

for the reconstruction and development of the liberated areas.

42. If certain members of NATO were to withdraw their aid from Portugal and, instead, invest it in the fight against

hunger, colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, his delegation was convinced that peace and security would be re-established in the world.

*The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.*

## 2036th meeting

Wednesday, 10 October 1973, at 10.50 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2036

### AGENDA ITEM 71

**Question of Territories under Portuguese administration**  
(*continued*) (A/9023/Add.3, A/9048, A/9053, A/9061, A/9079, A/9085, A/9089, A/9099, A/9111, A/9113, A/9132 and Add.1 and 2, A/9174, A/C.4/760, A/C.4/763)

#### GENERAL DEBATE (*concluded*)

1. Mr. FOURATI (Tunisia) welcomed the representatives of the liberation movements, who were the authentic spokesmen for the aspirations of their peoples, struggling for the independence of the Africans and for freedom throughout the world.

2. Tunisia had greeted with enthusiasm the declaration of independence of Guinea-Bissau, which it had recognized immediately. It reaffirmed its unconditional support for the struggle of those peoples against colonialism, although it noted with profound sorrow that almost 13 years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), millions of Africans were still suffering under foreign domination. It was a well-known fact that Portugal sowed death and desolation everywhere: recently, the Government of Lisbon had decided to exterminate the population of entire villages in Mozambique, whose sole crime had been to express their desire for freedom. It was therefore more necessary than ever to investigate the atrocities committed in that and other regions. For its part, his delegation supported the proposal along those lines put forward by Sweden on behalf of the Nordic countries at the 2030th meeting.

3. Despite the resolutions of the United Nations, Portugal still obstinately refused to reconsider its attitude and there was no reason to think that it was going to change its policy, which, however much Portugal might resent it, was inexplicable and historically indefensible.

4. The means at Portugal's disposal also enabled it to threaten the countries bordering on its colonies. Portugal therefore rejected any possibility of reaching a political solution to put an end to the repression, although experience showed that all the colonial Powers had finally had to resign themselves to recognizing the inalienable rights of the peoples of their colonies. Portugal must understand that the

sooner it adopted a positive attitude, the greater the possibilities it would have of establishing fruitful relations with the Territories it now occupied.

5. The United Nations could not continue to tolerate the obstinacy of the Government of Lisbon, since the denial of their inalienable rights to the peoples of Angola and Mozambique was a challenge to the United Nations and to international law and morality. Therefore, in the interests of international peace and security, the Security Council should not hesitate to take more effective measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to stop Portugal from continuing to flout the political and moral authority of the United Nations.

6. Despite everything, Portugal continued to enjoy the economic and military support generously offered to it by South Africa, the illegal régime of Ian Smith, economic interests and various States Members of the United Nations, which helped it to pursue its colonial war. Once again, he appealed to all those States to stop assisting Portugal and to use their influence to compel it to see reason. Portugal itself would benefit from that. Indeed, it was important to use every means to make Portugal understand that its victory was impossible and accept the conciliatory solution offered as a lesser evil, since nothing could hold back the process of decolonization. If Portugal did not abide by the exigencies of history, it would jeopardize the possibilities it still had of establishing economic and other relations with its colonies.

7. The national liberation movements, which Portugal was trying by all means to suppress, had given more than sufficient proof of their desire to resolve the current untenable situation by peaceful means, as the new Republic of Guinea-Bissau had recently declared.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Tula, representative of the Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola (FNLA), had also formulated specific and realistic proposals along those lines (2028th meeting).

8. It was only to be hoped that Portugal would also make an effort and understand that the result it so much sought to avoid was inevitable. In the meantime, the international community had a duty to render all support to the liberation movements and move on from mere condemnations to specific measures against Portugal, a State which was already universally condemned.

<sup>1</sup> See document S/11022.

9. Lastly, he pointed out that, as long as there was a single oppressed people or a single colonized Territory, as long as there were people suffering, the international community would have to continue to use every means at its disposal to eradicate all the vestiges of colonialism.

10. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) welcomed the new members of the Committee and wished them every success.

11. With regard to item 71, he said that recently the national liberation movements had intensified their struggle and had achieved great successes. For example, the people of Guinea-Bissau had declared themselves independent, thereby striking a hard blow at Portugal. Thus, the prediction of Amílcar Cabral that there was no force capable of preventing the complete liberation of the people of Guinea had come true.

