

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1931st
MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 October 1971,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

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 (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. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) said that colonialism and racism were rooted in the same inhuman ideology. Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese domination and Southern Rhodesia daily witnessed the denial of one of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter—the right of every nation to self-determination and independence. The General Assembly had for years been seeking ways and means of bringing about the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It should be acknowledged that, thanks to the efforts of most of the countries of Africa and Asia and the socialist States, much had been done in that direction. The General Assembly and the Security Council had repeatedly condemned the colonial and racist policies of Portugal and South Africa and had approved concrete measures for the elimination of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. At the twenty-fifth session the General Assembly, by its resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, had taken another important step—it had adopted the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration. Thus the crux of the matter lay not in the lack of proper decisions or guidelines, but in the way in which they were being implemented. If the relevant United Nations resolutions had been observed by all Member States, and especially by Portugal's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and South Africa's trading partners, the situation in Africa would not have been so serious as it was today.

2. The colonialist and racist régimes of Lisbon and Pretoria not only persisted in their refusal to grant freedom and independence to the African peoples, but had of late made armed attacks against independent African States in open violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Security Council had received complaints from the

Republic of Guinea and Senegal concerning armed invasions by Portuguese forces, and from Zambia concerning violations of its sovereignty by South Africa. That was clear evidence of the existence of a serious threat to world peace and security. At the same time the manoeuvres of the colonialist forces designed to mislead world opinion should not be overlooked. So-called constitutional changes and liberal reforms announced by Portugal were merely another attempt to perpetuate Portuguese domination in Africa. His delegation could not subscribe to the concept of "dialogue" initiated by South Africa and immediately acclaimed by many Western Powers. In the prevailing situation when the colonialist forces were repressing the indigenous populations and attacking independent African States, the acceptance of the concept of dialogue would be tantamount to capitulation to the reactionary forces. In that context, his delegation welcomed the decision by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Conference of Ministers of Central and East Africa to reject the idea of dialogue.

3. The delegation of Mongolia deplored any attempts to undermine the common efforts and to impede the implementation of the United Nations resolutions. The withdrawal of the United States and the United Kingdom 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 A/8277) must be regarded as an attempt by those Powers to impede the implementation of the Declaration.

4. The recent consideration by the Security Council of the situation in Namibia at the request of 35 African States¹ indicated clearly the gravity of the question. For five years since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, the authorities of Pretoria had been defying the United Nations and world opinion, arguing that the Namibians did not desire independence. Yet the world community was witnessing the heroic struggle of the patriots to secure their freedom. Now that the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice had once again confirmed the illegality of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia,² the South African authorities should be treated as aggressors and the measures laid down in Chapter VII of the Charter should be applied to them. The occupation of Namibia and the existence of military bases in the Territory were a constant

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1971*, document S/10326.

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

source of tension and a threat to the peace and security of the neighbouring regions. The recent violations of the sovereignty of Zambia and participation by South African troops in the atrocities perpetrated by the Portuguese against the patriots of Angola were clear testimony of that. It must be stressed that the main trading partners of South Africa were continuing their collaboration with the authorities in Namibia in spite of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations. Moreover the Government of the United Kingdom has decided to supply South Africa with arms in disregard of the Security Council's arms embargo decision. The time had come to take effective measures to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the racists from Namibia.

5. The colonial war waged by Portugal against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) had entered a new stage of barbarism with the use of herbicides and defoliants by the colonialists. Continued military support by the Western Powers had been clearly demonstrated by the convocation of a NATO Council session at Lisbon during the current year. It was common knowledge that without the help of NATO and other imperialist Powers, Portugal would be unable to wage war against the patriots on three fronts. There must be a broad campaign to deprive the Portuguese régime of the support it was receiving.

6. So far as Southern Rhodesia was concerned, the fate of the people of Zimbabwe still remained uncertain. The United Kingdom, instead of taking effective measures to put an end to the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, had now entered into secret negotiations with Ian Smith. According to reports, the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary was to visit Salisbury in November for talks with Smith, presumably with a view to an agreement that would enable Great Britain to legalize the *de facto* independence of Rhodesia. As a result of the United Kingdom's policy and with the support of other imperialist Powers, the white minority régime in Rhodesia was not only surviving but was becoming stronger. An illustration of that was the decision of the United States Senate aimed at authorizing the importation of Rhodesian chrome. Thus the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations were becoming ineffective.

