

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1641st
MEETING

Wednesday, 23 November 1966,
at 10.50 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 67:</i>	
<i>Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	283

Chairman: Mr. FAKHREDDINE Mohamed
(Sudan).

AGENDA ITEM 67

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (continued) (A/6292, A/6294, A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V; A/6335/Rev.1, A/6337, A/6340, A/C.4/673 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)*

1. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that the twenty-one years that had passed since the signing of the United Nations Charter had witnessed a marked increase in the area of freedom. The liberation struggle of the peoples had compelled colonialism to recede to a few pockets, to which it held on stubbornly, and it was in those remaining bastions of colonialism that the heroic struggle for freedom was being waged. It was in southern Africa, where that struggle was inextricably bound up with the battle against racial oppression, that colonialism would sooner or later come to a violent end. World peace was being threatened because a racist minority in that part of Africa was continuing in its misguided way to impose its will on the majority.

2. Mindful of its responsibilities under Article 14 of the Charter and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Assembly had adopted resolution 1542 (XV), in which it had declared that the Territories under Portuguese administration were Non-Self-Governing Territories within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. Portugal's denial of the right of the inhabitants of those Territories to self-determination and independence constituted a threat not only to the well-being of those peoples but to international peace.

3. The gravity of the situation in those Territories had been a matter of great concern to the Security

Council and to the General Assembly. In resolution 180 (1963) of 31 July 1963, the Security Council had deprecated the attitude of the Portuguese Government, its repeated violations of the principles of the Charter and its continued refusal to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Council, and had determined that the situation in those Territories was seriously disturbing peace and security in Africa. On three occasions in 1965 Senegal had appealed to the Security Council in connexion with thirteen Portuguese attacks on its territory. On 8 January 1966 Portuguese aircraft had dropped bombs on two Congolese villages. In October 1966 the Security Council had met once again to consider the threat to the Congolese Republic resulting from the fact that foreign mercenaries were using Angola as a base of operations for interfering in the affairs of the Congo.

4. On more than one occasion the Security Council and the General Assembly had called upon Portugal to implement the following: (a) the immediate recognition of the right of the peoples of the Territories under its administration to self-determination and independence; (b) the immediate cessation of all acts of repression and the withdrawal of all military and other forces employed for that purpose; (c) the promulgation of an unconditional political amnesty and the establishment of conditions that would allow the free functioning of political parties; (d) negotiations, on the basis of the recognition of the right to self-determination, with the authorized representatives of the political parties within and outside the Territories with a view to the transfer of power to political institutions freely elected and representative of the peoples, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV); and (e) the granting of independence immediately thereafter to all the Territories under its administration in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples. Portugal's reaction had been one of contempt. On 31 July 1963, at the 1049th meeting of the Security Council, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs had described resolution 180 (1963) as revolting and morally wrong. The Portuguese Government had consistently maintained that those Territories constituted with Portugal one pluri-continental nation and that there could be no discussion of change in the relationship between them. On 4 August 1965 Mr. Salazar had said that, as a result of the integration which had been a principle of Portuguese overseas policy for centuries, those Territories as a whole already formed a nation and a sovereign State, and to admit at every time of political crisis that a part of a Territory had the right to self-determination was to create a factor of instability and national disunion. In his inauguration speech in July 1965, President Tomás had paid a tribute to the armed forces for their intransigent defence of national territory in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portu-

*Resumed from the 1635th meeting.

guese Guinea and had emphasized that the fight must continue until final victory.

5. The Portuguese Press had expressed support for the Government's policy of political integration and had affirmed the Portuguese identity of the Territories and their inhabitants. Portugal's methods in pursuance of that policy had included the establishment of a framework for political integration and the introduction of measures to speed up economic integration, the settlement of Europeans in the Territories and the ruthless subjugation of the indigenous inhabitants. The institutions within that framework were based on the idea of a hierarchy, the apex of which would consist of Europeans and the base of Africans, who were called upon to bear intolerable burdens.