12. Czechoslovakia had welcomed that historic victory with great satisfaction and, as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had said in the cable he had sent to the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), the Czechoslovak people stood fully behind the people of Guinea-Bissau in their struggle to drive out the colonialists and was convinced that the new State would advance unhindered towards progress and prosperity.

13. In Angola and Mozambique, the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA) and the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) had also achieved great victories and now exercised control over vast liberated areas.

14. For all those reasons, his delegation welcomed the fact that the General Assembly, after having reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the colonial peoples and recognized the national liberation movements as the sole authentic representatives of their peoples, had recommended that Governments, specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies ensure the representation of those Territories by the liberation movements when dealing with matters relating to the colonial Territories in Africa (resolution 2918 (XXVII)). In that connexion, the decision of the Committee at the twenty-seventh session (1975th meeting) to invite the representatives of the national liberation movements to participate in its debates in an observer capacity was a very important event, since experience had shown that contacts with the liberation movements had always been beneficial. It was sufficient to mention that, as a result of the participation of the representatives of the national liberation movements in the Fourth Committee, an appeal had been made to the Portuguese Government by the Security Council in its resolution 322 (1972) to initiate negotiations with those movements with a view to putting an end to hostilities and implementing unconditionally the principles contained in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was to be regretted that that proposal had still evoked no response from the Government of Portugal, since, as Mr. Tula, representative of FNLA, had said at the 2028th meeting, although the whole world had changed, the Portuguese colonialists still held mediaeval concepts and infamous ideas about the Africans.

15. Indeed, the reports on the atrocities committed by the Portuguese colonialists in their African Territories had attracted the attention of world public opinion and would go down in history as an event comparable to the massacre at Sharpeville in March 1960.

16. In the resolutions adopted during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, Governments had been asked to put an end to any activity which might assist the colonialist régimes in maintaining their domination in the African Territories. The reason why the Portuguese colonialists could continue their ignominious war against the African nations was so well known that it could not even be described as an open secret. As indicated in chapter IX 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 (A/9023/Add.3) and confirmed by Mr. Tula at the 2028th meeting, Portugal received political, economic and military aid from certain NATO Powers. That aid, which coincided with the political and economic interests of those imperialist Powers, was one of the main obstacles confronting the liberation movements.

17. Czechoslovakia, as a socialist State, provided, and would continue to provide, all possible support to the liberation movements of the Territories under Portuguese administration and would endorse any recommendation which would promote the struggle of those peoples for freedom and independence.

18. Mr. REFADI (Libyan Arab Republic) pointed out that, despite the inhuman acts it committed in the Territories which it occupied, Portugal could not hold back the advance of the liberation forces, as was shown by the declaration of independence of Guinea-Bissau, which the Libyan Government had already recognized. That victory demonstrated yet again that the only effective means of conquering the colonialists was armed struggle. It was now time for the United Nations to give Guinea-Bissau all the help it needed for its development. For its part, Portugal could not evade its responsibility for the great damage it had inflicted on that country.

19. In 1972 both the General Assembly, in its resolution 2918 (XXVII), and the Security Council, in its resolution 322 (1972), had called upon Portugal to enter into negotiations; however, it had already been demonstrated that moderation had no effect. The Portuguese colonialists had responded to the moderation shown by the General Assembly with assassinations and massacres. They had assassinated the Secretary-General of PAIGC, Mr. Amílcar Cabral, in the hope of halting, or at least slowing down, the process of liberation in Guinea-Bissau. However, the result was precisely the contrary: the people of Guinea-Bissau had continued their armed struggle and had responded to the assassination of their leader by declaring independence. The Portuguese had also engaged in the indiscriminate killing of the African peoples. The international community would always condemn them for the massacres at Wiriya; of course, Portugal could not commit such atrocities if it did not have the effective political, military and economic support of some States Members of the United Nations.

20. The only effective way to put an end to the colonialist presence of Portugal in Africa was by armed struggle. The liberation movements should be supported in their struggle. The solution to the problem should come from within the African Territories themselves. The Libyan Arab Republic was doing all that it could within the framework of the Organization of African Units (OAU) to assist the national liberation movements in their struggle for the liberation and independence of their Territories.

21. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria), after welcoming the three new States admitted to the United Nations, said that it augured well that the current session had begun with the announcement of the independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. Algeria had been one of the first countries to recognize the new sovereign State. The text of the proclamation of independence<sup>2</sup> stated that the State of Guinea-Bissau was a sovereign, republican, democratic, anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist and non-aligned State whose main objective was the liberation of its territory. The new State considered one of the basic principles of its foreign policy to be the strengthening of its ties of militant solidarity and fraternity with all the other peoples of the Portuguese colonies. The new Republic expressed solidarity with all the peoples struggling for their freedom and independence in Africa, Asia and Latin America and with the Arab peoples fighting against zionism. That was a clear demonstration of the political maturity of the new country's leaders, who remained completely faithful to the memory of Amílcar Cabral and who had gained an important victory that would serve as an example to all countries, especially those in Africa, which were still fighting against colonialism and *apartheid*.

22. In all the Territories still under its domination, and particularly in Angola and Mozambique, Portugal was waging a war of genocide. The disclosures by the Reverend Adrian Hastings to the Special Committee (*ibid.*, para. 28, enclosure) regarding the systematic genocide perpetrated by the Portuguese in Mozambique in 1973 had aroused the horror and indignation of the international community.

23. True to its colonial policy, the Portuguese Government regarded those African Territories as Portuguese overseas provinces and, following the example of the Government of South Africa, ignored countless United Nations decisions which called upon it to grant independence to the peoples of the Territories under its domination. For the Government of Lisbon, self-determination meant that the population should consent to an imposed political structure. That interpretation stripped the concept of self-determination of any real meaning or scope.

24. Despite the considerable aid that Portugal received both from the member countries of NATO and from other countries on a bilateral basis, it was gratifying to note that Portugal was being progressively isolated and that it had already been excluded from some specialized agencies of the United Nations. Furthermore, the recent International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973, had been the first conference sponsored by the United Nations in which the liberation movements had been represented on an equal footing with Governments.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, annex I.

25. The situation prevailing in southern Africa was a cause for great concern from both the military and the economic point of view. The alliance between Portugal and the minority régimes of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa was being strengthened daily and it was obvious that its purpose was to transform that region into a veritable bastion of colonialism. For that reason, South African and Rhodesian nationals were currently participating directly in military operations in the Territories under Portuguese domination. In the economic field, Portugal received considerable foreign investments in those Territories and large contingents of white immigrants. The construction of the Cabora Bassa dam in Mozambique was an example of the diabolical policy of Portugal, which, in order to maintain its rule, attempted to introduce foreign settlers into the region, thus following a policy of settlement similar to that practised in Palestine. In the face of such a situation, all countries which loved peace and justice had a responsibility to establish a common front in order to put an end to the policy of the last colonialists in Africa.

26. Mr. CISSÉ (Mali) said that, even at San Francisco, the framers of the Charter of the United Nations had embodied in it the right of peoples to self-determination. Colonialism was an anachronism, which the international community had to eliminate as rapidly as possible and, for that reason, 13 years earlier, the General Assembly, in its resolution 1514 (XV), had adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The problem of colonialism, however, persisted. Portugal maintained unaltered its anachronistic policy and spoke of establishing a "multiracial" society, when it was well known that the reality was very different. The population in the Territories had access to education, welfare and progress according to well-defined racist criteria, similar to the features of a policy of racial supremacy against which the entire world had fought 30 years before. There was no need to refer to the "civilizing mission" cited by Portugal in order to justify its colonial presence in the Territories. It was enough to hear the statements by the non-African delegations to note with relief that that argument was time-worn.

27. The Overseas Organic Law of 23 June 1972, in its revised form, brought no fundamental change in the dependency status of the Territories. The elections arranged in March 1973 by the administering Power had led to the designation of candidates drawn from a list prepared in advance by the colonialist metropolitan Power. No political party that would defend the true interests of the Territories had been able to participate in the electoral campaign and in order to participate in the voting itself, the political parties had had to meet abnormal racial and social criteria.

28. From the slave trade to the Wiriyamu massacres, from the days of Henry the Navigator until the current time, Portugal had consistently trampled under foot the freedom of peoples, human dignity and universal brotherhood. However, for 10 years, the national liberation movements had been struggling heroically against an army of more than 160,000 men equipped with the most modern weapons. For its part, Portugal maintained its reign of terror in the Territories through internal repression marked by summary executions of patriots, the massacre of civilians and the resettlement of the indigenous inhabitants of the *aldeas*.

*mentos*, which were actually fortified villages under martial law. The annexationist ambitions of Portugal were obvious, and had acquired an international dimension through Portugal's association with various foreign economic interests. It was no secret that those foreign interests constituted the pressure groups which, in Western capitals, were helping Portugal to build up its fleet of combat aircraft, enabling the Portuguese to fly across the African sky bombing the civilian population and dropping defoliants on fertile lands.

