

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1930th
MEETING**

Monday, 25 October 1971,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Keith JOHNSON (Jamaica).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Skottsberg-Åhman (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

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. DHALEE (People's Democratic Republic of Yemen) said that the situation in Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia showed the persistence of colonialism and imperialism, in defiance of the Charter and the declarations and resolutions of the United Nations. Moreover, the minority régimes were planning to perpetuate their rule, with the help of some imperialist countries which wanted to exploit the wealth of the peoples of southern Africa and which were participating in the criminal wars being waged against the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau).

2. South Africa refused to relinquish its control of Namibia in spite of the resistance of the people of the Territory, the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and the Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 of the International Court of Justice.¹ The reports of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and of the United Nations Council for Namibia gave a clear picture of the situation prevailing there and of the inhuman policies and practices to which the Namibians were subjected. Any further toleration of the presence of South Africa in the Territory would cause the Namibians to lose faith in the United Nations, in its resolutions and in the International Court of Justice.

¹ 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.*

3. It was not strange that the United Kingdom and France supported South Africa against the Opinion of the International Court of Justice and the principles of the Charter, for their economic interests in the area were well known. There were two courses open to the countries which wanted to support the Opinion of the Court: to give moral and material support to the freedom fighters in Namibia and to apply the measures provided in Chapter VII of the Charter.

4. In Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom had done nothing to bring down the illegal Smith régime or to ensure majority rule, as it had been asked to do in various resolutions. The people of Zimbabwe were suffering imprisonment and extermination. Their struggle for self-determination was legitimate and should receive general support. The trade and arms embargo imposed by the Security Council should be maintained. The United Kingdom should honour its obligations and resort to armed force against the Smith régime, and any attempt to negotiate with that régime should be denounced. It was well established that the collaboration of Pretoria and Lisbon with Salisbury, in violation of the United Nations resolutions, helped to minimize the effect of the embargo imposed by the Security Council. It was imperative that those countries should comply with the relevant resolutions.

5. With regard to the Territories under Portuguese administration, his delegation rejected the contention that they were "overseas provinces" of Portugal. That country should abandon its imperialist dreams and should realize that the Africans would not lay down their arms until colonialism was wiped out.

6. The great capitalist monopolies were working together to exploit the people and the resources of the Territories. An example of that was the construction of the Cabora Bassa dam. In the face of those who dreamed of converting the Territories into another Southern Rhodesia under white minority rule, the people of Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) had resorted to a war of liberation and they should be supported with arms and money.

7. In that context, mention should be made of Portugal's aggression against Guinea and that of South Africa against Zambia; those criminal acts, which had been financed by economic interests, principally United States interests, constituted a real threat to international peace and security.

8. Southern Africa should become an example of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The United Nations should show itself capable of that achievement.

9. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that the process of decolonization was at once a matter of pride and despair for the United Nations. Despite a few important achievements, the process of decolonization had lost momentum in recent years and had now come to a standstill in the blind alley of southern Africa. Colonialism and racism in that area had begun to result also in the violation of the territorial integrity of independent African States. The situation could become a threat to international peace and security and could bring about a world-wide racial conflict.
10. Although the three items under consideration were interrelated, his delegation did not propose to deal with the question of Namibia until the Security Council had concluded its deliberations on the question.
11. Pakistan, which had always shown its total dedication to the struggle against colonialism, considered that the success achieved so far was attributable to the zeal and singleness of purpose of the members of the Committee. To keep that up, it was necessary not to lose sight of the fundamental objective and to avoid digressions which might lead the Committee into discussions that were in conflict with the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. That resolution, while affirming the right of peoples to self-determination, prohibited, in paragraph 6, any attempt to disrupt the national unity and the territorial integrity of independent States.
12. In Southern Rhodesia, the white minority régime was consolidating its hold over the Territory. The sanctions imposed by the Security Council had not been successful, owing primarily to the refusal of South Africa and Portugal to apply them. In those circumstances, the only effective means would have been to widen the scope of the sanctions to include all the measures provided in Article 41 of the Charter and to impose sanctions against South Africa and Portugal as well. Unfortunately, the negative votes of the United Kingdom and the United States had prevented the Security Council from adopting a decision to that effect. Security Council resolution 277 (1970), which had been adopted as a compromise, was inadequate, as was demonstrated by the fact that, despite the adoption by the General Assembly of the complementary resolution 2652 (XXV) of 3 December 1970, the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia maintained its defiant attitude.
13. The reasons for that attitude were not difficult to find. The first reason was the weakness shown by the United Kingdom in not honouring its obligations as administering Power and its reluctance to take effective steps to replace the illegal white minority régime by a majority government. It was regrettable that the United Kingdom Government was still persisting in its weak attitude and was exploring the possibility of having another round of talks with the white minority régime. His delegation was against any attempt to negotiate the future of the Zimbabwe people over their heads. The United Kingdom should take effective action to put an end to the illegal situation in Southern Rhodesia and to enter without further delay into consultations with the representatives of political parties of Zimbabwe which favoured majority rule, so that power could be transferred to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of free elections.
14. Secondly, the régime of Southern Rhodesia was able to maintain its defiant attitude because of the growing co-operation it was receiving from South Africa and Portugal in the political, economic and military spheres. Another factor was the role played by foreign economic and military interests. Those interests, which were reaping excessive benefits at the expense of the indigenous people, provided sustenance to the illegal régime and impeded the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.
15. The question of Southern Rhodesia did not need any further analysis: it was obvious that the racist minority régime in that country was wholly illegal, that its continuance constituted a threat to international peace and security and that steps should be taken to put an end to that régime and to transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of universal adult suffrage and majority rule. To that end, the Security Council had imposed sanctions, but the important thing was to decide how to make those sanctions more comprehensive and mandatory and to ensure that they were effectively enforced.
16. Pakistan, which fully supported the just aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe, had strongly condemned the unilateral declaration of independence and had refused to recognize the illegal racist régime of Southern Rhodesia. It favoured the imposition of all measures, including, if necessary, the use of force, to bring about the downfall of the illegal Smith régime. Pakistan had always supported the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Pakistani Government had broken off all relations with Southern Rhodesia and had imposed a total ban on trade and shipping with that country. It had also refused to allow Southern Rhodesian aircraft, as also foreign aircraft flying to or from Southern Rhodesia, to land at Pakistani airports or to fly over Pakistani territory. A similar ban had been imposed on all ships carrying cargo destined for Southern Rhodesia. Lastly, it had recently severed telecommunication and postal links with Southern Rhodesia.
17. In keeping with Pakistan's well-known stand on the question, his delegation supported the various resolutions and consensus adopted by the Special Committee, contained in document A/8423/Add.2 (parts I and II). It considered operative paragraphs 2, 8 and 9 of the Special Committee's resolution contained in paragraph 34 of chapter VI of its report (see A/8423/Add.2 (part I)) to be of particular importance in that they condemned the failure and refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom to take effective measures to bring down the illegal régime and called upon that Government to take such measures, including the use of force. It further urged all States to comply with the sanctions adopted by the Security Council and drew the latter's attention to the urgent need to widen the scope of the sanctions and consider imposing sanctions against South Africa and Portugal.
18. With regard to the Territories under Portuguese administration, that 10-year-old question remained as far from solution as it had been when the General Assembly first took cognizance of it. The hopes of a change in Portuguese policy aroused at the time of assumption of

office of Prime Minister Caetano had faded. The Government of Portugal persisted in its refusal to grant the right of self-determination to the peoples in the Territories under its domination and had stepped up its military operations against them. Despite General Assembly resolution 2707 (XXV) of 14 December 1970, which called upon the Government of Portugal not to use chemical and biological methods of warfare, it was using herbicides and defoliants which caused great damage to people and crops.

19. Portugal was helped by the military assistance it received from its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). What was more, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia had made common cause with it against the peoples fighting for their right to self-determination in southern Africa. Along with the military repression, the three countries had ventured into joint economic enterprises aimed at further consolidating their control over the peoples of the region. The Cabora Bassa dam on the Zambezi River and the Cunene River Basin project were cases in point. Those projects would provide an economic base for the hegemony of the white minorities over the peoples of the area. International pressure against foreign investment in the colonies had been instrumental in the withdrawal of Swedish and Italian firms from the Cabora Bassa project, the refusal of a United Kingdom firm to replace the withdrawing Swedish firm, and the refusal of the United States Export-Import Bank to provide credits for American sales to the project. Regrettably however, work was progressing with the participation of interests in France, South Africa and the Federal Republic of Germany.