6. Portugal had always encouraged Europeans to settle in the Territories, not as bearers of Portuguese civilization, but as soldier-settlers who would buttress Portuguese military efforts to retain the Territories, and perhaps as a preparation for a unilateral declaration of independence, with the complicity and connivance of Portugal. The most serious aspect of the situation, however, was the fact that Portugal had 50,000 military personnel in Angola, 40,000 in Mozambique and 20,000 in so-called Portuguese Guinea, including mobile police and militia, all of whom were intermittently engaged in repressive military operations. Mr. Manuel Alegre, a former officer in the Portuguese Army who had served in Angola and had been imprisoned in the São Paulo fortress, had told 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/6300/Rev.1, chap. V, paras. 328-340) of the inhuman treatment and torture to which African prisoners were subjected. Another petitioner, Mr. de Pádua, who had deserted from the Army in October 1961, had described the atmosphere as one of homicidal mania and complete lack of respect for the lives of the Africans. He had seen settlers furiously brandishing the severed heads of Angolans on pikes.

7. In Mozambique, Portuguese colonialism was reacting in the same manner and the orders were to massacre the population or to intern them in concentration camps.

8. In so-called Portuguese Guinea, Portuguese planes bombed villages and the settlers arrested and tortured their victims as they pleased.

9. It seemed strange that a small country like Portugal could maintain such a vast colonial empire and wage a relentless war on three fronts, a war that cost \$110 million a year in Angola alone. It was well known, however, that Portugal did not stand alone; it received all the assistance it required from the racists in southern Africa and certain other States. The racist alliance between Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia rendered the problems of southern Africa inseparable, since only concerted action aimed at those countries as a single entity would determine the final success of the struggle against racism and colonialism in that part of the African continent. It was not surprising that Portugal had been the first country in the world to allow Ian Smith to establish diplomatic representation on its territory. There was a military pact

between the three countries providing for direct intervention by the signatories in the event of the spread of revolutionary activity in the territory of any one of them. The South African newspaper *The Star* had stated in November 1964 that South Africa's defensive system on the ground depended on the possibilities of local defence in Mozambique, Angola and Southern Rhodesia and that South Africa would not remain inactive if one of those bastions were to be threatened.

10. It was disheartening that a number of States, some of them Members of the United Nations, were giving Portugal the material assistance which enabled it to confront the national liberation struggle in its colonies. The petitioners from the Portuguese Territories had said that aircraft, napalm bombs, tanks and weapons of all kinds reached Portugal from the Federal Republic of Germany directly or through Israel, from the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Belgium. In part that assistance was provided through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), since Portugal as a member of NATO had a right to military assistance from that organization, and in part under bilateral agreements between Portugal and its allies. His country hoped that those who provided Portugal with the instruments of war did not justify their action on the basis of superiority of Europeans and their inherent right to rule over the Africans.

11. It had been established beyond doubt that Portuguese colonialism would long since have succumbed to the African freedom fighters had it not been for the assistance which Portugal received from its allies. All the military might of NATO, however, could not silence the cry for freedom in Africa, for Africa was determined to bend events to its will and to shape the future of its own destiny. Throughout history man had fought with unrelenting courage against tyranny and oppression. In September 1898, the people of his country had lost 11,000 men, who had laid down their lives at Omdurman in defence of the land of their fathers and had won for themselves a permanent place in the hearts of their fellow countrymen. In honour of their memory, the Sudan pledged itself to extend all support to the African people of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea in their struggle to achieve freedom.

12. Conscious of its common destiny, Africa was irrevocably committed to travel the road which would bring it to total liberation and unity. It had turned to the United Nations because of the gravity of the situation resulting from the atrocities committed in the Portuguese Territories and from Portugal's threats of military intervention in Senegal, Guinea, Zambia, Tanzania and Malawi. Any aggression against those countries would find the whole of Africa united against it. His delegation asked the United Nations to condemn Portugal and to use its prestige and influence to help free the people of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea from the horrors and indignities inflicted upon them by Portuguese colonialism.

13. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) said that, in the past, United Nations bodies had tended to approach the problem of the Territories under Portuguese rule without fully taking into account the broader context of events in southern Africa as a whole. An analysis

of those events revealed that the repression of the peoples of the so-called "Portuguese" Territories represented but one element in the imperialist policy of a group of States with strategic and economic interests in Africa. That policy was directed towards blocking all efforts of the African peoples to free Africa from foreign domination and exploitation. It was inspired also by experience gained in Asia and in the Middle East in the creation of artificial States through foreign settlement. Portugal was similarly promoting the settlement of Europeans in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea.

