

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-NINTH YEAR

1812th MEETING, 17 DECEMBER 1974
UN LIBRARY
NOV 8 1980

NEW YORK

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1812)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 13 December 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11575)	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.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND TWELFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 17 December 1974, at 3 p.m.

President: Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mauritania, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1812)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 13 December 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11575)

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

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 13 December 1974 from the Permanent Representative of Upper Volta to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11575)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the 1811th meeting, I now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of Morocco, Upper Volta, Nigeria and Somalia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zaïmi (Morocco), Mr. Yao (Upper Volta), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria) and Mr. Hussein (Somalia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I also invite the President and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take places at the Council table.

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

3. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): The item on the Council's agenda today is exceptional from every point of view. It is exceptional first of all because of the scope of the debates to which it has given rise in the United Nations since the inception of the Organization. It is exceptional also, and especially, because of the number of resolutions adopted in connexion with it and the variety of international bodies which have had to express their views on it.

4. The United Nations, which is directly concerned with the future of a people and of its territory, has not been successful so far in imposing upon a Member State, South Africa, the force of international law. Neither has it succeeded in imposing upon that State respect for the Charter or for the obligations flowing from it.

5. On 27 October 1966, the General Assembly adopted, by 114 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions, resolution 2145 (XXI), by which it terminated the Mandate it had entrusted to South Africa over what was then called South West Africa. In taking that important decision the General Assembly put an end to the efforts which it had been vainly exerting for 20 years to make the South African Government respect the commitments it had freely and solemnly undertaken. By refusing, in fact, to respect its obligations, South Africa was unilaterally denouncing the Mandate that had been entrusted to it. Hence, there was nothing for the Assembly to do but to declare the Mandate that had been entrusted to South Africa null and void and consequently to adopt the measures necessary for the transfer of power to the indigenous population of what is today Namibia.

6. By the same resolution the General Assembly established an *ad hoc* committee of 14 members with the task of recommending practical means by which Namibia should be administered, so as to enable the people of the Territory to exercise the right of self-determination and to achieve independence.

7. The *Ad Hoc* Committee met between January and March 1967 and submitted its first report to the General Assembly at its fifth special session. In the light of that report, the General Assembly on 19 May 1967 adopted resolution 2248 (S-V), by which it decided: first, that everything was to be done to enable Namibia to accede to independence by June 1968 at the latest; secondly, that until independence the Territory would be administered, with the maximum possible participation of the population, by a United Nations Council for Namibia; thirdly, that that Council would entrust executive and administrative tasks to a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia; fourthly, that

the Council would have its headquarters in Namibia and would proceed there in order to establish the practical methods for the transfer of the administration of the Territory.

8. Naturally, the General Assembly once again called upon South Africa to comply with the provisions of that resolution by facilitating the transfer of the administration of the Territory. At the same time, the Assembly requested the Security Council to take all appropriate measures to enable the United Nations Council for Namibia to discharge its functions.

9. In accordance with the recommendations in that resolution, the United Nations Council for Namibia, on 28 August 1967, addressed a letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of South Africa requesting him to indicate the measures that his Government intended to take to facilitate the transfer of power with the least confusion.

10. On 27 September 1967, the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs replied that his Government had no intention of complying with the provisions of these resolutions, which it regarded as illegal.

11. On 16 December 1967, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2325 (XXII), in which it requested the Security Council to take effective steps to enable the United Nations to discharge the responsibilities it had assumed with respect to Namibia.

12. Since then several other resolutions—76, to be specific—have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, all condemning South Africa for its refusal to co-operate with the United Nations.

13. It was necessary to wait until 1970, more specifically 29 July 1970, before the Security Council, by resolution 284 (1970), decided to submit, in conformity with Article 96 (1) of the Charter, the question to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion.

14. I am bound to point out that a first opinion had already been given by the Court in 1950, when Pretoria had refused to submit to the new international system, on the pretext that the Mandates system had disappeared with the League of Nations.

15. In this connexion, the International Court of Justice stated:

“Their *raison d'être* and their original object remain. Since their fulfilment did not depend on the entity of the League of Nations, they could not be brought to an end simply because this supervisory organ ceased to exist. Nor could the right of the population to have the Territory administered in accordance with these rules depend thereon.”¹

¹ *International status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 133.

16. In its second opinion, of 21 June 1971,² the International Court of Justice declared the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal.

17. In spite of those two opinions of the International Court of Justice and of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, South Africa did not feel that it had to heed the appeal of the international community. Confronted by this categorical refusal, the Security Council met on 4 February 1972 at Addis Ababa to examine the question of Namibia again.

18. At that series of meetings the Security Council adopted resolution 309 (1972), by which it invited

“... the Secretary-General, in consultation and close co-operation with a group of the Security Council, composed of the representatives of Argentina, Somalia and Yugoslavia, to initiate . . . contacts with all parties concerned, with a view to establishing the necessary conditions so as to enable the people of Namibia, freely and with strict regard to the principle of human equality, to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

19. On the basis of this decision of the Security Council, the Secretary-General a few days later made the first move: he sent the text of the resolution to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa.

20. The Secretary-General, on his return from Addis Ababa, received on 7 February 1972 in New York the representative of South Africa, who transmitted to him the text of the statement made by the Prime Minister of South Africa on 4 February 1972. In that statement the Prime Minister of South Africa had said:

“I . . . do not wish . . . to anticipate this matter, except to say that if the Secretary-General of the United Nations wishes to come to South Africa to discuss . . . self-determination of non-white peoples with the [South African] Government among others, he will . . . find us to be willing partners in the discussion But if he wishes to come to South Africa to act as a mouthpiece for the extremists of the Organization of African Unity . . . I can tell him in advance that he will be wasting his time.” [S/10738 of 17 July 1972, para. 6.]

21. And yet those whom the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa described as extremists had adopted on 16 April 1969 at Lusaka the historic document called the Manifesto on Southern Africa.

22. I should like to point out that that document, prepared and adopted initially by the heads of State of eastern and central Africa, was adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and presented to the United Nations here by His Excellency Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of Cameroon and at that time the Chairman of the OAU. In the

² *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

aka Manifesto, the heads of State and Government of Namibia declared:

"We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill. We do not advocate violence, we advocate an end to the violence against human dignity which is now being perpetrated [in South Africa]. If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible, or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movements to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the timing of change. But while peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those at present in power in the States of southern Africa, we have no choice but to give the peoples of those Territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against the oppressors."³

That position surely cannot be described as extremist. That brief historical summary was required, especially since some will believe that the OAU and the United Nations have not given the South African régime sufficient time to reflect and adopt an appropriate position.

3. It is only because of the categorical refusal of the South African régime, only because of its intransigence and its arrogant attitude towards the obligations that it is duty bound to respect, only because of its refusal to honour United Nations resolutions, that other means have been tried.

4. It was certainly in that spirit that the United Nations Security Council for Namibia recommended to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session that contacts between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa be ended. That recommendation was adopted by the Assembly on 12 December 1973 [resolution 3111 (XXVIII)]. The Security Council also adopted, on 11 December 1973, its resolution 342 (1973) in which it decided not to proceed to further efforts on the basis of resolution 309 (1972).

5. Too much blood has been shed in Namibia for the Council not to take the decision required of it, namely to help the Namibian people to recover their freedom, wrested from them by a régime which quite obviously has failed in the mission entrusted to it. Nevertheless we wanted to give the Pretoria régime another chance by asking it to heed the appeals addressed to it by the international community through the Council.

26. The resolution was a very moderate one—what some people called balanced and others called weak—but we hope that the weakness will be compensated by the force represented by the unanimity with which it was adopted by the Council. It should therefore be possible for the South African régime to commit itself to solemn recognition both of the validity of all United Nations resolutions and also of the opinion of the International Court of Justice. That unambiguous recognition by South Africa of the sovereignty of the Namibian people over its national Territory should be followed by the withdrawal, without delay, of all occupying South African troops and the transfer to the

Namibian people, with the direct assistance of the United Nations, of all powers necessary for the establishment of a genuine, independent, unitary State, the sole master of its own destiny.

27. If this appeal were to be heeded it would be the first positive sign which would not only lead to the beginning of a settlement of the dire controversy which sets the South African Government against the international community but also, and in particular, safeguard peace in Africa and therefore international security. In any event, the United Nations and especially the Security Council must remain vigilant in the future with regard to the drama being enacted in Africa that is degrading the human race and threatening the very future of the Organization.

28. I should like now, Mr. President, with your permission, since I hope this may be the last meeting of the Council this month, to address those colleagues who are about to leave us at the end of their mandate.

29. We have all appreciated the contribution which you, Sir, have made as our colleague and friend, as well as the contribution of the representative of Austria to the debates and action of the Council. I should like, as an African and a representative of a country friendly to your own, to tell you how grateful I am for this year that I have spent with you, which has made it possible for me to benefit from your great experience and your knowledge of the problems confronting Africa and the international community.

30. Turning to my colleagues and brothers, the representatives of Indonesia, Kenya and Peru, I should like to tell them how much I have appreciated the constant support of their solidarity with us, the logical outcome of the common struggle which our countries are waging not only in the Council but also in all international bodies. That is our common struggle for peace, for equality between men and for the freedom of peoples. I am convinced that your example will go down in the annals of the Council as the example of a man moved by an unshakable faith in the Organization and its ideals of justice and freedom. Throughout the whole of their mandate they have always tried to serve the cause of mankind, and I can tell them that they have served it well. In conclusion, Mr. President, may I assure you of my unflinching friendship.

31. Mr. NJINE (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): The international status of Namibia, formally South West Africa, as a country under the Mandate of the League of Nations, should, like that of other colonial Territories coming within the competence of the League of Nations, have been redefined after the Second World War in the light of the new principles that have governed the international community since then. That fact is not disputed by anyone.

32. Speaking in the Security Council the representative of Pretoria himself said [1800th meeting]: "The Government of South Africa has always recognized that South West Africa has a distinct international status. We have no designs on it." How, then, can one explain the persistence of a colonial type of situation in Namibia?

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754, para. 12.

