

## 2103rd meeting

Monday, 4 November 1974, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2103

### AGENDA ITEM 65

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9623/Add.3, A/9624 (vol. I), A/9624/Add.1, A/9725 and Corr.1, A/9728, A/9775-S/11519, A/9786-S/11526, A/C.4/771)

#### GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. MUESHIHANGE (South West Africa People's Organization) said that the Committee was meeting under circumstances that were promising for the successful liquidation of oppression, exploitation and injustice everywhere, and particularly in southern Africa. The Republic of Guinea-Bissau had already assumed its rightful place in the United Nations and, in that connexion, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) saluted its comrades in the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC). SWAPO also took note of the establishment in Mozambique of a Transitional Government, headed by members of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO), and was certain that its comrades in Angola would soon succeed in shaking off all the vestiges of colonialism in that Territory.

2. The revolutionary victory of the forces of liberation against the former fascist Portuguese Government had once again convincingly demonstrated the effectiveness of the armed liberation struggle, and the fact that victory was inevitable. It had removed the psychological and strategic buffer which had long protected the white, minority, racist, colonialist régimes in southern Africa and presaged the beginning of the end for colonialism and white supremacy in the region.

3. The overwhelming rejection by the General Assembly of the credentials of the so-called representatives of the South African régime (see General Assembly resolution 3206 (XXIX)) had far-reaching implications. To all intents and purposes, the racist clique of Pretoria had been expelled from the United Nations. However, because of certain provisions of the United Nations Charter, reflecting the big-Power hegemony of 1945, the Vorster régime had been granted "a stay of execution" at the 1808th meeting of the Security Council on 30 October as a result of a first triple veto by the hypocritical Western imperialist Powers. The veto had revealed the trio of Western Powers to be the true enemies of a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Diplomatic persuasion and political pressure were thus invalidated by the very champions of non-violence and that left the oppressed masses of southern Africa no alternative but to counter the imperialist veto with revolutionary determination and violence. The Security Council had heard outright lies and distortions of history by the surrogates of Vorster, and SWAPO therefore wished to reiterate its position: the Vorster régime must accept all United Nations resolutions, particularly General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971;<sup>1</sup> it must withdraw from Namibia without delay, release all political prisoners, allow all exiles to return without reprisals and cease the

Bantustanization of Namibia. Acceptance of those conditions might indicate that the régime was seriously contemplating a genuine change and, in that connexion, SWAPO wished to reiterate its position regarding the so-called constitutional talks on the future of the Territory, as set forth in the statement issued at Lusaka on 26 September 1974 (see A/9786-S/11526).

4. As far as SWAPO was concerned, the situation in Namibia had not changed and since the United Nations, the International Court of Justice and SWAPO itself had categorically rejected any partitioning of Namibia, it could not now accept the old imperialist, colonialist and racist trick of divide and conquer. The people of Namibia were daily subjected to institutionalized repression in the form of mass arrests, torture, massacres, deportations, imprisonment, detentions and public floggings. That situation had recently led to the mass exodus of thousands of Namibians to neighbouring countries, particularly to Zambia.

5. SWAPO would continue to wage the struggle without compromise and to unite the people. It had already, through the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, requested the Security Council to convene a meeting on Namibia in order to consider enforcement action against the illegal occupation of the Territory. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) had already urged such a meeting and SWAPO appealed to the Fourth Committee to endorse that request.

6. He wished to introduce to the Committee Mr. John Ya Otto, a member of the National Executive of SWAPO, who would give an account of his political activities and personal experience in Namibia.

7. Mr. OTTO (South West Africa People's Organization), speaking on behalf of SWAPO and the people of Namibia, said that he was gratified by the overwhelming support of the international community for his people's struggle for liberation and national sovereignty. The situation in Namibia was going from bad to worse and it was becoming more and more dangerous for the opponents of the régime of *apartheid* in South Africa to live there. The opponents of that régime were not spared brutalities either by the South African police or the puppets of the régime in the homeland, with the result that men, women and children were being detained, tortured and flogged. The situation was even worse in Ovamboland in the northern part of Namibia, where a state of emergency existed and political meetings by SWAPO had been prohibited by Emergency Proclamation No. R.17 of February 1972. It was in such tense circumstances that the puppet Ovambo chiefs were brutalizing, harassing and persecuting SWAPO members. Moreover, since 1973, the Vorster régime had been carrying out a campaign of terror against SWAPO and its supporters all over Namibia. The fascists were thus trying to destroy the only effective instrument the Namibian people had against oppression, exploitation and injustice. SWAPO leaders and members had been subjected to trumped-up charges of inciting, encouraging and advising their listeners to commit unlawful acts, such as the killing or injuring of certain individuals or groups, and, in the wake of that renewed campaign of terror carried out by Vorster's agents in Namibia,

<sup>1</sup> *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.*

many members of SWAPO had been gaoled in all parts of the country.

8. The system operated in the following way: the South African police arrested a member of SWAPO, but, if a case could not be established against him, the police would then hand him over to the puppet chiefs for the so-called traditional punishment. It was in such circumstances that, between September and November 1973, 66 persons had been flogged, 105 people had been arrested at political rallies held by SWAPO in Ovamboland, 20 members of SWAPO had had to pay fines to the chiefs for their activities in SWAPO, several teachers and nurses had lost their jobs for being members of SWAPO and several members of the SWAPO Youth League had been sentenced to prison under the Sabotage Act of 1962.

