

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTIETH YEAR

1825th

MEETING: 3 JUNE 1975

UN LIBRARY

NOV 18 1983

NEW YORK

UN/DA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1825)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol **S/ . . .**) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions **of the** Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. **The** new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1825th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 3 June 1975, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Abdul Karim AL-SHAIKHLI (Iraq).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1825)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance **with** decisions taken by the Security Council at its 1823rd and 1824th meetings, I now invite the representatives of Burundi, Dahomey, Ghana, India, Liberia, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order that they may participate in the current discussion without the right to vote; When any of them wishes to address the Council, he will of course be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mikanagu (Burundi); Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey). Mr. Boaten (Ghana). Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Dennis (Liberia), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Daciu (Romania), Mr. Djigo (Senegal), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mwaanga (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance **with a** further decision taken at the 1823rd meeting, I now invite the President and the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President. Mr. Banda (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the members of the delegation took places at the Security Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to **inform** the members of the Council that I have received, in addition, a letter from the representative of the United Arab Emirates requesting to be invited to participate in the discussion in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure. Pursuant to the usual practice I propose, if I hear no objection, to invite the said representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote. **Owing** to the limited number of places at the Council table, I regret that I must invite the representative of the United Arab Emirates to take a place at the side of the Council chamber. I shall invite him to take a place at the Council table whenever **he** wishes to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates) took a place at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Dahomey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. **ADJIBADÉ** (Dahomey) (*interpretation from French*): It is a real pleasure for Dahomey to see Iraq presiding over the Security Council in June 1975, when the Council is once again considering the problem of **Namibia**. My -delegation- has -every reason to be pleased and to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Your talents as a diplomat and your **deep** -belief in justice and **fairness**, together with the progressive choices that your country has made, are for Africa in particular and the Third World in general a guarantee that the case now before the Security Council will be dealt with in such a way as to protect our common interests, which, in the present circumstances, lie -first and foremost in fully satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people as a whole, that is one and indivisible. We are convinced that you will do **your** utmost to ensure that the Security Council's work on this matter will conclude with the appropriate, effective and vigorous decision required by the situation.

6. The delegation of Dahomey wishes to thank you warmly, Mr. President, and all the members of the Security Council for allowing us to participate in the Council's work on the important question of Namibia and to present the views of the revolutionary military Government of Dahomey.

7. For almost **20** years now the United Nations has been considering the question of Namibia and its related issue, the illegal presence on Namibian territory of the fascist, reactionary and despicable *apartheid* regime set up by a handful of whites installed in Pretoria. Since 1966, when the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to entrust the administration of that Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the General Assembly and the Security Council have done everything and tried everything to make that gang of crazed individuals usurping power in Pretoria listen to reason.

8. With regard to this dispute and it would never have been a dispute without the obvious bad faith of the wild men in Pretoria—the General Assembly, in order to give a legal basis to the actions that the Organization might have to take in the future vis à vis the forces of evil in South Africa, felt it necessary to place the matter before the International Court of Justice, whose Advisory Opinion handed down on 21 June 1971 had only one meaning: that South Africa had an obligation to free the Territory of Namibia without delay and to transfer its responsibilities in the matter to the United Nations Council established to manage, provisionally, the interests of the people of Namibia.

9. In the search for possible solutions to the conflict arising from the persistent and continuing illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, we must recall the task that the Security Council entrusted to the Secretary-General to engage in a dialogue with the authorities of the racist Pretoria regime, with a view to ensuring that Namibia was returned to the United Nations.

10. A final effort was recently made by the Security Council. It is reflected in its resolution 366 (1974), according to which, and for those who refused to believe in the imminence of action against the Pretoria clique, was to serve as a last chance for South Africa to agree to the solution of the problem of Namibia desired by the United Nations. It is clear that if the backward-looking authorities of South African racism had really wished to show their good faith, more than one opportunity was given to them to do so. Unfortunately, all these efforts to achieve a solution were confronted and are still confronted by the categorical refusal of South Africa to respect the relevant decisions of the United Nations, and these decisions are without number. Instead of trying to understand the concerns of the international community and to make

up for its past poor performance, South Africa persists in maintaining its illegal presence in Namibia, and has blindly proceeded to hurl another challenge at the Organization, reflected in the letter of 27 May to the Secretary-General and Vorster's statement of 20 May [see S/11701].

11. It might perhaps be useful once again to stress the fact that various possible solutions have failed primarily because, on the strength of its alliances and the unconditional support it enjoys from certain influential Members of the United Nations, South Africa is guaranteed impunity and views our decisions with cavalier disdain.

12. Another reason we have failed in our attempts to bring about a solution to the problem of Namibia is that various United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, have been victims of diversionary tactics inasmuch as they have allowed themselves to be placated, in particular by some of those who occupy a privileged place in the Council.

