

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1932nd  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 27 October 1971,  
at 11 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 (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. DAO (Mali) expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the historic decision taken by the General Assembly to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971). That country, together with the other new Members, would undoubtedly play an important part in the work of the Fourth Committee.

2. The Committee had rightly decided to give priority to consideration of the dependent countries of southern Africa. As the Under-Secretary-General for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories had pointed out in his statement at the 1919th meeting, 18 million of the 28 million people still under foreign domination lived in southern Africa. Those people were being subjected to all manner of atrocities and crimes in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Southern Rhodesia and Namibia.

3. For more than 10 years Portugal, a small, backward country whose people were obliged to emigrate all over Europe as unskilled workers, had been waging a costly colonial war, which was entirely beyond its means, against the peaceful inhabitants of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)—Territories which it illogically termed its "overseas provinces". The Government of Portugal had been the first to realize that its financial, material and human resources were woefully insufficient to enable it to wage such a ruinous war in its overseas Territories. It therefore resorted to economic and military alliances and barbarous practices in order to perpetuate its domination of those Territories. His delegation regarded that strategy as a great illusion, for peoples who were fighting for freedom invariably triumphed in the end. The term "overseas provinces" should be considered in the light of the strategy adopted by the Portuguese Government, whose true pur-

pose was to exterminate the African inhabitants of its Territories and to replace them by white immigrants. The Cabora Bassa and Cunene projects constituted the driving force behind that policy. His Government consequently opposed those projects, whose execution would delay the liberation of the Territories and cause even greater bloodshed.

4. Spurred on by the steady progress achieved by the liberation movements, Portugal was seeking assistance from the odious régimes in Pretoria and Salisbury and the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The support given to Portugal by its allies helped to strengthen the colonialist camp in its desperate efforts to prevent the political emancipation of the Territories still under foreign domination. The purpose of such support was to promote the exploitation by foreign companies of the enormous economic resources of the colonial Territories and countries which had recently attained independence.

5. The substantial military assistance given to Portugal by the NATO Powers undoubtedly constituted one of the chief obstacles to victory of the liberation movements. The illegal régime in Salisbury and the racist régime in Pretoria, too, spared no effort to support Portuguese colonialism. Despite the enormous assistance which it was receiving, however, Portugal could already see the signs of its imminent defeat. The freedom fighters were increasingly well organized, and were steadily expanding and intensifying their activities. The Portuguese forces maintained control of the urban centres and the immediate surroundings, but only by day; the other regions of the Territories under Portuguese domination were under the control and administration of the freedom fighters. The reports and films which had been made available to the Committee provided ample evidence of that fact. His delegation paid a tribute to those who, at the risk of their lives, had undertaken valuable missions in order to present an objective picture before international public opinion. His delegation was referring not only to the information relating to the Territories under Portuguese administration but also to the two films on Papua and New Guinea and on Namibia which had been shown in 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 United Nations might wish to obtain some of those films for distribution among Member States.

6. The days of Portuguese domination in southern Africa were numbered. Consequently, the Portuguese forces were engaging in destructive practices which were unworthy of any civilization. They were using defoliants and other chemical products which destroyed all life—human, animal and vegetable. That practice served in itself to belie the

claim that the Territories constituted overseas provinces, for no Government would order the use of such products against the inhabitants of its own territory. The truth of the matter was that, before leaving Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau), Portugal wanted to turn them into a barren wilderness.

7. The activities of Portugal and its allies went even beyond such barbarous operations; they wished to inflame the whole of southern Africa in order to provide justification for recolonization. That was probably the reason for the barbarous attacks on the independent States of Guinea, Senegal, Zambia and the People's Republic of the Congo. The obvious intention was to start a conflagration in Africa which might be even greater than that which was now devouring Indo-China and the Middle East. Some members of NATO evidently thought that peace and security were a rare gift which should be withheld from other countries.

8. The Government of the United Kingdom was impeding a settlement of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Despite the sanctions which had been imposed at the behest of the United Kingdom Government, the minority régime of Ian Smith had been strengthened as a result of the failure of certain Powers to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions. Secret negotiations were going on between Ian Smith and the United Kingdom Government without the participation of the Africans concerned. Seeing themselves betrayed by the administering Power, the people of Zimbabwe had taken up arms to attain their inalienable right to freedom. Such struggles, which should be endorsed by the international community, were the only means of liberating Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Southern Rhodesia.