9. Only a few months previously, SWAPO had been informed that Ovambo chiefs intended to arrest SWAPO members and sympathizers and force them to go to the Caprivi Strip to serve as a shield for the South African forces against the SWAPO freedom fighters. Those who refused would be placed in concentration camps, which were being set up in the area. The choice was therefore clear and some SWAPO members had decided to leave the country rather than turn against their fellow members of SWAPO. Thus, about 3,000 men, women and children had left Namibia and were experiencing great difficulties as they made their way to safety in neighbouring countries, particularly Zambia. Their most serious problems were housing and transportation. There was also an urgent need to provide them with scholarships for study in Africa, Europe, the United States or anywhere else in the world. Those were human problems which concerned the lives of people and to which an immediate solution must be found.

10. He himself was a teacher by profession and had been among the 37 SWAPO members tried at Pretoria in 1967 and 1968. He had spent many months in solitary confinement and had been tortured by the South African security police on numerous occasions during his political life. He had been arrested on 1 December 1966 while teaching at a primary school in Windhoek and had been moved on the following day to Pretoria, where he had been gaoled in the Pretoria Central Prison. He had been constantly tortured until 7 December, when the South African police had tried to force him to make a statement about anything pertaining to SWAPO and the military training of its members. The statement he had written had not, however, seemed satisfactory to the South African police and the routine of torture had begun again and had been followed by five months of solitary confinement. His trial had started in August 1967 and had ended on 9 February 1968. He had been found guilty under the terms of the Suppression of Communism Act and had been given a five-year suspended sentence. He had been forbidden to live and teach in Windhoek and had therefore gone to live in Ovamboland, where he had continued to suffer at the hands of the South African security police until his departure from Namibia a few months previously. He and other SWAPO leaders and activists had left Namibia because they were going to be either imprisoned or assassinated. In that connexion, he wished to make special mention of three SWAPO leaders who had been imprisoned in South Africa simply because they had gone to meet the Secretary-General.

11. The system of oppression and injustice still continued undisturbed and there were many other men who could not recount their experiences because they were in prison in Namibia and on Robben Island in South Africa as a result of their decision to try to change the order which perpetuated slavery in their country and restore the human rights, dignity and the right to self-determination and independence of the Namibian people. The members of the Committee had to decide where they stood in a conflict in which Africans were

pawns in the hands of the racist white minority in Namibia. SWAPO wanted the United Nations to help it create a free and independent Namibia where every person, regardless of his colour or beliefs, would be equal, and also to assist it in its efforts to bring an end to the torture and suppression of the Namibian people by the racist whites. The recent exodus of SWAPO members from Namibia to other countries was only a temporary retreat to safety. They were determined to return to their motherland in the shortest possible time.

#### HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)\*

12. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its 2101st meeting the Committee had decided to grant a hearing to Miss Barbara Rogers, who would speak on behalf of the Friends of Namibia Committee of London.

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Miss Barbara J. Rogers, representative of the Friends of Namibia Committee, took a place at the Committee table.*

13. Miss ROGERS (Friends of Namibia Committee) said that she had requested the opportunity to petition the Committee in order to point out the efforts which had been made to establish a new, more constructive policy for the present United Kingdom Government and the extent to which the promises made by the Labour Party had been broken since they had come into power in 1974.

14. The illogical position taken by the United Kingdom since 1966 was instructive. In that year, at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly (1448th plenary meeting), the United Kingdom representative had informed the Assembly that his country recognized that, by its actions, South Africa had forfeited the right to administer the Mandate. Following that definitive statement of policy, however, the United Kingdom had reversed itself. It had asserted that in the absence of a definitive ruling on the issue by the International Court of Justice, and despite the fact that South Africa had no right to administer the Territory, there was a lacuna in international law as regards its obligation to withdraw from the Territory. Later, during the discussion of the draft resolution subsequently adopted as General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) (1454th plenary meeting), he had observed that, while the United Kingdom fully accepted the legality of terminating the Mandate, it could not support the draft resolution because of its impracticability in allocating responsibility to the United Nations. In 1970, in yet another reversal of its policy, the United Kingdom had at the 1550th meeting of the Security Council, refused to support Council resolution 284 (1970), which had referred the case to the International Court of Justice.

15. Reading out extracts from British Labour Party declarations, she showed that, while in opposition, the Labour Party had made repeated commitments regarding the policy it would follow on return to power: in its 1973 "Programme for Britain", it had stated that it would accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 and would support all constructive and effective measures at the United Nations to oblige South Africa to comply with its obligations to withdraw from Namibia; in its Manifesto for the first elections in 1974, it had stated that it would oppose all forms of racial discrimination and colonialism, in other words, it would support the liberation movements of southern Africa and a disengagement from the United Kingdom's unhealthy involvement with *apartheid*; in its Manifesto for the second elections in 1974, it had stated that the Labour Government would seek to end the unlawful South African occupation of Namibia. However, while the policy of the Labour Government had been clearly set out, information from well-placed sources seemed to indicate that its "policy review" was not a serious examination of policy in the light of

\* Resumed from the 2101st meeting.

the Labour Government's commitment, but was intended to bury the issues involved.

