

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FOURTH COMMITTEE, 1725th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 21 November 1967,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 24:

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued)
General debate (concluded). 301

Page

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

AGENDA ITEM 24

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, South West Africa and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued) (A/6868 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda) said that despite the ideals enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and despite the many resolutions that had been adopted on the subject of Southern Rhodesia and South West Africa, the evils which the United Nations was combating in southern Africa appeared to be thriving rather than disappearing. The Portuguese Government's absurd policy of claiming that the black Africans in the Territories under its domination were Portuguese citizens and the perpetuation of Ian Smith's illegal régime were but two examples of the failure of the United Nations to come to grips with the problem of decolonization.

2. The United Nations had chosen international opinion as a weapon for the eradication of those evils. It had been presumed that world opinion expressed through the resolutions of the United Nations would be heeded by South Africa and Portugal. However, the chapters of the 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 concerning Southern Rhodesia (A/6700/

Rev.1, chap. III), South West Africa (*ibid.*, chap. IV) and the Territories under Portuguese administration (*ibid.*, chap. V) and the recent report of the Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa^{1/} made it abundantly clear that South Africa and Portugal were determined never to yield to world opinion. It was time for the United Nations to formulate a new strategy to break the resistance of Portugal and South Africa and to uphold the principles enshrined in the Charter.

3. The report of Sub-Committee I (A/6868/Add.1) showed how extensive were the economic interests of the United Kingdom, the United States and some west European countries in the industries of Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and the Portuguese Territories. A private group concerned about the plight of the people of southern Africa had stated that there were over 250 United States companies operating in South Africa alone. It was imperative that the Governments whose nationals wielded extensive economic and financial influence in the colonial Territories should persuade those companies to serve the cause of self-determination, human equality and justice.

4. His delegation denounced the United Kingdom representative's deliberate attempt to divert the Committee's attention from the issue under discussion. That representative had tried to equate foreign investment in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and other colonial countries with foreign investment in independent developing countries. That was a deplorable tactic at a time when the United Nations was appealing for a concerted effort and a re-examination of the methods used to free the peoples of dependent Territories from the bonds of colonialism and apartheid. Uganda had made it quite clear that its need to attract foreign investment would never lead it to condone the activities of investors who frustrated decolonization efforts.

5. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) expressed his delegation's indignation at the United Kingdom representative's attempt to mislead the Committee by asserting that foreign economic investments in southern Africa were always beneficial to the indigenous populations. The fact was that the United Kingdom bore the major responsibility for the deplorable situation in southern Africa.

6. One example of the Western Powers' economic exploitation of colonial Territories was the recent discovery, reported in The New York Times of 20 September 1967, of a large oilfield of high-quality crude oil off the coast of Portugal's west African

^{1/} S/8196/Add.1. For the printed text of this document, see Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 35, document A/6864/Add.1.

enclave of Cabinda. The field was strategically placed from the point of view of supplying Western Europe, since the petroleum was not subject to Arab-Israel disputes and the sea voyage to Europe was much shorter than the route round South Africa. The anticipated production of 150,000 barrels daily was twice Portugal's present oil needs and would thus free the country from dependence on Middle Eastern sources. Furthermore, Portuguese authorities had promised to provide military protection in areas where special security measures were requested to counteract possible attacks by Angolan freedom fighters.

7. His delegation would support any resolution condemning foreign economic activities in southern Africa, with a view to enabling the indigenous peoples to benefit from their own natural resources.

8. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had the same reservations with regard to the item under discussion as it had expressed with regard to item 66 (1708th meeting). Furthermore, his delegation found the wording of the item improper with reference to Portuguese Territories and it wished to place on record its objection and protest in regard to that wording.

9. The present debate seemed to be designed to open another front in the familiar ideological conflict which was now spreading from world politics to world economics. As in all conflicts, it was essential to proceed carefully, lest a false step taken at the outset should develop into a major error, and to examine the issue dispassionately and realistically.

10. The very wording of the item meant that the debate began with a bias against all non-local investments in so-called Non-Self-Governing Territories. That bias should be recognized and corrected.