9. The important information Namibia provided in the statements by the Reverend Michael Scott (1921st meeting) and Miss Barbara J. Rogers (1922nd meeting) should be taken into account by the Committee and disseminated as widely as possible. The Government of Mali regarded the presence of South Africa in Namibia as illegal and considered that the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 handed down by the International Court of Justice<sup>1</sup> was binding on Member States. It recognized the responsibility of the United Nations for the implementation of the relevant resolutions, and the legitimacy of the liberation struggle being waged by the Namibian people.

10. African Governments had repeatedly expressed concern about arms sales to South Africa. Those arms, which were termed "defensive", might be used as "offensive" arms against neighbouring independent States, as had indeed occurred in Zambia. The countries which sold arms to South Africa had always maintained that they would supervise the use of such arms. Not surprisingly, however, they had remained silent after South Africa's recent attack on Zambia. The following practical measures should therefore be adopted immediately: sales of arms, missiles and licences to South Africa and Portugal should cease forthwith; all Member States should comply scrupulously with

the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions; the United Nations should exercise all its rights with regard to Namibia, in accordance with the Opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice; and the United Kingdom should shoulder its responsibilities vis-à-vis the people of Zimbabwe. Only if such measures were adopted could Africa live in peace and freedom. His delegation hoped that the recommendations formulated by the Special Committee in 1971 in connexion with all the items under consideration would receive widespread support in the Fourth Committee.

11. Mr. MWASAKAFYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that in 1968 Vice-Admiral L. C. Heinz, the United States Director of Military Assistance, had stated before a Sub-Committee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives that the modest military assistance provided by the United States had helped to foster close working relationships with the Portuguese military. On 26 July 1971, Mr. Spiro Agnew, Vice-President of the United States, had said in Lisbon that Portugal was dedicated to the defence of traditional Western values. Sir Alec Douglas-Home, who had visited Portugal in June 1971, was reported to have said that the Portuguese could not be accused of racialism and that they had set an example to black and white.

12. The Tanzanian delegation had recently spoken of the need for a new united front. It now proposed to specify the attitudes and actions which would be incompatible with the spirit of a new united front, particularly in relation to the Territories under Portuguese domination. His delegation opposed the policies of Portugal, not because Portugal was a poor European country, or because it was governed by a dictatorial régime, or because it had such friends as Mr. Agnew and Sir Alec Douglas-Home. It opposed Portugal because Portugal practised and defended inhuman policies and because it was a colonialist, Fascist and racist country. No one who cared for the principles of racial equality and elementary justice could speak of Portugal as a country that could not be accused of racialism. Colonialism was nothing but a hideous form of racialism.

13. The policies pursued by the Fascist Portuguese régime in its African colonies differed little from the policy of *apartheid* practised by South Africa within its territory and in Namibia. The common feature was government by a white minority whose prosperity and power were based on control of the resources of the country or Territory under its domination and on the subordination of a black majority. Furthermore, both Portugal and South Africa recognized that the application of the concept of political and racial equality would be ruinous to the existing way of life of the white minority and was therefore to be resisted at all costs and at all times. In short, Portugal and South Africa sought by force to maintain white supremacy over Africans. Those who spoke of Portugal as a country which did not practise racialism should explain why Portugal had always voted against resolutions condemning *apartheid* in South Africa and why Portugal supported the racist minority régime in Salisbury. No honest man could refute the fact that by 1964 there had not been a single African doctor in Mozambique and that the Territory still had one of the highest mortality rates in Africa.

<sup>1</sup> 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.*

14. Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, had apparently been deluded by Portuguese claims about the policy of assimilation. A close look at that policy revealed that it represented absolute fascism. An *assimilado* was a black African who had been forced to reject everything that was African and had accepted everything that was Portuguese. Anyone who knew what Portugal stood for and what it had to offer would understand why Africans had chosen to fight rather than to be “assimilated”. It was ridiculous to state that Portugal believed in racial harmony or to praise Portugal for its racial policies in its African colonies.

15. It was not clear what Mr. Agnew had meant by “traditional Western values”, but it was clear that his attitude and that of Sir Alec Douglas-Home were incompatible with the spirit of the new united front, which recognized that certain policies, such as those pursued by Portugal in its African colonies, were incompatible with human equality and dignity.