29. Portugal, condemned by the great majority of States Members of the United Nations, had chosen to associate itself with the grand coalition of racists in southern Africa by endeavouring to make Angola and Mozambique into buffer zones to serve as a *cordon sanitaire* for the minority régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. That diabolical undertaking had led Portugal to implement the so-called "policy of maintaining the racial balance", a policy that consisted of nothing more or less than the creation of conditions favourable to the importation of white settlers and the promotion of their development to enable them to strengthen racial superiority within the colonial context of the Territories. Portugal currently did not hesitate to exploit the military advantages accruing to it as a member of NATO and a signatory of various bilateral agreements, in order to strengthen the Pretoria-Lisbon-Salisbury axis. Chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3) shed some light on that situation. On 8 March 1973 Lord Gifford had made an appeal at the 903rd meeting of the Special Committee, calling on the international community to prevent the economic expansion of the European Economic Community in the Territories under Portuguese administration.

30. The international community had repeatedly condemned the activities of the foreign interests that were impeding the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). However, some countries, virtually the same ones that were providing military assistance to Portugal, continued to tolerate, and even to encourage, the firms operating in the Territories under Portuguese administration. It was time that those Governments realized that, in view of the circumstances, it was difficult to take seriously the statements made by their representatives on the inalienable rights of peoples to freedom and independence, on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

31. Mali, which had participated in the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973, was confident that the decisions taken on that occasion were endorsed by the international community. The participation of non-governmental organizations in the task of decolonization was of paramount importance, particularly because of the repercussions on the mass information media. For that reason, the delegation of Mali supported the idea of holding a conference of non-governmental organizations on colonialism and *apartheid* in southern Africa.

32. In all the forums of the United Nations, in OAU, in the conferences of non-aligned countries and at meetings of trade unions, women's organizations, youth organizations, pacifist movements and religious organizations, emphasis

had been placed on the urgency of initiating concerted action to put an end to Portugal's colonial policy. It was heartening to note the similarity of views and the unity of action between opponents of colonialism of all types and the national liberation movements in the Territories under Portuguese domination. A decade of glorious struggle had not only reaffirmed the militancy of those movements, but had provided them with an opportunity to achieve a better understanding of their historic responsibility in safeguarding the legitimate interests of the people whose authentic representatives they were.

33. One measure of the historically inevitable success of the national liberation movements was the recent declaration of independence of the new Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Mali had described in the General Assembly (2145th plenary meeting) as one of the most significant events of the twentieth century. The emergence of the new State was the culmination of the great successes achieved by PAIGC against the reactionary and decadent régime of Lisbon. In the light of that inspiring example of the determination of a people to obtain its freedom, the United Nations should decide to admit the Republic of Guinea-Bissau to membership of the United Nations as soon as possible. Such a decision could only be construed as a favourable omen for the future admission of Angola and Mozambique.

34. His delegation was of the view that colonialism, which was fighting to keep its last strongholds in southern Africa, should be opposed with vigour and determination. The principles of the Charter made such action imperative.

35. Mr. IBRAHIM (Sudan) paid tribute to Amílcar Cabral, who would live on in memory as a symbol of love of country and freedom. Until the very end, Cabral had offered Portugal the opportunity to avoid suffering and bloodshed but unfortunately Portugal had heeded neither his offers nor the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for negotiation with the liberation movements. Since his death, Guinea-Bissau had proclaimed itself an independent republic, and many countries had recognized it as such. In continuing its colonialist wars, Portugal was deceiving itself and acting against all reason.

36. He thanked the Nordic countries for the interest they had shown in the liberation struggles and said that he was willing to support any recommendation which they might make along the lines of the proposals contained in the joint statement transmitted by the representative of Sweden at the 2030th meeting.

37. A number of countries had expressed their support for any measures which the Africans might take, apart from the use of force. Portugal had chosen to use force and had opposed any negotiation, so that Africa itself had no choice but to resort to the use of force itself. Guinea-Bissau had proclaimed its independence, and anyone making statements in the Committee should recognize the new State and provide it with the assistance it so desperately needed. Africa knew who those helping the Caetano régime were and would remember them when the time came.

38. Like Israel, Portugal would not be able to remain so intransigent or to defy the United Nations by opposing its

resolutions without the financial and moral aid and assistance of the NATO countries. If that situation persisted, the world would witness a confrontation like that currently taking place in the Middle East.