13. Dahomey believes that the reply of Vorster's clique to resolution 366 (1974) is irresponsible and unacceptable. It is a manifestation of the impunity which has been guaranteed South Africa. The representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), our brother Sam Nujoma, has described at considerable length the masquerade put on by the South African authorities in Namibia which has been made possible thanks to blind repression, cruel intimidation and the stifling of the legitimate aspirations of the nationalists in Namibia. There is no need to revert to this; the record on the subject is well known to the Council, partly because it has been before the Council for so long and partly because it is so voluminous. Dahomey will only say that by its reply South Africa has once again confirmed to the international community that it has absolutely no intention whatsoever of changing its policies of inhuman cruelty, which have been condemned as reprehensible by the world at large. South Africa's reply to resolution 366 (1974) bares the real intentions and the folly of Vorster's clique. It is to be hoped that those who protect those evil forces will draw from that reply the appropriate moral lesson: namely, that one cannot defend Vorster and his clique without participating in this vast conspiracy against mankind and deliberately becoming part of the persistent threat to international peace and security for which the supporters of *apartheid* in their irresponsibility must be held accountable.

14. Ever since the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice was handed down, for Africans at least, the problem of the presence of South Africa in Namibia should no longer really exist nor is it truly negotiable. South Africa must immediately put an end to its occupation and return that Territory to the United Nations.

15. The question, then, is not whether South Africa should leave Namibia. The problem 'before the Council is, rather, what ways and means can be used to compel South Africa to give up an entity that does not belong to it, an entity the international community has decided to manage until the interests of that Territory are handed over to the Namibian people themselves. The Council's decision should be as clear as possible. It should avoid any ambiguity. Vorster's clique must understand that the time of tacit complicity with its inhuman policies of racial discrimination, arbitrary laws, repression and exportation of *apartheid* is long past. The Council's decision must be a strong one; it must be intended to make South Africa understand once and for all that Namibia is not, nor can it be, the Republic of South Africa. It is a single entity which cannot be divided in any way to satisfy the overt or covert selfish interests of a white minority. In a word, the Council's decision should be intended to give the United Nations Council for Namibia what it needs to establish itself in Namibia and effectively play the administering role that has been entrusted to it until powers are transferred to the indigenous population of Namibia.

16. Since all possible recourses for reasonable settlement have been exhausted, as we said last year and will repeat today, since Vorster's gang has eyes but will not see, has ears but will not hear, the only choice remaining for the Council is to throttle the supporters of *apartheid* and compel them to stop taunting the Organization through appropriate enforcement action. In order to achieve that objective, the Council should first and foremost impose a rigorous embargo on South Africa both at the economic level and with regard to arms. The Council must also apply rigorous sanctions to South Africa until it gives the various resolutions on Namibia the kind of consideration the international community expects it to give them.

17. The time for talk is long past. This is not the time for wonderful declarations of intent. This is the time for **action, concrete** action, action that will bring about progress on the question of Namibia in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Organization. The basic framework for such action already exists; it is not necessary to create a new framework for contact with South Africa. To claim the opposite would amount to a singular display of amnesia and a refusal to draw any benefit from past experience and would indicate a desire to divert the Council from what should properly be its preoccupations in this problem of Namibia.

18. The delegation of Dahomey will not be deluded. It is well aware of the fact that the various proposals that have been put forward will remain dead letters if they are not endorsed by certain members of the Security Council whose interests are likely to be affected.

19. In making our proposals, we have not lost sight of the fact that the Republic of South Africa is a

very important economic Power. Neither have we lost sight of the fact that in the present monetary crisis the Republic of South Africa supplies certain members of the Council with that very much sought after precious metal, gold. Nor have we forgotten that owing to a lack of petro-dollars, some do not hesitate to defend the largest supplier of gold. That is why we would appeal to those who, in order to safeguard their own interests, have a stake in protecting the mentally deranged members of Vorster's gang; we would ask whether once again they will dare deal a death blow to the prestige and credibility of the Organization, and in particular to the prestige of its principal organ, the Security Council. If they intend to do precisely that, then let them remember that world public opinion has its eyes on New York and is anxious to know the outcome of the Council's deliberations; let them not forget also that the use of their veto rights cannot be considered the expression of the opinion of the international community, but rather an expression of the policies for which they stand.

20. It would be a matter of considerable regret and very damaging to the Organization if the unbridled defence by certain Powers of their selfish interests were to deny the Security Council a unique opportunity to take certain concrete political action in respect of Namibia.

21. There can be no doubt but that in order to justify their position, those who protect the gang in Pretoria will not fail to **find** certain positive notes in Vorster's reply to resolution 366 (1974) and will claim that in fact that reply constitutes a favourable response to the appeals of the Council. In the presence of such diversionary tactics, the question which comes quickly to mind is whether it is fitting and proper for the Security Council to agree to listen to Vorster crying out to the world at large that he feels that the United Nations has no rights over Namibia. Can such provocation and insolence remain unpunished? We are also entitled to ask whether or not the United Nations **recognizes** SWAPO as the sole liberation movement representing the true aspirations of the Namibian people. If certain members of the Council, on the basis of certain political and legal quibbles, endorse Vorster's position on SWAPO, then one should ask them also whether they believe in all conscience, that those who support the *apartheid* regime in Pretoria truly represent the aspirations of the majority of the white minority in South Africa.

