

and could not be expelled, since Zimbabwe was their country.

117. Neither ZAPU nor ZANU had ever stated that the whites must leave Zimbabwe. The people of Zimbabwe believed in the universal principles of majority rule and adult suffrage. They would achieve those principles the hard way, because all peaceful means had failed. The statement made by the Reverend Canaan Banana at the 2039th meeting was irrelevant to the issue. So too was the question of talks with the African National Council, a body that had been formed by ZAPU merely to act as the publicity organ inside the country. The African National Council was not in touch with the people who mattered for the purposes of revolution. In contrast, his organization had the full support of the people. The United Kingdom Government was trying to use the leadership of the African National Council for its own selfish ends. The Council had been warned to beware of such manoeuvres, the whole purpose of which was to consolidate the economic and military position of Ian Smith. If Smith had been present at the meeting, he would have been delighted with the support given him by the representative of the Council, support which he had received ever since the unilateral declaration of independence.

118. In conclusion, because of British intrigue in Southern Rhodesia, he warned the United Nations to be very careful in dealing with the matter.

119. Mr. FAHNBULLEH (Liberia) said that his intention was not to reply to the United Kingdom but rather to appeal to the United States as a result of the statement made by the representative of ZAPU. The relations between Liberia and the United States had always been friendly and cordial, and he appealed to the representative of the United States, as a member of the House of Representatives, to present the case of Zimbabwe to the people of his country. If he did so, he could rely upon the gratitude of the African people.

Organization of work

120. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the decision taken at the 2037th meeting, the Committee would begin the general debate on the question of Namibia (item 70) at its next meeting and he suggested that on 5 November the Committee should begin its general consideration of the activities of foreign economic and other interests impeding implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (item 73).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

2046th meeting

Friday, 26 October 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2046

AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Namibia

(A/9023/Add.2, A/9024, A/9061, A/9065, A/9066, A/9225)

GENERAL DEBATE

In the absence of the Chairman, Mrs. Joka-Bangura (Sierra Leone), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 2139th meeting on 3 October 1973, Mr. Mishake Muyongo, representative of the South West Africa People's Organization, took a place at the Committee table.

1. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), speaking as the representative of Zambia and as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, said that the conduct of the Vorster régime during the year made it imperative for the United Nations to take decisive action which would compel South Africa to withdraw immediately from Namibia. The authority and prestige of the Organization were at stake and it could no longer afford to tolerate the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

2. By its resolution 309 (1972), adopted at Addis Ababa at its 1638th meeting, the Security Council had offered South Africa a chance to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia. The Government of Zambia, which knew only too well the fanatical resolve of the racists in Pretoria to perpetuate their stranglehold on the Territory, had not concealed its apprehension. As all members of the Committee were aware, the contacts that the Secretary-General had undertaken with the South African régime in pursuance of the Security Council resolution had produced negative results. That had not been unexpected. Nor had it been surprising that the South African régime had sought to exploit the contacts as a forum for justifying its aggressive policies against the Namibian people.

3. The South African régime continued to impose its will on the Namibian people, as evidenced by its so-called "homelands" policy and the establishment of the so-called "Advisory Council for South West Africa", the sole purpose of which was to deceive and confuse the international community. Nevertheless, the Namibian people were determined to resist the balkanization of their country and were not prepared to accept the traitors in the "Advisory Council" as their representatives.

4. The colonialist policy of South Africa had left the people of Namibia no alternative but to intensify their armed struggle. Zambia would continue to assist the people of Namibia in their just struggle under the determined leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

5. The decision of the General Assembly to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia (resolution 2145 (XXI)) and to establish a United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole legal authority over that Territory (resolution 2248 (S-V)) imposed on Member States a special obligation towards the people of Namibia. All Member States must try to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. Some States, however, were pursuing policies which encouraged that country to continue its stranglehold on Namibia. Certain Western countries had joined hands with the South African régime in plundering the resources of Namibia and had sustained South Africa's illegal presence in the Territory through the supply of arms, which the Vorster régime used in suppressing the Namibian people.