39. The decisions and resolutions adopted in 1972 constituted a genuine advance because of the constructive elements they contained. However, the recommendations must be made more effective, not by changing the language used, but by ensuring their implementation. Amílcar Cabral had often said that what was needed was not condemnations but tangible results.

40. The Government of the Sudan fully supported the liberation movements, as had been stated by its President at the tenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa in May 1973, and at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in September 1973. If the United Nations did not take effective measures to force Portugal to cease immediately its oppression in Africa, the Africans would be compelled to resort to violence.

41. Mr. STOBY (Guyana) said that in his statement at the twenty-seventh session (1986th meeting), Amílcar Cabral had said that his people were struggling not only for independence and freedom but also to ensure respect for the resolutions and the Charter of the United Nations. The real struggle was between the United Nations, which affirmed the need to put an end to colonialism, and Portugal. An understanding of that fact was fundamental to an appreciation of what was happening. The United Nations, as an institution, was deeply involved in the struggle, as were its prestige and the principles for which it stood.

42. The liberation movements had believed that their objectives could be achieved by peaceful means. In the face of Portugal's intransigence and its increased use of violence, the liberation movements had been forced to resort to armed struggle. The Lusaka Manifesto<sup>3</sup> stated that it was better to negotiate than to destroy, and it was still not too late for Portugal to desist from its madness and enter into negotiations with the liberation movements. Unfortunately, there had been no change in the policy of Portugal, which persisted in its intention to continue the struggle with the desperation typical of a country which knows that it is doomed to defeat.

43. Chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3) showed that the national liberation movements were stepping up their attacks and were winning their fight for freedom. Even in Portugal itself, there was growing protest against the policy of the Caetano régime. In Guinea-Bissau, even more decisive events had recently taken place. The Popular National Assembly, meeting in the liberated areas, had proclaimed a new independent State, which Guyana had recognized and to which it was providing assistance.

44. The colonialist wars being waged by Portugal were acquiring an international character, inasmuch as the

African States bordering on the Territories under that country's administration were subjected to bombings, raids and even attempts at invasion. Portugal's war capacity was directly related to the military support it received from its Western allies. The statements of spokesmen of those allies to the effect that the military equipment they supplied to Portugal was not being used for the colonial war were nothing but lies and sophistries. The aid that they gave to Portugal was an affront to the international community and a factor that aggravated the situation and made it difficult to arrive at a solution.

45. If Portugal and its allies did not respect United Nations resolutions, the struggle would continue until the final victory. The United Nations and the specialized agencies were giving assistance in Africa to refugees and the population of the liberated areas. Nevertheless, they could and should do more in that field. The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa could be supplemented by allocations from the regular budget. Similarly, use could also be made of the resources in the Secretary-General's disposal for technical assistance. At the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo, it had been said that the liberated areas should be considered as being among the least developed of the developing countries. The United Nations could find a way to increase resources for those purposes. If the General Assembly decided anything to that effect, Guyana would support such a decision.

46. Similarly, although the representatives of the liberation movements had been recognized as observers, it was necessary to go even further with regard to the legal status of the liberation movements. For the moment, his delegation would not make any concrete proposals, although it hoped that that question would be looked into further.

47. Mr. TEYMOUR (Egypt) expressed his delegation's joy at the independence of Guinea-Bissau, a new State which the Egyptian Government had recognized a few weeks earlier. That joy had, however, been marred by the absence of the late Secretary-General of PAIGC, who should have received the congratulations and applause of those who believed in the dignity of man. Amílcar Cabral would live on in his people as a symbol of independence and freedom, enlightening the struggle against all forms of colonialism and racism.

48. The Fourth Committee had long been discussing the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration. That was because Portugal refused to recognize the fundamental right of mankind to self-determination and freedom, in accordance with the established principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Articles 1 and 55 of the Charter explicitly referred to the right to self-determination, which was inspired by the content of Chapters XI, XII and XIII, on Non-Self-Governing Territories and the trusteeship system. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (General Assembly resolution 2200 (XXI), annex) explicitly stated that all peoples had the right to self-determination.

49. He welcomed the birth of the new State of Guinea-Bissau and the struggle for liberty and independence, and he drew attention to the fact that the imperialist régime of Portugal had become steadily more stubborn and inhuman

<sup>3</sup> Manifesto on Southern Africa; for the text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.



by aligning itself with the racist régimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and defying the United Nations and its Charter. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal had stated at the twenty-seventh session (2048th plenary meeting) that his country did not reject the principle of self-determination, but the massacres and atrocities being committed by the Portuguese army categorically gave the lie to his words.