7. In view of the foregoing, his delegation supported the recommendations made by the Special Committee in chapter VI of its report (A/8423/Add.2).

8. The situation in southern Africa had become a matter of serious concern for the world community. It had been discussed by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, OAU, and many other international governmental and non-governmental organizations. To achieve the ultimate goal it was essential to combine efforts to isolate the colonialist and racist régimes and bring about the speedy implementation of the Declaration. His delegation accorded great significance to the work done by the Special Committee, and especially to its contacts with non-governmental organizations such as the World Peace Council and the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization. It was also encouraging to note that during the current year a joint meeting had been held for the first time by the Special Committee dealing with decolonization, the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, and the United Nations Council for Namibia. His delegation fully endorsed

the consensus achieved at that meeting, particularly the decision concerning the need for the widest dissemination of information concerning the evils and dangers of colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination (see A/8388).

9. Mongolia had always supported the legitimate struggle of the oppressed peoples for their freedom and independence. It did not maintain relations or contacts of any kind with the colonialist and racist régimes, and it stood for the complete liquidation of all forms of colonial enslavement and racial intolerance.

10. Mr. DELGADO (Cuba) said that his delegation was gratified at the decision by the General Assembly to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971).

11. Referring to southern Africa, he said that the great majority of Member States were in favour of the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Territories under Portuguese administration, and demanded an end to the colonial situation; that was evident from a number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session and subsequent decisions by the Security Council, the Special Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

12. The Cuban delegation had supported those resolutions, but would like to make it clear that it had no faith in the likelihood of their being observed by the racist régimes and their allies; thus they were not the most appropriate vehicle for the fulfilment by the peoples in question of their legitimate aspirations to national independence.

13. South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal and their allies continued to violate the Charter and United Nations agreements, ignoring the resolutions and measures adopted and snapping their fingers at international public opinion. Although the United Nations had declared the presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal, the racist régime of Pretoria continued to re-enforce its political, military and economic presence in that Territory, as was confirmed by the information contained in chapter VII of the report of the Special Committee to the General Assembly (A/8423/Add.3 (part I)).

14. The régimes of Southern Rhodesia and Portugal were following the same road, seeking to buttress their political system of domination and intensifying the economic exploitation and military repression of the indigenous people, as could be seen from the information contained in chapters VI and VIII of the Special Committee's report (A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II), A/8423/Add.4). Mineral production in Southern Rhodesia in 1969, for example, had increased by 30 per cent as compared with 1968, while the value of exports had risen from \$R 195.1 million in 1968 to \$R 240 million in 1969. The same trend was observable in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

15. He drew attention to the observations made by the *Ad Hoc* Group of the Special Committee at the time of its meetings in Africa, and contained in chapter V of the report, and especially to those concerning the testimony given by the representatives of the national liberation

movements, and to the *Ad Hoc* Group's findings with regard to the worsening of the situation in southern Africa during the preceding year (A/8423/Add.1, para. 18 (1) and (3)).

16. That would not have been possible had not the racist régimes in southern Africa been able to rely on the active political, economic and military support of the major imperialist Powers, particularly the United States of America and other NATO members. The Security Council's sanctions against the Smith régime and the bans on arms supplies to southern Africa, and the exhortations to those régimes and that of Portugal, served merely as a moral justification for the imperialist Powers, which continued to give their backing to the racist *entente* in southern Africa. Eloquent proof of that support was the NATO ministerial meeting which had been held at Lisbon.

17. The three racist régimes had formed an "unholy alliance" which was reflected in the intensification of repression against the national liberation movements in those Territories and in a process of integration and economic collaboration directed towards perpetuating the presence of their interests and the expansion of their sphere of influence. They had thus extended the colonial war beyond the frontiers of the Territories they occupied, perpetrating countless aggressions against the Republic of Guinea, the People's Republic of the Congo, Zambia and Senegal.