22. The time has come for the Security Council to assume its responsibility, just as Vorster has assumed what he considers his by continuing to defy the Organization, by flouting it and by spurning its resolutions to the extent of challenging United Nations rights over Namibia. That situation must not be allowed to last much longer. The Council must no longer be satisfied with half measures which can have no effect on a fascist regime, whose Nazi background, as

exemplified in its philosophy of *apartheid*, admits of no doubt whatsoever.

23. The Council **must** act **quickly**. It **must** impose rigorous sanctions such as I described earlier. Failure on the part of the Council would be fraught with serious consequences, for if the Council were not to perform its duty, then it would give Africa no other choice but to take desperate violent action. Were the Security Council to fail to act, then the African people, in defence of the just cause of SWAPO, could not fail to give that liberation movement the moral, material and logistical support it needs to attack the enemy everywhere **at** any time and to liberate the Territory of Namibia.

24. In other words, if the Council once again allows itself to be lulled by devious arguments and fails to discharge its **responsibility** -as **it** should, **then** the **Namibian** people will settle **its** own problem sooner or later, within or without the United Nations, in a manner similar to the way the Cambodian problem or the problem of Viet-Nam has been settled and **in** a manner similar to that of the -settlement which will be reached in many other areas,- with undoubted effect on international peace and security.

25. Mr. President, if Africa has to go **that** far, then the Council over which you are presiding will have to face its responsibilities, because it will have allowed itself to yield to the various manoeuvres and soporific drugs which the racist Government of *apartheid* and its protectors do not tire in administering to it. But we hope that Africa **will** not have to take the action described because of the losses in innocent human lives that would result from any solution involving violence.

26. My delegation is convinced that you will do your utmost to see to it that your country's **name will** not have to be added to this sorry page in the history of the **Organization**, as it would have to be if the Council decided to **turn** a deaf ear to the appeal made to it by all of Africa. The Council must assume its proper responsibilities and give Vorster's clique the kind of treatment it deserves. Africa would not remain impassive in the circumstances. Africa in turn would assume its responsibility, and perhaps then the consciences of some would waken to **the** voice of reason and justice.

27. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Romania, whom I now invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

28. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, 'Mr. President, I should like to say that the **Romanian** delegation **is** extremely happy to see you presiding over the Security Council this month. May- we convey to **you our** warmest congratulations. I should like also to express my thanks to you and the other members of the Council

for having permitted me to take part in this debate on the situation in Namibia. **This** is a problem of great importance for international legality and justice, for, in the final analysis, peace and security in the African continent- depend upon the solution of this problem.

29. May I take this **opportunity** to **convey** to the President of SWAPO, **Mr. Sam Nujoma**, **my** cordial and friendly congratulations. At the same time, I should like to express the satisfaction of the **Romanian** delegation at seeing him here at this debate. His participation in the work of the Council is, in our view, a valuable contribution to the cause of the freedom and independence of his country, and further recognition of the fact that the destiny of a people cannot be settled without the direct participation of its legitimate representatives.

30. The current proceedings of the Council are actually part **of** the long sustained effort. of the United Nations, but we must **recognize** that the problem of Namibia could already have been solved if so much tolerance had not been shown to the Pretoria regime.

31. An important event in the activities of the United Nations in this regard was the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 366 (1974), which is familiar to us all, and which, *inter alia*, demanded that South Africa make a solemn declaration that it will comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations in regard to Namibia. South Africa was also called upon to take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal of its illegal administration in Namibia and to transfer power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations: In that same resolution the Council expressed its **grave** concern at South Africa's efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, and further demanded that South Africa release all Namibian political and other **prisoners**.

32. Today's debate has been preceded by intense political and diplomatic activity undertaken recently by **the** Organization, by the United Nations Council for Namibia-the organ legally entrusted by the United Nations with administering the Territory until it becomes independent-and by various States, including members **of** the Security Council. We should also stress in **this** regard the efforts of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the resolutions it adopted at the Ninth Extraordinary Session of the Council of Ministers, held from 7 to 10 April 1975 in Dar es Salaam.

33. As has been stressed here by African delegations, the reply of the Minister for **Foreign** Affairs of the -Pretoria regime addressed to the Secretary-General [*ibid.*] did **not** live up to the hopes of the Members of the United Nations.

34. Obviously, 'there is only one choice in the face of a persistently negative attitude on the part of the

Pretoria regime towards the sacred right of the Namibian people to independence-in the face of defiance of United Nations resolutions on Namibia and the requests made by the international community; and that choice is the adoption of **firm** and concrete measures with regard to South Africa so that it will immediately and unconditionally withdraw its illegal administration from that Territory.

35. The position of Romania with regard to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is well known. It was set forth in this very chamber on 25 October 1974 [1803rd meeting]. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, my delegation considers that the position of that body was eloquently expounded at the beginning of our debate by the representative of Zambia, Mr. Rupiah **Banda**, President of the Council for Namibia [1823rd meeting].

