

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1687th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 11 October 1967,
at 3.45 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Requests for hearings (continued)</i>	
<i>Request concerning Southern Rhodesia (agenda item 23) (continued)</i>	27
<i>Requests concerning South West Africa (agenda item 64)</i>	29
<i>Request concerning Territories under Portuguese administration (agenda item 66)</i>	29

Chairman: Mr. George J. TOMEH (Syria).

Requests for hearings (continued)

REQUEST CONCERNING SOUTHERN RHODESIA
(AGENDA ITEM 23) (continued) (A/C.4/691)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.4/691, containing a request for a hearing concerning Southern Rhodesia from Dr. Robert John, President of the International Council for Rhodesia.
2. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) congratulated the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur and said that his delegation would do everything it could to help ensure the success of the Committee's work.
3. The petitioner, who claimed to speak for Rhodesia, was in reality nothing but an agent of the fascists at Salisbury, who had given him the task of defending and justifying the activities of the illegal régime. It would be contrary to the principles of the United Nations to allow Dr. Robert John, or anyone like him, to appear before the Fourth Committee for the purpose of defending the inadmissible acts of a minority which was defying the United Nations Charter.
4. On behalf of the Afro-Asian group he urged that the request should be rejected out of hand, for it was an insult to the United Nations and to the fraternal people of Zimbabwe.
5. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America) said that she would like first of all to make it clear that her delegation's position on the request for a hearing was simply a position of principle. Although the exercise of the right of petition was not unlimited, it should not be denied simply because the opinions of the petitioner were at variance with those of the majority of Member States.
6. She need hardly point out that although Dr. Robert John enjoyed full freedom of expression in the United States, the views which he defended in no way coincided with those of the United States Government.

7. The United States position had not in fact changed: the Salisbury régime was a rebel and illegal régime, and the United States would continue to support the efforts of the United Kingdom and the Security Council to put an end to it, in accordance with the aspirations of all the inhabitants of the Territory.

8. However, for the reasons of principle to which she had referred, her delegation would vote in favour of the hearing. It would have no objection to postponing a decision on the matter provided that it was not postponed indefinitely.

9. Mr. TRESSELT (Norway) associated himself with the congratulations addressed to the Chairman, to other officers of the Committee and to Mr. Djermaakoye.

10. In his opinion, it would perhaps be premature to take a decision on the request for a hearing at the current meeting. Before deciding the matter, the Committee should obtain further information about Dr. John and ascertain to what extent he represented the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia. It might therefore be better to ask the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to study the matter more closely and report on it in due course.

11. Mr. VAN DIJK (Netherlands) supported that suggestion.

12. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he was firmly opposed to postponing the matter. It would be regrettable if the Fourth Committee or the Special Committee wasted time examining a petition from an impostor who in reality was nothing but the spokesman of a handful of racists who were defying the United Nations and world public opinion. As for the principles invoked by the United Nations representative, they had not, unfortunately, always been reflected in the positions taken by her delegation.

13. No one had ever claimed that the petitioner was taking his orders from Washington. Yet it would be incorrect to say that his organization had no connexion with the United States authorities, for it was registered in the United States.

14. With regard to principles, he would like to make the point that Africa was suffering at the present time because certain countries of the Western world had lost their sense of true moral values. Since the United States delegation had declared in the Security Council that the Southern Rhodesian régime was a rebel régime and that the United States Government would support all the measures taken against it by the United Kingdom, the Africans wanted to know how the United States could tolerate the presence

within its territory of an organization whose activities were at variance with those of the United Nations. For his part, he would urge United States citizens who believed in the dignity and freedom of the African peoples, as also the Government of the United States and the Governments of other countries, to put an end to the activities of groups of that sort. In any case, it would be a fatal mistake to allow any latitude to Dr. John and others like him in the name of freedom of speech and democratic principles.

15. Mr. SHAKHOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported without reservation the proposals made by the representatives of Mauritania and the United Republic of Tanzania. It would be unthinkable to allow a representative of a group of fascist rebels, condemned by both the United Nations and the administering Power, to use the Fourth Committee as a forum in which to proclaim that group's views, which the Press would doubtless fully publicize.

16. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he too wished to associate himself with the congratulations addressed to the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee.

17. Yugoslavia's position on the matter under discussion was diametrically opposed to that of the United States. Indeed, he could well remember that a few years earlier it had taken two weeks of debate to reach a decision to allow Mr. Julius Nyerere, who at that time was only a petitioner, to be heard by the United Nations. It would appear that the United States had considerably altered its position on requests for hearings since that time. As the United States representative had invoked certain principles, it might not be amiss to recall those of the United Nations Charter: the principle of self-determination, the principle of the equality of all men and the principle of respect for the human person. Yet it was precisely against those principles that Dr. John and his like were fighting. The Yugoslav delegation was acquainted with the statements made by Dr. John in 1966 and could affirm that they were entirely at variance with the position taken by the United Kingdom, the United States and all other Member States. Indeed, it would be difficult to find a worse racist than the petitioner. For those reasons the Committee should not grant his request.

18. Mrs. ANDERSON (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said she would like to make it clear, for the benefit of the Tanzanian representative, that as there was complete freedom of association in the United States, no ordinary group of citizens had to register with the authorities. Therefore the organization represented by Dr. John had not had to register. Registration was compulsory only for agents of foreign Powers. She took exception to the remarks of the Tanzanian representative, who arrogated to himself questions of principle and sought to imply that the United States invoked questions of principle only when it wished to defend its own interests.

19. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his Government had never claimed to have a monopoly on good faith and principles. However, it was difficult

to invoke any principle whatsoever in support of the request of a spokesman of those who were oppressing more than 4 million Africans. In doing so, the United States was apt to give the impression that it was itself in favour of that oppression. With regard to the question of the registration of the organization represented by Dr. John, he thought it quite understandable that he should not be familiar with all the details of United States legislation. In any case, he considered it difficult to maintain that the petitioner was not the agent of a foreign Power. The Salisbury régime existed, and it exercised, even though illegally, *de facto* authority. There was accordingly no justification for the United States Government's allowing that organization full freedom to carry on its activities in United States territory. It was high time for the United States to take a more realistic stand on the subject. His delegation reserved the right to speak again if its position on the matter came into question.

20. Mr. NASKAR (India) said that his delegation's attitude regarding the hearing of petitioners was a liberal one; in the present instance, however, he doubted whether Dr. John could be considered a petitioner. Dr. John did not speak on behalf of a people which was the victim of colonial oppression. Far from being a spokesman of the people of Zimbabwe, he was the spokesman of the illegal régime imposed on them. In order to avoid confusion and to prevent the doors of the United Nations from being open to all comers, the request for a hearing should be rejected.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the objections to Dr. John's request for a hearing, it would be advisable to take a vote.

22. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) asked whether a vote could not be avoided by leaving the decision to the Chair.

23. In the present case, the first question to be decided was whether the Committee could hear a petitioner on the question of Southern Rhodesia, and the second was whether Dr. John could be regarded as a petitioner. If the answers to those questions were affirmative, Dr. John could not be deprived, by a majority decision, of the right to be heard, for that would be an infraction of the Charter and would impair the prestige of the United Nations.

24. According to rule 108 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Chairman accorded the right to speak during the Committee's meetings, and according to rule 109 the Chairman remained under the authority of the Committee. The Committee should therefore leave it to the Chair to make a ruling on Dr. John's request in the light of the factors which the delegation of Ceylon had mentioned.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that he did not consider the solution proposed by the representative of Ceylon to be appropriate in that instance because there was a division of opinion. According to rule 109, it was for the Committee to take the decision, and a vote was therefore necessary.

26. If there was no objection, he would put to the vote Dr. John's request for a hearing on the question of Southern Rhodesia.

Dr. John's request for a hearing was rejected by 66 votes to 1, with 25 abstentions.

REQUESTS CONCERNING SOUTH WEST AFRICA
(AGENDA ITEM 64) (A/C.4/692 AND ADD.1 AND 2)

27. The CHAIRMAN recalled that in connexion with South West Africa he had received three requests for hearings in letters dated 15 and 27 September 1967 (A/C.4/692 and Add.1 and 2). The first was from Mr. Jacob Kuhangua, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the second from Mr. Nathaniel Mbaeva and Mr. Mburumba Kerina, representatives of the South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF), and the third from the Reverend Michael Scott, of the International League for the Rights of Man.

28. Mr. HATTINGH (South Africa) asked that the following reservation should be entered into the meeting record on behalf of his delegation.

29. South Africa objected to the hearing of petitioners on the question of South West Africa as there was no provision under the Mandates System of the League of Nations for the granting of oral petitions to inhabitants of Mandated Territories. The Charter of the United Nations contained one provision, Article 87 b, authorizing the acceptance and examination of petitions but with respect to Trust Territories only. The South African Government had therefore right from the beginning in the United Nations consistently recorded its objections to the granting of such oral hearings, and he formally wished to do so again in respect of the present requests and in respect of any further requests on South West Africa which might still be submitted in the course of the session.

30. Mr. MALECELA (United Republic of Tanzania) recalled that his delegation must be considered morally absent when statements were made by the representative of the Republic of South Africa because it considered that the Government of that country did not represent the people.

31. Mr. NASKAR (India) said that the objection raised by the representative of the Republic of South Africa was not valid, as the United Nations had abrogated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa.

32. Mr. HATTINGH (South Africa) pointed out that he had confined his statement to the item under consideration, namely the second item, which concerned requests for hearings, without going into the substance of the South West Africa question. He said it had doubtless not escaped the notice of the

Chair that the Indian representative had raised substantive aspects of the South West Africa issue, which was not before the Committee. In his view, a substantive discussion on the question of South West Africa would be out of order because, by the unanimous decision of the General Assembly, it was a matter for consideration by that organ and not by the Committee.

33. Mr. KANNANGARA (Ceylon) said that the South African delegation's reservation was actually incompatible with the agenda item, which concerned the hearing of petitioners on the question of South West Africa.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no other objections, he would take it that the Committee granted the requests for hearings on South West Africa which were contained in documents A/C.4/692 and Add.1 and 2.

It was so decided.

REQUEST CONCERNING TERRITORIES UNDER
PORTUGUESE ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA ITEM
66) (A/C.4/693)

35. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in a letter dated 4 June 1967 and addressed to the Director of the Department of Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories (A/C.4/693), Mr. Albert Bonaparte Nank had requested a hearing on Territories under Portuguese administration.

36. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal) said that his delegation objected to the hearing of petitioners from Portuguese Territories because, under Article 87 b of the Charter, petitioners could only be heard on questions concerning Trust Territories. He added that that was the position of principle which his delegation had consistently held in all cases, independently of the individuals seeking to be heard as petitioners; and it applied to all similar requests, should any others be received by the Committee thereafter. He asked that his delegation's reservation should be included in the meeting record.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no other objections, he would take it that the Committee granted the request for a hearing concerning Territories under Portuguese administration (A/C.4/693).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.