6. He called upon all States Members of the United Nations to refrain from any dealings with South Africa which served to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to increase the misery of the people of that country. All Member States should strive for the full implementation of the numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia.

7. Speaking as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, he submitted to the Committee the report of the Council to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly (A/9024). The report indicated that the situation in Namibia continued to be disturbing. It showed that South Africa had not only persisted in, but had intensified, its policy of defiance of international law and the decisions of the United Nations.

8. In March 1973 the United Nations Council for Namibia had expressed to the Secretary-General its opposition to any continuation of the contacts with South Africa, since that would mean an acceptance of the policies of that country by the United Nations (*ibid.*, para. 177). The position of the United Nations Council for Namibia had found strong support at the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973, at the twenty-first ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) held at Addis Ababa in May 1973, and at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Algiers in September 1973 (*ibid.*, paras. 306-308). All those organizations had agreed that the contacts were detrimental to the interests of the people of Namibia and the same opinion had been expressed to the Council by the officials of Governments with whom the Council had held consultations in 1973.

9. Also in 1973, the United Nations Council for Namibia had met at Dar-es-Salaam, Lusaka and Kinshasa at the invitation of the Governments of the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zaire. The consultations held by the Council in those African countries, which were in the forefront of the battle against colonialism and racial

discrimination, had strengthened its determination to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly in the interest of the people of Namibia.

10. At Lusaka, Zambia, the Council had held a special session in June when it had adopted its Lusaka Declaration (*ibid.*, para. 157), in which it had concluded that the time had come for the international community to recognize that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia could not continue without serious danger to international peace and security. As a consequence, the Council had called on all Member States to intensify their co-operation to ensure full compliance with the United Nations resolutions on Namibia and to support, politically and materially, the struggle of the people of the Territory for independence and self-determination.

11. The United Nations Council for Namibia had also sent missions to Botswana and Sweden, where discussions with officials of the two Governments had been most fruitful. Similarly, it had dispatched delegations to the specialized agencies and other institutions; those delegations had consulted the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. During those discussions, the delegations of the Council had raised the question of its becoming a member of those specialized agencies as representing Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia had been invited, as the Special Administration for Namibia, to attend the fifth Africa-Indian Ocean Regional Air Navigation Meeting, organized by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) at Rome in January 1973. The Council would consolidate the excellent relationship which it had initiated with ICAO and would gain membership in other institutions, thus challenging the representation of South Africa.

12. In 1973, the Council had participated actively in the Oslo Conference, whose recommendations (see A/9061, annex, sect. IV) constituted an important contribution to the efforts to eliminate colonialism and *apartheid* and to assist those fighting against those evils. The Council had also been invited to the twenty-first session of the Council of Ministers of OAU and to the tenth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of that Organization. It had also attended the tenth anniversary celebrations of OAU, had participated in the meetings of its Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa, held in Ghana from 10 January to 2 February 1973, and had held consultations with the Organization during its mission to Africa. Recently, the Council had been honoured by the visit of the Administrative Secretary-General of OAU, who had attended one of its meetings in September and had pledged the continued support of the Organization for the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Council had also been represented at several other international conferences and meetings.

13. At the same time, the Council had continued to work very closely with the representatives of the Namibian people. The consultations with Namibians and, more specifically, the participation of SWAPO in the work of the Council had proved to be most important. The Council had

been able to gain first-hand information on the attitude of Namibians on any event occurring in their Territory and to strengthen its relationship with SWAPO.

14. On 24 August 1973 the United Nations Council for Namibia had for the first time held a meeting commemorating Namibia Day, which fell on 26 August. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Security Council, the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, the Commission on Human Rights and all States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies had been represented.

15. He drew the attention of members of the Committee to the recommendations in the report (A/9024, para. 336) and assured them that the Council would continue to do its utmost to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

16. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria), speaking as the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, introduced to the Fourth Committee chapter VIII of the report of the Special Committee on its work during 1973, relating to the question of Namibia (A/9023/Add.2).