36. According to information in the possession of the Council for Namibia, and also according to the statement made by the representative of SWAPO [ibid.], it appears that, in clear contradiction of the wish for a peaceful transfer of power in Namibia, South Africa is continuing to strengthen its **illegal**, brutal presence in that country. There has been an intensification of systematic repressive measures against Namibian patriots, and the arrest of members and leaders of SWAPO has continued. There is a continuation, too, of actions aimed at the division of Namibia into Bantustans in order to undermine the national unity and territorial integrity of the country, thus defying United Nations decisions and the will of the Namibian people.

37. In its reply to the Secretary-General, the Pretoria Government in actual fact rejected the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 366 (1974) of the **Security** Council, thus disregarding the political and constitutional framework laid down by the United Nations in the light of its responsibilities.

38. South Africa has not even attempted to conceal its intentions; it is endeavouring to perpetuate by other means its domination in the Territory, particularly by the so-called "Constitutional Conference" within the framework of "law and **order**"—**promulgated**, of course, by the South African authorities. That is why the position of SWAPO, which rejects the **organization** of elections in Namibia under the supervision of the occupation forces of the Pretoria regime, is entirely justified.

39. We also find entirely justified the request of SWAPO that any election in Namibia take place under the auspices of the United Nations, the **sole** authority legally empowered to administer the Territory until it becomes independent.

40. Romania fully supports the Namibian people in its decision to use all means available to it to win its inalienable rights. We resolutely condemn the **maneu-**

vres of the **Pretoria** regime, which is attempting to deceive world public opinion in order to mask its real purpose of undermining the national unity of the Namibian people and the territorial integrity of Namibia.

41. The **Romanian** Government, faithful to its position of principle with regard to the struggle of the peoples of the colonies and their national liberation movements, supports the efforts of SWAPO to build a free, unitary and independent Namibia. We are giving it constant political, diplomatic and material support, in accordance with **the** Joint Communiqué issued after **the** talks which took place in Bucharest in August 1973 between President **Nicolae Ceaușescu** and the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma.

42. The **Romanian** delegation considers that the United Nations must contribute more energetically and more effectively to the cause of the independence of Namibia and measure up to its important **responsibilities** towards that Territory. In accordance with the provisions of its Charter, **the United Nations** should, in our view, take the following actions:

—**First**, take firm measures to ensure the territorial integrity of Namibia **and** the independence of that country as a single State and to enforce respect for the sacred right of **the Namibian** people to permanent sovereignty over its natural resources;

—**Secondly**, adopt resolute and concrete measures to prevail upon South Africa immediately to withdraw its armed forces and police and its whole illegal administration from Namibia;

—**Thirdly**, enhance the role of the Security Council in the implementation of its own resolutions and strengthen these decisions and also expand the assistance which the Security Council should give to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the full discharge of the mandate **entrusted** to it by the General Assembly.

43. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the **Romanian** delegation supports the **proposals made** in the course of this debate by the President of the Council and those put forward by the President of SWAPO. We are also in favour of all other measures that are likely to contribute to the complete **implementation** of the United Nations resolutions on Namibia, thus permitting the Namibian people to exercise their sacred right to self-determination and independence in accordance with their interests and national aspirations.

44. In this way the United Nations can make a contribution to the accomplishment of one of its most important and urgent tasks in the world today, that is to say, the elimination once and for all of the last remaining vestiges of colonial regimes, the elimination of all forms of domination and oppression on the part of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

45. In conclusion, I should like to say that our keenest desire is to be able to welcome as soon as possible the State of Namibia as a full-fledged Member of the **Organization**. We should like to express the hope that the Namibian people will be able fully to enjoy the fruits of its own work and also the fruits of international co-operation and that it will be able to make its own contribution to the solution of the problems facing the international community.

46. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the representative of Yugoslavia to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

47. Mr. **PETRIĆ** (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you, in your capacity as representative of the friendly and non-aligned country of Iraq, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council during the month of June, a month when the **Council** is dealing with one of the most important of international problems. I would **also** stress how apt it was that the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda started under the presidency of the friendly and non-aligned country of Guyana.

48. My delegation is taking part in the consideration of this very urgent problem as the delegation of a country which is a staunch friend and constant ally of the peoples of Africa in their liberation struggle for the eradication of every manifestation and of the last remnants of colonialism and racism from their continent. We also wish to express our firm belief that, under your able guidance, Mr. President, the Security Council will examine with full responsibility the situation with which we are confronted and will take appropriate measures.

49. It is regrettable that we have had to meet again in order to deal with the reactionary and aggressive policy of South Africa in Namibia. The General Assembly and the Security Council have already met so many times, since 1966, and have adopted so many decisions that it is almost embarrassing to enumerate them, while the people of Namibia, the peoples of Africa, are demanding that we take resolute and effective action.