11. There could be no doubt that every effort should be made to promote the economic development of the Territories described as non-self-governing, that economic development could not come about without investment and that the encouragement of investments from all convenient sources represented a liberal political and economic policy. His delegation submitted that no better way of promoting the economic development of any Territory, self-governing or non-self-governing, had yet been found than by encouraging investments from all sources which did not clash with the interests of those Territories and their people. Abuses might of course creep in and they would have to be checked, but that did not disprove the need for investments. When such investments were not available locally, the only alternative was to obtain them from abroad. It was therefore necessary to ensure that the investment policy was subordinated to the interests of the economic development of the Territories concerned and that those investments did not become instruments of political influence. That applied to all foreign investments, not only to those in Territories described as non-self-governing.

12. Unfortunately, most of the speakers in the debate had taken for granted the conclusion that foreign investments were undesirable in themselves. It had thus become an artificial debate, with no bearing on the facts. His delegation ventured to suggest that the

danger of abuse of foreign investments had been emphasized for certain ulterior motives, and not because there was any substance in such allegations.

13. Some investors apparently felt excluded from investing in Territories described as non-self-governing. The reason for their exclusion might be that they habitually sought to invest their ideology together with their money. It was not surprising that preference was given to investments which were politically and ideologically neutral and which contributed exclusively to the economic development of the Territories. It was entirely legitimate that investors should take reasonable profits, but the wealth they produced added to the patrimony of the Territory and of its population.

14. As he had pointed out at the 1716th meeting, the investment of metropolitan Portugal in its overseas provinces could not be considered foreign investment since it was investment within the same sovereign unit. Portugal welcomed foreign investment in its overseas provinces, since it was concerned with promoting their economic development and a sound investment policy was the universally recognized way of accelerating economic development. Portugal's investment policy and legislation was the same for both metropolitan Portugal and the overseas provinces; foreigners were not granted any rights or privileges that were not granted to Portuguese nationals, which included all those born in Portuguese Territories and their descendants who had preserved their nationality, irrespective of race or colour. It was therefore false to allege that foreigners investing in Portuguese Territories could do so to the detriment of the local population.

15. A sweeping allegation had been made that foreign investment in Portuguese Territories was exempt from taxation. Since the main purpose of investment was to develop the local economy, it was a normal practice everywhere to grant certain facilities to new enterprises for brief initial periods. It was difficult to see how the two contradictory allegations which had been made, namely, that foreign investors paid scarcely anything to the Portuguese Government, and that foreign investors helped the Portuguese Government to wage its so-called wars in Africa, could both be true.

16. He had already refuted allegations concerning Portugal's labour policy in his statement at the 1716th meeting. Such allegations, especially those relating to the emigration of labour, had also been disproved by the International Labour Organisation's fact-finding mission. He emphasized that emigration of labour was entirely voluntary; it was not peculiar to the Portuguese provinces but existed also in some African countries in the region; and the welfare of emigrant labour was assured by bilateral agreements which were strictly enforced. The ILO report^{2/} also refuted the allegations made in the report of Sub-Committee I and repeated by several speakers concerning the internal labour situation in the Portuguese provinces. There was no discrimination whatsoever between one Portuguese

^{2/} Report of the Commission appointed under Article 26 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation to examine the Complaint filed by the Government of Ghana concerning the observance by the Government of Portugal of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), Geneva, International Labour Office, 1962.

national and another in any part of Portuguese territory. He also rejected the allegations relating to ownership of land; the rights of the local population in that respect were adequately safeguarded by legislation which was strictly enforced.

17. His delegation rejected the report of Sub-Committee I (A/6868/Add.1) and all the allegations based upon it. The report built up allegations in order to arrive at a preconceived conclusion and completely ignored the political, economic and social realities of Portuguese life.

18. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the complicity between the Portuguese and United Kingdom representatives was clear; both had spoken on matters which were not on the agenda. Foreign investment in Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea was not directed at promoting the economic development of the Territories for the benefit of the people. It was clear that Portugal would not grant independence to the Territories and allow the people to decide the matter of investments for themselves, since Portugal itself would then derive no profit from the Territories.