16. The efforts by a number of British organizations and concerned individuals to obtain a constructive Government policy on Namibia had been considerable. None of the measures proposed had been unrealistic or even particularly noteworthy; they had all been adopted by one or more of the Western countries, particularly the Nordic countries and Australia. Yet the United Kingdom Government had retrogressed by holding joint naval exercises with South Africa and by vetoing the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations. It should therefore be subjected to severe censure by the international community and she wondered whether such an unreliable Government, which seemed to be permanently backward-looking in its defence of colonialism and *apartheid*, was worthy of a permanent seat on the Security Council. She hoped that members of the Committee would focus special attention on the illegal and racist approach of the United Kingdom Government towards the question of Namibia.

17. Recent reports showed that South Africa was preparing to pull out of Namibia and that business sources in Johannesburg were anticipating a withdrawal within 12 months. A number of businesses were in fact withdrawing from Namibia, since they were encountering difficulties in raising capital for investment in that Territory. The various proposals for Namibia by the South African régime were attempts to divert international pressure, an indication of the effectiveness of such pressure. She therefore urged that increased pressure be exerted on South Africa in order to obtain its complete withdrawal as soon as possible.

18. She also wished to stress the crucial importance of the continued involvement of the United Kingdom, France and Japan in the exploitation of uranium deposits at Rössing, in Namibia. That was a project controlled by the South African Industrial Development Corporation, though operated and financed by a United Kingdom company, the Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation Ltd. The entire project depended on massive purchasing contracts, from the United Kingdom Government, concluded in 1970 under the Labour Government. Although the Government Minister concerned had since admitted that that had been a serious mistake and that the present Government was committed to terminating those contracts, there was no sign of its doing so. In the meantime, French and Japanese contracts had been concluded for the purchase of Rössing uranium. The uranium deal seemed to be the real reason why the United Kingdom was refusing to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Experience had shown that South Africa could be forced out of Namibia, as could foreign investors; however, that would require concerted pressure on the United Kingdom and France to cease maintaining South Africa's presence in the Territory.

19. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria) asked whether Miss Rogers could provide further details on foreign companies and Governments operating in Namibia despite the advisory opinion of the Court and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

20. Miss ROGERS (Friends of Namibia Committee) said that while investment in Namibia appeared to be confined to a few large investors, there were several oil and mineral companies prospecting in the Territory, including companies from the United States, Canada, France and the Federal Republic of Germany. More detailed information could be obtained from the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia.

21. The CHAIRMAN thanked Miss Rogers for the information that she had provided to the Committee.

*Miss Rogers withdrew.*

## GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

22. Mr. MAMPUYA (Zaire), after briefly reviewing the history of Namibia, said that South Africa's refusal to grant independence to the Territory was due to its unwillingness to implement United Nations resolutions and to the collaboration of certain Powers with South Africa in the field of trade and armaments. Furthermore, the Territory's rich mineral wealth was important both for strategic purposes and for the development of the industrialized countries.

23. The shameful exploitation of the people of Namibia was an affront to the civilized world and to the principles for which the United Nations stood. South Africa's allies, which had recently been unmasked for their opposition to the expulsion of South Africa from the Organization, bore full responsibility for all the crimes perpetrated against the Namibian people. Zaire vigorously condemned the attitude of South Africa and all those countries which supported it in its defiance of United Nations decisions. To the extent of its means, Zaire would offer its moral and material support to the SWAPO freedom fighters in their struggle to throw off South Africa's racist tutelage. His country would abide by any United Nations decision designed to force South Africa to grant independence to Namibia.

24. Mr. KARHILO (Finland) said that the fact that conditions continued to deteriorate in Namibia was especially deplorable, for the Territory was one for which the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility. It was important to continue to seek effective approaches to bring about a solution. Recent statements by white leaders in South Africa and Namibia indicating that international pressure had not been in vain should be an encouragement to the world community to make further efforts to put an end to the intolerable situation in the Territory.

25. During the period of contacts between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa, South Africa had attempted to strengthen its position in Namibia and had intensified measures of repression. In those circumstances the Security Council's decision, in its resolution 342 (1973), to discontinue the contacts was perfectly understandable. It was to be hoped, however, that all possibilities of reaching a peaceful settlement were still being thoroughly investigated.

26. The Government of Finland had actively supported the cause of Namibian people in various United Nations bodies and was willing to become a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It considered that the General Assembly, by terminating South Africa's Mandate in resolution 2145 (XXI), had irrevocably committed the United Nations to helping the people of Namibia to attain self-determination and independence, and it had therefore striven actively to fulfil that objective. As a member of the Security Council in 1970, Finland had suggested some practical ways of inducing South Africa to withdraw from Namibia,<sup>2</sup> which had led to the adoption of resolution 284 (1970), requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, and resolution 283 (1970), calling for the establishment of a United Nations fund for Namibia. There could be little doubt that international public opinion had been significantly influenced by the advisory opinion subsequently handed down by the Court, which was a landmark in the evolution of international law. The Government of Finland regarded the United Nations Fund for Namibia as a vehicle for fulfilling the Organization's obligations towards the people of Namibia and had criticized in the past operations which did not meet the purpose for which the Fund had been set up, namely, to finance a thorough socio-economic investigation of the human and

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth Year*, 1527th meeting, para. 27; 1528th meeting, para. 4; and 1550th meeting, para. 33.

natural resources of Namibia. It was therefore encouraging to learn from the Secretary-General's report on the operation of the Fund (A/9725 and Corr.1) of certain positive developments and, in particular, of the decision of the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish an Institute for Namibia to enable Namibians to undertake research, training, planning and related activities, with special reference to the establishment of an independent State of Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 73). The fact that the Institute was to be the main project financed by the Fund was completely consonant with the ideas of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 2679 (XXV), under which the Fund had been established, and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia was to be commended for his remarkable contribution to the preparation of the plan for the Institute. The Government of Finland intended to increase further its support of the Fund.

27. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9624 (vol. I) and A/9624/Add.1) reflected the considerable progress made by the Council in its efforts to bring about the independence of Namibia. The Council's Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 84) appeared to be particularly important, in view of the alarming reports of foreign investments in the Territory and the exploitation of its natural resources by the Republic of South Africa.

28. The United Nations could consider itself fortunate in having, as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Seán MacBride, whose accomplishments in the struggle for human rights had been deservedly recognized through the award to him of the Nobel Peace Prize. His delegation had no hesitation in endorsing the request that Mr. MacBride should be reappointed to the post of Commissioner.

29. Action by the Members, organs and officials of the United Nations, important though it was, could not alone free Namibia. The key factor in the struggle was the Namibian people's desire for self-determination and independence, a desire which had been clearly manifested in the wide support they had given to SWAPO. In recognition of the firm determination of the Namibian people, Finland had contributed to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and extended humanitarian assistance directly to SWAPO. It shared the opinion of the United Nations Council for Namibia that, despite the deterioration of conditions in Namibia, the South African position had been substantially weakened as a result of the efforts of the Namibian people.

30. Mr. HARKETT (Morocco) expressed his delegation's admiration of the representatives of SWAPO and its full solidarity with the Namibian people in their struggle; he also thanked those who had testified on the evils of the Pretoria régime's inhuman policy, and the members of the Special Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia for their valuable contribution to the liberation struggle.

31. He briefly reviewed the background of the question of Namibia and South Africa's constant refusal to co-operate with the United Nations on that question. The fact that the Secretary-General had had to abandon his attempts to open the door to dialogue by visiting Namibia had been due to the patent bad faith evinced by the Pretoria régime, which had utilized the contacts for internal political ends—namely, to break down its isolation and to expound its own conception of self-determination, the aim of which continued to be the domination of the people of Namibia and the perpetuation of the illegal occupation. Yet the Secretary-General's visit had made it possible to remove certain doubts; it had shown that South Africa's policy of domination over the Namibian people remained unchanged and that the latter firmly desired self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

32. The arrogant attitude of the South African régime had once again been manifested in the South African

representative's statement at the 1800th meeting of the Security Council, when he had affirmed that his Government supported the proposal of the National Party of South West Africa—representing the white population—for multiracial constitutional talks among the peoples of Namibia. As SWAPO had stressed in a letter addressed to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9786-S/11526, annex), that had been a deliberate political manoeuvre designed to deceive world public opinion. In addition, in his statement to the Security Council, the representative of the racist régime had stated that the administration of the Territory had been designed to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number of inhabitants of the Territory, but that they were of very different cultures and levels; and that it was for the inhabitants of the Territory themselves, and not for South Africa or the United Nations, to decide the Territory's political future, in the light of the fact that all options were open to them. The South African representative's hypocritical statement had confirmed his Government's obstinate desire to pursue its "Bantustan" policy of fragmentation.

33. In the meantime, as the Secretary-General had pointed out in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/9601/Add.1), the situation in Namibia continued to deteriorate. The tragic situation was described in chapter IX of the Special Committee's report (A/9623/Add.3), which referred to the increasing level of police terror and intimidation to which the Namibian people were subjected, both by the illegal South African régime and the authorities of the so-called "homelands". Both that report and the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia denounced the repressive measures to which the people of Namibia were subjected. In the face of that repression and of South Africa's illegal occupation of an international Territory, the United Nations should seek ways to bring the situation to an end, especially since the Organization had undertaken responsibility for the defence of the Namibian people and for the future of the Territory. As requested by OAU in the resolution on Namibia adopted at the twenty-third session of its Council of Ministers, held at Mogadiscio in June 1974, the Security Council should examine as soon as possible the serious situation prevailing in Namibia: since South Africa's illegal occupation constituted a threat to the peace and open aggression, the Security Council could take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to put an end to that situation.

34. The collaboration of certain Powers with South Africa in various fields, as well as foreign investments in Namibia, were detrimental to the Namibian people and constituted an encouragement to the racist régime to defy the United Nations. International investments had strengthened the programme of the National Party of South West Africa, which was aimed at maintaining white domination.

35. His delegation appealed to those Powers to terminate their collaboration with the Pretoria régime and to dissuade the companies under their jurisdiction from investing in Namibia and from depleting the Territory's natural resources.

36. His delegation hoped that all Member States would furnish aid of all kinds to the freedom fighters in their legitimate struggle. He thanked the United Nations Council for Namibia and all the Governments, as well as governmental and non-governmental organizations, that were assisting the Namibian people in their struggle. In the face of the increasingly harsh repressive measures adopted by the Pretoria régime, which sought to fragment the Territory and perpetuate its illegal occupation, the national liberation movement, under the leadership of SWAPO, had been forced to take up arms. His delegation paid a tribute to SWAPO, the legitimate and authentic representative of the heroic Namibian people, for its sacrifices, determination, courage and military successes.