14. In 1960, the accession of several African States to independence and the renaissance of African nationalism had led a number of colonial Powers to band together in a last effort to resist the liberation movement. Mining companies had organized the secession of Katanga, a new constitution had been granted to the racist minority in Southern Rhodesia, and Africans aspiring to freedom had been savagely repressed at Sharpeville and Windhoek. About the same time, the Angolan people had rebelled against Portuguese rule, and Portugal, with the support of other countries, had embarked on a war of repression. West Germany, the United Kingdom and other Western Powers had rushed to Portugal's aid. Angola had been opened up to investments by certain financial groups, and strategic bases, such as those at Beja and the island of Flores, had been made available in return for assistance. With that assistance, Portugal had been able to embark on outright genocide. The statements of petitioners who had appeared before the Special Committee revealed the atrocities committed by the Portuguese armed forces and by the Polícia Internacional da Defesa do Estado (PIDE). The assistance granted by certain Western States to Portugal had included military assistance. The petitioners heard by the Special Committee during its meetings in Algiers had included Mr. Ervedosa, a former officer of the Portuguese air force who had been in Angola from 1961 to 1963; he had told the Committee that bombers, communications aircraft, tactical support aircraft, long-range patrol aircraft, napalm bombs and other bombs, and depth charges, all supplied by NATO, had been used in the Angolan war (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V, paras. 296-320). Mr. de Pádua, a former medical officer in the Portuguese army, had said that it was reported that Israel, acting as an intermediary for the Federal Republic of Germany, had supplied the Portuguese with sub-machine-guns (*ibid.*, para. 326). That statement had been confirmed by a press communiqué issued by the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA) in Dar es Salaam on 6 May 1966, in which it was stated that an MPLA guerrilla unit had captured war material, including machine-guns of Israel make, from Portuguese troops in the Cabinda area. In its communiqué, MPLA had protested vigorously against the assistance given by Israel to the Portuguese colonialists in Angola.

15. In spite of the increasing number of Portuguese troops sent to Mozambique, Angola and so-called Portuguese Guinea, the determination of the people of the Territories had not been shaken and they were continuing their struggle for freedom. Faced with that situation, the Portuguese Government had promoted the settlement of Europeans in the Territories. The im-

portance of such settlement had been stressed by the Portuguese Overseas Council in October 1965. Steps had been taken to attract settlers both from Europe and from South Africa.

16. Portugal was also intensifying its military and economic co-operation with the Pretoria and Salisbury racist minority régimes. Meetings had been held between the Portuguese and Southern Rhodesian authorities in 1961 with a view to co-ordinating operations against nationalists. The Prime Minister of what had then been the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland had met Mr. Salazar to discuss the establishment of an integrated defence system along the Congolese borders. PIDE had openly arrested opponents of the Portuguese Government in the streets of Salisbury. The Portuguese authorities and the authorities of the Federation had also co-operated in conveying supplies to the mercenaries in Katanga.

17. It was clear that the Salisbury, Pretoria and Lisbon authorities, aided by neo-colonialist Powers, were endeavouring to establish an economically, politically and militarily integrated bloc. The survival of the minority régimes and of Portuguese colonial rule was clearly dependent on the support provided by certain Western allies. Without the aid of NATO, and that of the Pretoria and Salisbury régimes, and the obstacles placed in the way of effective action on the part of the United Nations, Portugal would be unable to hold the people of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea at bay. The Afro-Asian States, however, and all who regarded decolonization as an irreversible movement, were with those people in their struggle. The Organization of African Unity had adopted measures to promote the liberation of the Territories colonized by Portugal and of those under the control of racist minorities. The African States would spare no effort to provide all the assistance that the liberation movements needed and would not hesitate to denounce those seeking to perpetuate colonial rule in any form whatever.

18. The United Nations should adopt a new approach to the problem. His delegation felt that questions relating to southern Africa should perhaps be examined as a single subject, by a single organ. Only thus could the United Nations act effectively to help the oppressed peoples of southern Africa to regain freedom and independence.

19. Mr. GOMA-NGANGA (Congo, Brazzaville) recalled that at the previous session the General Assembly, in resolution 2107 (XX), had urged Member States to break off diplomatic and consular relations with the Government of Portugal or refrain from establishing such relations, to close their ports to vessels flying the Portuguese flag or in the service of Portugal, to prohibit their ships from entering any ports in Portugal and its colonial territories, to refuse landing and transit facilities to Portuguese aircraft and to boycott all trade with Portugal. It had also requested the Security Council to consider adopting appropriate measures against Portugal in order to give effect to its resolutions. It might be asked how many States had acted on those recommendations. The Congo (Brazzaville), for its part, always complied with engagements freely contracted.