17. In carrying out its work on the question of Namibia, pursuant to paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 2908 (XXVII) on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee had taken into consideration the various relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 3031 (XXVII), and the relevant decisions of the Security Council.

18. In its consideration of the item, the Special Committee had had the benefit of receiving first-hand information on the current situation in Namibia from the national liberation movement of the Territory, SWAPO, whose representative had participated in its proceedings for the first time in an observer capacity, in accordance with the relevant decision of the Special Committee in 1972 and its subsequent approval by the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly at the twenty-seventh session. The Special Committee had also paid due regard to the programme of action and recommendations of the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973 (see A/9061, annex, sect. IV), and to General Assembly resolution 2911 (XXVII) relating to the Week of Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples of Southern Africa and Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde Fighting for Freedom, Independence and Equal Rights and other relevant General Assembly resolutions.

19. In the consensus set out in chapter VIII of its report (A/9023/Add.2, para. 14), the Special Committee had expressed once again its profound concern at the extremely dangerous situation resulting from South Africa's adamant refusal to live up to its international responsibilities in respect to Namibia and its increasing resort to coercion and oppression of the Namibian people in an endeavour to perpetuate and consolidate its illegal occupation of the

Territory. That situation had been made all the more critical and explosive by South Africa's extension to the Territory of its criminal policies of *apartheid*, including the creation of so-called self-governing "homelands" aimed at destroying the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

20. With regard to the contacts and efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolutions 309 (1972), 319 (1972) and 323 (1972), it was the opinion of the Special Committee that the recent statements by the Government of South Africa, appearing in the Secretary-General's latest report on the question,¹ amply demonstrated that that Government had no intention of complying with United Nations decisions relating to Namibia. Accordingly, the Committee had endorsed the decisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia (see A/9024, para. 336) and the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU to the effect that those "contacts" should be terminated, since they were detrimental to the interests of the people of Namibia. The Committee had been strengthened in that opinion by the fact that, even while the "contacts" had been going on, the South African Government had continued to implement its "homelands" policy in Namibia, in utter disregard of the views of the majority of the Namibian people and in open violation of the relevant decisions of the Security Council.

21. Given those circumstances, the Special Committee in its consensus had condemned the Government of South Africa and the support that the latter received from members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), from its major trading partners and from financial, economic and other interests. Accordingly, the Committee had called upon all concerned to discontinue such support forthwith and to comply with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Further, the Committee had expressed the hope that the Security Council would take effective measures, in accordance with the Charter, to secure South Africa's compliance with its resolution 310 (1972) calling for South Africa's immediate withdrawal from the Territory.

22. The Special Committee had commended the people of Namibia for their opposition to South Africa's illegal presence in the Territory. It had noted with particular satisfaction the continuing struggle of SWAPO for the liberation of the Territory and the united stand taken by the National Convention of Non-White Peoples of Namibia in support of freedom and independence. The Committee had reaffirmed its solidarity with the people of Namibia in their legitimate struggle and had called upon all States, specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to provide the people of Namibia, through their national liberation movement, with the necessary moral and material assistance.

23. Speaking on behalf of the Special Committee, he expressed the hope that the Fourth Committee would fully endorse the various recommendations of the Special Committee, as outlined in chapter VIII of its report.

¹ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June, 1973, document S/10921.

24. Mr. MUYONGO (South West Africa People's Organization) thanked the officers and members of the Committee for permitting the representatives of the national liberation movement of Namibia to participate as observers in the Committee's discussions.

25. The Fourth Committee was meeting at a crucial and historic moment, when the progressive forces of the world were rejoicing at the solemn declaration of independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau by the revolutionary forces of that country, led by the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), a declaration by which they had rejected once and for all Portugal's anachronistic concept of overseas territorialism. The people of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau had inflicted devastating defeats on the forces of imperialism, decadent colonialism, neo-colonialism and reaction. For its part, SWAPO of Namibia enthusiastically welcomed that victory, which was also its own.