33. The truth of the matter is that ever since the first session of the General Assembly South Africa, rejecting any change in the territorial status to bring it into conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter, has set in motion the process of annexation of Namibia by extending to that Territory its methods of government based essentially on *apartheid* and the repression and exploitation of Africans.
34. The United Nations has reacted energetically to such criminal acts. In its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 the General Assembly decided to put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to bring that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, entrusting the administration of the Territory, until its independence, to the body now known as the United Nations Council for Namibia.
35. When asked by the Organization what would be the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, the International Court of Justice replied unambiguously in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 that the presence of the Pretoria régime in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa should be obliged to cease immediately its administration and occupation of that country.
36. In resolution 310 (1972) of 4 February 1972, the Security Council itself strongly condemned the repression prevalent in Namibia and declared that the continued occupation of the Territory by the South African Government in defiance of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and of the Charter created conditions detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security in the region.
37. Although, as usual, the racist Government rejected out of hand the views thus expressed by highly respected organs of the international community, the Security Council, in one last effort at conciliation, in its resolution 309 (1972) of 4 February 1972, invited the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with South Africa and all parties concerned with a view to establishing the necessary conditions to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter.
38. Later developments more than justified the scepticism that had been voiced in various quarters as to the usefulness and purpose of such a dialogue. What happened was that while the Secretary-General—to whom my delegation wishes to express sincere gratitude for the skill and wisdom with which he performed his delicate mission in the circumstances—was holding talks with the Pretoria authorities, the latter saw fit to intensify their policy of the balkanization of Namibia into “homelands” by setting up the notorious Consultative Council, which is nothing other than a divisive tribal organ in the pay of the racists.
39. This system of exploitation which has been inflicted upon the Namibian people has been strongly denounced by the International Commission of Jurists in an article entitled “Bantustan homelands in Namibia: a new servitude”, which appeared in issue No. 11 of the Commission's *Journal*, dated December 1973. In it, we read that notwithstanding vague allusions to self-determination of the “homelands” made by the South African Government in order to reassure international public opinion, the fact is that those “homelands” are being kept strictly in the present *status quo*, which means that the natural wealth of Namibia is to remain in the hands of the whites, while the black, if he is to survive, is condemned to the precarious life of a farmer.
40. During this period, moreover, repressive measures against political movements under the South African Emergency Laws and public floggings of unspeakable savagery reached alarming proportions described in detail in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia.⁴
41. Faced with the persistent bad faith of the South African racist Government, which has quite bluntly refused to recognize the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, in his report of 30 April 1973, the Secretary-General reached the conclusion that
- “... the position of the South African Government is still far from coinciding with that established in the resolutions of the United Nations concerning Namibia” [S/10921, para. 18].
42. Confronted with the *de facto* annexation of Namibia by South Africa, one cannot attach any credit at all to the statements made by Mr. Botha in the Council on 24 October, when he said that self-determination for Namibia could come about within 10 years. So it was very right for the Security Council in its resolution 342 (1973) to decide not to continue the contacts which the racists were plainly seeking to exploit in order to pursue their dilatory tactics to improve their image in international circles and give themselves respectability they do not merit in the eyes of the world Organization.
43. In the present circumstances the United Nations should fulfil its obligations towards the people of Namibia fully and effectively. There are no grounds at all for capitulation to the challenge of the racists. The patience of the Namibian people also has certain limits. That people, which has placed such trust in the Organization, is expecting the promises the Security Council has always made it to be fulfilled, and it is looking forward to the day when the racist usurpers will at last be obliged to transfer power to it.
44. My delegation believes that in view of the aggressive and expansionist policy of the South African régime in Namibia and the extreme patience shown by the Organization towards South Africa, this present debate will give rise to very little controversy; surely no delegation present wishes to deny the Namibian people its inalienable right to self-determination, national independence and protection of its territorial integrity. Those rights were reaffirmed by the Security Council in its resolution 323 (1972) of 6 December 1972.
45. The unanimous vote that has just taken place in the Council regarding Namibia has given added meaning to what the President of the United Republic of Cameroon said as he recalled the result of the recent debate in the Security Council on *apartheid*. President Ahmadou Ahidjo said:
- “Fully aware of the profound attachment of the peoples of these great countries to the principles of freedom,

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24.

equality and fraternity for all men, we voice our hopes that their Governments will in the future prove able to take account of public opinion in their own countries and in the world at large."

46. By its favourable vote on the draft resolution in document S/11579, my delegation wishes to confirm its determination to support by all means the just struggle of the Namibian people not merely to regain its freedom but also to ensure that the rights of the United Nations with regard to Namibia are respected.

47. I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the President and to all the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia and also the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their tireless efforts to speed up the process of the liberation of that Territory.

48. Mr. CHUANG Yen (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Recently, the South African racist régime has suddenly chanted the peace tune. At one time, it expressed its readiness to coexist peacefully and strengthen co-operation with the African countries and to pursue a policy of friendship and good neighbourliness; at another, it struck a posture of being ready for peaceful evolution and even expressed its pleasure and sympathy over the current changes in the African situation.

49. This propaganda has been conducted by the South African racist régime under the impact of the rapidly developing revolutionary situation in southern Africa to extricate itself from isolation and to preserve its illegal rule in Namibia by resorting to the counter-revolutionary dual policies of repression and deception. It will not be difficult to come to a proper conclusion if one just takes a look at what the South African racist régime has been doing in Namibia behind the above-mentioned smoke-screens.

50. In a statement issued by the Executive of the National Party of South West Africa on 24 September this year, the South African racist authorities asserted the need to act in a more positive and practical manner to undertake discussions with representatives of the other population groups of the Territory, more particularly on South West Africa's future pattern of constitutional government. Here the South African racist régime has failed to express the slightest intention to withdraw from Namibia, still less to recognize the Namibian people's right to self-determination on the basis of national unity and territorial integrity. It is only prepared to discuss with some "population groups" the so-called "future pattern of constitutional government" in Namibia, under its continued illegal occupation. In other words, it wants to legalize and facilitate the continued pursuance of the notorious bantustan system. Leaving aside the liberation movements which have been engaged in heroic fights in the interests of the Namibian people, the reactionary South African authorities have proposed to enter into discussions with the "population groups" in Namibia.

51. Who constitute what they call "population groups"? To tell the truth, they are none other than the few puppets fostered and controlled by the reactionary South African authorities. That trick of the South African authorities has been exposed by the South West Africa People's Organiza-

tion (SWAPO) as a well-calculated and deliberate political manoeuvre aimed at misleading world public opinion, at entrenching bantustans and subsequently annexing Namibia to South Africa.

52. In this connexion, even some Western papers have admitted that the South African authorities are carving up Namibia in a planned way. They intend to allocate small pieces of sterile land in the northern part of the Territory and elsewhere for the creation of a so-called "independent" Ovamboland, etc., and thereby place the rest of the Territory with fertile soil and rich mineral resources under a white ruling régime for their perpetual occupation. In the event of opposition from the indigenous people, the white racists are prepared to demand a union with South Africa straight away. In discussing this issue, Du Plessis, the head of the National Party of South West Africa, who is also the South African Minister of Community Development, openly admitted that the future of Namibia must be determined with the approval of the South African Government and that there was no question of South West Africa being separated entirely from South Africa.

53. On 20 November this year, Dirk Mudge, Member of the Executive Committee of the so-called South West Africa National Party, tabled a motion in the so-called South West Africa Legislative Assembly on the talks about the future of South West Africa. The motion contained 14 points. Now let us take a look at the essential points of this motion.

54. Point 1 of the motion says that there should be recognition of the fact that there were various peoples in "South West Africa", and the rights of each should be recognized. On the surface, this appears to be quite fair, but it has completely ignored the objective fact as to who are the masters of Namibia and who are the aggressors illegally occupying Namibia. It is designed to blur the basic distinction between occupation and anti-occupation, between aggression and anti-aggression, thereby creating confusion among the people.

55. In our view, only with the immediate withdrawal of the reactionary South African authorities from Namibia and the removal of that rock weighing down on the Namibian people will it be possible for the indigenous people to become the masters of their own land and for the rights of each people there to be respected. Otherwise, the white racists and colonialists will be allowed to do whatever they please, while the broad masses of the black inhabitants are crudely deprived of their basic right to subsistence; and such an intolerable state of affairs will continue indefinitely.

56. Point 5 of the motion refers to the maintenance of law and order in "South West Africa" in the process of moving towards self-determination, and it adds: "therefore, South Africa would not withdraw from 'South West Africa' because that would lead to chaos".

57. Point 6 asserts that South Africa could only leave South West Africa once the people asked for it and that no other body or country could replace South Africa. This is exactly the tone of a slave-owner, as if there simply did not exist a United Nations, as if the Namibian people could not survive without the South African racists. These are nothing

but excuses used by the South African authorities for their continued illegal occupation of Namibia: it is simply gangsters' logic. It must be pointed out that it is on the basis of this logic that the South African racists have thus far persistently refused to recognize the correct United Nations resolutions on the Namibian question and refused to recognize the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal administering authorities in Namibia.

58. The South African racist régime has acted so truculently because it has the all-out political, diplomatic, military and economic support of imperialism. In order to strangle the national liberation movements and preserve its enormous economic and political interests in southern Africa, imperialism has tried by all means to sustain the Fascist rule of the South African authorities. Herein lies an important reason why the Namibian question has remained unsettled over the past two decades and more, and why the South African authorities have dared to defy the relevant United Nations resolutions.

59. The Chinese Government and people have always firmly supported the just struggle of the Namibian people. We maintain that the South African authorities must put an immediate end to their illegal occupation of Namibia, withdraw all their military and police forces as well as their administration from Namibia and let the United Nations Council for Namibia take over and prepare for the independence of Namibia. The national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia must be guaranteed against sabotage by the South African authorities; the South African authorities must immediately repeal their barbarous measures of infringing on the political and basic human rights of the Namibian people and release at once all the detained political prisoners.

60. Although the Chinese delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution S/11579, we would prefer that, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council resolution immediately call for strong measures to apply effective sanctions against the South African racist régime for its persistent gross violation of the Charter principles and refusal to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

61. An excellent situation prevails in the world, even more so in Africa. The struggle of the Namibian people has won not only the support of the African countries and peoples but also the ever broader support of all the justice-upholding countries and peoples throughout the world. There will yet be setbacks and difficulties of various kinds along their road of advance, but the difficulties cannot stem the progress of the revolutionary struggle of Namibia. We are deeply convinced that so long as they strengthen their unity, heighten their vigilance, persevere in various forms of struggle, including armed struggle, the Namibian people, with the support of all the justice-upholding countries and peoples of Africa and the rest of the world, will certainly drive out the South African racist régime from their homeland and win national independence and liberation.

62. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): At the request of the African countries and in accordance with the recommendation of

the General Assembly in its resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 13 December 1974, the Security Council is again considering the question of Namibia.

