

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1923rd
MEETING**

Monday, 11 October 1971,
at 10.50 a.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 (part I))

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

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

GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), Rapporteur, speaking as Rapporteur 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, and opening the general debate on agenda items 66, 67 and 68, introduced the chapters of the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1971 on the questions of Namibia, Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia (A/8423/Add.1, Add.2 (parts I and II), Add.3 (part I) and Add.4), which had been prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2708 (XXV) of 14 December 1970.

2. In considering those questions, the Special Committee had taken into account the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. In particular, pursuant to paragraph 3 (9) (c) of General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, the Special Committee had dispatched a small group of representatives to countries in Africa in order to establish contact with the representatives of national liberation movements of the colonial Territories on that continent and with officials of the Organization of African Unity and to obtain direct and up-to-date information on the conditions prevailing in those Territories. As would be seen in chapter V of the report (A/8423/Add.1), the results of those contacts were reflected in a number of concrete and important resolutions and decisions which the Special Committee had adopted during the year. He drew particular attention to the observations of the *Ad Hoc* Group, subsequently endorsed *in toto* by the Special Committee, which were set out in paragraph 18 of chapter V. In those observations, the Committee proposed specific measures designed to ensure the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Special Committee had adopted a further resolution dealing with those aspects of the problems which were common to the three items before

the Fourth Committee. That resolution appeared in paragraph 19 of chapter V.

3. In chapter VII of its report (A/8423/Add.3 (part I)), the Special Committee reported on its consideration of the question of Namibia in 1971. He drew special attention to the consensus adopted by the Committee, which appeared in paragraph 19 of that chapter.

4. As could be seen from chapter VIII of the report (A/8423/Add.4), the situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration had also received the full consideration of the Special Committee during 1971. Paragraphs 30, 31 and 32 of that chapter set forth the text of the resolutions adopted, referring respectively, to the use by Portugal of chemical substances against the liberation movements in the Territories, the decision of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to hold a meeting at Lisbon, and a number of other questions concerning Portugal and the Territories under its domination.

5. The consideration given by the Special Committee in 1971 to the question of Southern Rhodesia was described in chapter VI of the report (A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II)). In addition to adopting a general resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, the Special Committee had adopted three consensus and two resolutions on specific aspects of the question. The consensus set out in paragraph 31 of chapter VI referred to the decision of the United Kingdom Government to proceed with the sale of helicopters and spare parts for military equipment to the Government of South Africa; in the resolution appearing in paragraph 32 the Special Committee urged the International Olympic Committee to suspend the so-called National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia from its membership. Following the rejection of that recommendation, the Special Committee had adopted the consensus appearing in paragraph 41 (a). He gave a brief summary of the resolution appearing in paragraph 33, concerning the consultations of the United Kingdom Government with the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia, the consensus in paragraph 41 (b) concerning the recent decision of the United States Senate which, if confirmed, would permit the importation of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, and the general resolution on the item set out in paragraph 34.

6. In conclusion, he announced that the Special Committee expected to take decisions during the current week on the two other items that were closely related to those before the Fourth Committee: namely, the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the international organizations concerned, and the foreign economic and other interests in colonial Territories which were impeding the

implementation of the Declaration. The relevant chapters of the report would be made available to the Fourth Committee as soon as those decisions had been taken. He commended all the chapters of the report to the attention of the Committee and expressed the hope that its members would give their full support to the various decisions and recommendations of the Special Committee.

7. Following a brief procedural discussion, in which Mr. ABDILLEH (Somalia), Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) and Mr. TURKSON (Ghana) took part, the CHAIRMAN recalled the Committee's decision, taken at the 1921st meeting, to consider the three items concerning southern Africa together.

8. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) pointed out that pages 20 and 21 of the French version of document A/8423/Add.4 were in English and that part of General Assembly resolution 2707 (XXV) of 14 December 1970 was missing. He asked the Secretariat to correct the error. He further pointed out that the phrase "should be given the highest priority", which appeared at the end of his statement in the provisional summary record of the 1919th meeting (A/C.4/SR.1919), should read "should receive the closest attention", for otherwise he would be contradicting what he had stated previously.

9. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta), speaking on a point of order, requested that, before continuing the general debate, the United Kingdom delegation should inform the Committee of the negotiations its Government was conducting with Southern Rhodesia. He did not think it could be claimed that the matter was secret, since an article had appeared in *Time* magazine of 4 October 1971 stating that the United Kingdom seemed to be making progress in the conversations towards a compromise that would restore Southern Rhodesia to colonial status. Although it stated that the details were still secret, the article gave the new formula for reaching an understanding which, it stated, would be based on five points: (1) the Africans of Southern Rhodesia would be permitted to make unimpeded progress towards majority rule over a period of at least 30 years; (2) the Southern Rhodesian legislature would pass no new laws of segregation or suppression; (3) the political status of Africans would be raised, with the help of British grants of \$12 million a year for African education and economic development; (4) the Southern Rhodesians would work towards eliminating racial discrimination; (5) the United Kingdom Government must be satisfied that the formula for eventual independence was acceptable to Southern Rhodesia's African population.

10. Mr. TEMPLE (United Kingdom), replying to the representative of the Upper Volta, said that it was extremely unwise to place too much credence on press reports. No formal negotiations had taken place with the Smith régime. What was currently taking place was a series of talks about talks and no decision had been taken as to whether negotiations would take place.

11. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) pointed out to the representative of the United Kingdom that his comment that it was "extremely unwise" to believe what the press said was irrelevant, since the representative of the Upper Volta had merely asked for some enlightenment on the information in his possession.

12. Mr. SOEGAMA (Indonesia) said that the Indonesian delegation was completely in accord with the Chairman's suggestion that the question of southern Africa deserved urgent attention at the current session. The United Nations could not but concern itself with the situation in southern Africa, where colonialism had entrenched itself in its last enclave on the African continent. The plight of the African people of Zimbabwe had first come before the Committee in 1965, on the occasion of the illegal rebellion of the white minority. Portugal's obsession with the supposed glories of its imperial past had become all the more shocking now that the greater part of the continent enjoyed freedom. The members of the Committee all recognized that the various aspects of the situation in southern Africa were interrelated and would act diligently to ensure that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was applied to the peoples of Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The situation in Namibia, which had troubled the Organization since 1946, was of even greater urgency in view of the captivity of the Namibian people. The Indonesian delegation fervently hoped to assist in obtaining for the Namibians the freedom promised them so many years earlier by the Mandate of the League of Nations. As the inheritor of the Mandate, the United Nations now had the opportunity to fulfil that promise. The Security Council, the General Assembly and, more recently, the International Court of Justice had affirmed unequivocally the right of the Namibian people to independence and the obligation of the United Nations to help them to achieve that goal. The United Nations, however, had addressed too many words of encouragement to the Namibian people without offering them effective relief. If it continued to do so, the Namibian people would lose faith in the United Nations. If the Committee reopened a debate whose only outcome was inaction, it would have failed in its obligation to the Namibian people. If, however, as was urged in a letter dated 17 September 1971 to the President of the Security Council¹ from 37 African States, the Committee was to discuss ways and means of bringing about the immediate withdrawal of South Africa, the Indonesian delegation would be among the first to support a reopening of the debate.

13. His delegation did not believe that the problem was insoluble and that an impasse had been reached; on the contrary, he considered that the United Nations should concentrate its efforts on effecting a real transfer of power from the illegal representatives of the South African Government to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which had been appropriately recognized as the *de jure* Government of Namibia. In view of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, Security Council resolution 276 (1970) and the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice,² the United Nations should make a firm declaration so that there could be no doubt at all concerning the *de jure* right of the Council for Namibia to exercise executive functions on behalf of the United Nations concerning Namibia.

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.

Furthermore, his delegation proposed that the Council for Namibia should be expanded to include Namibians, since the international community had pledged that control should one day pass into the hands of Namibians themselves. Lastly, all Member States should be encouraged to confer diplomatic recognition on the new Government.