37. With the effective support of OAU and all countries that stood for peace and justice, the Namibian people were determined to continue their struggle. He was convinced that the United Nations would continue to assist them, and would find the appropriate means of recovering the international territory.

38. Mr. WU Miao-fa (China) said that, eight years after the General Assembly had placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, the racist régime of South Africa, with the support of certain Western Powers, was clinging to its colonialist position in that country, in persistent defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. That not only showed contempt for the Organization but was also a serious challenge to the African people and the people of the whole world. In the past year, the racist régime had increased its repression of the Namibian people and had stepped up its collusion with Southern Rhodesia and other colonialist régimes in an attempt to stamp out the national liberation struggle. The South African régime was a reactionary bulwark in southern Africa and, as stated in the resolution on Namibia adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its twenty-third session, in June 1974, constituted a threat to the peace and security of the African continent and the whole world.

39. However, the heavier the oppression, the stronger the resistance. The Namibian guerrillas, who eight years earlier had started their armed struggle with spears, arrows and rifles, were steadily growing in strength and winning continuous victories. In May 1973, the persistent struggle of the 300,000 Ovamboland people had led to the bankruptcy of the Bantustan forces put up by the South African authorities, which showed that no reactionary force could bend the will of the Namibian people for independence.

40. The South African racist régime dared to be so truculent because it had obtained the energetic support of imperialism and colonialism, which were helping it to strangle the national liberation movements in order to protect their enormous economic and political interests in southern Africa. The visit of the South African Chief of Staff to Washington for secret military talks, the supply by the United Kingdom Government of Buccaneer aircraft to South Africa, the continuous supply of large quantities of arms by another Western Power and the holding of joint military exercises violated the relevant United Nations resolutions and undermined the African people's struggle for self-determination and independence.

41. Despite the unrelenting efforts of many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to ensure the implementation of the United Nations resolutions, imperialism and colonialism were playing all kinds of tricks to perpetuate and legalize South Africa's colonial rule in Namibia. At a time when the national liberation struggle in southern Africa was developing vigorously, the reactionary South African authorities' recent proposals for so-called negotiations were as SWAPO had said, a deliberate political manoeuvre aimed at misleading world public opinion. Since the United Nations was the Administering Authority for Namibia, South Africa's presence in that country was illegal and it had no right to enter into any discussion on its future with anyone. Even some Western newspapers had admitted that the South African authorities were planning to carve up Namibia. They intended to allocate a small piece of sterile land in the north to a so-called independent Ovamboland and place the rest of the fertile land and rich mineral resources under a white régime. Should the indigenous people disagree, the white racists would demand union with South Africa. The head of the so-called National Party of South West Africa, who was also the South African Minister for Community Development and Public Works had admitted that there was no question of separating South West Africa entirely from South Africa.

42. The vetoing by the United States and two other permanent members of the Security Council of the Council's draft resolution on the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations<sup>3</sup> had been predictable and had brought home to people the fact that unrelenting struggles must be waged against racism, colonialism and their clandestine supporters before complete national liberation could be obtained.

43. The Chinese Government and people had always firmly supported the just struggle of the Namibian people. His Government maintained that the South African authorities must immediately end their illegal occupation of Namibia, that its national unity and territorial integrity must be guaranteed and that the South African authorities must immediately release all political prisoners. The situation in Africa at that time was most encouraging. If the Namibian people strengthened their unity and persevered in all forms of struggle, including armed warfare, they would drive the reactionary South African régime out of their territory and attain national independence with the support of all the justice-loving peoples of the world.

44. Mr. HUSAIN (Bangladesh) said that for decades the world had witnessed and condemned the policies practised by South Africa on its own territory as well as in Namibia. South Africa not only violated United Nations resolutions on Namibia, but had also used every means to maintain its stranglehold on that Territory. It had extended to Namibia, in some cases with retroactive effect, the operation of its own vicious and repressive laws; the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia had provided information concerning the acts of terror to which the Namibian people were being subjected. The South African régime had continued to establish so-called Bantustans, mostly in the arid northern zone of Namibia; some of them were fraudulently styled "self-governing areas" in an attempt to mislead the world. A further disturbing aspect of the Namibian situation was the increasing expropriation of Namibia's non-renewable sources by South African and other foreign economic interests. His delegation greatly deplored those activities which would leave the Territory denuded and its population impoverished. He therefore welcomed the decision taken by the United Nations Council for Namibia to issue its Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 84), designed to secure the country's mineral wealth and resources in trust for the Namibian peoples. It hoped that South Africa and its foreign allies would weigh the implications of the Decree and refrain from activities designed to serve their immediate selfish ends. It was most important that States Members of the United Nations should declare that they would boycott business and financial interests that had violated the decree and had continued to make unethical profits after South Africa's Mandate for Namibia had been terminated.

45. His delegation condemned South Africa's flagrant defiance of United Nations resolutions demanding its withdrawal from Namibia. It joined with other nations in expressing its deep sense of indignation at the ruthless laws used to suppress the people of Namibia. Those selfish and short-sighted policies were doomed to failure and would only strengthen the determination of the Namibian people to end the illegal occupation of their land. In conformity with the principles laid down in his country's Constitution concerning the right of all peoples to freedom and human dignity, his delegation declared its solidarity with all nations which had pledged both moral and material support to the cause of the Namibian people.