16. Portugal was fighting wars that it could never win, and those countries which entertained any illusions on that matter would do well to think again. The war in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) was no longer the forgotten war of Africa; it was now the war of a minority of madmen against the majority. Not only had the number of countries supporting the liberation movements increased steadily, but the number of private individuals and organizations providing such support had been increasing. It was encouraging to note that there were such individuals and organizations in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and even in Portugal itself. As the representative of a country which had been, and still was, the victim of Portuguese criminal aggression and which provided host facilities for a number of liberation movements and for the Liberation Committee of the Organization of African Unity, he expressed his Government's appreciation to all the countries and peoples which had joined the fight against Portuguese fascism in Africa.

17. There was no doubt that the war against Portuguese fascism and colonialism would be won; how and when it was won would depend on what the United Nations decided to do in the cause of peace. It depended to an even greater extent on whether the more powerful Western nations, led by the United States of America, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, would support those who opposed colonialism, fascism and racism in southern Africa. His delegation appealed to those Governments and others which sympathized with the régimes in southern Africa to join the new united front. In establishing that front, his delegation was not abandoning its objective of uprooting Portuguese colonialism and fascism from Africa. Africa was committed to that objective, as were all progressive and sane forces in the world. The united front favoured action against the forces of evil in southern Africa; it was not seeking new objectives. His delegation addressed those remarks, in particular, to those Governments which for years had claimed that Portugal meant well to Africans. Portuguese administration meant nothing but Fascist domination of a majority of Africans.

18. The United Nations, as also individual Member States, had ample opportunity to help the people suffering under

Portuguese domination. It was disheartening to note that newspapers in the United States expressed horror and disgust at the mass killing of seals in northern Canada but never said a word about the murder of Africans by Portuguese forces in the Territories under Portuguese domination.

19. His delegation had faith in the United Nations. Barely 10 years earlier, the Tanzanian people had themselves been subjected to colonialism. The United Nations had taken action to enable them to attain independence and freedom. His delegation believed that the United Nations could take similar action on behalf of the people of the Territories under Portuguese domination.

20. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the problems of southern Africa were interrelated. As the Secretary-General had stated in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization, finding peaceful solutions for the colonial problems in that part of the world had proved especially difficult, not only because of the adamant refusal of the authorities in power to heed world opinion, but because the contiguity of the Territories concerned had enabled those authorities to succour and support each other in their resistance to the pressures brought upon them by the international community (A/8401/Add.1, para. 297).

21. The concept of a strong white-dominated economic and defensive bloc straddling the southern part of Africa had long been uppermost in the minds of the rulers of Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon. Plans for the creation of that bloc were now being laid with increasing confidence.

22. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had stated in 1970 that in the 10 years since the Sharpeville incident the international climate had taken a favourable turn for South Africa, largely attributable to its remarkable economic growth and that, in the long run, the international power and influence of any State was largely determined by its economic strength and countries were bound together by economic ties. It was in the light of those words that the Cabora Bassa dam project must be viewed. The intention behind the project was to integrate the countries of southern Africa into a giant power-using area so as to facilitate the economic unification and centralization of a vast region stretching across the boundaries of a dozen different States. The real purpose of the project, devised by South Africa and financed by a giant international consortium, was to create a centre not only of hydroelectric power but also of white power in southern Africa. The needs of the smaller African States which might benefit from such a project would always be subordinated to the economic needs of the white minority régimes. It was significant that Portugal had announced a scheme to settle a million white immigrants along the Zambezi in what was obviously an attempt to create fresh reserves of white opposition to African freedom and thus to hold the line against the African freedom movements.

23. The Cunene project in Angola, another joint South African-Portuguese venture, would be used not for the economic advancement of all the people of the region but for the expansion and entrenchment of *apartheid* power northwards into Africa while Portugal fought a desperate

rearguard action to preserve the colonies it no longer had a right to govern.

24. South Africa and Portugal had openly flouted Security Council resolutions 277 (1970) and 253 (1968) by maintaining normal trade relations with Southern Rhodesia. They had made it possible for the illegal régime to continue to export asbestos, copper, chrome, iron ore and tobacco, either by buying the goods themselves and re-exporting them or by providing misleading certificates of origin and hence assisting the illegal authorities in Southern Rhodesia and their agents abroad in their efforts to evade sanctions. In its fourth report, the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968)<sup>2</sup> stated that the relevant cases showed that the purported export of maize from Mozambique greatly exceeded the total exports from that country as published in official statistical yearbooks and that considerations of the same nature applied also to mineral exports, especially chrome, lithium ore and asbestos. Those examples reinforced his delegation's view that a minority white-dominated economic empire was being created behind the racist régime in South Africa, the outdated colonial régime in Lisbon and the illegal white minority régime in Salisbury.