63. The problem of Namibia deeply affects the interests of the whole of free Africa and of the whole of freedom-loving mankind. The just struggle of the Namibian people for its freedom and independence is an integral component of the struggle of the African peoples against the racist and colonialist régimes in southern Africa and against colonialism and aggression as a whole. The perpetuation of a hotbed of colonial domination in southern Africa has an adverse effect upon the political situation not only in Africa but in the whole of the world. It creates a threat to international peace and security for the countries of Africa.

64. This situation is against the efforts of all the peace-loving countries which are aimed at the deepening and further expansion of the easing of international tensions and at the strengthening of the process of the restructuring of international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The easing of tensions, which has now become the governing factor in the development of international relations, establishes favourable conditions for the further rise of the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples on the African continent.

65. The breadth of the national liberation struggle is growing in scale all the time, and this struggle leads on to further important victories. A new independent State has been born upon the African continent—Guinea-Bissau. There have been positive changes in the achievement of self-determination and independence by the peoples who were formerly under the administration of Portugal. The continuing unlawful occupation by South Africa of the Territory of Namibia and the existence of South African and Southern Rhodesian colonial racist régimes in the twentieth century is an anachronism left over from previous centuries—and an end must be put to this state of affairs forthwith.

66. The United Nations has adopted a whole series of resolutions on Namibia whose purpose was the liquidation of the unlawful occupation of that Territory by South Africa. The United Nations has recognized and has confirmed on numerous occasions in its resolutions the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. By an official decision of the United Nations, the Mandate of the Republic of South Africa to administer Namibia has been terminated. The national unity of the people of Namibia and the territorial integrity of that country have been officially recognized and have been confirmed on numerous occasions. Therefore, any further presence in that country of South African authorities and troops and any attributes of racist domination by the Republic of South Africa is unlawful and is in conflict with United Nations decisions.

67. At the present session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in elaboration and confirmation of the numerous earlier decisions of the United Nations, resolution 3295 (XXIX) was adopted, again confirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and

independence. By that resolution the United Nations officially recognizes the national movement of Namibia—SWAPO—as the genuine representative of the people of Namibia. Today the representative of SWAPO, Mr. Muesihange, spoke in the Security Council. But the South African racist régime is continuing to ignore the decisions of the United Nations and is obdurate in its colonialist and racist policy of oppression and enslavement of Namibia and its people.

68. The representatives of African States who have spoken here have rightly pointed to the true reason for the challenging attitude of South Africa in relation to the United Nations, the reason why the racists of South Africa are continuing to be defiant towards the United Nations and towards the peoples of Africa and are continuing to accept a direct confrontation with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Charter of the United Nations and are ignoring world public opinion. The reason is clear; it cannot be concealed or papered over; it resides in the open support given by certain Western Powers to the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa. It is precisely this aid and this support on the part, first of all, of certain States members of NATO, as well as on the part of the imperialist transnational monopolies, that makes it possible for the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa to pit itself against the United Nations, against the peoples of Africa and against world public opinion.

69. This support of the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa constitutes a direct violation of resolutions both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. In other words, we have before us selfishness and self-interest on the part of individual Powers and monopolies, so that by basing themselves upon the racist régime of Pretoria they can continue to inflict colonial exploitation on the indigenous inhabitants of Namibia and to appropriate its natural wealth for the purpose of their own self-enrichment.

70. In the documents of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, there is a concrete exposition of the nefarious role of the imperialist monopolies which act as they will in Namibia. In one of the documents of the Committee it is officially recognized that "Namibia can be considered as the 'most exploited Territory in history', because at least one third of its gross national product is exported as profits by foreign mining companies".⁵

71. However, it is not only the economic interests that are the basis for the support given to the South African régime. An important role is also being played by the designs to block the national liberation movement in the southern part of Africa. It is precisely those designs which are served by the last racist bastions in Africa, namely, the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. We are bound to come to the conclusion also that it is precisely for this reason that the close ties of certain Western Powers and Israel with the racists of Pretoria are not limited only to the economic sphere. They expand into political and military co-

operation, in violation of United Nations decisions on Namibia. As has been shown in practice, the South African authorities in these circumstances are not going to be influenced either by talks or by persuasion.

72. Almost three years ago, early in 1972, during the series of meetings held by the Security Council in Africa, voices were heard in support of a dialogue between the United Nations and the régime in the Republic of South Africa. The delegation of the USSR at that time expressed serious doubts concerning the appropriateness of such action by the Security Council, considering its unpromising nature in view of the position of the racists of South Africa. Nevertheless, this course was experimented with, inasmuch as some still continued to believe in it naively. However, now all have become convinced, and indeed, life itself has confirmed that dialogue with racists is not only useless but can actually be harmful, inasmuch as it creates illusions of the possibility of coming to terms with racists. Thereby the correctness of the approach of the Soviet Union to the present question was convincingly confirmed.

73. The consistent position of principle of the USSR in the struggle against colonialism and racism is well known. Colonialism, racism, *apartheid*, zionism and all other manifestations of heinousness towards man are resolutely rejected by the Soviet Union. Twenty million Soviet people gave their lives in order to liberate mankind from the racist plague of fascism. The USSR firmly and consistently has been following the precepts of the great Lenin and is in favour of total and final liquidation of colonial and racist régimes. The Soviet Union, both on a State basis and through its social organizations, has constantly been providing and continues to provide comprehensive selfless assistance and support to the national liberation movements of Africa in their struggle to attain national independence. The Soviet Union supports the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence on the basis of the principle of territorial integrity of that country and non-interference in its domestic affairs. We recognize the lawfulness of the struggle of the people of Namibia by all means at its disposal.

74. The USSR has supported and continues to support all decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly which provide for the speedy liberation of Namibia from the domination of racists, as well as recommendations of the implementation of effective and valid measures aimed at the achievement of this just goal. Firmly condemning the policy of racial discrimination and *apartheid* practised by the Government of the Republic of South Africa, which is also being extended to the Territory of Namibia occupied by South Africa, the Soviet Union does not maintain with the Republic of South Africa any diplomatic, consular, economic or other ties whatsoever.

75. The anti-colonial struggle of the oppressed peoples requires that there be an increase in the pressure of every kind exerted upon the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa in order to isolate it to the utmost in the international arena. That is why the Soviet delegation in the Security Council supported the draft resolution to exclude the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations. The Soviet Union considers that the firmest measures must at

⁵ *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 23, chap. IV, annex, appendix IV, para. 7.

last be taken against the racists from Pretoria. The Soviet delegation is ready to support proposals concerning the application against the racist régime of South Africa of the kind of effective measures provided for in the Charter of the United Nations which would compel the Republic of South Africa to comply with those decisions.

76. The Soviet delegation has supported the resolution adopted today by the Security Council on the question under consideration, the draft of which was introduced by the African countries of Kenya and Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, although, frankly speaking, we would have preferred a stronger text.

77. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): The Council meets today in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX) which, in its section II:

“Urges the Security Council to convene urgently in order to take without delay effective measures, in accordance with the relevant Chapters of the Charter of the United Nations and with the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly regarding Namibia, to put an end to South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia”.

78. It gives my delegation deep satisfaction that the Council has been able to respond in such a speedy and effective manner to the request made by the General Assembly under that resolution. Our appreciation goes in the first place to our colleagues and friends from Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon, who have spared no efforts in order to arrive at a formula which is both effective and generally acceptable. Their deep concern for the plight of the people of Namibia, shared by all members of the Council, and their keen sense of the art of the possible have been greatly instrumental in bringing about the draft resolution that has now been adopted unanimously by the Council. The statesmanship and spirit of accommodation displayed by all members is a further source of satisfaction for my delegation.

79. In supporting the draft resolution sponsored by the delegations from Africa, my delegation has been guided in the first place by the firm and constant stand that Indonesia has always taken against colonialism in all its forms and guises. The role that Indonesia has played in support of the struggle for independence in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world is well known and needs no further elaboration. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Indonesia has a special interest in the speedy resolution of the Namibian problem in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, taking into account the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that South Africa is under the obligation to withdraw its presence from the Territory.

80. As I have stated on previous occasions; another basic attitude constantly governing the approach of my delegation is that, in regard to matters considered of vital importance to a region, Indonesia is always prepared to be primarily guided by the views and interests of the countries in the region concerned. It is Indonesia’s firm belief, one that is shared by all members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, that the countries in the region are more

knowledgeable about the problems of their region and that such problems have a more immediate bearing upon them than upon anyone else. It is therefore, in our view, only proper that greater preponderance be accorded to the views and interests of those countries.

81. It is the view of my delegation that the resolution adopted by the Council this morning can be characterized as both reasonable and timely. It is not as strong as most of us would have wished. It should, however, offer greater chances of being implemented. By according South Africa a final warning and an opportunity to comply with the various relevant resolutions of the United Nations, the resolution adopted this morning makes every effort to solve the problem of Namibia without recourse to the sanctionary measures provided by the Charter. At the same time, it provides a series of concrete steps by which South African withdrawal from Namibia can be accomplished. It seeks practical measures by which the suffering of the people of Namibia can be put to an immediate end by requiring the South African Government to implement the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to release all political prisoners, to abolish all discriminatory and repressive laws and freely to permit all exiled Namibians to return to their country. In the view of my delegation, the resolution offers both concrete and effective measures for dealing with the long unsolved problem of Namibia.

82. The latest developments in the South African region offer no justification for jubilation. There seems to be some indication that the racist and colonialist régimes in southern Africa may now at last begin to feel the pressure brought upon them by the international community, making them realize that they can no longer defy at will the wishes of the world community.

83. It is, however, still much too early to speak of a change of heart. The developments there are still too embryonic, too slow and too uncertain. Much more tangible proof is needed to dispel the justified suspicion and the scepticism of the world community with regard to the words and deeds of the régimes at Pretoria and Salisbury in view of their behaviour in the past. We believe, however, that the time has now become more propitious for the winds of change to set their course in the southern part of the African continent. It is the task of the United Nations, and in particular that of the Security Council, to take the necessary steps that would accelerate the process towards the final solution of the remaining colonial problems in Africa. The resolution adopted this morning by the Council is, in my delegation’s view, a step in the right direction. We therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/11579.

84. This is most likely the last meeting of the Council in which my delegation will participate, as our term of office will end on 31 December. Allow me, therefore, to avail myself of this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to all colleagues around this table and to the members of their delegations for their co-operation and good will, which have made it possible for my delegation to make its contribution, for whatever it is worth, to the work of the Council. It has indeed been a privilege for me to be so closely associated, on an official as well as on a personal level, with such distinguished representatives of friendly countries. Indone-

sia feels especially privileged to have had the opportunity to work together with the non-aligned members of the Council in the common efforts to find solutions to problems with which the Council has been confronted. Previous representatives of the non-aligned countries in the Council, Ambassador Cissé of Guinea, Ambassador Sen of India, Ambassador Boyd of Panama, Ambassador Abdulla of Sudan and Ambassador Mojsov of Yugoslavia, have established an excellent reputation of service and dedication to the work of the Council. My delegation hopes that we have helped to maintain that reputation of the non-aligned members.