46. His delegation wished to record its appreciation of the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to translate

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1974, document S/11543.*



its multifaceted programme into reality. It wished, in particular, to commend the Government and people of Zambia for their unwavering support for the people of Namibia and to pay tribute to the efforts made by the international community to resolve speedily the Namibian problem.

47. His delegation was convinced that the United Nations must take resolute action to expose the economic interests and hypocritical policies from which South Africa drew its inspiration and power. After the change in Portuguese policies and the progress towards independence achieved in its former colonies, the victory of the Namibian people in their struggle for independence seemed assured. His delegation pledged its whole-hearted co-operation in all measures that the United Nations and its agencies might take to bring freedom to the oppressed people of Namibia.

48. Mr. LESSING (German Democratic Republic) said that since its foundation the United Nations had been called upon to deal with the problem of Namibia, and considerable effort had been devoted to determining its legal status, reaffirming the illegality of its occupation by the South African *apartheid* régime, and adopting a number of very important resolutions and decisions.

49. His delegation believed that the most important decisions taken within the United Nations had been the General Assembly's confirmation of the illegality of South Africa's occupation of Namibia in its resolution 2145 (XXI), its condemnation of South Africa in its resolution 2325 (XXII), the recognition of SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people in its resolution 3111 (XXVIII), and the application of sanctions by the Security Council in its resolution 301 (1971).

50. His delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII), and had always complied with the decisions, demands and requests of the Security Council and other United Nations organs. His country had no diplomatic, consular or trade relations with South Africa or Namibia, since such relations would be utterly inconsistent with the foreign policy of the German Democratic Republic, which, like that of its socialist friends and allies, was aimed at strengthening peace, encouraging détente on an international scale and fighting imperialism, colonialism and racism in all their forms and manifestations. His country had welcomed the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, adopted at the sixth special session in General Assembly resolution 3202 (S-VI) and the reaffirmation of the principle that the natural resources of each country belonged to its people. It also welcomed the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. The German Democratic Republic had ratified the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* (General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex) on 22 May 1974. Other action taken by his country with regard to Namibia had been described in the report of the Secretary-General on the subject (A/9728).

51. His delegation had given moral, political and material support to SWAPO for many years, and would continue to do so. It appreciated the untiring efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and other United Nations organizations concerned to expose the illegal and criminal activities of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa and in Namibia. The reports of those bodies had clearly shown, first, that the South African régime was increasing its oppression of the people of Namibia and intensifying its criminal policy with a view to retaining the whole of Namibia or at least those areas in which its known natural resources were located and, secondly, that a number of Western Powers supported, either directly or indirectly, the illegal occupation of Namibia.

52. The debates in the General Assembly and, in particular, the recent debate and votes in the Security Council had clearly demonstrated that the *apartheid* régime continued to believe that it could vindicate its crimes by its old arguments and find new friends to support it. Only the three Western Powers which were permanent members of the Security Council had saved South Africa from expulsion from the United Nations. The white settlers in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, together with some Western Powers, were profitably engaged in exploiting the people and natural resources of those countries and were likely to cling to their privileges and profits as long as possible.

53. The German Democratic Republic supported the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, including the armed struggle led by SWAPO. His delegation believed that further action should be taken to enforce the decisions of the United Nations and of its Council for Namibia, and particularly the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia. The Security Council should be requested to consider further measures with a view to terminating the *apartheid* régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia, and his delegation was prepared to support any measures, including sanctions against South Africa, which would help to put an end to the overt or covert evasion of such sanctions.

54. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq) reiterated his country's firm support of the struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence. His delegation had been a sponsor of the Security Council's draft resolution calling for South Africa's expulsion from the United Nations, which had not been adopted because of the veto of the three Western permanent members of the Council. It abhorred and condemned the policies of *apartheid* of the racial Government of South Africa which, like Zionism, were crimes against humanity. The collaboration between the racist régime in Pretoria and the Zionists in Palestine during the October War of 1973 was a well-known fact.

55. His delegation had stated in the Committee during the discussion on Southern Rhodesia (2095th meeting) that sanctions should also be applied to the régime of South Africa, whose policies and behaviour was no different from that of the illegal régime of Ian Smith. The only difference was that they had illegally usurped power, while many African and Asian States were still under colonial rule.

56. The illegal and immoral occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the authorities of Pretoria in defiance of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and of United Nations decisions called for immediate action.

57. A statement by the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs that all options were open for Namibia, including independence, would deceive no one. The allegation that the peoples under colonial domination were not ready to exercise their rights to self-determination and independence did not even convince its defenders. Those who fought for independence were well prepared to govern themselves. The Security Council, although hindered by the veto power of South Africa's protectors, should re-evaluate the situation and take the necessary action to put an end to the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia which threatened peace and security in Africa and the whole world. The people and Government of Iraq had full confidence that the people of Namibia would triumph over the invaders.