25. The "unholy alliance" was being further consolidated by extensive military and police co-operation among the three régimes. Collaboration was reported between South African police forces and the security forces of Southern Rhodesia against African freedom fighters. The Minister of Police had stated in the South African Parliament on 18 September 1970 that the need to have South African forces on the border and in Southern Rhodesia was still as great as it had been at any time in the past. In denying the existence of a military pact, Mr. Vorster had stated that no treaties were needed between friends. South African helicopters were allegedly being used on reconnaissance and counter-insurgency duty in Angola, and South African troops were being used to guard South African-owned installations there. There was evidence of co-operation in the field and the security chiefs met regularly to discuss the guerrilla situation in southern Africa. It was clear that a military bloc was being established and consolidated to ensure the survival of the unpopular white minority rule in southern Africa.

26. The bloc could not have been created without the active participation and support of certain western business interests and international finance corporations, which unfortunately received tacit encouragement from their Governments. The latter appeared indifferent to the brutalities of forced labour, the indignities suffered by the African people and the ruthless plunder of economic resources for the benefit of a few. Those Governments and business interests which put financial gain before justice and the dignity of man would find, sooner or later, that expediency could not triumph over principle.

27. The Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice confirmed his Government's view that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa was under an obligation to withdraw its

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Special Supplement No. 2.*

administration from the Territory. Mindful of its obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago had agreed to recognize the travel and identity documents issued to Namibians by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Under the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, it had agreed to provide one scholarship per year tenable in Trinidad and Tobago. It was, however, unable to provide travel grants for the holders of such scholarships and therefore noted with interest the suggestion made by the representative of the Philippines that airlines should be persuaded to allocate a few free tickets to United Nations Namibian scholars. His delegation also welcomed the constructive suggestions made by the petitioner, Miss Barbara J. Rogers (1922nd meeting), and would give them careful consideration in an effort to ensure that some new initiatives aimed at securing the compliance of South Africa with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 would be taken.

28. The defiant attitude adopted by Portugal with regard to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, in respect of the Territories under its administration was due to the aid it received through its membership of the NATO alliance. Portugal could not have survived the costly wars in its colonies were it not for sizable loans from its NATO partners, their substantial imports from Portugal and its colonies and, above all, the substantial quantities of war material supplied to Portugal under the pretext of helping it to meet its NATO commitments. So long as it was protected by that NATO shield, Portugal would continue to disregard the unassailable right of the peoples of its Territories to self-government.

29. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, he reaffirmed his delegation's view that Security Council resolutions applying sanctions against that Territory should be scrupulously observed and that all measures adopted by the racist minority régime of Ian Smith were illegal.

30. In the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, his delegation had stated that it would regard the new United Kingdom initiative to arrive at an accommodation with Ian Smith with grave suspicion until it knew on what basis the United Kingdom Government was to negotiate with the illegal régime. Hence it could not but reiterate the terms of General Assembly resolution 2652 (XXV) of 3 December 1970, which condemned the failure and refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority régime. The only possible measures, short of armed force, which could dislodge the Smith régime were comprehensive and sweeping economic sanctions, vigorously enforced and extended to South Africa and the Portuguese Territories.

31. The situation in southern Africa was fraught with danger for all the inhabitants of the area and threatened world peace and security. His delegation hoped that, in line with the mood of change sweeping through the United Nations, more realistic steps would be taken to bring the situation in southern Africa under effective control so that

the black African majority in that part of the world could enjoy peace, freedom and justice.

32. Mr. METAXAS (Greece) said that his delegation welcomed the increase in the number of colonial countries acceding to independence. The increase was due primarily to the colonial peoples' resolve to win the place they deserved among free nations, but also to the development in Europe of the great liberal and peace-minded public opinion that had led to the political changes which had brought the colonial era to an end.

33. Even before the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Greece had always fostered the ideals embodied in the Declaration proclaimed in that resolution. At the fifteenth session the representative of Greece had stated that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples gave the international community a glimpse of one of the finest victories awaiting mankind, a victory which would be all the greater because it would be won under the moral impetus of the idea of freedom. Subsequently, Greece had endorsed the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly by resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970. It had also associated itself closely with the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It continued strongly to support the right of peoples to self-determination and to play a consistent and active role against racial discrimination. It had signed and ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. Greek policy was based on those principles, which reflected deeply rooted convictions of the Greek people.