85. My gratitude and that of my delegation goes also to the Secretary-General and his close collaborators assigned to the Security Council, to the members of the Secretariat who have given such valuable co-operation during the two years that Indonesia has been a non-permanent member of the Council.

86. As my delegation is on the point of terminating its work in the Council, we are greatly heartened by the fact that the places to be vacated by the five non-permanent members will be occupied by countries known for their dedication and commitment to the ideals and principles of the Charter. I am confident that the Council, with their participation, will be able to play, with increasing success, the vital role assigned to it by the Charter as the principal organ entrusted with the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

87. Mr. President, allow me to address a few words to you personally, as I will not have the occasion to do so next month because both of us will be leaving the Council at the end of this year. I am one of the many who have been privileged to know you for quite a number of years and I have learned to like and admire you. My first professional contact with you was some 15 years ago, during one of the lower points in the relations between our two countries, when you were the Ambassador of Australia at Jakarta. You showed a deep understanding of Indonesia and the Indonesian people, an understanding which you have continued to show ever since. Your vision of the relations between our two countries has been vindicated by the developments, especially during the last five to six years, when those relations have become very close indeed on the basis of mutual understanding, friendship and co-operation. I had the good fortune that my two years in the Council coincided with yours and I must thank you for the close co-operation and continued personal friendship that you have accorded to me during these last two years, within and outside the Council. In my previous intervention in the Council, I have expressed my confidence that under your wise guidance our work would again come to a fruitful conclusion. That confidence was not misplaced. The Council has managed to conclude its debate successfully on two important issues. May I, on behalf of my delegation, express our high appreciation for the way you have acquitted yourself of your task and congratulate you on the successful outcome.

88. May I be permitted to thank my colleague and brother from Mauritania, who has spoken such kind words and expressed such kind sentiments about the role which I have played in the Council.

89. The two years that I have represented my country in the Council have been a great experience for me which I would not have liked to miss. Though I cannot deny that I will feel relieved when at the end of this year the clocks chime in the New Year, there will be certainly many occasions in the future when I will look back with nostalgia to my term in the Council, to the close and friendly working relationship that exists in the Council between its members, a relationship which has become the basis for lasting personal friendships. My delegation wishes the Council well and its members every success in their endeavour to maintain and preserve peace and security in the world.

90. Mr. SALAZAR (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/11579 and wishes briefly to explain some of the reasons for our affirmative vote.

91. There can be very few subjects on which the General Assembly and the Security Council have shown such unanimous and continuous concern as they have with regard to the Territory formerly known as South West Africa, later recognized by the General Assembly under the name of Namibia.

92. My delegation has a tradition of solidarity with those who have sought to make that Territory an independent, free and sovereign nation, in keeping with the historical trends which most fortunately have put an end to an era of colonial rule whose last bastions were to be found in Africa. My country has welcomed with great pleasure the attainment of independence by all the new African nations which now sit in the United Nations, and we are glad to have them here today as free and sovereign nations and to share with them many of their legitimate aspirations. My delegation wishes to maintain its solidarity in the battles that still lie ahead so that those peoples in the African continent still subject to foreign rule may in the near future also enjoy their right to independence.

93. My delegation has followed closely the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and we pay tribute to the praiseworthy performance of its members at various stages of its work. Its thorough reports have described for us the obstacles placed by South Africa in the path of independence for Namibia.

94. My delegation is convinced that, ever since General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), in which the General Assembly decided to put an end to South Africa's mandate over Namibia and to assume direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence, the Assembly has been in a state of direct conflict with South Africa because of that country's refusal to respect this and other decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council in which those bodies, expressing themselves in many different ways requested South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. My delegation clearly cannot fail to give its support to a new resolution according to which the United Nations would recover the rights which have been denied it to lead Namibia to full independence.

95. My delegation agrees with paragraph 6 of the resolution just adopted by the Security Council, according to

which the Council is to review the item on or before 30 May 1975 because, although South Africa's recent behaviour has not been very encouraging there are grounds for hoping that positive changes are taking place in the conduct of that nation which may facilitate a satisfactory transition and which may lead to the early attainment by the people of Namibia of their right to independence.

96. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the French delegation was not surprised that the Group of African States asked you to convene the Security Council for the purpose of examining the question of Namibia. This meeting was provided for by the resolution adopted a few days ago in the General Assembly [*resolution 3295 (XXIX)*] and, although we had to express certain reservations concerning many of its provisions, we were not opposed to the principle of convening the Council because such a move appeared entirely justified to us.

97. Our reaction could not have been any different, because for many years now we have made known our concern with the situation in Namibia. It is clear that South Africa has not fulfilled its obligation to transform the political status of the population of South West Africa and that it has not promoted that people's exercise of its right to self-determination and independence, a right universally recognized as universally applicable. The result is an abnormal situation which must be remedied. I shall recall that for its part France has favoured the formulation of proposals made with a view to finding a solution, but that South Africa has not lived up to our expectations. This is why, last December, the Security Council had to suspend its work on Namibia after having observed and deplored the fact that no genuine progress had been made in the situation in the Territory.

98. Since then a year has elapsed, important events have taken place in Africa and, now that we are again opening the Namibian file, one observation becomes imperative. Our debate is now taking place at a time when the international situation is very different from what it was at former meetings of the Council. Breaking with years of inflexibility and with the pursuit of a pointless war, the new Portuguese Government has started on the process of decolonization with which we are all familiar. After Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, the Sao Tome and Principe islands and Angola will accede to national sovereignty in 1975. Two new States close to southern Africa of considerable land area and population will thus now not only take the place which is rightfully theirs within the Organization but will also exercise their influence throughout the whole of the region. These changes may lead to others. We are all aware that as of a few days ago in the rebel colony of Rhodesia itself the hope for a political solution at last seems to be making its appearance. The beginning of a dialogue appears to be emerging between the leaders of the white minority and the representatives of the black majority. The French delegation would not, of course, wish to show too much optimism or to anticipate events, but it does appear significant to us that perhaps a new wind might be blowing in Salisbury.

99. The ties which exist between Rhodesia and South Africa are too well known for us not to draw the conclusion that at Pretoria the need for a change is also being felt. We

hope that that may happen in Namibia as well, but we note that so far the situation referred to for more than 20 years at each session of the General Assembly has not changed much. Certainly statements have been made in the Security Council, and in South Africa on 5 November last, concerning the way in which the Pretoria Government envisages the future of the Territory. In particular, we have heard that it is intended to advance the date on which Namibians might exercise their right to self-determination. We have learned also that a certain flexibility might be introduced into the legislation currently in force in regard to the movement of persons, which might lead—at least we hope it would—to the leaders of political parties having the right to move about freely in Namibia.

100. However, we are bound to note that the former state of affairs has not truly changed much up to now. The public statements that have been made appear to us to be inadequate. They do not dispel certain ambiguities concerning the right of the Namibian people as such to independence in the unity of its Territory. The formula that "all options will be open" to the inhabitants of the Territory, although at first sight not excluding independence, does not really provide us with any explanation of the genuine policy of South Africa, which cannot be freed from its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations. Without losing sight of the facts which affect the sometimes difficult process of decolonization, which we are all aware of, we feel that the reasonable attitude for the South African Government to take would be to indicate clearly very soon what new measures it will take in order to make it possible for the Namibian people freely to take a stand in favour of independence.

101. Those are the reasons why we voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Council. Moreover, we are bound to condemn the application in Namibia of discriminatory laws and practices, which we formally censure. Considering, as I have said, that South Africa must speak out unambiguously on the right of Namibia to self-determination and independence, in the unity of its territory, we agree that the declaration we expect from South Africa should be a solemn one.

102. Lastly, although certain elements of flexibility have already been introduced concerning the barriers blocking public freedoms, we wish to associate ourselves with the appeal addressed to the South African Government to release political detainees, to abolish discriminatory laws and practices and to allow the return of political exiles.

103. Our affirmative vote was not cast without certain reservations. I shall rapidly pass over the difficulties of principle that we have concerning references to resolutions on which we have abstained. However, I should like to recall, in connexion with the references to the decision of the International Court of 21 June 1971 and the consequences that some draw from it, that our position was made clear in the statement made by my delegation in the Security Council on 5 October 1971 [*1588th meeting*].

104. Having expressed those reservations, we are gratified that the sponsors have found it possible to confirm the principles to which they are profoundly attached, even though they were presenting a draft resolution which to a

large extent takes account of the facts. We are all gratified also that the process of consultation, which so frequently and so legitimately promotes our decisions, has made it possible for us to reach agreement.

105. Sentiment and reason will in future concur in encouraging our work. Our African friends feel deeply a will for equality, justice and dignity to which the whole of our community subscribes very willingly. At the same time, we have the clear impression that the hour of negotiation and of settlement by stages is striking. May that belief be neither disappointed nor compromised by any hasty actions.

106. It might perhaps have been better if at this session the United Nations had exercised on South Africa the moral pressure which is its principal means of action, while refraining from endangering the possibility of useful contacts. No one, surely, believes that measures which are to be taken at last in Namibia and negotiations which are to be conducted throughout southern Africa will produce any results in a few weeks, or even in a few months. Each of us can, however, say to himself that today joint efforts could promote the necessary solutions. My Government has not waited for the current developments to encourage the Government of South Africa to show that it is willing to compromise. It has repeated to the Pretoria authorities the appeals and warnings that I formulated at this table on 30 October last [*1808th meeting*]. It hopes that those representations and that advice will not remain without effect and that the authorities in question will show realism, in order to bring their doctrines and practices closer to the ideals of the United Nations. My Government will continue to act along those lines and to call for the progressive disappearance of something that shocks us so much, in the hope that a frank, rapid and peaceful transformation in southern Africa, and particularly in Namibia, may take place.

107. As I conclude this statement, Mr. President, I am aware that this meeting is perhaps the last that we shall hold this year, the last at which we shall have the pleasure of working under your lofty and well-intentioned authority. May I pay a particular tribute to your wisdom, your competence and your talent as a diplomat, which have made it possible both this year and last year, in particularly difficult and tragic circumstances, to overcome successfully obstacles which appeared to be quite dangerous. I express my admiration and friendship for you.