SO. South Africa has turned a deaf ear to all this and has failed to show any readiness to solve the problem, continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and preventing the people of the Territory from **realizing** their right to self-determination, freedom, independence and territorial integrity. In spite of this, the international community and the Security Council have given proof of a maximum of patience and good will, endeavouring, unsuccessfully, to induce South Africa to permit a peaceful solution of the problem. It has become crystal clear to everyone that, faced with South Africa's defiance, we cannot continue to meet and repeat the same appeals all over again without hindering thereby the struggle of the people

of Namibia and seriously impairing the prestige of the United Nations as a whole and of the Security Council in particular, as well as their effectiveness as important instruments of struggle against colonialism and racism.

51. In its last attempt, in resolution 366 (1974), the Security Council once again urged South Africa to undertake an obligation to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, to recognize the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia and to take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal of its illegal administration maintained in Namibia and to transfer power to the people of Namibia with the assistance and under the supervision of the United Nations. However, in giving to South Africa yet another opportunity, in setting yet another deadline for taking the necessary steps towards the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council at a time when the historic victories of the peoples of former Portuguese colonies and the growing armed struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia had radically changed the situation in the whole of southern Africa and when it had become clear to all that the resistance of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* had no prospects whatsoever—the Security Council did not simply repeat its earlier appeals.

52. We all know that agreement, that unanimity with regard to resolution 366 (1974)—in a situation when a strong demand for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter through the imposing of a mandatory arms embargo and mandatory sanctions against South Africa had already been made—was possible on the understanding that if South Africa rejected even this opportunity, the next resolution could not be a mere repetition of resolution 366 (1974).

53. In its declaration and resolution 23 (IX) on Namibia, the Council of Ministers of the OAU, meeting at Dar es Salaam in April 1975, showed itself ready to offer one more chance to South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and to enable the population of the Territory to **realize** its right to self-determination, territorial integrity, freedom and independence. But it was also stressed that, failing this, struggle by all means would continue.

54. Now what reply have we received, in return, from South Africa? Prime Minister Vorster, in his statement of 20 May, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. **Muller**, in his letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 27 May [see **S/11701**], continue to refuse to recognize the right of the United Nations to administer Namibia; they do not recognize SWAPO as the liberation movement and legitimate representative of the people of the Territory; they consider the territorial integrity of Namibia to be only one of the possible options and refuse to put an end to their illegal occupation and withdraw from the Territory. At the same time, to take part in contacts and

negotiations with the Secretary-General and the Special Committee of the OAU, they offer, as representatives of the Territory, stooges and quislings chosen by them and serving the occupation administration. Every so-called new **hint** is immediately and wholly invalidated by the repetition and even aggravation of the worst and totally unacceptable stands of South Africa, presented, this time also, with the customary and deliberate arrogance.

55. What attitude can the Security Council adopt towards a Government that does not recognize the legitimate and repeatedly confirmed competence of the United Nations in Namibia? How can the **Secretary-General** have contacts with a Government that does not recognize the decisions of the United Nations? How can the OAU contact a Government that does not recognize SWAPO? And, generally speaking, what can be the subject of talks with a regime that considers the territorial integrity of Namibia to be one of the options and claims that its aggressive and illegal presence in the Territory represents the wish of its inhabitants?

56. The situation is clear. South Africa has not changed its well-known reactionary and unacceptable policy and, in fact, wants to conduct talks under the old conditions, for purposes of bantustanization, that is, for the further legalization and perpetuation of its presence in Namibia. And the terrible massacre perpetrated the other day in Salisbury by the racist regime of Southern Rhodesia, where South Africa still keeps military units, shows best what we **are** faced with.

57. We deem that South Africa's so-called reply to the Security Council is unacceptable. We state this with a full sense of responsibility, because the Yugoslav delegation has been following this problem actively for a number of years as a member of the Special Committee of **24**,² of the Council for Namibia and of the Security Council in 1972 and **1973**—the bodies **wich** have been, so far unsuccessfully, exerting efforts for its solution.

58. As a European, socialist and non-aligned country, Yugoslavia is deeply convinced that peace and international security are indivisible. There can be no detente and peace between some countries only or peace in some regions alone, while simultaneously there is disregard of the situation in southern Africa, or anywhere else. By its reactionary, racist policy South Africa has created a dangerous hotbed of conflict and an area of crisis liable to endanger peace and security in the whole world. For this reason, the Security **Council**, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should, as a matter of urgency, take measures for the eradication of this hotbed of conflict and for compelling South Africa to cease its illegal occupation of Namibia. Actually, the Security Council undertook this obligation in paragraph 5 of

resolution 366 (1974). When saying and demanding this, we have particularly in mind the responsibility and obligations of the permanent members of the Security Council who, together with the other members of the Council, voted unanimously in favour of resolution 366 (1974).