26. On the other hand, the Zionist expansionist forces illegally occupying African and Arab territories had nearly brought the world to the brink of a nuclear holocaust. Those political Zionists, who, ironically, enjoyed the admiration and whole-hearted support of the Hitlerite Vorster régime—which, like the Zionists, was illegally occupying Namibia—had once again brought untold sufferings and loss of human life. The Zionists in Namibia were rallying behind Israel and had collected large sums of money for that country. In those circumstances, SWAPO categorically condemned that collusion of the two occupationist régimes of South Africa and Israel.

27. In addition, the Fourth Committee was meeting at a time when the people of Namibia had renewed their political resistance, taken the liberation struggle into their own hands and vindicated their right to self-determination and independence by all means necessary.

28. Since the summer of 1971, events in Namibia had swept forward with such speed that the illegal occupationist forces had been rebuffed. During that period, the Namibians had demanded that Namibia should be given freedom and that the illegal Vorster régime should leave Namibia to the Namibians. They had taken that action in the face of the police-state machinery of the racist power; the world should take note of that fact.

29. The military operations of the armed units and the political protests of the masses were complementary. It had often been stated by SWAPO that military, diplomatic and political actions were not contradictory, but rather complementary, and should always be co-ordinated and carried out concurrently. He was happy to state that the various parts of the liberation movement were now functioning together. His organization might not have liberated areas; it had never claimed to have them. Such action might not be the basis for the liberation of Namibia, if the practical problems and the objective conditions of Namibia were understood and appreciated. The liberation struggle embraced both the urban centres and the hinterland of Namibia. The South West Africa People's Organization would therefore not feel satisfied until every Namibian was part of the liberation movement.

30. Only a few days earlier, the international community had learnt of the overwhelming rejection of the vicious attempt by the Pretoria régime to Bantustanize the northern part of Namibia. The South West Africa People's Organization had called for a boycott of the bogus elections in Ovamboland and the people had complied with that appeal, thus clearly showing their political maturity. As an agent of the racist régime had told a reporter of *The New York Times*, the majority of the young people in Namibia were against that régime's policies and wanted the illegal occupation to end; indeed the majority of the indigenous population were young. Hence, if the régime did not accept that verdict, it would certainly face much greater troubles in the future.

31. The Vorster régime had intensified its methods of repression and terrorism, particularly since the racist South African Government had engaged in a dialogue with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Since April 1973, over 300 Namibians had been arrested and tortured. For example, in May 1973, 10 political leaders had been arrested in Ovamboland and charged with having made statements aimed at undermining the security of the State and having held an illegal meeting at Odangwa, the capital of Ovamboland. Their arrest had given rise to a demonstration by some 5,000 people and another by about 1,500 people, which the police had broken up by force. The demonstrators had carried posters demanding the end of the "Bantustan" policy, the release of their leaders, and the abrogation of the emergency proclamation, under which all meetings were prohibited. In the course of the hearings against those political leaders, however, only the leader of the Democratic Co-operative Development Party had been charged with making statements aimed at undermining the authority of the State.

32. In June 1973, the men had again been brought before the Magistrate's Court at Ondangwa. It had been reported that their trial could not open because an application was to be heard first by the Supreme Court, in which the Defence Counsel would ask for the furnishing of further particulars of the case or, alternatively, the quashing of the indictment against the men. A South African correspondent had been granted a special permit to be present at part of the proceedings but he had been prevented from interviewing Africans, and police had followed his every step.

33. In May, an explosion had destroyed the premises of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, where the newspaper *Omukwetu*, one of the few periodicals to oppose *apartheid*, was printed. Total damage amounted to about \$US 700,000. According to press reports, rumours had begun to circulate that the explosion had been caused by whites, but a little later, leaders of the Ovamboland "Government" had appealed to the people to refrain from making irresponsible statements about the explosion.

34. According to a report which had appeared in a religious publication in July, two days before the explosion the Ovamboland Legislative Council had discussed the newspaper *Omukwetu* and had threatened to silence it.