19. Mr. GATUGUTA (Kenya), replying to the representative of Portugal's claim that foreign investment in the Territories under Portuguese administration was in the interests of all the inhabitants, asked how many African doctors, engineers and lawyers had been produced out of a population of about 13 million during the 400 years of Portuguese rule. Unless a substantial number had been produced, it must be assumed that Portugal had been merely exploiting the African people. He also asked how many of the industrial and commercial firms in the Territories were controlled by Africans, how many Africans held high executive posts and where the profits of those firms went. The Portuguese representative had said that there was no discrimination between Portuguese nationals, yet the policy of assimilation discriminated against the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea who did not reach the standard set by Portugal for assimilados. Foreign economic investment was only desirable in countries where the people had control over it. In the Territories under Portuguese administration, foreign investment benefited only a small clique of oppressors, as the Special Committee's report showed.

20. He completely rejected the Portuguese representative's allegations and his attempts to convince the Committee that foreign economic interests were benefiting the peoples of Africa.

21. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal), replying to the representative of Kenya, said that foreign investment was indeed promoting the interests of the population in the Portuguese provinces. Portugal's primary concern was to ensure the welfare and progress of all the population without any discrimination as to race or colour. He could not provide statistics concerning the number of African doctors, engineers or lawyers in the provinces since no statistics based on race or colour were compiled; such statistics would only foment racism. He could assure the representative of Kenya, however, that members of all profes-

sions had been drawn from the African provinces for a long time past. More than a century previously, Portugal had opened a medical college at Luanda but it had been closed down owing to a lack of students. For centuries, students from all the overseas provinces had studied at universities in metropolitan Portugal, and there were now universities in Mozambique and Angola.

22. On the question of assimilados, many representatives appeared to be labouring under a misconception. At the present time, all persons born in Portuguese territory were Portuguese citizens with equal status. During a brief period, the system of assimilation had been introduced as an experiment to try to promote the social progress of the local population in the overseas provinces. Under that system, those who wished to retain their tribal ways and live under their own laws could do so, while others who had certain qualifications could opt for citizenship and live under the common law of the land. No discrimination was involved and no one was excluded from citizenship. Many who could have qualified for full citizenship under the system had chosen not to do so since those living under tribal dispensations had enjoyed special privileges and measures of protection.

23. He could not agree that foreign investment should only be permitted in independent countries. Economic development should be promoted in what the Committee considered to be Non-Self-Governing Territories. Portugal felt that it had a duty to promote economic development in its provinces by all available means; it therefore encouraged investment from any quarter provided that no conditions were attached to it and that it was designed to promote the economic development of the provinces and, consequently, of the population.

24. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) rejected the concept of assimilation. It was no great honour for any African to be branded as Portuguese.

25. He deplored the Portuguese representative's negative attitude in rejecting the report of Sub-Committee I in its entirety. That attitude was neither fair nor rational and was unacceptable to the majority of delegations present.

26. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo) said that in his view it was better for a dependent Territory to remain underdeveloped rather than to be developed in order to provide profits for others. The natural resources of the Territories under Portuguese administration should not be developed until the Territories had been granted self-government.

27. With regard to the medical college at Luanda mentioned by the Portuguese representative, he pointed out that primary schools should be established before universities or there would obviously not be any students for the latter.

28. Mr. TEVOEDJRE (Dahomey) said that the fact that Portugal kept no statistics proved that it was intellectually underdeveloped. He asked the Portuguese representative to mention any single achievement of his Government in the enclave in Dahomey which it had held for centuries until a few years earlier.

29. Mr. DE MIRANDA (Portugal) pointed out to the representative of Dahomey that he had said that Portugal did not keep statistics based on race or colour, not that it kept no statistics. His question concerning the enclave in Dahomey, São João Batista de Ajudá, was out of place since, as the representative of Dahomey

should know, that enclave had merely been a fort with a few hundred square yards of territory and no inhabitants except those who manned the fort.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.