108. I should also like to tell our colleagues from Indonesia, Kenya, Peru, and Austria, who like those from Australia will be leaving the Council at the end of this year, how much I have appreciated the co-operation established between us during the two years during which they have been members of our Council. I wish them all the best of luck in their continuing activities in the United Nations.

109. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for the very generous words he has addressed to me. May I say that I reciprocate by looking back on the degree to which I myself have benefited from his wisdom and experience during these past two years on occasions when we have had an opportunity to negotiate together on some of the difficult issues that have faced the Council. I shall recollect those occasions with great satisfaction and pleasure.

110. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In our recent debate on relations between the United Nations and South Africa, my delegation clearly and firmly stated its position on this grave aspect of that problem—the question of Namibia. Consequently, we have no difficulty at all in casting a favourable vote on the excellent draft resolution presented by Kenya, Mauritania, and the United Republic of Cameroon, which clearly condemns the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the application in that Territory of laws and practices of racial discrimination and repression and at the same time, as a natural consequence of that condemnation, demands the implementation by the Pretoria Government of measures to establish legality in the Territory of Namibia through the prompt application of all the resolutions of United Nations organs, and most particularly the relevant resolution we have just adopted.

111. My delegation was profoundly satisfied to note the unanimity shown on this resolution by the African members of the Council. We interpret that unanimity as a clear demonstration of universal awareness of the intolerable colonial and racist situation in southern Africa, particularly in a Territory that is truly a Trust Territory of the United Nations itself. At the same time we cannot fail to note with interest and cautious hope certain signs in South Africa and Rhodesia which could mean a movement towards common sense and respect for law by those respective régimes. Clearly it is for the United Nations to encourage any sign of progress towards liberation of the peoples of southern Africa, but it is important that in so doing it does not lessen its vigilance or slacken its juridical and moral pressure to obtain respect for its resolutions.

112. This is probably the last public meeting of the Security Council in which Peru will participate, since its term of office expires on 31 December. I should not like this opportunity to pass without first stating my delegation's great satisfaction at the fact that we are being replaced in the Council by a young South American State—Guyana, which, happily is, present today, the youngest of all the South American countries but one of the most active of their number on the international scene, where it has with great coherence and much spirit defended its own national interests, the interests of the Latin American area to which it belongs and the interests of non-alignment.

113. Secondly, I should like to say that our two years of membership in the Security Council have been at once a great pleasure and of great benefit to my country and, in particular, my delegation. This has been a memorable period, a period of much hard work, in which sensitive issues have been dealt with, issues closely concerning international peace and security: the situations in Zambia and the Middle East in 1973, the situation in Cyprus, the problem of the relations of the Organization with the Government of South Africa in 1974. In respect of those problems, the Council has, as is its prime duty, made use of all possible means to preserve peace and security, although it has not always succeeded in doing so to the extent desired, for reasons that are understandable and indeed proper in an Organization that is, after all, not supranational but, rather, an organization of Governments, one in which Member States jealously preserve their positions and interests.

114. Peru believes it has fulfilled the mandate given it by the General Assembly. Among other things, it was one of the first countries to take part in the peace-keeping measures adopted by the Security Council. My delegation trusts that throughout its term of office in the Council it has never lost sight of the norms of the Charter of the United Nations or the peaceful traditions of my country and of Latin America or our traditional respect for law and the principles of non-alignment to the extent that they imply authentic independence of the major centres of political and economic power.

115. I wish to state our gratitude for the intelligent and generous co-operation shown by you, Sir, who are presiding over our work today with your characteristic brilliance and by the representatives of Austria, Indonesia and Kenya who, like the representatives of Peru, are now reaching the end of their terms of office in the Council. The close co-operation my delegation has maintained with the non-aligned countries and, in general, with the non-permanent members of the Council, has, we feel, been of great benefit to the cause of peace.

116. We must not overlook the exceedingly beneficial co-ordination of our work with the distinguished representatives of the five permanent members of the Security Council; all of their countries are bound to my own by close ties of friendship.

117. My delegation and I personally wish, finally, to express our admiration and gratitude to the Secretary-General for his constant co-operation with and respect for the Council. My delegation witnessed this attitude particularly when, on two occasions, it presided over the Council. I extend our thanks and admiration also to the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, as well as to the other Secretariat members who have assisted him in his tasks.

118. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution S/11579 in the firm belief that the Security Council should shoulder its responsibility with regard to Namibia without any further delay. The measures enlisted in the resolution are, in fact, long overdue. The General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia as long ago as 27 October 1966.

119. In spite of numerous resolutions adopted over a number of years by the Security Council, and in spite of the opinion of the International Court of Justice to the effect that South Africa is under the obligation to withdraw its presence from Namibia, South Africa persists in its refusal to withdraw. In addition to its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa has further immeasurably multiplied its wrongs and violations by inflicting the evils and the degradations of *apartheid* upon the inhabitants of the captive Territory.

120. Too often in the past the Council had resolved to meet immediately to consider what action to take if South Africa did not comply with the decisions of the Council. The provisions contained in the resolution adopted this morning serve to show only too clearly that the Council has in fact failed so far to take any effective action to extricate Namibia and to rescue its inhabitants from the shackles of Pretoria.

121. The provisions of the resolution adopted today are but a minimum of the action expected from the Council in the fulfilment of its duties and obligations. My delegation devoutly hopes, not only for the sake of the people of Namibia but also for the sake of the United Nations itself, that the Council will not fail this time to have the courage, the wisdom and the determination to pursue faithfully the implementation of the decision it has unanimously adopted today.

122. May I also avail myself of this opportunity to extend to the non-permanent members of the Council who will soon be leaving the Council, including you, Mr. President, my delegation's sincere best wishes and our gratitude for having had the valuable opportunity of working with you in amity and in a spirit of co-operation in the Council. We consider ourselves the richer for the experience, and we shall always cherish the memories of the eventful year we spent together as members of this august body.

123. Mr. TCHERNOUCHTENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): First of all, my delegation wishes to emphasize that the Byelorussian SSR, in taking part in the work of the United Nations, has always been in favour of the speediest and unconditional eradication of colonialism, and for the speediest granting of independence and freedom to all colonial countries and peoples. We have always been on the side of the fighters for national freedom and independence. This course has been dictated by the whole of our world outlook; it proceeds from Lenin's foreign policy, the corner-stone of which is the brotherly union of the forces of socialism with the national liberation movements and with the peoples that have cast off the yoke of colonialism and semi-colonial bondage. Our solidarity with the peoples fighting against imperialism, racism and colonialism finds its expression in our comprehensive support, both political and material, for their just struggle.

124. Our delegation considers it essential also to point out that, through the international détente that has been achieved, a favourable set of circumstances has been produced for the conclusion of the process of decolonization and for the final liberation from colonialism of all countries and peoples. All this determines our attitude towards the question of Namibia, now being considered by the Security Council.

125. More than a decade has elapsed since the question of South West Africa, and then of Namibia, began to appear consistently on the agenda of the United Nations. It would seem that its very permanence imparted to it a character of pointlessness and lack of prospects. But very much indeed has changed since the question of revoking the Mandate of the Republic of South Africa—then the Union of South Africa—over South West Africa was raised.

126. The international balance of forces has changed: there has been a great growth in the role of socialist and non-aligned countries in international relations. The implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, has become a major historic phase of the struggle being conducted within

the framework of the United Nations against colonialism and racism.

127. It should be pointed out also that in recent years the General Assembly and the Security Council began to adopt resolutions which, had they been implemented, could have contributed to the acceleration of the solution of the question of Namibia in the interest of the people of that Territory. However, this has constantly been blocked by the South African racists, who have enslaved Namibia and created there unlimited possibilities for its domination by the foreign monopolies of a number of Western countries which are mercilessly exploiting the indigenous population and plundering Namibia's natural resources.

128. But the struggle of the people of Namibia indicates that the day is not far off when that colony, which has suffered more than most others, will achieve its freedom and independence. Eloquent evidence of this is the statement of the representative of SWAPO, which, as pointed out in a recently adopted General Assembly resolution, is the genuine representative of the people of Namibia [*resolution 3295 (XXIX)*].

129. The Byelorussian delegation, expressing its solidarity with the patriots of SWAPO and with the people of Namibia, wishes them further success in the fierce struggle which they are waging, and expresses its confidence that their just cause will triumph. The struggle of the Namibian people is intimately connected with the efforts and determination of the people of Africa to put a final end to colonialism, racism and *apartheid* upon the African continent.

130. In this historic process of liberation from colonialism, one of the important landmarks is the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire. In these circumstances, matters connected with the struggle against the colonialism, racism and *apartheid* of the régimes which exist in Southern Rhodesia and in the Republic of South Africa are coming to the forefront of the struggle against colonialism. The struggle for freedom and independence in Namibia is acquiring a special significance.

131. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR strongly condemns the racist authorities of South Africa for their brazen refusal to carry out the decisions of various organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council, for their continuing unlawful occupation of Namibia, for the establishment of the criminal system of *apartheid* there and for their attempts to convert Namibia into a huge reservation, a sort of cemetery for the living. It condemns the terrorism and the repression inflicted on Namibia's indigenous inhabitants. We are against the attempts of the South African racists to destroy the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia by proclaiming so-called self-governing regions and playing out a comedy of elections in that Territory.

132. The Byelorussian SSR does not maintain any relations at all with the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa. Our consistent position of principle against the policy of racism, colonialism and *apartheid* pursued by the Republic of South Africa was reflected in our vote in the Security Council for the exclusion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations. However, that decision was

not adopted, owing to the positions of three Western Powers. This situation, of course, makes necessary further struggle within the United Nations against the Republic of South Africa and its criminal policy.

133. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR voted for resolution 366 (1974), in spite of its inadequacy. Obviously the resolution that has been adopted marks only one of the intermediate stages in the complex struggle which is being waged for the freedom and independence of Namibia. Everybody knows perfectly well who is blocking the speedy, just and democratic solution of the problem of Namibia. From the data provided in the documents of the United Nations we see who are really responsible for the colonial tragedy of the people of Namibia. This also emerges from today's statements by the representatives of African countries and by the representative of SWAPO. The policy of support to the racist régime in the Republic of South Africa practised by a number of Western countries, and in particular by Israel, and the selfish interests of transnational monopolies are what constitute a barrier to that solution. Without the assistance and support of certain circles of NATO, Pretoria would not have decided to defy the United Nations, the people of Africa and world public opinion. The Republic of South Africa is a bastion of imperialism upon the African continent. The economic interests of the imperialist Powers are closely interwoven with their military and strategic goals. This is what determines the position of a number of Western Powers which are hampering a just solution of the question of Namibia and the granting of independence and freedom to that much-suffering country.