18. The stage of pronouncements, resolutions and recommendations was over and done with. What was necessary was to contribute effectively towards the liberation of those peoples. His delegation would spare no effort to support whatever initiatives were taken in that direction. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba would continue to show solidarity and support for the heroic struggle of the patriots of Namibia, Zimbabwe, Guinea (Bissau), Angola and Mozambique, for it shared their conviction that that was the most effective as well as the only road for achieving their true freedom and independence.

19. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria), after welcoming the four new Member States, Bahrain, Bhutan, Oman and Qatar, pointed out, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria had done in the General Assembly on 13 October (1965th plenary meeting), that his delegation found it painful to revert year after year to the hackneyed themes of colonial problems and racial discrimination. Nevertheless, it would never cease from denouncing those anachronistic situations which existed throughout the world and especially on the African continent, where colonial exploitation and oppression persisted. Since the statements made at the preceding session of the General Assembly no progress whatsoever had been made in the African Territories controlled by the colonialist régimes.

20. In view of Portugal's intransigence, the United Nations should be unsparing in its efforts in support of the demands of the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese domination, waging a bloody struggle whose legitimacy the international community had recognized. Portugal had not only disregarded the right of peoples to self-determination and continued its colonial war without heeding the General Assembly's resolutions on the subject, but had not even hesitated to permit attacks on the territorial integrity of

independent African States, as was evidenced by the complaints by Guinea and Senegal at the Security Council. Portugal was also continuing to strengthen its links with certain States which were doing all they could to support it in its colonialist activities. A further proof of that support was the latest NATO meeting held during the current year at Lisbon.

21. The construction of the Cabora Bassa dam in Mozambique was an example of Portugal's policy of maintaining its domination at all costs by attracting powerful foreign economic interests and encouraging immigration into the Territories by Europeans.

22. As in the case in Palestine, where the actual Palestinians had been deprived of all their rights and converted into stateless persons in their own land, the rights of the indigenous population were being flouted with the establishment of foreign settlers. In order to strengthen the links which bound it to Pretoria and Salisbury, and which enabled it to survive, Portugal had adopted a policy of colonial settlement similar to that of Rhodesia and South Africa. The United Nations had thus far not seen fit to study that method of colonization by immigrants which was replacing that of colonization by the metropolis.

23. In Southern Rhodesia, despite the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, the Smith régime was consolidating itself and resisting the coercive measures with the aid of South Africa and also of certain States, particularly the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America. Since the unilateral declaration of independence by the Smith régime, the United Kingdom had done nothing effective to lead the people of Zimbabwe to independence and freedom, as the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 required. Although the United Kingdom Government had said that the Smith régime was illegal, it had tacitly recognized it in that negotiations with Salisbury had been proceeding for some time.

24. Faced with consolidation of the coalition of colonialist and racist régimes in order to maintain their domination at all costs, the peace-loving and justice-loving countries should combine forces for assisting those oppressed peoples still suffering the sad fate of subjection to colonialism and racial discrimination.

25. Another no less important problem was that of Namibia. The South African Government had deliberately ignored all the United Nations resolutions and showed no intention of withdrawing from Namibia notwithstanding the General Assembly's action in terminating its Mandate and assuming responsibility for administering that Territory.

26. As stated in the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice and in Security Council resolution 301 (1971), the presence of South Africa in Namibia constituted an internationally unlawful act and a breach of the international obligations and of the rights of the people of the Territory of Namibia. The Security Council should use every means at its command to ensure the withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia. Its permanent members, and in particular those

with substantial interests in southern Africa, should give assistance in any effective action to enable the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. All justice-loving countries should assist the Namibian people materially and morally in its liberation struggle until that end was achieved.

27. Mr. NGANDU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that he had felt deep disappointment on examining the various reports on the situation in southern Africa and listening to the petitioners who had described the colonial oppression in the region. Despite the many United Nations resolutions calling upon the colonial Powers to put an end to the present régime and allow the African majority to recover its freedom, those Powers were combining in ever more stubborn opposition, as if they wished to underscore the Organization's impotence.