59. We doubt that there is a single member of the Security Council who would be prepared to qualify South Africa's answer as satisfactory. We also sincerely hope that—in the spirit of unanimity manifested at the time of the adoption of resolution 366 **(1974)**—the members of the Council will remain consistent and will adopt concrete measures against South Africa, which has **flagrantly** violated the Charter and all the decisions of the Assembly and the Council concerning the question of Namibia. We appeal, in particular, to those who had earlier given their support, for totally unacceptable reasons, to the South African regime, thus enabling it to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, to abandon such a policy once and for all. Colonialism, racism and **apartheid** constitute the greatest anachronism and shame of the epoch in which we live and it is high time to deal a decisive blow to their **last** remaining bastions. We hope that everyone realizes by now that the existing situation is untenable and that South Africa's aggressive and reactionary policy will soon be bankrupt, as every aggression is doomed, sooner or later, to utter failure, as amply proved by recent history.

60. The Yugoslav people and Government; in keeping with their well-known policy, will continue to lend, as heretofore, full political, moral and material assistance to the people of Namibia and its legitimate representative SWAPO, in their struggle for the realization of its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. This assistance is given in the spirit of our traditional policy of support to every struggle against imperialism, colonialism and all other forms of foreign domination.

61. With regard to the matter now before us, we feel that on the basis of Chapter VII of the Charter, the Security Council should adopt appropriate measures and, as a minimum, the mandatory complete prohibition of the sale of weapons to South Africa. Any measure of military co-operation, either direct or indirect, or of assistance to South Africa in the military field strengthens its racist regime in its policies of **apartheid** and occupation of Namibia. Consequently, it goes without saying that all forms of military co-operation and ties with South Africa must be discontinued—whether in the area of supply of arms, the facilitation of its own arms production, installation or the like.

62. May I be allowed to mention here that the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries in its Declaration of 21 March 1975 concluded, *inter alia*, that:

“the Bureau demands that the oppressive white minority regime in South Africa implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations concerning Namibia. It reaffirms its categorical rejection of the transplanting of ignoble ‘Bantustani policies in the Territory. It demands the strictest respect for, the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, while pledging its continued support to the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of their liberation movement SWAPO. The Coordinating Bureau calls upon the Security Council of the United Nations to live up to its responsibility and adopt all necessary measures, **including those** under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to enforce the United Nations decision on Namibia.”

63. In conclusion, we should like to ‘stress once again that South Africa has rejected every constructive **initiative** taken with regard to it, and -that it has violated all the **decisions** and resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and all relevant principles. Consequently, we put forward with full responsibility **the demand**’ that the Security Council take the strongest action in this case.

64. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In recent years, under the great call of the OAU to “eliminate all forms of colonialism on the African continent”, the African countries and peoples, holding aloft the banner of unity and struggle, have won one great victory after another in their struggles against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, racism, Zionism and great-power hegemonism. At present, the situation in Africa is getting better and better. Through protracted armed struggles the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola have won their right to national independence, and the Portuguese colonial domination that has lasted for five centuries in Africa has been collapsing. The national liberation struggles of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania which are still under the domination of the white racist regimes are developing increasingly in depth. The excellent situation in Africa has struck panic into the hearts of the South African and Southern Rhodesian colonial racist regimes that are still putting up a stubborn resistance and have thus landed themselves in unprecedented isolation.

65. However, like all other reactionaries in the world, the South African and Southern Rhodesian racists will never step **down** from the stage of history of their own accord ‘and **they** are still engaged in a desperate struggle. What calls for special alertness now is that, **with the** support and abetment of the imperialists and the super-Powers, they are racking their brains to play and push their counter-revolutionary dual tactics in order to maintain, their reactionary rule. While stepping up armed suppression, they are engaged in political deception and are vigorously -trumpeting so-called reconciliation in an

attempt to split the national liberation movements in those countries, break the militant unity of the African countries and undermine the armed struggle of the peoples in southern Africa so as to save themselves from their doomed destruction.

66. One hard **evidence** of the political deception employed **by** Vorster under the smokescreen of “reconciliation” and “dialogue” is a statement made by Vorster on 20 May on the question of Namibia. What kind of stuff is this statement? Does it signify the slightest change in the colonialist policy pursued by South Africa over Namibia?

67. In his statement [*ibid.*] Vorster said that the United Nations has no right to exercise any supervision over South African administration of Namibia. As is known to all, South Africa’s occupation of Namibia is entirely illegal and the General Assembly and the Security Council have in their relevant resolutions repeatedly condemned South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia, **recognized** the United Nations as the administering authority of Namibia **and** demanded the immediate withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia. Now Vorster has even dared to declare that the United Nations has no right to look into South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia. Is this not contempt for the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as an open challenge against the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations?