134. Finally, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to state that in standing out boldly for the definitive liquidation of all colonial and racist régimes, it continues to support the unconditional right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence and to advocate the territorial integrity of that country and non-interference in its domestic affairs. We recognize the lawfulness of the struggle of the Namibian people against the criminal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, which runs counter to the decisions of the United Nations. We are against the plundering of its wealth by the racists of the Republic of South Africa and their allies, the transnational monopolies.

135. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR continues to favour the adoption of the most resolute and effective measures in this direction. We are for the freedom and independence of Namibia. At the same time, our delegation considers that the elimination of a hotbed of racism and colonialism in southern Africa will lessen the threat of war and strengthen peace and security upon the African continent.

136. In concluding my statement, may I address myself to you, Mr. President, and to the representatives of the other countries, non-permanent members of the Security Council, whose term of office is coming to an end this year. As other members of the Security Council have done, I should like to express my warmest feelings to the representatives of Austria, Australia, Indonesia, Kenya and Peru, countries which have taken an active part for two years in the work of the Security Council in carrying out that complex, responsible

and lofty mission entrusted to the Council under the Charter of the United Nations.

137. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): There seems to be growing up an unwritten rule of procedure in the Organization, namely, that the Soviet Union is entitled to attack the good faith, the motives, the intentions, the honesty of any other nation, but it is somehow out of order or contrary to the accepted and established practice or, indeed, just bad form for anyone to reply.

138. Mr. President, you will perhaps not be surprised to learn I find this general proposition somewhat unacceptable. We were indeed having a very helpful and a useful debate designed to assist the situation, save once again for the contribution made by the representative of the Soviet Union. It is perfectly but regrettably clear that the Soviet Union is more concerned with advocating its now somewhat eccentric brand of propaganda than it is with genuinely helping to find a solution to the very real problems of Namibia and South Africa.

139. The Soviet contributions—since they were two—were irrelevant to our proceedings. They were negative in content and they were ideological in tone. They were well below the level which the occasion and the issue demands, especially from a country as great and as powerful as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was, indeed, almost irresponsible to have made such a speech at such a time when at last there is some real sign of a change of heart in southern Africa. I much regret that it was thought necessary to do so and I suspect the Soviet Union may in due course come to regret it too.

140. The resolution we have just adopted unanimously is important, in our view, on two counts. It is important because it marks, I understand, a welcome return to the way in which the Council has traditionally tried to conduct its business. There were full consultations before the draft resolution was submitted in an effort to accommodate the various points of view of different members of the Council. As a result, we have been able to adopt a resolution which has the full, if not the unqualified, backing of all of us. I believe that the Council's authority has been strengthened by the way in which this resolution has been adopted. I believe, too, that the resolution itself will be heeded all the more by those at whom it is directed. I am grateful to the sponsors of this resolution, the representatives of Kenya, Mauritania and the United Republic of Cameroon for taking other delegations' views into account before they proceeded to submit it. A great deal of the credit goes also to our distinguished and experienced President—but I shall have more to say about him in a moment.

141. The second reason why this resolution is so important is that it comes at a time when immense changes are taking place in southern Africa. The news from Rhodesia must encourage all of us who hope for an early and a peacefully negotiated settlement in that country, based on the wishes of the majority of its population. It is far too early to predict the outcome—and I entirely agree with what the representative of Indonesia said in this respect—but it is only right that the Council should take note of the statesmanlike role played by the African Governments principally concerned,

and also by the South African Government itself. We welcome these developments. Our vote is designed to promote similar change in Namibia. This is in our view a realistic resolution.

142. Of course we cannot expect changes overnight, nor can changes be delayed indefinitely. Already there are signs that the South African Government is taking a fresh look at its policy in Namibia. I do not think that I need quote the statements made recently by the South African Prime Minister; they will be familiar to all the members of the Council. But there are also some encouraging signs that the leaders of the white community of Namibia are beginning to recognize the need for early action. As the Deputy Leader of the National Party of South West Africa, Mr. Mudge, said recently in an interview:

“We would have preferred more time, but we don't have it. We South Westers will have to move a great deal faster than many of us would like.”

And later in the same interview he said:

“Clearly we will have to start talking to South Africa about withdrawal at some stage.”

143. We therefore hope for early change. The exact direction of that change may not yet be clear, but already there is a sense of movement, and we welcome this. Our task, and the task of the Security Council, is, we believe, to try to encourage these developments and also to make clear to the South African Government the need to keep the United Nations fully informed of its future intentions. The United Nations has a natural and a proper interest in the future of this Territory, with its unique form of international status. My Government, for its part, will continue to keep in touch with the South African Government. We shall do everything we can to promote that peaceful change in Namibia.

144. As members of the Council will be aware, my Government recently reviewed its own policy towards Namibia. The details are set out in the letter from the representative of the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General of 4 December 1974,⁶ and I need only therefore summarize some of the main points. My Government concluded that the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia could no longer be regarded as being in force, since South Africa had itself repudiated that Mandate and the obligations which it had accepted under and by virtue of that relationship. It follows therefore, in our view, that South Africa's occupation of Namibia is unlawful and that it should withdraw from the Territory. My Foreign Secretary said in the House of Commons:

“The Government looks to South Africa to heed the United Nations calls on it to withdraw from this international Territory, and we shall lend our support in the international community to help bring this about.”

That is what we believe we are doing here today.

145. There are, however, certain features of the resolution on which my Government has reservations which it is only right that I should make clear. These relate primarily to the

⁶ A/9918.

advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. We cannot agree with the view expressed in that opinion that the General Assembly had the executive competence to terminate the Mandate. We cannot therefore accept that it was so terminated by Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). This reservation has of course to be viewed together with our opinion on the illegality of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia, to which I have already referred. Nor can we agree that resolutions of the Security Council are mandatory in the absence of any prior finding under Article 39 of the Charter that there existed a threat to or breach of the peace or an act of aggression. Consequently, we cannot share the view that Security Council resolution 276 (1970) imposed obligations upon States Members of the Organization.

146. As the Council will appreciate, these reservations touch on matters which go far beyond the particular issue before us today. They relate to our view of the way in which the Charter is to be interpreted, and the relationship between the various organs of the United Nations. This being so, it is only right that while voting for this resolution and supporting it whole-heartedly in relation to Namibia, I should make it clear that in so doing we do not accept any possible implication which might arise relating to the interpretation of the Charter or the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. But I think I have said enough to make it clear that we associate ourselves with the aims of this world body in relation to Namibia, even if there are inevitably differences of emphasis between us and some other Members. When the Council last discussed South Africa, I said [*1808th meeting*]:

"I hope [South Africa] will recognize the weight of international opinion that is opposed to its policies. I hope it will heed the voices we have all heard in this chamber. I trust it will act accordingly."

147. That remains our hope and our belief. We want the people of Namibia to be given the chance to determine their own future freely and at the earliest reasonable date. We now look to the South African Government to make the necessary arrangements, in consultation with the United Nations, and in doing so to remedy a situation that has lasted far too long and which has perpetuated a conflict between South Africa and the Organization almost from the day it was founded nearly 30 years ago—indeed before, if my memory serves me right, NATO came into existence.

148. Finally, may I refer to the contribution made to the work of the Security Council by the representatives of Austria, Peru, Indonesia and Kenya. All of them have made major and significant contributions to the work of the Council, certainly in the short time since I have been on it. On behalf of my country and my delegation, as well as on my own behalf, may I say that it has been a great personal as well as a public pleasure to have been associated with them in the work of the Council.

149. As for you, Mr. President, my delegation's appreciation of your skill is somewhat tempered by the realization that this is the last period during which you will occupy the seat of President of the Security Council. You will shortly be returning to Canberra and retiring from diplomatic life. All of us—and in particular a relative newcomer like myself—have benefited from your long experience, your friendship

and your wise guidance in the ways of these United Nations. Your departure, Mr. President, will diminish this place. You have played an influential role in so many different areas of United Nations activity. In times when some voices are perhaps immoderate or intolerant, you have always been a persuasive example of the virtues of moderation, tolerance and compromise in the conduct of international affairs. Mr. President, you will be missed greatly.

150. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): When the Security Council met last year in December to consider the question of Namibia, it unanimously terminated the contacts entrusted by it to the Secretary-General in close cooperation with a group of three Council members, as provided for in resolution 309 (1972). Speaking in the debate at that time [*1758th meeting*], my delegation stressed the hope that further developments would enable the Council in the foreseeable future to deal with the question again on a more positive note.

151. Positive developments have taken place during the course of this year in the Portuguese colonies surrounding the Republic of South Africa. The new Government of Portugal has recognized the right of the peoples of its colonial Territories to self-determination and independence. By the end of July of next year two former colonies of Portugal, Mozambique, on the one hand, and Sao Tome and Principe, on the other, will have become independent States side by side with the independent Republic of Guinea-Bissau, which has already joined the United Nations. By then we hope provisional Governments will have been established in Angola and in Cape Verde with a view to the attainment by those Territories during 1975 of the goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The winds of change, to which reference has so often been made, have thus begun to blow in southern Africa.

152. No corresponding trend, however, has become manifest in Namibia. Quite to the contrary, we are bound to state that the conditions prevailing in this Territory have deteriorated. During the general debate on Namibia in the Fourth Committee this year, 82 speakers, Austria among them, elaborated on this subject. The General Assembly, consequently, adopted resolution 3295 (XXIX), urging the Security Council "to take without delay effective measures, in accordance with the relevant Chapters of the Charter of the United Nations and with the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia".

153. By adopting unanimously today what will be known as resolution 366 (1974), the Security Council calls upon South Africa to make a solemn declaration that it will comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 in regard to Namibia and that, furthermore, it recognizes the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia as a nation.

154. I would like to congratulate the sponsors of this resolution, my African colleagues on the Council, who succeeded through intense consultations in working out a text acceptable to the whole of the Council. This is indeed a

memorable achievement. Austria fully subscribes to this resolution and we express the hope that the Government of South Africa will see fit this time to react positively to this unanimous appeal of the Security Council. It seems difficult indeed for any country in the world not to heed such a strong and authoritative appeal.

155. As many speakers have pointed out before me, we are at present witnessing important developments in southern Africa and we are confident that these efforts to bring about peaceful change by peaceful means through negotiations will succeed. Quite independently of the outcome of these initiatives, we have to pay a high tribute already at this stage to those African statesmen, in particular President Kaunda of Zambia, President Nyerere of the United Republic of Tanzania and President Seretse Khama of Botswana, and other leaders, for the humanist spirit in which they have entered these endeavours.