28. As to the situation in Namibia, his delegation did not expect too much from the recent Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice. It was also sceptical about the possibilities of success of the United Nations Council for Namibia. After 20 years of seeking opinions from the Court, setting up committees and adopting resolutions, the position of the Namibians remained unchanged, whereas South Africa's illegal hold on the Territory had tightened. The economic boycott of South Africa had proved ineffective, thanks to certain Powers which had substantial interests there. Their attitude was a basic factor impeding United Nations action in Namibia and throughout southern Africa. Since South Africa had not discharged its obligations under Articles 73, 74 and 76 of the United Nations Charter, it was incumbent on the United Nations to discharge its own. It was not simply a matter of the Organization's prestige but also of its duties towards the Namibian people.

29. In the Territories under its domination, Portugal continued to violate with impunity the provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter and the numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, on the pretext that the Territories in question were integral parts of the metropolitan country. The people of those Territories had steadily rejected that pretext, and had embarked on a struggle against the colonial yoke and the régime of torture, suffering and exploitation to which they were subjected. The United Nations had been discussing the Territory since 1961, but although various bodies had been set up and many resolutions adopted on the subject, the situation had continued to deteriorate. Currently, the annual expenditure earmarked by Portugal for defence was reaching alarming proportions and the number of its troops in Africa had grown considerably. The Portuguese authorities were refusing any political solution and affirming their determination to overcome the freedom fighters by force of arms. Portugal had gone to the length of attacking the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia, Senegal and Guinea—independent African States which bordered on its colonies. It was obvious that so poor a State as Portugal could maintain such a long drawn-out and extensive colonial war only with the assistance of its allies.

30. One of his country's goals was self-determination and independence for the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Because of its geographical position, it had

committed itself to providing the freedom fighters with all the assistance they needed to achieve their objectives. Everything possible should be done to see that Portugal complied with all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

31. With regard to the situation in Southern Rhodesia, almost six years had passed since the date of the unilateral declaration of independence which had resulted in the establishment of a second *apartheid* régime based on that of South Africa. A long train of events had led up to the declaration. In 1961, the white colonialists, who had suppressed political organizations of African nationalists within the abortive Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, had succeeded in inducing the United Kingdom Parliament to adopt a new constitution for Southern Rhodesia, which abrogated the rights previously reserved to Her Majesty's Government with regard to the adoption of discriminatory measures against Africans. In 1962, the United Nations General Assembly had affirmed, in resolution 1747 (XVI), that Southern Rhodesia was not an autonomous territory, and had invited the United Kingdom Government to draw up a new constitution for Southern Rhodesia guaranteeing the rights of the majority. The United Kingdom had not considered itself bound by that resolution and had always questioned the competence of the United Nations to intervene in the affairs of Southern Rhodesia.

32. Whenever the United Nations attempted to deal with the question of Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom announced the possibility of negotiations with the rebel régime. His delegation considered that the only acceptable negotiations were those aimed at restoring their rights to the African majority and helping the Africans to come to power.

33. Despite its obligations under Security Council resolution 277 (1970), the United Kingdom had accepted the *status quo* in Southern Rhodesia and had failed to act. His Government therefore felt that OAU and the nationalist movements of Zimbabwe should resort to force, and had placed its military bases and airports at the disposal of the African freedom fighters. In that connexion, the unity displayed by the Rhodesian combatants in merging the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) was highly encouraging. The next step was to assist them in launching a guerrilla war by providing them with all the means available for fighting such a war.

34. The problems of southern Africa were not due exclusively to the white minority in power in the region but also to the large monopolies and sources of foreign capital which were exploiting the resources of that part of Africa. His Government condemned the policy of those foreign interests and monopolies and the policy of the Powers and organizations which made it possible for them to invest in southern Africa. Those Powers, especially Portugal's allies in NATO, should be strongly condemned. In that connexion, he referred to a statement made by Mr. Nogueira, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the latest NATO meeting, held at Lisbon in June 1971, to the effect that Portugal was in Africa to protect Western interests—which explained the support given by certain Powers to the oppressive régime in southern Africa.