20. It was gratifying to note that, despite the formidable odds, the tough resistance of the liberation movements had brought the situation to a point where Portuguese officers in Angola no longer talked of winning. Portugal contended that it was pursuing a policy of multiracialism and that the constitutional changes under way would give increased autonomy, leading to self-government for the overseas Territories under its administration. So far, the concept of multiracialism had not been translated into practice and had been lost in the process of assimilation to Portuguese culture. The constitutional developments in the Territories under Portuguese administration must be watched carefully because it might happen that Portugal, weary of military operations against the liberation movements and encouraged by the hope of greater economic integration with Europe after it became an associate member of the European Economic Community, might decide to withdraw from those Territories, leaving them under the control of white minorities. It was necessary to ensure against the emergence of further South Africa-oriented "Rhodesias" in those Territories.

21. So far, all the efforts to make Portugal accept the inexorable process of decolonization had had no effect. Greater pressure was called for. In that regard, Portugal's NATO allies had an important part to play: they should use their influence with Portugal so that it abandoned its ostrich-like policy and retired from its colonies. In accordance with the principles and resolutions of the United Nations, Pakistan had always supported the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration in their legiti-

mate struggle for their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. It had never provided Portugal with any military or material assistance, nor would it do so in the future.

22. Mr. OULD HACHÈME (Mauritania) said that 11 years after the adoption of the General Assembly's historic resolution 1514 (XV), the problem of decolonization was still on the Committee's agenda. Despite the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the Portuguese colonialists and Fascists were intensifying their barbarous practices in Africa and depriving millions of human beings of their inalienable rights. The massive assistance provided by some States members of NATO permitted Portugal to carry on a long war on three fronts—Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau)—which it could not do otherwise. In addition to the arms it received, Portugal relied on diplomatic support to enable it to carry out its repressive colonialist policy. In view of that situation, the independent African States would continue to support the national liberation movements, in spite of Portugal's aggression against neighbouring countries such as Senegal and Guinea.

23. Fortunately, the national liberation movements now controlled a third of the territory in which they were operating and had established political, economic and social institutions to help the population to settle in those regions and escape from Portuguese colonialism. He paid a tribute to the heroic struggle being waged by those movements in spite of their limited resources.

24. With the help it was receiving from NATO, Portugal kept an army of about 140,000 men in Africa. It claimed to be a messenger of civilization, but its idea of civilization was well known: barbarity, slavery and racism. It was time that Portugal accepted the realities of history's evolution and granted self-determination and full, unconditional independence to its African Territories, in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly.

25. The President of Mauritania and President of the Eighth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), speaking in the General Assembly (1938th plenary meeting), had expressed the African countries' concern at the tragic situation in southern Africa, particularly in Namibia, which was still occupied by South Africa. On various occasions, other eminent African Heads of State and Government had explained the point of view of the sovereign countries of Africa. The President of Cameroon in 1969 and the President of Zambia in 1970 had clearly and firmly described in the General Assembly the peculiar aspects of what Africa was experiencing. The International Court of Justice had also unequivocally stated in its Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971 that it was the General Assembly which was responsible for that Territory. Consequently, the occupation of Namibia was illegal and the organs of the United Nations should assume their responsibility once and for all.

26. The South African forces not only were trampling on the rights of the peoples under their yoke but were also

violating the sovereignty of neighbouring States. The South African Government's aggression in Zambia constituted a serious situation which threatened international peace and security. Mauritania's position had already been clearly defined by its President at the 1583rd meeting of the Security Council on 27 September 1971. Strong measures must immediately be taken to put an end to the occupation of Namibia. The sanctions already approved must be appropriately implemented. The Security Council must demand and obtain South Africa's unconditional withdrawal from Namibia.

27. His delegation welcomed the position of the United States of America as expressed at the General Assembly (1950th plenary meeting) by Secretary of State Rogers that it accepted the decision of the International Court of Justice. Furthermore, the United States had assured OAU that it would help to facilitate the self-determination of African peoples.