58. Mr. CAMARA (Senegal) said that the Committee's discussion on the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia had taken place when the *apartheid* régime of South Africa had been in the dock in the Security Council. The policy of *apartheid* and the problem of Namibia had been discussed in detail during the Council's debate on the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, which had ended at the 1808th meeting of the Council in a very significant vote. The

situation was simple and would never have existed had it not been for South Africa's contempt for the Organization, international ethics and fundamental human rights. Even though the Mandate for South West Africa had been entrusted to South Africa by the League of Nations, South Africa had refused to hand it back when requested by the League's successor, the United Nations, despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971. That request had been made in order to prepare the Territory for independence and because the Pretoria régime had wrongly exercised its administering powers. Since 1966, when the United Nations had terminated South Africa's Mandate for the country, South Africa had introduced the system of *apartheid* in Namibia, treating that international Territory as one of its own provinces. It had instituted a policy of Bantustanization intended to divide the different tribes. It had used repressive measures worthy of fascism against the growing national liberation movement. To maintain and strengthen the sphere of influence of the racist and colonialist régimes in southern Africa, South Africa had defied the United Nations and helped the Salisbury régime to evade sanctions.

59. Faced with that situation, the General Assembly had affirmed the international nature of the Territory, had established a United Nations Council for Namibia responsible for administering it until its independence and had set up a United Nations Fund for Namibia. Subsequently the Council had established the Institute for Namibia to provide Namibians with education and training to enable them to govern themselves. The last General Assembly resolution on Namibia (resolution 3111 (XXVIII)) summed up the fundamental position of the international community with regard to the problem. The OAU had also regularly adopted resolutions on that subject. Yet South Africa continued to defy world public opinion. Its representative's statement at the 1800th meeting of the Security Council had set out South African policies even more clearly than usual. He had expressed surprise that South Africa was being asked to make all the concessions, as if it had rights over Namibia. He had referred to South Africa's proposal in 1951 for a new agreement with the principal allied and associated Powers to replace the Mandate<sup>4</sup> and had outlined his country's plans for the future of that Territory explaining that it was not for South Africa or the United Nations but for its own inhabitants to decide the political future of Namibia. The options that he had said were open to them no doubt included an incorporation of the Territory of the Namibian people into South Africa.

60. There was therefore a pressing need for the international community to assume its responsibility for that international Territory without heeding a few Powers whose only desire was to protect their interest in the exploitation of its riches. The honour of the United Nations was at stake. If it allowed the struggle waged by SWAPO to continue, the international community would be responsible for the resulting death and destruction. SWAPO, supported by the African and other peace-loving countries, had no choice other than armed action, which created an increasingly explosive situation for the illegal occupants of the Territory. The tension prevailing in Namibia had been graphically described by a German who had lived for three years in its capital in two articles entitled "Veillée d'armes au Sud-Ouest africain", which had appeared in the Paris newspaper *Le Monde* on 11 and 12 October 1974. If a blood-bath was to be avoided, the Vorster régime must be convinced that it should hand over responsibility for that Territory to the United Nations, which would open the way for the self-determination and independence of the Namibian people.

61. Mr. FEDORIV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), welcoming the representatives of the national liberation

movements, including SWAPO, wished them success in their long but just struggle for the noble cause of national independence and social justice. The rulers of Pretoria had been unmasked as invaders and occupiers of Namibia. It was significant that many Member States maintained no relations of any kind with the Vorster régime. The occupation could not continue for ever, as shown by the growing national liberation struggle, the mounting political activity of the Namibian people and the increasing solidarity of the peoples of the world with Africa's struggle.

62. While the leaders of the liberation movement in Namibia were being persecuted, Vorster's so-called "Government" was hatching plans for the future dismemberment of Namibia. Indeed, the situation in Namibia was worsening, as the police and armed forces of the occupiers increased their strength and further draconian laws were passed which violated human rights and dignity. The prisons were full of freedom fighters, many of whom were being tortured by the South African police. Yet, despite strict censorship of the press, the news filtered out. As United Nations documents indicated, such a degrading punishment as beating with sticks was a frequent and legally-recognized practice. The rulers sought to show that such punishment was traditional, though that assertion had been denied by the representative of SWAPO at the 968th meeting of the Special Committee on 2 April 1974; it was in any case, a well-known fact that that punishment had been devised by the so-called "civilized" colonizers.

63. The people of Namibia went in daily fear of been arrested merely because they wished to be free. The oppression of the people of Namibia was carried out directly or indirectly with the aid of certain States which, in violation of United Nations resolutions, maintained political, economic and financial links with the illegal Vorster régime and supplied it with arms. Chapter IX of the Special Committee's report (A/9623/Add.3) pointed to the increasing flow of foreign capital to the Territory, particularly in the mining and oil exploration sectors, which had made Namibia the most exploited territory in history. The despotic régime was strengthened by the participation of several NATO members in the economic exploitation of Namibia, in violation of Security Council resolution 283 (1970).

64. In order to deceive world public opinion, the South African régime was attempting in its own way to settle the question of self-determination by the establishment of "homelands" and the so-called "Advisory Council". His delegation had stated at the previous session (2052nd meeting) that the dismemberment of Namibia in the cause of "self-determination" violated the integrity of Namibia and constituted a crime against its people. The colonialists were seeking to justify their illegal acts by denying the existence of one single Namibian people and by fostering tribal strife; yet, whatever the colonialists affirmed, the people and land of Namibia were a reality. The people of Namibia had no wish to reconcile themselves to the racist occupation, to the puppet "Advisory Council" and the notorious "homelands", and were resorting increasingly to armed force in the struggle for territorial integrity, freedom and independence. The political struggle was becoming more active. The establishment of the National Convention, which embraced all the political parties and organizations of Namibia, confirmed the political solidarity of the national liberation forces. The days of the occupiers were numbered.