20. It was hard to understand why countries such as Portugal and South Africa, which continually flouted the resolutions of the United Nations, still retained their seats in the Organization. While his delegation was anxious to see U Thant continue in office as Secretary-General of the United Nations, it was easy to understand why he did not wish to accept a new term in the present circumstances.

21. Portugal had always refused to recognize the right of its colonies to self-determination. On 4 August 1965 Mr. Salazar had tried to justify Portugal's policy regarding the call for self-determination and the African demand for "one man, one vote" in a statement reproduced in paragraph 11 of the Special Committee's report (A/6300/Rev.1, chap. V). Unfortunately there were people in the world naïve enough to be influenced by such absurd arguments. Mr. Salazar's claim that "integration" was a principle of Portugal's overseas policy was nonsense, and it was strange that, while Ian Smith was proclaiming the impossibility of integration of the white and black races, Mr. Salazar, whose ideas were identical, should try to deceive world opinion in that way. It was a mistake to suppose that the people of Africa could be duped and thus prevented from attaining their objective and throwing off foreign rule.

22. Mr. Salazar seemed to think that he alone was competent to decide the destinies of peoples. He hoped to convert the Territories under Portuguese administration into citadels like South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. The settlement of Europeans in the "Overseas Territories" had always been a cornerstone of Portuguese colonial policy; the settlers took possession of all the arable land and the Africans were obliged to work on their estates like serfs. It was reported that early in 1966 the Portuguese National Assembly had put new pressure on the authorities to increase the flow of settlers to Angola and Mozambique. The Vice-President of the Overseas Council was said to have stated that it cost the Portuguese Government the equivalent of about \$US10,500 to settle a single family in Africa with the necessary land, housing and facilities. South African settlers, mainly from drought-stricken areas in the West Transvaal, were settling in Mozambique. What had happened in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Australia was being repeated in the Portuguese Territories.

23. The serious situation in the Territories under Portuguese administration was a cause for grave concern. It was high time that the obstacles to the progress of the people still under colonial domination should be removed. The essential weakness of sociologists, ethnologists, economists and historians was that they never recognized that the difficulties encountered by a country were not peculiar to that country but were common to all countries at a similar stage of development, and that such difficulties could be overcome by other peoples sometimes more quickly than their own countries had overcome them. Some representatives in the United Nations were sometimes heard to say that colonialism was a good thing. It was hard to understand what a country like Portugal could give to the colonial peoples when Portugal itself was economically backward and the majority of its population impoverished and illiterate and living in terror of the secret police.

24. It was, however, the monopolies in the highly industrialized countries, especially the United States and the United Kingdom, which were the real masters in Portugal and its colonial empire. It was thanks to them that Portugal still retained vestiges of its colonial empire throughout the world. More than 75 per cent of the capital invested in Portugal and its Territories was either directly or indirectly linked to foreign trusts. Standard Oil had a monopoly of oil prospecting and production in so-called Portuguese Guinea and in Portugal itself, and Petrofina, a subsidiary of Royal Dutch Shell, had a similar monopoly in Mozambique. United States and United Kingdom capital controlled the uranium mines in the Portuguese Territories, and the wolfram, lead and manganese mines were also in the hands of foreign monopolies. Everything in the Territories was controlled by the Companhia União Fabril and its foreign capital, from transport, naval shipyards, trade, the foodstuffs industry and insurance companies to ministers, deputies, newspapers, and so on. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Western monopolies supported the policy of the Portuguese Government in Africa. In 1961 and 1962, Portugal, which itself was under-developed economically, had spent more than \$240 million on its colonial wars; that money could only have come from the foreign monopolies. Portugal was not capable of waging a war on three fronts without the help of its NATO allies.

25. Apart from the support which Portugal received from foreign regional groups and the role played by foreign monopolies in the Territories, the third factor to be taken into account in any consideration of the question was the record of atrocities committed by Portuguese soldiers. Colonial oppression had always been marked by acts of barbarity, but none more so than that of Portugal in its African Territories. Salazar's police régime could only be compared to that of Hitler. The oppression, poverty and exploitation of the Africans was increasing daily, while the white financiers were growing rich. The testimony of the many refugees who sought asylum in the Congo (Brazzaville) made that clear, as did the book entitled Portugal in Africa by James Duffy, with a foreword by Ronald Segal.