34. In conformity with those principles, the Greek delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2707 (XXV) of 14 December 1970, concerning Territories under Portuguese administration. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, it had adopted all the necessary administrative and legislative measures to give effect to the relevant Security Council resolutions. As could be seen from its replies to the Secretary-General's questionnaires, Greece had no trade whatsoever with Southern Rhodesia. Such a policy called for considerable sacrifice on the part of a country which relied on its trade to meet the requirements of economic development. It considered, however, that material sacrifice was not only indispensable but was indeed of little importance compared with the promotion of a just and moral cause.

35. Greece did not condone the presence of South Africa in Namibia and complied with the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council in that regard. Neither its citizens nor its firms were engaged in any activities, commercial, industrial or financial, in the Territory of Namibia. It had no regular shipping, aviation or transport services with Namibia, nor did it maintain consular representation in the Territory.

36. Greece contributed to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and partici-

pated in the programme for granting study and training facilities to inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories. In addition, despite increasing requirements in the educational field in his country, Greece had been glad to grant over 300 scholarships to African students in 1971. It hoped that its efforts in that field would contribute to better understanding among peoples.

37. Because of its long-standing relations with all the peoples of Africa, his country was sensitive to all major events in the African continent. It reaffirmed its trust in the principles enunciated in the Lusaka Manifesto<sup>3</sup> and reiterated the hope that the constructive ideas and appeals in the Manifesto would not remain without response.

38. His delegation sincerely hoped that the United Nations would be able to make progress in the search for a solution to the outstanding problems on which depended the well-being and happiness of a broad section of mankind. His delegation would continue to contribute to all reasonable and realistic initiatives aimed at further promoting the principles and ideals of the Organization.

39. Mr. DELETS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the continuing domination of more than 20 million indigenous inhabitants of southern Africa by the South African and Southern Rhodesian racists and the Portuguese colonialists was being used by the imperialist Western Powers as a platform for their struggle against national liberation movements. That was proved by the withdrawal of the United States and the United Kingdom from the Special Committee (see A/8276 and A/8277), the decision of the United Kingdom to resume the supply of arms to South Africa, the relaxation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia by the Western Powers, the United Kingdom's attempts to reach an agreement with that régime, and the measures taken in NATO to arm the Portuguese colonialists. Thus, the statements of those Powers in the United Nations concerning their good intentions in the matter of decolonization could only be regarded as hypocritical.

40. The recent reconsideration of the question of Namibia in the Security Council at the request of 36 African States<sup>4</sup> had shown that the racist "trusteeship" over that Territory had turned it into one of the most oppressed and exploited of African colonies, where the inhuman laws of *apartheid* prevailed as they did in South Africa. Moreover, the Pretoria Government's stubborn refusal to comply with over 80 United Nations resolutions and with the recent Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia constituted an insolent denial of the authority of the United Nations. His delegation therefore endorsed the view that the time had come for decisive and practical action. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to solve the problem so long as the Western Powers continued to support South Africa and in effect to condone its occupation of Namibia.

<sup>3</sup> Manifesto on Southern Africa. For the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1971*, document S/10326.

Those States should therefore be told categorically to desist from their attitude of duplicity, and pressure should be brought to bear on them to cease their support of the South African régime.

41. The attempts of the Portuguese colonialists to suppress national liberation movements in the Territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) represented a serious threat to international peace and security. In addition to following the example of their senior partners in NATO—the United States aggressors in Indo-China—the Portuguese colonialists were not only using brutal methods against the African patriots, but were even infringing the sovereignty of independent African States, as was proved by the recent complaints of Guinea and Senegal to the Security Council. The alliance between Portugal and South Africa and Southern Rhodesia was constantly growing closer and now included military co-operation: South African military “advisers” and helicopters with pilots had been used in Portuguese punitive operations in Angola and Mozambique. Thanks to the support of its NATO partners, Portugal was able to keep 90 per cent of its entire army in the colonies, and that army was armed to the teeth, especially by the United States and the United Kingdom. The strategy behind those actions was to foment the Portuguese colonial war and thus to divert the national liberation forces from intensifying the liberation movement in the southernmost part of Africa. That policy was accompanied by the economic infiltration of the Western Powers into southern Africa as a whole and the Portuguese colonies in particular: two thirds of the capital of companies registered in Portugal was foreign or foreign controlled.

42. Nevertheless, the march of history could not be reversed and the peoples of the Portuguese Territories would prevail in their struggle for freedom and independence. It was the duty of the United Nations to give them all possible support. The key to the whole problem was to put an end to the aid and support that the leading members of NATO were supplying to Portugal.