35. As had been repeatedly stated in the Security Council, the situation in southern Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security. For that reason his Government again urged the United Nations to end the suffering and exploitation of the Africans in that region as soon as possible. It also urged the allies and partners of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia to change their attitude.

36. Mr. AL-JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the liberation movement in southern Africa seemed to have reached a difficult stage owing to the negation by colonialists and racist régimes of the right of Africans to self-determination and independence and the fact that those régimes had resorted to violence to crush the liberation movement.

37. Since 1945, South Africa had refused to accept United Nations decisions with regard to Namibia, and its Government had recently stated that it would not accept the Advisory Opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice either. It was well known that the inability of the United Nations to act in the face of South Africa's flagrant defiance was due not to any lack of sincerity on the part of the majority of its Members but to an inherent weakness in the machinery for enforcing its resolutions and to the persistent refusal of a number of States, great and small, to abide by their obligations under the Charter. The Organization must act decisively to meet that situation. His delegation felt that the national liberation movement in Namibia was entitled to resort to all available means for attaining its independence, that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia depended on the use of force and that, consequently, all States should scrupulously apply Security Council resolution 282 (1970) on the arms embargo. It also felt that South Africa's refusal to withdraw from Namibia constituted an act of aggression and a threat to international peace and security within the context of Chapter VII of the Charter. The Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice made it obvious that the only entity entitled to administer Namibia was the United Nations, which had created its Council for Namibia for that purpose.

38. It was of great significance that the South African Government had the support of the economic, military and political interests of certain Western Powers and their allies. Disregarding their obligations under the Charter, some Member States supported South Africa through investment and arms production in defiance of decisions taken by the international community. Reference might be made to the letter dated 7 May 1971 from the Chairman of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* to the President of the Security Council,³ which stated that the involvement of the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel was becoming more apparent. In a note issued on 21 May 1971 it was reported that the Israeli Uzi sub-machine gun was being manufactured in South Africa under special licence.⁴ Moreover, a

recent document prepared by the Secretariat Unit on *Apartheid* showed that trade between Israel and South Africa had increased significantly between 1968 and 1970. The same document pointed out that Israel, along with Taiwan and Hong Kong, was one of the Asian countries doing most to maintain and increase its trade relations with South Africa.

39. Conditions in the Territories occupied by Portugal were serious. The principal organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council, had dealt with the threat to international peace constituted by the war in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). Since the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, millions of human beings had recovered the right to control their own destinies; however, Portugal was one of the last of the European States that still turned a deaf ear to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It clung to the absurd fiction that the African Territories it administered were in some way linked to the Iberian Peninsula. The Portuguese were waging a criminal war of annihilation against the African freedom fighters, with the support of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. It was clear that the imperialist Powers had established and were supporting a triple alliance of colonialist régimes in southern Africa with a view to crushing the African liberation movement. The whole world knew that the protection, support and assistance given to Portugal by its major allies in NATO were primarily responsible for the intensification of Portugal's colonial wars. His delegation thought the time had come for firm action by the United Nations aimed at independence for the people in the Portuguese Territories.

40. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, on 3 December 1970 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2652 (XXV), which condemned the lack of action on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom and its refusal to take effective measures to depose the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia and transfer the power to the people of Zimbabwe. The resolution also declared illegal all measures taken by the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia. However, Ian Smith's régime continued to consolidate its power and was stepping up its co-operation with the Government of South Africa with a view to obtaining military and economic aid. Since the United Kingdom had failed to assume its responsibilities with regard to Southern Rhodesia and the Western Powers were providing moral, political and military support to the minority régime, and since the economic sanctions had been circumvented with the help of Portugal and South Africa, it was clear that the Security Council should impose additional mandatory measures as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

41. The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirmed its unequivocal support of the African nationalist and liberation movements and was convinced that the struggle going on in Namibia, Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Zimbabwe would be successful.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1971*, document S/10190.

⁴ See A/AC.115/L.285/Add.3.