35. Such were the repressive acts which the illegal occupiers of Namibia were daily committing against the people. The South African régime, contrary to the provisions of

General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and other United Nations resolutions, continued to apply its *apartheid* laws in Namibia. One such law was the recent amendment to the so-called "Development of Self-Government for Native Nations in South West Africa Amendment Act" of 1968, which sought to declare Bantustans self-governing territories. In a memorandum accompanying the bill, it was stated that the Government of the Republic of South Africa reaffirmed its often repeated assurance that it was its firm and irrevocable intention to lead individual nations in South West Africa and the Eastern Caprivi Strip to self-government and independence. In point of fact, in speaking of nations, they were referring to individual tribes.

36. It should be noted that, when the racists held discussions with the Secretary-General, they employed a somewhat different terminology. However, in point of fact, judged by its actions, South Africa's real intentions with regard to Namibia were to fragment the country into "Kaffirstans". To that end, it had established the "Advisory Council", which was merely an instrument used to create élite minorities which would help to ensure the continuation of the *status quo*. For example, the so-called multi-racial Advisory Council was no more than a circus of puppets, whom the people had labelled "Black Boers". Similarly, the so-called legislative assemblies were composed of discredited puppets, appointed by the racist régime after they had been rejected by the people during the recent bogus elections.

37. In the same way, the Bantu Investment Corporation served the interests of the régime. In order to consolidate its chicanery, the racist régime needed time and for that reason had agreed to the possibility of a dialogue. When it had become aware of that sinister scheme, SWAPO had called for the immediate termination of the dialogue; it was now repeating that call.

38. For its part, the liberation movement was indefatigably pursuing its struggle against the racists.

39. During the first eight months of 1968 the struggle had intensified and it had been accelerating ever since and had already won innumerable victories; the latter had for the most part been passed over in silence by the racist régime, which generally denied them completely or made use of them to whip up racist reaction among the whites. It was undeniable that there was a growing feeling of insecurity among the latter as a result of the armed struggle. *Die Vaderland*, the mouthpiece of the racist régime in South Africa, had observed in one of its editorials that the death of two South African policemen on the border between Caprivi and Zambia must make every thinking person in that economically prosperous country realize that the Republic of South Africa was involved in a titanic struggle and that the next few years might prove decisive for the future of the country. . . . It went without saying that SWAPO was resolved to do everything possible to increase that insecurity and it was already clear that the presumed invincibility of fascist South Africa was being put to the test.

40. The world press had reported the activities of freedom fighters in recent months. On a number of occasions, the

liberation movements had attacked the enemy remorselessly and, in addition to inflicting heavy casualties, had captured NATO weapons, which SWAPO had displayed during the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Addis Ababa in May 1973.

41. Namibia continued to be the moral and legal responsibility of the United Nations; SWAPO demanded that the Organization honour its responsibility. To that end, the United Nations should strictly implement its own resolutions. The Security Council in its resolution 301 (1971) and the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971² had in the most explicit terms called upon all States Members of the United Nations to abstain from any dealings with South Africa in all cases in which the latter purported to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia and in particular any dealings implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, its presence and administration.

42. Unfortunately, in spite of Security Council resolutions calling for the closing of consulates, France, a permanent member of the Security Council, had just opened a consulate in Namibia. Such an action indicated, if not total irresponsibility, at least a lack of sensibility to the sufferings of the people of Namibia. Furthermore, the Federal Republic of Germany had been admitted to membership of the United Nations when it was known to be violating the Charter by maintaining a consulate in Namibia.

43. Moreover, in its resolution 283 (1970) the Security Council had called upon all States to ensure that companies and other commercial and industrial enterprises owned by, or under direct control of, the State ceased all dealings with respect to commercial or industrial enterprises or concessions in Namibia and ceased all further investment activities in the Territory. It had also called upon States to withhold from their nationals or companies of their nationality all forms of financial support that would be used to facilitate trade or commerce with Namibia and to discourage their nationals or companies of their nationality from investing or obtaining concessions in Namibia. With regard to those provisions, almost all the Western countries stood accused.

44. The conclusion, therefore, was that continuing economic and military aid to South Africa from the United Kingdom, France, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and others enabled the racist régime to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia.