156. It is of paramount importance that the United Nations keep the evolution of events under close and critical scrutiny, because for the first time representative leaders of black and white Africa have found sufficient common ground for a serious exchange of views. A new element of fluidity seems to have been introduced into what has hitherto been a completely inflexible set of relationships. This is particularly encouraging in the context of Southern Rhodesia where, for the first time in many years, free political life has begun to flourish, thus opening up prospects of a real dialogue between the majority and the minority.

157. Let me conclude, therefore, by expressing the hope that the people of Namibia will soon be in a position to realize their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the principles laid down in our Charter. A heavy responsibility has been placed on the Government of the Republic of South Africa, and we can only hope that its response will be rapid, positive and constructive.

158. This may well be the last meeting of the Council in which my delegation will participate before Austria's term of office on the Council ends on 31 December of this year. I would therefore, Mr. President, ask for your indulgence in allowing me briefly to cross the borderlines of today's agenda and make a few observations of a more general character.

159. The years 1973 and 1974 have been two most significant and indeed spirited years in the history of this body. Briefly recalling the most important items will demonstrate the breadth of the work of the Council during these two years. The situation in Zambia was the first question to preoccupy the Council early in 1973 and I myself had the privilege of taking part in a mission to that country together with two most distinguished colleagues, Ambassador Anwar Sani of Indonesia and Ambassador Pérez de Cuéllar of Peru, who are still on the Council, as well as Ambassador Abdulla of Sudan, who has left the Council on a new assignment. In March of 1973 the Council went to Panama City for its first historic series of meetings in Latin America. The summer months of last year witnessed another determined effort to set in motion a process towards a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. Yet war broke out in October 1973 and, in its wake, the Security Council spared no effort

to influence the course of events in order to stop military conflagration. It acted without delay on a cease-fire proposal, and the decisiveness and care the Council invested in the composition and dispatch of the United Nations Emergency Force to Egypt have been rightly acclaimed. The Council later sought to contribute to the proper functioning of the Geneva Conference in the United Nations context. Several months later the United Nations Disengagement Observation Force was stationed on the Golan Heights.

160. The events in Cyprus which developed as a result of the coup in July 1974 thrust upon the Council the urgent task of dealing responsibly with the fate of a small country exposed both to a most difficult domestic situation and to military intervention from outside. It is to the credit of all parties concerned that the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus could be extended only recently, thus continuing to provide an element of security and peace to the population of the island.

161. During all this time, as indeed today, the Security Council has addressed itself repeatedly to various serious aspects of the situation in southern Africa, which remains one of the most complicated issues on the agenda, but where some hope for progress now seems to be justified.

162. My delegation has attempted to contribute to the debates and decisions of the Council in all these fields to the best of its knowledge and ability. We have done so in the same spirit I sought to define in my first statement before the Council in January 1973 [1684th meeting]. For it was logical that we would endeavour to bring the specific contribution of Austria, a European country, to the work of the Council. In the process it was equally our intention to demonstrate in a new context in what way the concept of permanent neutrality and the independent foreign policy which flows from it can be put to the service of those specific aims and objectives which belong to the Security Council.

163. We have come to the Council in the firm belief that the independent foreign policy of a country dedicated to the concept of permanent neutrality can be of such service. This, as we said earlier, stems from the very origin of neutrality which, in its true sense, is not a concept of inaction, of passivity, or of indifference, but a concept in active search of peace. If during our years of membership in the Council we were able to support a great number of initiatives, it was in the firm belief that we could thus bring permanent neutrality to the permanent service of peace. We have endeavoured to formulate our policy in a positive, active and forward-looking way without departing from the basic principles which have characterized the foreign policy of an independent and sovereign Austria for the past 20 years. It may still be too early to assess properly and fully the interaction and interrelation between the peace policies of the United Nations and the peaceful functions of permanent neutrality such as those carried out by Austria and a number of other European countries. We feel, however, that in a modest way new proof has been furnished not only of the compatibility of these policies but also of their complementary nature.

164. The past two years have provided us not only with this opportunity to demonstrate our concern as a Member

State with important issues of the United Nations but also to see for the first time the inner functioning of the main organ of the United Nations charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. In this connexion, members of the Council will recall that my Government was among those which forwarded extensive comments on the question of enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council in accordance with the principles embodied in the provisions of the Charter. On 17 January 1974 [176]st meeting, I had occasion to refer to the desirability of reviewing and updating the provisional rules of procedure, and my delegation subsequently circulated to members of the Council a series of informal suggestions in this regard. In view of the many urgent matters of which the Council was seized, there was only limited time available to study all the aspects and implications of those proposals in a detailed manner. It is gratifying to note, however, that our proposals have received careful attention and stimulated valuable comments. My delegation hopes that discussions on this question will continue and will be concluded in an agreed and satisfactory manner in due course.

165. These, then, have been two most rewarding years for myself and for my delegation—as they would be for any country which had the honour of serving on the Security Council for the first time. May I therefore take this opportunity of expressing my delegation's profound appreciation of the understanding and co-operation it has received from all the members of the Council. On behalf of the members of my delegation, as well as in my own name, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and all delegations for their co-operation and for the spirit of friendship in which this was extended by the five permanent members as well as by the non-permanent members. I hope that the spirit of friendship, mutual respect and understanding we have established will not only remain in this chamber but will also last between those who remain and those who leave it. Our thanks are due in equal measure to the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs and their staff members, by whom we have been particularly well served.

166. Finally, may I greet the incoming members: first of all our fellow European countries, Italy and Sweden, but also the friendly countries of Guyana, Japan and the United Republic of Tanzania, which will accept the heavy responsibilities of Council membership on 1 January 1975. We wish them the best of success in their new functions.

167. My concluding words go to you, Mr. President, as did my first statement this month. This has been a most gratifying association and I wish to thank you once again on behalf of my delegation for all you have done not only during your two terms of Presidency but also on the many occasions on which we have been privileged to work with you, and to pay the highest tribute to your quiet and patient statesmanship.

168. Mr. SCALI (United States of America): United Nations concern over the South African administration of Namibia spans the life of the Organization. For the seventh consecutive year the Security Council is considering this same question. Since the Council met last December to discuss the future of Namibia, political developments of

great importance to Namibia and the rest of southern Africa have taken place, as we are all aware.

169. The April events in Portugal have irrevocably altered the political map of southern Africa. Those events have set in motion a continuing and dramatic movement towards full decolonization in Portuguese Africa. More recently, meetings held in Zambia involving the various political forces on the Rhodesian scene have raised hopes that a solution to the Rhodesian problem acceptable to a majority of the people may soon be negotiated. These developments, we believe, must necessarily impel South Africa to re-examine its basic policies regarding Namibia in the light of the new realities.

170. The position of my Government on the Namibian question is clear and unequivocal. We have informed the Government of South Africa of our views on this issue and will continue to do so when appropriate. We believe that there is an urgent need to resolve this long-standing and contentious issue peacefully and as soon as possible.

171. We are encouraged by recent indications that South Africa may be reviewing its policies in Namibia. The South African Government has announced that the people of Namibia will be called upon to decide their own future; that all options, including full independence, are open to them; and that the people of the Territory may exercise their right to self-determination "considerably sooner" than the 10-year forecast made by the South African Foreign Minister in 1973. We believe that a peaceful and realistic solution should be sought now. We understand that a meeting is planned between representatives of various groups in the Territory and the leaders of the white population to discuss the constitutional development of the Territory. We believe that no significant element of the Namibian people or of Namibian political life should be excluded.

172. However, much as we welcome the changes in recent South African Government statements on Namibia, we wish to state in all candour our view that those statements lack the necessary precision and detail. It is this very precision, along with positive actions, which is required to lay to rest the scepticism with which South African pronouncements on Namibia have been received in many quarters. What is called for is a specific, unequivocal statement of South Africa's intention with regard to the Territory. We urge that Government to make known as soon as possible its plans to permit the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination in the near future.

173. We favour the development of renewed contacts between the Secretary-General and the South African Government to assist South Africa in arranging for the exercise of self-determination. The constructive involvement of the United Nations and the Secretary-General can be of significant importance in ensuring an orderly transition of power in the Territory, which is to everyone's benefit. We also believe that South Africa should abolish discriminatory laws and practices and encourage freer political expression within the whole Territory.

174. While awaiting further South African clarification of its Namibian policy, the United States will continue to

adhere to its present policy with regard to the Territory. As we have done since 1970, we shall continue to discourage United States investment in Namibia and 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 belief that South Africa should act quickly and positively to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

175. In addition, we are pleased that we were able to join together in advance consultations with members of the Group of African States to adopt this important new resolution.

176. Mr. President, in the expectation that this will be our last meeting this year I want to reiterate the high respect and admiration with which you are regarded by my delegation. Your work in the Council, especially during two separate and arduous Presidencies, has been in the highest tradition of the Council. If additional evidence were needed, you have proved that Australia in its devotion to the maintenance of international peace and security admirably meets the most important criterion for the election of non-permanent members of the Council.

177. To our other colleagues who will leave the Council at the end of the month—Austria, Indonesia, Kenya and Peru—I would like to express my deep gratitude for their hard work, their co-operation, dedication and courtesy and belief in the common ideals which have marked our work together. Even on those rare occasions when we were not in full agreement, we have always shared the common aim of doing our utmost to help to maintain international peace and security.

178. Mr. MAINA (Kenya): Mr. President, as I am speaking for the first time since you assumed the Presidency of the Council, allow me to join the others who have paid tribute to you. As a newcomer I had heard of your reputation for skill and dedication to the work of the Council, and these qualities have once again been demonstrated since you assumed the Presidency this month. We are grateful to you for all your efforts. My tribute goes also to your predecessor, Ambassador Scali, who presided over our affairs very ably last month.

179. The Council is once again called upon to consider the question of Namibia. The resolution referring the case to the Council this time is very clear. It states:

“Urges the Security Council to convene urgently in order to take without delay effective measures, in accordance with the relevant Chapters of the Charter of the United Nations and with resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly regarding Namibia, to put an end to South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia” [*General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX)*].

180. We are all agreed, as is indicated by the unanimous vote on the resolution adopted this morning, that South Africa has been in unlawful occupation of the Territory of

Namibia since the General Assembly terminated its mandate in 1966. My delegation has persistently stated that South Africa must leave the United Nations Trust Territory of Namibia.

