

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1848th  
MEETING**

Friday, 14 November 1969,  
at 3.30 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 65:	
Question of Territories under Portuguese administration ( <i>continued</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.4/L.938 and Add.1 and 2 ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	189
Organization of work . . . . .	192

**Chairman: Mr. Théodore IDZUMBUIR**  
**(Democratic Republic of the Congo).**

**AGENDA ITEM 65**

**Question of Territories under Portuguese administration**  
**(*continued*) (A/7623/Add.3 and Corr.1, A/7694, A/C.4/**  
**L.938 and Add.1 and 2)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.4/L.938 AND ADD.1 AND 2 (*concluded*)

1. Mr. GROBBELAAR (South Africa) said that his delegation found the draft resolution contained in document A/C.4/L.938 unacceptable *inter alia* because of its firm conviction that the United Nations was not competent to involve itself in the matter and also because the resolution once again contained far-ranging allegations and accusations that were devoid of substance and which his delegation rejected. The draft resolution took no cognizance of the situation as it actually existed. His delegation's attitude was on record and did not need to be repeated. The South African delegation was therefore opposed to the resolution and had voted against it.

2. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Argentina) said that his delegation's abstention in the vote naturally did not mean that it questioned the actual principle of decolonization, which Argentina had always upheld.

3. His delegation had appreciated the efforts of those sponsoring the draft resolution to obtain the support of different groups and had had an opportunity to express its reservations concerning certain paragraphs at a meeting of the Latin American group. It had welcomed the changes in the wording of the request to international organizations and the specialized agencies to support the liberation movements. As in the case of the resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, for which his delegation had cast a favourable vote, he felt that the United Nations and the specialized agencies should not become involved, either directly or indirectly, with liberation movements, regardless of their nature or objectives. The United Nations should serve States and peoples and should endeavour to act by appealing to reason and persuasion.

4. In the draft resolution adopted at the previous meeting, indirect and apparently groundless accusations were levelled at countries and multilateral bodies. Far from strengthening the scope of the resolution, that accumulation of charges had the opposite effect. His delegation had already indicated, when voting for the resolution on the question of Southern Rhodesia, that it opposed the adoption of texts which contributed nothing new and offered no prospects for adjudicating and settling the issues under consideration within the framework of the United Nations Charter (1841st meeting, paras. 71 and 72). The Committee was in danger of foundering in a sea of words, and only more realistic and more direct methods would enable it to solve the problems before it.

5. Mr. MORENO PINO (Mexico) said that his delegation had had to abstain from voting even though Mexico wholeheartedly approved of the fundamental principles underlying the draft resolution, as well as its ultimate objectives.

6. Since his delegation had already had many opportunities to define its position—in connexion with the adoption of General Assembly resolutions 2270 (XXII) and 2395 (XXIII), as well as during the general debate in the Committee at the present session—it would confine itself to reiterating the arguments, observations and reservations it had formulated on those occasions.

7. Mr. ASIROGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, if there had been a separate vote on the different paragraphs of the draft, it would have abstained from voting on the seventh preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 4, 6, 9, 11 and 13.

8. Mr. CASTALDO (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained because the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 13 were based on an entirely mistaken view of the situation. Furthermore, Italy was opposed to certain condemnatory formulas which, when based on unsubstantiated allegations, were unlikely to facilitate the political developments desired by all. Nevertheless, Italy supported the spirit and the objectives of the draft resolution appearing in document A/C.4/L.938, and was firmly convinced that the peoples of the Portuguese Territories should be guaranteed the right of self-determination so that those Territories could be decolonized without delay.

9. Miss DUBRA (Uruguay) wished to express the reservations of her delegation, which had nevertheless voted for the draft resolution.

10. First, her delegation felt that it was for the Security Council to pronounce moral condemnations. It also

objected to operative paragraphs 4, 11, and 13, feeling, in particular, that the United Nations should not support the armed struggle of liberation movements. Furthermore, there was no proof that certain States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) were co-operating with Portugal.