68. Vorster has the cheek to say: “**We** do not occupy the Territory”-referring to Namibia. “We are there because-the people of the Territory want us there”. **Here, Vorster** is again harping on the long-discredited gangster’s logic of the colonialists. As a matter of fact, from the day the South African racist **régime** started its illegal occupation of Namibia, the Namibian people have never ceased their heroic struggles for national independence and the liberation of the country. According to the wishes of the Namibian people, the South African authorities should have got out of Namibia long ago. The so-called “leaders of the peoples” referred to **by** the South African authorities are precisely a handful of puppets that have been fostered for maintaining their colonialist domination over Namibia. Vorster is attempting to confer on this handful of puppets the title of the “leaders of the peoples” for imposition on the Namibian people. Such a despicable practice is of course totally unacceptable to the entire Namibian people **and** the other African peoples. To put it bluntly, those who really desire the continued illegal South African racist occupation of Namibia are none other than the South African authorities themselves **and** the imperialist forces that have tremendous economic interests in South Africa and other parts of southern Africa and that have ceaselessly given enormous political and military support to these racists. Incidentally, it was **the** Minister for

Foreign Affairs of South Africa who **confessed straight** away that "South Africa will remain in and continue to administer the Territory". This has revealed point blank the true intention of the South African authorities stubbornly to hang on in Namibia.

69. Vorster also said that the local inhabitants should be given the opportunity to express their views freely on their political and constitutional future, that it was for the "population groups" there and the "peoples", in the plural, to choose the future of Namibia, and that all options were open to them, and so on and so forth. Those with a discerning eye know full well the true meaning of these words. They mean that the South African authorities still want to divide the Namibian people into the **so-called** "population groups" and resort to the trick of so-called "constitutional discussions"* to step up their reactionary "Bantustan" policy of divide and rule.

70. However, while spreading a smokescreen of the so-called "reconciliation", the Vorster and Smith racist regimes have not 'relaxed, but have stepped up their tactics of bloody armed repression. Last April, it was none **other than** the South African racist **régime** that sent out armed force and police to suppress the SWAPO supporters, killing and wounding several of them and arresting several hundred patriots, thus creating an appalling incident of bloodshed. Likewise, it is none other than the South African racist regime that has stepped up arms expansion and war preparations, strengthened its apparatus for military repression and added another 50 per cent to its 1974 huge military budget, which reached the amount of some 1.4 billion United States dollars. It is none other than the South African racist regime that has wildly clamoured that South Africa possesses the highest-standard army on the African continent, that no force on earth could seize political power from the hands of the whites and that the whites would continue their rule in South Africa. Not only have the South African armed force and police refused to **quit** Zimbabwe, but with their support, the Smith authorities of Southern Rhodesia went so far as to create another bloody incident by massacring Zimbabwe African nationalists in Salisbury on 1 June.

71. Are these facts not sufficient to show that behind the evil wind of the so-called "reconciliation" and "dialogue" stirred up by Vorster, Smith and company there is a conspiracy to intensify further the armed repression against the peoples in southern Africa? However, the great-African people are after all a people with political consciousness.' From the **pratic**e of their protracted struggles, they have come to **realize** that the nature of colonialists and **racists** will never change. The African countries and peoples that have a glorious tradition of fighting imperialism will certainly see through the various tricks played by the enemy, use revolutionary dual tactics to deal with the enemy's counter-revolutionary dual tactics,

strengthen their unity, persevere in 'Struggle, and particularly armed struggle, so as to frustrate all the enemy's schemes and. **win** the independence and liberation of the whole of Africa. As is pointed out in the statement of SWAPO on 21 May: "The SWAPO of Namibia, in face of these provocations of the South African regime, indicates that there is no alternative but to step up armed struggle in order to liberate our country from the arrogant foreign aggressors". The OAU issued a statement on 22 May calling on the Namibian people to continue to struggle until they attain total independence. This is **the** powerful reply of the Namibian people and the other African peoples to Vorster's arrogant statement. The Chinese delegation firmly supports **it**:

72. The Chinese Government and **people have** always supported the people of Namibia and other parts of southern Africa in their just struggles for national independence and liberation. The Chinese people **and** the African people are comrades-in-arms fighting on the same front. In the future we shall continue to strengthen our unity and carry through to the end the joint fight for the independence and liberation of the whole continent of Africa.

73. Mr. **SCALI** (United **States** of America): Mr. President, may **I** add my good wishes to those of my colleagues upon your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. I assure you of the full co-operation of the United States delegation. I also would like to congratulate our colleagues from **Guyana** upon the very able manner in which they presided over the Council during the **month** of May.

74. Last December [**1811th meeting**] the United States supported Council resolution 366 (1974). We voted "**yes**" in the belief that the text, though imperfect in some ways, adequately reflected our view that South Africa should act quickly and decisively to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. -We believe; moreover, that the Security Council rightly placed its views and recommendations before the South African Government and urged it to move **promptly** along the path indicated.

75. During the last six months there has been some forward movement in the Namibian situation, but not enough. It is clear, however, that regardless of how disappointed we are at the pace of steps towards genuine self-determination at this stage, we must move carefully lest we worsen rather than improve the outlook for justice and freedom.

76. In this connexion we hear calls for an **arms embargo**. The record of the United States **Government** in this respect is one of **which the American** people can' be proud. For 12 years the United States Government has voluntarily refused **to allow** shipments of American arms and military equipment to South Africa. Our Government has done this as a matter of principle. We do so out of conviction, and not because

we are required to do so by an international **forum**. **If others** wish, they **can join us in such a voluntary** policy, and we earnestly invite them to do so.