28. The Security Council had just adopted its resolution 301 (1971), whereby it reaffirmed the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and recognized the direct responsibilities of the United Nations in the matter. The resolution took note of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, which declared the presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal and referred to the obligation of Member States to recognize that illegality. The text was also categorical with regard to the invalidity of any commitments made by South Africa concerning Namibia.

29. As to the embargo on arms for South Africa, the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/8422) stated that, in spite of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the collaboration of certain Member States with South Africa was increasing daily. What was more, there were new cronies of South Africa, such as Israel, which was building a munitions factory on South African territory.

30. The Southern Rhodesian régime was hanging on and making headway in spite of all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. The determination of the white minority to remain in power through a unilateral declaration of independence, with the complicity of the United Kingdom, violated fundamental principles and was therefore illegal.

31. Various delegations had referred to the atrocities committed in Southern Rhodesia by the Smith régime. Hitherto that régime had shown no regard for the people of Zimbabwe, and that was a matter of deep concern to his delegation. The sanctions imposed on the régime could not have the desired results because Portugal and South Africa were providing the assistance needed to strengthen it. In his delegation's view, specific steps should be taken to make the sanctions effective, and direct negotiations should be held between the United Kingdom Government and representatives of the political parties and liberation movements of Zimbabwe to put an end to tyranny and establish a democratic government.

AGENDA ITEM 67

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, A/C.4/739)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Raymond F. Mbala, representative of the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (A/C.4/739), took a seat at the Committee table.

32. Mr. NYIRENDA (Zambia) and Mr. MWASAKA-FYUKA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking on a point of order, recalled that the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had decided not to recognize the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (GRAE) and had recommended that members of OAU withdraw their recognition from that Government. Although they had no objection to the petitioner's being heard, they wished to place on record their reservations as to his representation and state that the fact of hearing him speak did not conflict with the OAU decision, in accordance with which their respective Governments had withdrawn their recognition from the said Government in exile.

33. Mr. MBALA (Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (GRAE)) said that he was speaking on behalf of the brave people of Angola and of GRAE, and stated that, after 11 years of armed struggle, new victories were being won against the Portuguese colonialists. The enemy was much better equipped, owing to NATO co-operation, but did not have the unshakable faith that moved the people of Angola.

34. The Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola (FNLA) had liberated and now controlled vast regions of the Territory.

35. Apart from their military operations, the Portuguese colonialists were attempting to wage psychological warfare against the people of Angola, in an effort to divide them by malicious propaganda. He was proud to report that the effort had failed, and had only served to redouble the Angolans' determination to destroy the Portuguese and their European supporters.

36. Portugal was being supplied with napalm and military equipment by the United States and European imperialists through NATO. Recently FNLA had seized United States guns and ammunition used by the Portuguese. The Lisbon authorities were trying to invest their colonial wars with international ramifications in order to secure greater participation by their allies. Some months earlier, the Minister of Defence of the Portuguese Government had stated that Portugal would place its African ports at the disposal of NATO if NATO would protect the Portuguese colonial empire. With the same object in view, Mr. Franco Nogueira, the former Minister for Foreign Affairs, had said in 1969 that Portugal had officially requested NATO to extend its protection to Angola and Guinea (Bissau) in order to strengthen the defence of the North and South Atlantic Oceans. The people of Angola would never forget the

support given to Portuguese colonialism. He urged the European countries to use their influence to persuade Portugal to withdraw from Angola. At the same time, he expressed gratitude for the support given by certain African countries to Angola's war of liberation.

37. Portuguese prisoners who were held by GRAE were regularly visited by the International Red Cross. However, the Portuguese thus far refused even to publish a list of the Angolan prisoners-of-war in their hands. He asked the Committee to adopt a resolution forcing Portugal to publish such a list and to allow the International Red Cross to visit Angolan prisoners. He demanded an end to the barbaric torture being perpetrated against all Angolan prisoners-of-war.

38. Mr. ISHAN (Nigeria) associated himself with the reservations expressed by the representatives of Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania with regard to the organization represented by the petitioner. However, he was grateful for his interesting statement.

39. Following a proposal made by Mr. CALLEJA (Costa Rica), the CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, Mr. Mbala's statement would be issued in the usual manner.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.