11. Mr. HENNINGSEN (Norway) said that, despite certain reservations, his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.4/L.938 and Add.1 and 2 because the Norwegian people were convinced that the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration had an inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. In the inexorable march of history, which during the past twenty years had brought about the liberation of many colonial peoples, it was only just that the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration should also be given an opportunity to exercise that right without delay. His Government therefore noted with regret that the recommendations made by the Security Council and the General Assembly in that regard had gone unheeded by the Government of Portugal. However, his delegation had detected in the Portuguese representative's statement at the previous meeting a note which suggested that certain misunderstandings might be eliminated in the future and that a solution might be found to a tragic situation which all deplored.

12. It must be acknowledged that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.938 and Add. 1 and 2 had attempted to find formulas which would make it possible to obtain the majority which had voted at the twenty-third session in favour of a draft resolution on the Territories under Portuguese administration couched in new and more realistic terms than hitherto. In spite of those efforts, the text just adopted in many respects went beyond the position taken by the General Assembly the year before, to an extent which was not justified by the course of events in Portugal and the Territories under its administration. His delegation's positive vote had been possible only because of its commitment to the ideas expressed in General Assembly resolution 2395 (XXIII), which inspired the draft. But it wished to warn against the tendency to seek to change the position of delegations by gradual escalations in the language of resolutions. It was convinced that the verbal expression of the opinion of the international community remained a serious matter, and would in the future have to judge all texts accordingly.

13. With regard to specific points in the draft resolution, the seventh preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 13 were unacceptable to his delegation, since NATO was a regional organization for collective self-defence within clearly defined geographical limits, outside of which there were no military or political commitments whatsoever.

14. The Norwegian delegation also had certain reservations with regard to the provisions of operative paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7, which were based on assumptions which might not be entirely substantiated. It also maintained its position with regard to the respective powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council and expressed very serious reservations regarding operative paragraph 12, which in its view should be understood to exclude enforcement action under the Charter of the United Nations.

15. His delegation could not accept the theory that there was necessarily a connexion between the activities of certain economic interests and the prospects for independence of the Territories under Portuguese administration; nor could it accept the legal and practical implications of the appeal to the specialized agencies in operative paragraph 11 to increase their moral and material assistance to the peoples of the Territories who were struggling for their freedom, since they would thus risk involvement in political conflict, in contravention of their statutes. That remark in no way affected Norway's support for the humanitarian activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with respect to refugees from Territories under Portuguese administration.

16. Mr. VALENZUELA (Chile) said he was pleased that the sponsors of the draft resolution had held extensive consultations, thus paving the way for a text which a greater number of delegations had been able to support; that spirit of compromise should make it possible to ensure the maximum effectiveness of the resolutions adopted by the Committee.

17. His delegation had some reservations concerning operative paragraph 4, since it believed that there was insufficient evidence for the allegations which it contained. Having voiced those reservations, Chile, in keeping with its traditional international policy, condemned all violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States.

18. Chile also maintained its reservations concerning the legal aspects of operative paragraph 11.

19. On the other hand, his delegation considered operative paragraph 10 particularly relevant, because the only way of settling the matter peacefully was to urge the Portuguese Government to respond to the appeals of the international community concerning the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

20. Mr. MATHIAS (Portugal) said his delegation had the most formal reservations about the text which had been adopted.

21. Mr. MUEMPU-SAMPU (Democratic Republic of the Congo), replying to the Portuguese representative's statement, reminded the Portuguese delegation, first, that Portugal had no right to take the place of the courageous peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola, and to claim to speak on their behalf of their right to freedom and sovereignty; secondly, that the Portuguese representative's statements were nothing more than a reaffirmation of his scorn for the resolution which the Committee had just adopted with a view to putting an end to colonization in Africa; and thirdly, that the peoples subjugated by Portugal had never expressed the desire to form part of the Portuguese "metropolitan" area. The Fourth Committee, which was responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, could not accept Portugal's arguments, which were designed to justify a colonialist enterprise. Portugal should not speak in the Committee and its delegation's statements should not be reflected in the documents relating to the Committee's work.

22. Mr. BGOYA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the explanations of vote given at the preceding meeting by the delegations of Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States. His delegation thanked the Danish delegation for having supported the draft resolution, but did not accept the reservations it had made concerning operative paragraphs 4, 9, 11 and 13. If the Danish representative did not see the connexion between the economic and commercial practices of the NATO countries and the colonial policies of Portugal, it must be by choice. A country which invested in the Portuguese Territories helped Portugal to develop its economy and to gain power, which it used in its colonial wars; such a country deserved no more leniency than Portugal itself. Furthermore, it was known for certain that some Western countries, particularly the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, supplied Portugal with arms which the latter undoubtedly used against the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau).