50. The conscience of the world demanded that the colonial régimes be liquidated so that peace might be achieved and the dignity of man preserved. The OAU, the Special Committee and the Oslo Conference had also condemned Portugal for its colonialist attitude. In pursuing its inhuman policy in Angola and Mozambique and in the newly independent State of Guinea-Bissau, Portugal did not scruple to use any means of destruction, including chemical defoliants, as was shown in chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9023/Add.3). The atrocities committed by Portugal were contrary to the Hague Convention concerning Laws and Customs of War on Land, of October 1907,<sup>4</sup> article 22 of which stipulated that the right of belligerents to inflict injury on the enemy was not unlimited. Portugal refused to respect the 1949 Geneva Conventions<sup>5</sup> and, although a Member of the United Nations, defied the Charter and applied the law of the jungle.

51. Egypt strongly condemned that attitude. The Portuguese colonialists maintained that since January 1973 there had been certain changes in their colonies. In order to refute that fabrication, it sufficed to recall that Portugal insisted on affirming that the African Territories which it controlled were "overseas provinces". Moreover, in chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee it was pointed out that Portugal would be able to keep Angola and Mozambique under white domination, which was a national objective, only if the number of white settlers kept pace with the number of "more evolved blacks" (*ibid.*, annex I, part A, para. 67). Accordingly, with a view to guaranteeing white supremacy, Portugal was promoting white settlement. That was the reason behind the creation of projects such as that of Cabora Bassa and the Cunene River Basin, which his delegation condemned.

52. Portugal could not pretend any more to be working for the economic welfare of the Territories it occupied, because its trade relations with the colonies had proved to be detrimental to the latter and beneficial for Portugal. It sufficed to say that in commercial and financial transactions the metropolitan escudo was regarded as foreign currency in the colonies, and that the colonies' balance of trade was constantly in deficit owing to the excess of imports over exports. In 1970, in their trade relations with Portugal, Angola had had a deficit of 2,363 million escudos and Mozambique a deficit of 495 million. On the other hand, between 1966 and 1970, Portugal's gold and foreign exchange reserves had increased by about 33 per cent. It should be noted also that in the Territories restrictive measures had been applied with regard to products that

might compete with those of the metropolitan country. With such a situation, the only viable solution was the full independence of the Territories under Portuguese administration.

53. The United Nations and OAU had condemned the Cabora Bassa and Cunene River Basin projects because they were designed to reinforce colonial domination in Angola and Mozambique. For that reason, in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 2795 (XXVI), those Governments that had failed to prevent their nationals and the companies under their jurisdiction from participating in those projects had been requested to take the necessary measures to terminate their participation and to withdraw immediately from all activities related to those projects.

54. Furthermore, according to the *Bulletin mensuel d'information économique et politique* (Maisons-Alfort) of January 1973, the economic profits which Portugal was deriving from the Territories were such that it had no recourse but to attempt the impossible to maintain the current situation. The magazine said, for example, that in southern Mozambique a deposit of some 200,000 million cubic metres of gas was being exploited for delivery to South Africa. Similarly, the gold deposits in Mozambique might be greater than those of South Africa. As if that were not enough, the Cabora Bassa project was going to industrialize the mineral zones. And all that would be for the benefit of Portugal.

55. Portugal had no thought of changing its attitude. The international community should, therefore, comply with United Nations resolutions by depriving Portugal of every means of assistance which allowed it to defy the Organization and by extending all possible assistance to the liberation movements.

56. For its part, his delegation demanded that Portugal should recognize immediately the right of peoples to self-determination; that it should put an immediate end to its colonial wars and all acts of repression against the peoples of the Territories it was occupying and withdraw the military and other forces which it was maintaining in those Territories; that it should proclaim an unconditional political amnesty and transfer all powers to institutions representative of the population; that it should cease all its attacks against the security and territorial integrity of neighbouring sovereign States; and, lastly, that it should release the men and property it held following the attacks and violations committed against those sovereign States.

#### *Requests for hearings (continued)*

57. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a request for a hearing relating to the question of Namibia, and he suggested that, in accordance with the Committee's practice, it should be circulated as an official document of the Committee. If there were no objections, he would take it that his suggestion was accepted.

*It was so agreed.*<sup>6</sup>

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*

<sup>4</sup> Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

<sup>5</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 970-973.

<sup>6</sup> The request was circulated as document A/C.4/761/Add.2.