repressive measures against the African people. The explosive situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration was the result not only of the policy of Portugal but also of the military and economic assistance extended to it by the NATO Powers and Israel. It was not surprising that, with their support and the help of European mercenaries, Portugal was able to survive in Africa and to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States.

6. His delegation had no doubt that the liberation struggle of the African people in the Territories under Portuguese administration would eventually be successful, but for the moment there was no indication that Portugal would abandon its colonial policy. Since it was the responsibility of the United Nations to help the African people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, his delegation would support any measures designed to compel Portugal to change its policy. Meanwhile, he paid a tribute to the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) for their heroic resistance to foreign domination.

Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

7. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that Portugal's denial of the right of the peoples of its Territories to self-determination and independence was a threat not only to the well-being of those peoples but also to international peace. As early as July 1963, by its resolution 180 (1963), the Security Council had denounced Portugal's repeated violation of the principles of the Charter and had stated that the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration was seriously disturbing peace and security in Africa. Indeed, both Senegal and the Democratic Republic of the Congo had had occasion to complain to the Security Council of Portuguese attacks on their territory.

8. The Security Council and the General Assembly had more than once called on Portugal to recognize the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence, to cease all acts of repression, to allow political parties to function freely, to open negotiations with a view to transferring power to freely elected representatives of the people, and to grant independence immediately thereafter to all its Territories. Portugal's reaction had been one of contempt and its Foreign Minister had described the resolutions as revolting and immoral. Portugal persisted in regarding the Territories as overseas provinces and had stated that it would fight to retain them until it achieved final victory. European settlement of its Territories continued to be a corner-stone of Portugal's colonial policy, perhaps in preparation for a unilateral declaration of independence by the settlers, with the complicity and connivance of Portugal.

9. The most serious aspect of Portuguese domination was the build-up of armaments and military personnel, who were engaged in a series of brutal repressive operations. However, it would take more than torture and bombs to break the magnificent spirit of the indigenous peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The freedom fighters were merely the incarnation of the indomitable will of the people to overthrow the oppressor and to satisfy their thirst for knowledge and progress. Despite bombs and napalm, schools and hospitals were still operating in the liberated areas of the African Territories. While Portugal explored new means of terror, the liberation struggle remained free from barbarity.

10. That a small country like Portugal could maintain such a vast colonial empire and wage a relentless war on three fronts was due to the military, political and economic assistance it was receiving from racists in southern Africa and certain other States. Only concerted action directed against Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia as a single entity would determine the final success of the struggle against racism and colonialism, for those countries not only had many interests and problems in common but were equally determined to defend the values they shared. It was disheartening that some members of the NATO alliance were providing Portugal with military assistance. He hoped that those countries did not justify their actions by

claiming that it was the white man's inherent right to rule over Africans. Portugal's allies were to a large extent responsible for the damage to lives and property that Portugal was inflicting; without their collusion, Portuguese colonialism would have succumbed long since. Now that Western firms were investing more and more in Angola and Mozambique, Portugal was committed to providing whatever military protection was necessary.

11. In the introduction to his annual report (A/7201/Add.1, para. 152), the Secretary-General had said that there was a need to increase efforts at withholding assistance to the Portuguese Government and to take further international measures to assist the peoples of the Territories to attain their goal of freedom and independence. His delegation hoped that the Committee would consider the question of the Portuguese Territories with the depth of understanding and vision displayed by the Secretary-General.

Mr. Solomon (Trinidad and Tobago) resumed the Chair.

12. Mr. EILAN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the United Arab Republic had misused the debate to mention the Middle East dispute in the hope that, if a fallacious comparison was repeated often enough, someone might believe it was true. The voting record clearly indicated Israel's attitude towards Portuguese colonialism.

13. With regard to the accusation that Israel was supporting Portugal, it was true that arms from Israel were to be found in Africa, but they had been given to sovereign African States. Israel was not one of the countries which made political capital out of its assistance to African countries.

14. Mr. ABDEL-WAHAB (United Arab Republic) said that, for twenty years, Israel had practised colonialism and racism by evicting the indigenous people of Palestine and neighbouring Arab countries from their homes. Israel's record was one of tyranny and aggression against the Arab people. With regard to the supply of weapons to African territories, he wondered whether the representative of Israel was implying that African States were supplying Portugal with weapons.

AGENDA ITEM 64

Question of Namibia (hearing of petitioners) (continued)* (A/C.4/709)

15. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mr. J. Kozonguizi, who had asked for a hearing on the question of Namibia (A/C.4/709), had withdrawn his request.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

* Resumed from the 1783rd meeting.