45. In view of the repeated violations of United Nations resolutions by Member States, he wondered whether the routine approval of resolutions was an effective measure. The time had perhaps come for the United Nations to begin to explore ways and means of implementing all its resolutions concerning Namibia. At the Namibia Inter-

² *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, p 16.*

national Conference organized by SWAPO at Brussels in May 1972, as at the Oslo Conference in April 1973 and in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9024), relevant and practical proposals for action had been put forward. He therefore suggested that the Committee should study those proposals and recommendations with a view to implementing them.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, the list of speakers would be closed on Monday, 29 October, at 6 p.m.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

2047th meeting

Monday, 29 October 1973, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Leonardo DIAZ GONZALEZ (Venezuela).

A/C.4/SR.2047

AGENDA ITEM 70

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9023/Add.2, A/9024, A/9061, A/9065, A/9066, A/9225 and Corr.1, A/C.4/761 and Add.1-3)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that, at the 2031st, 2037th and 2043rd meetings respectively, the Committee had decided to grant requests for hearings from the Reverend Michael Scott, representative of the International League for the Rights of Man (A/C.4/761), Miss Barbara Rogers, representative of the Friends of Namibia Committee (A/C.4/761/Add.2) and Mr. Veue N. Mbaeva, representative of the South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF) (A/C.4/761/Add.3). With the Committee's consent, Mr. Mbaeva would be accompanied by Mr. Nburumba Kerina, a member of the same organization.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Reverend Michael Scott, representative of the International League for the Rights of Man, Miss Barbara Rogers, representative of the Friends of Namibia Committee, and Mr. Veue N. Mbaeva and Mr. Nburumba Kerina, representatives of the South West Africa National United Front, took places at the Committee table.

2. The Reverend Michael SCOTT (International League for the Rights of Man) said that he first of all wished to transmit a message to the Committee from the grandson of Chief Mutasa, who was currently in England, there being a detention order against him in Southern Rhodesia. Mr. Mutasa could not enter his own land, because it was occupied by white settlers. That young man had managed a multiracial farm, established before the unilateral declaration of independence, which had become very successful, but in 1970, the Smith régime had detained him and in 1971 it had closed the farm and had confiscated all the proceeds from the sale of the farm property. After two years of imprisonment, the régime had freed Mr. Mutasa on condition that he would leave Southern Rhodesia. All that indicated that the Smith régime feared lest the United Nations and the entire world recognize the rights of the Africans.

3. It should be stressed that past history showed that the United Kingdom could not transfer the rights that had been entrusted to it without the consent of the Africans. In that connexion, it was sufficient to note that, shortly after the independence of Zambia, ownership of the mining rights in that country had still not been decided. Finally, it had been announced that the rights belonged to the Crown and could not be transferred to another Government. That had been a question which the British South Africa Company had not understood until a British Minister had explained that if the Company did not negotiate with the Crown before independence it would have to negotiate at a later date with the President of Zambia. The current British manoeuvres must therefore be interpreted in the light of those events.

4. On the question of Namibia, he made it clear that he was not speaking on behalf of the African people, as he had done on several occasions, because there were now Africans who were able to defend the cause of their people at the United Nations. He was speaking on behalf of the International League for the Rights of Man and asked the Committee to consider carefully all the implications before inviting representatives of the African people to the United Nations.

5. In that connexion, he said that, a few days before, a political leader of the Ovambos had been flogged in public because, according to the South African authorities, he had spoken to press correspondents and had distributed subversive pamphlets. He cited that case because the Committee should be aware that if a representative of the African people, who was subject to the laws of South Africa, was invited to speak at the United Nations, it could result in his imprisonment. Needless to say such incidents constituted the worst affront to human dignity that he had ever seen.

6. He himself was also a banned person in South Africa, and he urged members of the Committee to consider with the utmost care the implications of inviting representatives of the African people, since they could be accused of sedition or treason.

7. Nevertheless, he also believed that, in order for the Committee to obtain first-hand information, the opportunity of appearing before it must be given to any person