65. His delegation supported the immediate implementation of United Nations resolutions and of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, concerning the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia.

66. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica) said that the story of Namibia and the failure of the international community to find effective means of wresting the Territory from its subjugators was a sad

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 38, document A/1901, para. 14.

and disgraceful one. However, a new wind of change was blowing through Africa. The people of Guinea-Bissau had been admitted to membership in the United Nations. The Portuguese colonial system had collapsed, and the Territories of the former Portuguese empire were moving towards complete freedom. Pressure on Rhodesia and South Africa was being intensified. The debate in the Security Council on South Africa's relationship with the United Nations in the past few weeks had brought out the abhorrence felt by all countries for that country's social system, even by those which had seen fit to veto the draft resolution calling for South Africa's expulsion. As the new wind of change blew ever more strongly, censure of South Africa was being expressed in even more forthright terms. Even the three countries which had vetoed the draft resolution to expel South Africa had made strong statements, condemning *apartheid* and censuring the Pretoria régime for its tardiness in assessing the Namibian problem.

67. Over the years, the two most promising developments with regard to Namibia had been the emergence and growing militancy of the liberation movements, and the establishment, on the initiative of African, Asian and Latin American States, of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

68. His delegation applauded the valiant struggle being waged by the freedom fighters in Namibia and regarded the enactment of South African legislation making the activities of liberation movements illegal as a travesty of justice.

69. The Government and people of Jamaica were grateful to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President for their indefatigable work on behalf of the Territory and its peoples. His delegation took particular pride in the fact that the present President was the representative of Guyana, a country with which Jamaica was closely associated. His delegation also welcomed the close working relationship established between the representatives of SWAPO and the Council. SWAPO must be given every opportunity for extending its activities against South Africa, and his delegation therefore endorsed the request to the Secretary-General to extend financial assistance to the representative of SWAPO so that he could carry out his duties in New York on a continuing basis (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 85). Another welcome development was the admission of the United Nations Council for Namibia to associate membership in the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the representation of Namibia at a number of international conferences.

70. The establishment of an Institute for Namibia was a significant step towards the provision of training facilities that would enable Namibians to lay the foundations of their new nation. It was to be hoped that links would be established between the Institute and related bodies both in Member countries and in the United Nations system.

71. The steps taken by the Council towards making Member Governments of the United Nations more aware of the Namibian questions had clearly led to a fuller support of the Council's programme of work.

72. It was to be hoped that all Member States would step up the pressure on South Africa. His delegation urged those Members which held that expulsion of South Africa was not the best way of dealing with that country's defiance of international opinion to demonstrate their good faith by refraining from acts that were harmful to the interests of Namibia and by finding positive ways of carrying out the expressed wishes of the United Nations.

73. His delegation endorsed the strong measure taken by the Council in the face of the continued exploitation of mineral and marine resources in Namibia. It attached special importance to paragraph 6 of the Decree on the Natural Resources

of Namibia (*ibid.*, para. 84) and urged all individual States or corporations which were contravening, or intended to contravene, the provisions of the Decree to reconsider their policies. It trusted that the details of the involvement of certain countries in that illegal exploitation would be widely circulated and would deter further exploitation.

74. His delegation agreed with the United Nations Council for Namibia that the moment was propitious for decisive action by Member States to terminate the stranglehold of the illegal South African régime and accordingly called for maximum assistance to the people of Namibia in the building of their nation. It supported all the recommendations of the Council set out in paragraph 267 of document A/9624 (vol. I) and in paragraph 85 of document A/9624/Add.1.

75. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and expressed his delegation's full support for the Council's recommendations.

76. Mr. MONTROYA (Peru) said that his country, as a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, had had the opportunity to observe at close range the inhuman effects of the application of that policy not only to the non-white population of South Africa but also to the African people of Namibia. It strongly condemned the South African Government, which was flouting the United Nations resolutions and creating a source of tension which threatened international peace and security by maintaining the colonial situation and carrying out its *apartheid* policy.

77. During the recent discussion in the Security Council on the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, the representative of Peru, at the 1799th meeting of the Council, had analysed the whole situation and had pointed out that since 1953, when the General Assembly, in its resolution 749 (VIII), had clearly requested the South African Government to transfer the administration of the territory to the United Nations, the South African Government had made no attempt to comply with that request. Peru had voted in favour of the Security Council draft resolution calling for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations under Article 6 of the Charter for obvious reasons of principle and to show its identification with the just fight of the African peoples. His delegation had consistently condemned South Africa's refusal to withdraw from Namibia despite the termination of its Mandate by the General Assembly and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971; its presence in Namibia in fact constituted a case of occupation of a territory by force.

78. The testimony of petitioners, studies by non-governmental organizations and the reports of the Special Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia had shown that the South African Government was encouraged in its inhuman policies by foreign economic interests.

79. Peru offered its co-operation with the third world and the non-aligned countries to eradicate all forms of colonial domination and discrimination because, as a member of the Security Council and the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, it strongly supported the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

#### *Requests for hearings*

80. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that he had received a communication from the Secretary-General of the World Peace Council. In the absence of any objection, he took it that the Committee wished it to be circulated as an official document.

*It was so decided.*<sup>5</sup>

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

<sup>5</sup> The communication was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/771/Add.4.