14. Although the United Nations Council for Namibia theoretically enjoyed *de jure* recognition as the only legitimate administrator for Namibia, it had no *de facto* presence in the Territory yet. With all the moral force of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice and the near-unanimous will of United Nations Members behind it, the Council for Namibia could contact the South African authorities to lay down procedures for their handing over of the administration and withdrawal from the Territory, a withdrawal which, as the representative of Guyana had stressed on 27 September 1971 at the 1584th meeting of the Security Council, must be "unconditional". The Council could then at last take up its rightful position as the guardian of the territorial integrity and safety of the Namibian people. The United Nations should seek to make it quite clear to South Africa that it took quite seriously the "sacred trust" which all the Members of the United Nations now exercised jointly on behalf of the people of Namibia. His delegation considered the presence of an interim international body capable of administering the Territory of Namibia to be absolutely essential.

15. Referring to the Territories under Portuguese administration, he said that Indonesia had always rejected Portugal's presence in Africa. It did not accept the claim that Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea (Bissau) were "overseas provinces" of Portugal. Nor did it believe that any country could change the international status of another territory without respect for the will of the people involved and the approval of the international community. No so-called reforms could soften Portugal's policy with regard to those Territories or make it acceptable to the peoples under Portuguese domination or to the international community.

16. Because self-determination and independence were of paramount importance to peoples not yet free, Indonesia would continue to support the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant resolutions. In that connexion, Indonesia fully endorsed the resolution adopted by the Special Committee, contained in chapter VIII of its report (A/8423/Add.4, para. 32) and hoped that, in pursuance of General Assembly resolutions 2707 (XXV) and 2621 (XXV), the General Assembly and the Security Council would redouble their efforts in that area.

17. The United Nations had been giving the problem of Southern Rhodesia serious attention ever since the unilateral declaration of independence by the minority régime of Ian Smith in 1965. Although the Security Council had called upon all States to place an embargo on the supply of arms and trade in petroleum products, which had subsequently been extended to cover all imports and exports from the rebel colony, Portugal and South Africa had

maintained close economic relations with Southern Rhodesia and, if the information at his delegation's disposal was correct, the United States Senate had decided to lift the ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome.

18. Although the United Kingdom, a Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, had the responsibility and the legal authority to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise their right to self-determination, reports had appeared in the press of negotiations between Lord Goodman and the Southern Rhodesian régime. His delegation hoped that those negotiations would guarantee majority rule in Zimbabwe. Indonesia would condemn any settlement which bestowed the mantle of legitimacy on Ian Smith's Government and relieved the United Kingdom of its moral obligation to the African people of Zimbabwe.

19. During the current year the Special Committee had adopted three resolutions pertaining to Southern Rhodesia, which had the support of the Indonesian delegation. Indonesia supported the appeal in the resolution contained in chapter VI of the Special Committee's report (A/8423/Add.2 (part I), para. 32) for the annulment of the invitation to Southern Rhodesia to participate in the twentieth Olympiad. It also suggested that the Committee and the General Assembly should request the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to refuse visas to the team and the officials of the so-called "National Olympic Committee of Rhodesia", in the event of their going to Munich to participate in the 1972 Olympic Games.

20. The second resolution (*ibid.*, para. 33) concerned the secret talks already mentioned. Indonesia held the view that any negotiations between the United Kingdom and the Smith régime on any basis other than General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 tended to legalize the régime and hence should be rejected. The future of Zimbabwe must provide for independence and majority rule. The third resolution was that appearing in chapter VI, paragraph 34 of the report.

21. The reason why representatives of many countries of diverse cultures and political opinions had assembled under the designation of the United Nations was that they all accepted certain universal standards concerning human rights. Decolonization represented just one of the programmes aimed at securing those human rights. In 1971 when "universality" had been much mentioned in connexion with the question of membership, the goal of the United Nations should be to secure universal recognition of the programme of human rights on which it was based. The interrelated problems of southern Africa defied all attempts at solution, because there were still States Members of the United Nations which were not willing to comply fully with the universal standards of human rights, which were the supports of the edifices of world order that the United Nations was toiling to construct.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.