43. Although the Security Council had adopted several resolutions declaring that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security, and the General Assembly had rightly qualified the racism practised in that country as a crime against humanity, the situation continued to deteriorate, mainly because the sanctions prescribed by the Security Council were being ignored, not only by South Africa but also by some Western Powers. Since South Africa and Portugal had openly refused to apply those sanctions, such States as the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, while paying lip service to the Security Council decisions, were in fact carrying on trade with Southern Rhodesia through South Africa and Portugal. The fourth report of the Committee set up to implement Security Council resolution 253 (1968) showed that the volume of Southern Rhodesia’s exports had risen by \$52 million in 1970; that Committee had also noted three cases of flagrant violation or evasion of the sanctions through trade transactions with Southern Rhodesia by firms in Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland; those transactions were known to the Governments concerned, which had declared their intention to continue to trade with Southern Rhodesia.

44. In the political sphere, the Smith régime was pursuing a policy of oppression and terrorism of the African population, and the Salisbury dictator had stated to the press that Southern Rhodesia would remain under white rule and would not have an African Prime Minister during his lifetime. The white minority also enjoyed the economic, political and military support of its partners in the “unholy alliance”: thus, in defiance of Security Council decisions, South African troops were still illegally stationed in the territory of Southern Rhodesia and were taking part in punitive expeditions against the African patriots.

45. The responsibility of the United Kingdom, the United States and other Western Powers for the failure of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia was proved by figures showing a great increase in the volume of trade between those countries and South Africa in 1970 and by the fact that over one third of Southern Rhodesian exports went to countries outside southern Africa and mainly to the Western countries which ostensibly applied the sanctions. He cited several examples of Southern Rhodesian and South African companies which were controlled by British and Anglo-American corporations to demonstrate the special role of the United Kingdom in the whole system of aid and support to the Southern Rhodesian racists.

46. Since the declaration of independence in 1965, the United Kingdom had made many attempts to reach a friendly agreement with the Smith régime and, although it had been compelled by world public opinion to withhold its recognition of Southern Rhodesia and to accept the economic boycott, it clearly did not wish to take any resolute action. Moreover, the United Kingdom Government was not at all concerned with the vital interests of the African population, as could be seen from the notorious “five principles” for the settlement of the Southern Rhodesian question, which evaded such primordial issues as the immediate transfer of power to the African population and which were in effect racist. The United Kingdom had recently made further intensive efforts to reach agreement with the Salisbury régime, and that behind the backs of the African population and its recognized leaders; according to the press, those negotiations related to a “reconciliation” between the United Kingdom and the Smith régime, a transaction contrary to the interests of the African population, whereby the “majority” in Southern Rhodesia would be based not on the principle of “one man, one vote”, but on property and educational qualifications, thus delaying the prospects of African rule for many years. That arrangement had of course delighted Ian Smith, who was singing the praises of the United Kingdom Government. The African countries and all the peace-loving States of the world had expressed indignation at such shameful juggling with the destiny of millions of Africans, and the United Kingdom’s policy had been decisively condemned at the Eighth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in June 1971. The support given by the United Kingdom, the United States and other Western Powers to the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia could be explained by their economic and strategic interests in southern Africa, which they regarded as a valuable source of raw materials and markets and as an interesting investment area, and from which the Western monopolies derived greater profits than from most other parts of the world. The imperialists also regarded Southern

Rhodesia as an important stronghold for retaining their political and economic domination of the region, where they were mounting a counter-attack against the independent African States. They were therefore trying to bolster up the colonial and racist régimes, which were their best guarantees for protecting the capital they had invested in southern Africa.

47. The United Nations should renew its efforts to free the people of Zimbabwe from the tyranny of the racist régime by concentrating on the implementation of existing Security Council and General Assembly decisions, and particularly on the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted in General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, which drew attention to the need to widen the scope of the sanctions against the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia. Those sanctions should be extended to South Africa and Portugal, in view of their refusal to carry out the

relevant decisions of the Security Council. The United Kingdom's attempts to reach agreement with the racist régime, against the interests of the people of Zimbabwe and in contravention of United Nations decisions, should be severely censured.

48. The alliance between South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal was known to Africans as the "unholy alliance"; but the unholy flourished where conditions were favourable, and those conditions were being created by the imperialist States which for centuries had battered on the blood and sweat of colonial peoples and were now fostering Fascist and racist régimes and arming them against the national liberation movements. Like all other progressive nations, the Byelorussian SSR had always resolutely supported those movements and was firmly convinced that their struggle would be crowned with success.

*The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.*