26. Despite the fact that the NATO countries had repeatedly stated that the military equipment which they supplied to Portugal under NATO was intended exclusively for Portugal's use in Europe, it was well known that the United States and other Western Powers were providing substantial material assistance to Portugal. That was borne out by the evidence of members of national liberation movements which had captured military equipment from the Portuguese. Moreover, the foreign companies operating in the Territories were contributing part of their profits to help in the "defence" of the Territories.

27. Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, too, were assisting Portugal. Portugal had been the first country to recognize the illegal régime of Ian Smith and South African racists were helping to increase Portugal's military contingents. Portugal's desperate attempt to avoid defeat should be considered in the global context of the death-struggle of imperialism. Since the great October Revolution in the USSR, the influence of capitalism and imperialism had been

diminishing and the creation of peoples' democracies after the Second World War had shown the oppressed peoples that only the new system could give them the life which was their right. While capitalism and colonialism were collapsing, the national liberation movement of colonial peoples was growing stronger. Only an effective coalition of all the forces of progress could save world peace. Portugal's provocations were multiplying. Its aircraft repeatedly violated the air space of States which were neighbours of the African Territories under Portuguese administration, and Portuguese soldiers repeatedly violated the frontiers with Guinea, Senegal and the Congo (Brazzaville). Some of those complaints had been referred to the Security Council as a threat to international security, but the provocations were occurring daily while Portugal claimed that the other party was the aggressor. The imperialists wished to create trouble on the frontier with the Congo (Brazzaville) in order to endanger the revolution in that country, which was on the side of the forces of progress. The people of his country were contributing to the strengthening of world peace by endeavouring to establish a genuinely revolutionary and democratic State, and they would defend their revolution at any cost. The liberation of a people or a continent should be the work of that people or continent itself. Those who wished to help should do so effectively, not merely by empty words and platonic resolutions which served no useful purpose. It was on the revolutionary capacity, unity and self-confidence of its people that the liberation of a Territory from colonialism depended.

28. He asked the Committee to adopt a strong resolution which would call upon all countries to give moral, financial and military support to the fighters for peace, which would condemn unequivocally the racist trio of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia together with the NATO countries, especially the United States, which gave help to Portugal. The resolution should also ask the Security Council and the General Assembly to set a time-limit for the granting of independence to the Territories under Portuguese administration, and, if Portugal refused to comply, to expel that country from the United Nations.

29. Mr. RAMIN (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the allegations by the representatives of the Sudan and Algeria that his country had supplied weapons to Portugal were without foundation. His country's position on that matter had been reaffirmed by the Permanent Representative of Israel in a letter of 12 September 1966 to the Chairman of the Special Committee (A/AC.109/212) and his Government did not supply arms to Portugal in any form,

directly or indirectly. His country's firm position on all colonial problems was well known and no distortion could mislead delegations in that regard.

30. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that his remarks had been based on statements which petitioners had made to the Special Committee during its visit to Africa. Mr. de Pádua had told the Committee that Israel, acting as an intermediary for the Federal Republic of Germany, had supplied the Portuguese with sub-machine-guns. Mr. Manuel Alegre had confirmed that he had seen machine-guns of Israel make.

31. Mr. LAALA (Algeria) said that he believed that the statements made to the Special Committee by the Portuguese nationals who had fought in Angola and Mozambique reflected the true situation prevailing in the Portuguese Territories.

32. Mr. ALJUBOURI (Iraq) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the Sudanese representative. He pointed out that the Special Committee and the Fourth Committee had always accepted and given credence to evidence presented by nationalist organizations. He asked whether the Committee was to believe representatives of nationalist organizations or a State that had been created by the manoeuvres of the imperialists. Another United Nations body was at present considering an act of aggression committed by that State, a country that had always helped the imperialists and colonialists.

33. Mr. RAMIN (Israel) said that members should confine themselves to the item under consideration and not to matters before another body.

34. His delegation had carefully studied the report of the Special Committee. The allegations that Israel supplied arms to Portugal were false. He recalled the statement he had made in the Fourth Committee on 21 November 1963 (1489th meeting) that, long before the adoption of Security Council resolution 180 (1963), his country had taken all the necessary steps to ensure that no arms or other military equipment would be exported from Israel to Portugal in any form, directly or indirectly; it was his Government's declared policy not to sell arms to a State which was fighting to maintain colonial rule.

35. Mr. EL HADI (Sudan) said that, whatever the imperialists and their lackeys might maintain, the fact remained that arms manufactured in Israel had been used against the nationalists in Angola and Mozambique.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.