77. As the Security Council is considering what constructive steps it can take for the future of Namibia, there are four fundamental questions, as we see **it**: whether there **is a** commitment on the part of South Africa to a course of self-determination for all the people of Namibia and to respect for their rights; the timing of steps towards self-determination once that principle is accepted **by** South Africa; the question of whether all Namibians, of whatever colour, political affiliation or social origin, would have their voices heard in determining the future of the Territory; and, finally, the role of the United Nations in the process of self-determination for all the people of Namibia.

78. The South African Government made public its position on Namibia in a letter [see **S/11701**] of 27 May from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Muller, to the Secretary-General. In that letter the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs restated many positions already put forward by his Government.

79. My delegation believes we should explore South Africa's offer to resume a dialogue with a representative of the Secretary-General and to enter into discussions with African **leaders**, with the Chairman of the United Nations Council for Namibia and with the Special Committee of the OAU. We fully **recognize** the past difficulties in such dialogues, and we note the restrictive terms of South Africa's present offer. Nonetheless, in our **view**, it is important that new efforts be made to determine whether, in fact, a genuine discussion can now be initiated through these channels.

80. We also note that the letter of 27 May, in discussing the future of the Territory, states that all options are open, including "independence as one State". We have also noted that that letter reiterates South Africa's recognition of the international status of the Territory and states that it is the South African Government's wish that a constitutional conference take place in as short a time as possible.

81. Mr. Muller's words go somewhat beyond the assurances he gave the Secretary-General in April 1973. They may reflect a more realistic appraisal of the situation in southern Africa. Ambiguities remain, and South Africa should provide clarification of its intent. We wish to know more precisely when and in what manner the planned constitutional convention will be conducted and who exactly will participate.

82. During the Council's debate on 17 December 1974 [**1812th meeting**], I called unequivocally for precision and detail in South African planning for Namibia's future. Such clarity, coupled with positive action, is called for to ensure a peaceful and realistic settlement of the Territory's future.

83. Mr. Muller's most recent statements may offer hope that South Africa will allow a truly fair exercise of self-determination in Namibia. South Africa must now move from general statements of purpose to specific implementing action. Can South Africa be in any doubt that the international community wants these steps to define Namibia's separate status and the time-table for carrying them out-and wants these to be stated in unambiguous terms?

84. At its meeting in Dar es Salaam in April, the Council of Ministers of the OAU reviewed the situation in Namibia and adopted a comprehensive declaration on the Territory aimed at overcoming South Africa's recalcitrance. Members of the Security Council, including the United States, have also been active in seeking **to encourage South Africa to move** forward decisively in Namibia to allow the Namibian people to express their views freely on the political future and the constitutional structure of the Territory.

85. The United Nations, and the Security Council especially, have a unique and grave responsibility for Namibia and **its** future. South Africa has now given us some reason to expect that **it** acknowledges the interest of the international community in Namibia, even though it still has not accepted United Nations participation in the process of self-determination for Namibia. Once again we declare to South Africa that it is our considered view that without a role for the United Nations in the self-determination process the international community cannot judge progress objectively and therefore cannot be satisfied that the people of Namibia will be able to exercise a democratic choice as to their future.

86. The United States, for its part, remains committed to the view that within a short time all the people of Namibia should be given the opportunity to express their views freely and under United Nations supervision on the political future and constitutional structure of the Territory; that all Namibian political groups should be allowed to campaign for their views and to participate without hindrance in peaceful political activities in the course of the process of self-determination; that the Territory should not **be** split up in accordance with the policy of **apartheid**; and that the future of Namibia should be determined by the freely expressed choice of its inhabitants.

87. As we continue to press towards these goals, the United States will sustain its present policies with regard to the Territory. We will continue to discourage United States investment in Namibia and to deny export-import bank guarantees and other facilities for trade with Namibia. We will continue to withhold United States Government protection of United States investments, made on the basis of rights acquired through the South African Government after 1966, against the claims of a future lawful Government of Namibia. This policy reflects our strongly held belief that South Africa should act in

the immediate future to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

88. The obligation of the Council is to foster a peaceful and just settlement. Our agreed goal is the exercise by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination. As a responsible deliberative body, it is our duty to encourage all the parties concerned and to explore every possible opportunity for launching the process of timely self-determination.

89. In view of the facts of the Namibian situation, it is difficult to find that a threat to international peace and security exists within the **meaning** of the Charter. The party seen by some as causing **the** threat has agreed on some of the objectives desired by the international community and has offered to exchange views on the means of achieving them. This clearly does not add up to a crisis, peace-and-war situation

at this time. Thus, in our view, it would not be appropriate to invoke mandatory sanctions which are specifically reserved for threats to peace. We believe the Council, in collaboration with the African States, should insist that South Africa give concrete effect to its words, give **firm** assurances about the issues on which it has not yet declared its position and move forward with dispatch towards a new environment of freedom in southern Africa.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

Notes

¹ *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.*

² Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the **Granting** of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经营处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o dirijase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