23. If southern Africa was not to become the scene of the most bloody racial wars, it was absolutely necessary to change the course of events in the Territories administered by Portugal, namely, to prevent the international capitalist monopolies from exploiting the wealth of those Territories through their investments and from strengthening Portugal's power of oppression by supplying it with bombers and even by training the Portuguese army. The abstention of the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and France in the vote on the draft resolution and the negative vote of the delegation representing the *apartheid* régime must be interpreted in the light of the support which the imperialist Powers were giving to Portugal.

24. The collusion of the Western imperialist Powers with Portugal in the latter's colonial wars had too long been treated as an incidental factor. However, it was known that NATO had spent \$2 million in Portugal in the form of grants for military studies which indirectly helped Portugal to make war in her colonies. The Portuguese Air Force was equipped with aircraft manufactured in the Western NATO countries, which had supposedly been supplied in the context of the North Atlantic Treaty, but were in fact used in the war against the African peoples. France had built ships and submarines for the Portuguese Navy under an agreement between Portugal and France signed on 25 September 1964. The loans given to Portugal by France for that order amounted to \$100 million and there was nothing in the agreement to prevent the Portuguese colonialists from using those vessels in their colonial wars. The United States had helped to finance the construction of a number of other ships within the framework of NATO. Portugal maintained in Mozambique about 40,000 men equipped mainly with guns of the G-S type manufactured in the Federal Republic of Germany. The lorries used by the Portuguese in the colonies were mainly Mercedes-Benz and Unimog vehicles, manufactured in the same country, Berliet lorries manufactured in France and Austin Gipsy lorries bought from the United Kingdom. Thus, the war being waged by Portugal in its colonies was not so much that of Portugal itself as that of the Western imperialist Powers, which considered Portugal's continued presence in Africa necessary to maintain their control over the resources of

the African continent. It was obvious that Portugal could not spend 50 per cent of its national income on defence without endangering its economy. It could do so only because of the loans and assistance given it by the imperialist countries.

25. Some delegations, particularly that of the United States, had said that draft resolution A/C.4/L.938 and Add.1 and 2 departed from the spirit of the Manifesto on Southern Africa adopted at Lusaka (see A/7754). The countries of Eastern and Central Africa had seen fit to issue the Manifesto because their position with regard to *apartheid* and colonialism in Africa had been misunderstood and clarification was required. Unfortunately, it seemed that the Manifesto itself had been misinterpreted and that one important point must be made clear: if the fascist régimes in power in Rhodesia and South Africa abandoned their policy, the African countries would then change their attitude towards the various territories.

26. With regard to the wording of the draft resolution, the United States representative had opposed the repeated use of the words "condemns" and "deplores". What position could be adopted with regard to colonialism, other than condemnation? The United States set itself up as a champion of conciliation, but that country's history contained more acts of violence than acts of conciliation, the most immediate example being the war which the United States was currently waging in Viet-Nam. The United States was using napalm in Viet-Nam but preaching conciliation in the case of the Territories administered by Portugal.

27. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolution but expressed great disappointment at the position taken by Spain, which had joined Portugal and South Africa in opposing the liberation of the African peoples. He wondered whether the exchange of official visits between the Spanish Government and the Portuguese Government would henceforth lead Spain to vote in favour of Portugal, in defiance of the principle that the peoples of the African Territories should be free. He hoped that the Spanish delegation understood the full implications of the step it had just taken, which was tantamount to denying the dignity of the human person.

28. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he wished to refute certain allegations made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

29. That representative had said that the United States was investing in the Territories administered by Portugal; that was true, but it should be remembered that virtually every country in the world was seeking to attract United States investments, and that total United States investments in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) were negligible in comparison with total United States investments throughout the world. Any investment which contributed to the economic development of a territory contributed by that very fact to the process which must lead that territory to exercise its right of self-determination. At the same time, the United States considered that if the accession of the Portuguese Territories to independence would be advantageous to those Territories, it would also be advantageous to Portugal: there was no doubt that the former colonial

Powers were much more prosperous now than when they had still had their colonies.

30. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had said that some countries, particularly the United States, supplied arms to Portugal, which used them in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). On behalf of the Government of the United States, he categorically denied that allegation, which had not been substantiated by any valid evidence.

31. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had gone on to say that the United Kingdom, the United States and others wanted Portugal to remain in Africa. On the contrary, as he himself had stated at the morning meeting (1847th meeting, para. 71), the United States firmly believed in self-determination for the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). It was convinced that that would be best not only for those peoples, but for the people of Portugal as well.

32. With regard to another aspect of the question, there were important nuances of difference between Portugal and South Africa; indeed, the authors of the Manifesto on Southern Africa themselves stated (see A/7754, para. 12) that the obstacle to change was not the same in all the countries of southern Africa and therefore the possibility of continuing the struggle through peaceful means varied from one country to another.

33. The Tanzanian representative had referred contemptuously to those who objected to the repetitions of "condemn, condemn, condemn and deplore, deplore, deplore". In fact, that statement had been made not by the United States but by the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Baroodly.

34. The representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had questioned his right to speak on behalf of conciliation, alleging that the whole ethic of the United States had been one of violence and referring to the American Declaration of Independence. He most vehemently rejected that accusation, which he regarded as a gratuitous insult. He appreciated the reference to the American Declaration of Independence—signalling the first struggle against colonialism—but that document itself bore witness to the lengths to which its authors had gone in trying to achieve a peaceful settlement with the former colonial Government. As for Viet-Nam, his country was at present making every effort to find a just and peaceful settlement in the Paris negotiations. He made no apology for advocating that peaceful and conciliatory approaches be tried, in the spirit of the Manifesto on Southern Africa of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations Charter.

35. Mr. LEE WILLIAMS (United Kingdom), exercising his right of reply, said that his delegation categorically and contemptuously rejected the accusation by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the United Kingdom supplied arms which were used against the indigenous population of the African Territories under Portuguese administration.

36. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), exercising his right of reply, said that his delegation rejected the allegations of the representative of Dahomey. Neither the Spanish delegation nor the Spanish Government had altered its position.

Spain's policy had always been to respect the right of peoples to self-determination and, on the basis of that policy, it was granting independence to its former colonies one after another. His country had always felt very close to the African peoples and it would be recalled that, on the occasion of a recent and very important vote, it had been able to provide proof of that attitude by giving its support to the African countries.

37. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey), exercising his right of reply, said that he had listened with great attention to the Spanish representative's reply. He regretted that the latter had not given his delegation's reasons for voting against the resolution. If Spain really felt drawn towards Africa—and its recent behaviour had shown that it did—he did not see how it could possibly abandon to their fate the thousands of human beings who were suffering under colonialism in the Territories administered by Portugal.

38. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), exercising his right of reply, said that his country had always had a clear and firm attitude with regard to colonialism. If his delegation had voted against the draft resolution appearing in document A/C.4/L.938, it was because certain paragraphs contained provisions that it could not reasonably accept.

39. Mr. REMOVILLE (France), exercising his right of reply, said that his delegation strongly objected to the Tanzanian representative's allegation that France was providing Portugal with arms which were used against the national liberation movements in Africa.

40. With regard to *apartheid*, France's position had been clearly stated in the Special Political Committee and he did not think it necessary to define it again.

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had expressed the wish that Portugal's statement should be struck from the record (see para. 21 above). He asked if that was a mere wish or a formal proposal.

42. Mr. MUEMPU-SAMPU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) recalled that the purpose of the Fourth Committee was to achieve decolonization. It would be logical to exclude from the summary records any statements that were diametrically opposed to the Committee's aims. His suggestion was not, however, a formal proposal.

#### *Organization of work*

43. The CHAIRMAN, in connexion with the general debate on agenda items 12, 13, 23, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71, recalled that the Committee had decided that the list of speakers would be closed at noon on Friday, 14 November (see 1845th meeting, para. 17). However, in view of the circumstances in which the discussions had taken place since then, several delegations wishing to take an active part in the work of the Committee had been unable to enter their names in time and had expressed the hope that they could still do so. If there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to reconsider its earlier decision and decide that the list of speakers would be closed at 6 p.m. on Monday, 17 November.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.*