181. We have all condemned South Africa’s refusal to comply with the United Nations decisions on Namibia. My delegation views with great concern the continued defiance by South Africa of the United Nations. Indeed, it is the view of my delegation that the non-compliance of South Africa with the decisions of the United Nations concerning Namibia is an act of hostility by South Africa against the United Nations which calls for stern measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

182. Lately we have been hearing concern expressed about the authority and dignity of the United Nations. There have been suggestions that the dignity and authority of the Organization are being eroded. My delegation considers that that dignity is being eroded by such acts as the defiance by South Africa of the decisions of the United Nations on Namibia. What then should the Security Council do in the light of this persistent defiance of South Africa?

183. When the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia, it also placed that country under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The responsibility for administering the Territory until it became independent was entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was established in 1967. The United Nations, through that Council, has attempted on various occasions to enter into arrangements with South Africa for the purpose of the orderly transfer of authority from South Africa to the Council for Namibia. Despite the abhorrence by the Africans of the so-called dialogue with South Africa, the African members of the Council were prepared to authorize the Secretary-General, assisted by three members of the Council, through its resolution 309 (1972), to enter into discussions with South Africa regarding this orderly transfer.

184. We know that South Africa acted in bad faith, contrary to the opinion of those who counselled moderation and patience. The Council and the General Assembly terminated the fruitless discussions last year. It is important to note that when the talks were halted there was no sign of conciliation on the part of South Africa; indeed, South Africa assumed an arrogant posture. Its Prime Minister is alleged to have boasted, when campaigning for elections early this year, that South Africa would never surrender Namibia to the United Nations. Indeed, it was not until the now notorious debate on the relationship between South Africa and the United Nations that South Africa once again returned to its deceitful path of appearing to be changing or becoming enlightened.

185. I am referring to the statement of the representative of South Africa in the Council [*1800th meeting*] when he said that South Africa should be given time to change. I am also referring to the so-called “voice of reason” attributed to Mr. Vorster, when he pleaded for a six-month period of grace to make changes, particularly in Namibia. My delegation has not been taken in by these utterances, and we believe that the Council and the international community must take suitable

ble action to compel South Africa to relinquish its stranglehold on Namibia.

186. It is the view of my delegation that if all Member States implemented the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council regarding Namibia, and in particular Security Council resolution 283 (1970), South Africa would not be able to continue its defiance of the United Nations. My delegation condemns South Africa for its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations. We do hope that the wind of change that is blowing in southern Africa has given a clear indication to South Africa and its supporters that the writing is on the wall and that the sooner they get the message the better for all.

187. The Council and the international community cannot wait any longer. It should be remembered that Namibia was not the only Mandated Territory after the First World War. We cannot believe that the people of Namibia are different from the peoples of the former Tanganyika or Cameroon, for example, who were under the same German oppression before the First World War, but who are now sitting with us as sovereign Members of the United Nations. There were many other Mandated Territories, both in Africa and in Asia, that have become independent and we must ask: why not Namibia, too? This appears to have been a case of the United Nations entrusting the sheep to the wolves. It is a shame. It is a comfort, however, to remember that the will of a people cannot be destroyed for ever. However oppressive South Africa becomes, we are confident that the peoples of Namibia will rise, like those of Guinea-Bissau, and others elsewhere, to crush the forces of injustice.

188. Speaking now as an African member of the Council, I wish to comment generally on our understanding of the resolution that has been adopted by the Council. The resolution was arrived at after lengthy negotiations with the other interested parties. My delegation deems it a very mild resolution. It does not truthfully reflect the gravity of the issues in Namibia, but we as Africans are prepared at all times to give other people a chance to demonstrate their good faith. It will be recalled that previously we have been accused of presenting resolutions that embarrassed other members of the Council. We have also been accused sometimes of introducing resolutions calling for immediate and on the spot solutions of complex issues. We do not of course share the sentiments of our accusers, maybe because we are the wearers of the shoes of imperialism and colonialism and they have been the manufacturers, and, as the saying goes, it is the wearer who knows where the shoe pinches.

189. The Namibian people are entitled to self-determination and independence. The South African Government has no right to be in Namibia, and we ask its friends to counsel South Africa to comply with the provisions of this resolution. We also urge those countries that continue to exploit the natural resources of Namibia for the benefit of South Africa to stop such exploitation and to channel their efforts towards aiding the Namibian people to achieve their independence. We are confident that those countries, given the political will, could use their economic interests, in both Namibia and South Africa, in an appropriate way so as to

compel South Africa to abandon its abhorrent illegal occupation and practices of *apartheid* in Namibia.

190. Three months have elapsed since Mr. Vorster asked to be given six months in which to bring about changes. The Council cannot be accused of pushing Mr. Vorster and his so-called white nation, since the time fixed for the review of this matter is well beyond the six-month period requested by Mr. Vorster in October. We urge the United Nations to take appropriate action under Chapter VII of the Charter in 1975, if no acceptable changes have taken place by that time.

191. As it is our prayer that we do not suffer any misfortune compelling you, Mr. President, to convene another meeting of the Council, we regard this as our last meeting this year. Kenya's term in the Council also comes to an end on 31 December 1974. We therefore wish to take this opportunity to wish everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. We thank all those who have made Kenya's contribution to the Council possible. In our list we include all members of the Council, all Members of the United Nations and the Secretary-General and his staff, particularly the wonderful people who sit at the inner table and produce our records, as well as the interpreters. We constantly think of them when meetings drag on unavoidably for many long hours.

192. Finally, I should like to say that Kenya has gone through a very momentous period in the Council and has made, I believe, its modest contribution. We have great faith in the United Nations and in the Security Council and we do not share the gloom of others. We urge all members of the Council, particularly the permanent members, to have greater faith in the Council and in the United Nations. It should be the commitment of all to strengthen the Organization rather than to look for its faults, or for alternatives to it. We have so much faith in the United Nations that we are inclined to regard the tendency to do the latter not as a malignant ailment but as a temporary fever that will pass away. We can see no alternative to the United Nations but chaos and disaster for mankind. We hope that others will see it the way we do.

193. The PRESIDENT: Speaking now as the representative of AUSTRALIA, I should like to express, in a very few words, my delegation's satisfaction that the Council has found itself able to adopt this resolution unanimously. That surely reflects a welcome spirit of moderation and realism on all sides, both within the Council and outside it, which I like to think takes account of the new sounds that seem to be emanating these days from southern Africa. At the same time, this is coupled with a firm determination to maintain pressure on the South African Government to acknowledge the will of the United Nations as a whole, and to act accordingly.

194. My own Government has made quite clear on numerous occasions its view that South Africa has no lawful right to occupy and administer Namibia and that it has failed to discharge the Mandate given to it 54 years ago. We are entitled now to expect clear evidence of intention on the part of the South African Government to co-operate with the United Nations, without equivocations and reservations, and we look to it to facilitate and not obstruct the future

independence of the whole of the Territory. Although we do not expect to make any further direct contribution through the Security Council, Australia will expect to play its full part in promoting Namibia's movement towards independence, especially if, as we hope, we are elected to serve on the Council for Namibia.

195. In my capacity of PRESIDENT, I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

196. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): A few words in connection with the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Richard. It is indeed a strange situation. Whenever the soviet delegation talks about the invidious manoeuvres of NATO, the representative of the United Kingdom starts, raises his hand, and says "It is I who am bad, it was the United Kingdom to which the Soviet representative was referring". It is of course his right to take upon himself, and upon his country, all the responsibility for all the invidious manoeuvres of NATO. But I personally think this is also a matter of a bad conscience on the part of the United Kingdom representative.

197. He talked here about demagoguery. I take that to mean that he would like to hear rather more specific figures and to have more specific information as to how the United Kingdom is assisting the racists of the Republic of South Africa. Well, I shall be very happy to give him that satisfaction.

198. According to statistics recently published by the Harvard Business School, 16 per cent of all the affiliates of British transnational monopolies are in the Republic of South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. In South Africa alone, British investments have long exceeded \$3 billion. The average annual income earned on those British investments runs from 25 to 30 per cent. In individual instances, as Professor Ripley, a well-known student of foreign investment, has indicated, the income earned by British investments in South Africa and directly in Namibia, where the de Beers Company operates, is running at 200 per cent annually. That, then, is the economic foundation that constrains the United Kingdom to maintain its relations with the racists of the Republic of South Africa.

199. As far as the military basis is concerned, it is well known that the shooting upon the African population at Sharpville in 1960 was carried out using, among other things, British armoured cars. It is also well known that there is a British military base at Simonstown which is apparently now being abandoned, not so much because there is no longer a desire to maintain it but because resources are lacking.

200. In political terms, the United Kingdom has recently shown its support for the racists of the Republic of South Africa by using the veto in the Security Council against an entirely justified draft resolution [S/11543 of 24 October 1974] proposed by African countries calling for the expulsion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations. Those, then, briefly, are the economic, military and

political reasons why the United Kingdom is very closely involved in the existing complex of racism and colonialism in the southern part of Africa.

201. Finally, if today's statement by the representative of the United Kingdom may be understood to mean that he would wish each statement by the Soviet delegation containing a reference to NATO to make specific mention of the United Kingdom as well, then we can certainly do that. We are merely waiting for confirmation that that is indeed the wish of the United Kingdom representative.

202. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): The representative of the Soviet Union proves my point. None of the figures he has given and none of the facts he has disclosed are new in any way, shape or form.

203. The point I made earlier on—and I had hoped it was not too complex—was that in a debate in which the Security Council is agreed, when action is taking place over Namibia, at a time when there is a real chance of change in southern Africa, this kind of ideological skirmishing by the Government of the Soviet Union is irrelevant, unfortunate and, in our view, inappropriate.

204. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I note that the intervention just made by the representative of the United Kingdom did not contain a request to the effect that every time the Soviet delegation refers to NATO, it should include a specific reference to the United Kingdom.

205. The PRESIDENT: My fellow members of the Council whose term on the Council will, like mine, expire at the end of this month have pronounced their valedictions to the Council and have spoken with appreciation of the co-operation they have enjoyed over the past two years with all their colleagues, permanent as well as non-permanent, and with the Secretary-General and his staff. I cannot forbear mentioning the enormous assistance Mr. Kurt Herndl has given me on the occasions when I have been under pressure as President. They have spoken also of the privilege and honour of having served the cause of the United Nations on the Council during this period.

206. As representative of Australia, I should like to join them in expressing the hope that their presumption is not premature. As President I am still very conscious that two weeks remain before the end of December. As President I shall hold myself ready and available and I hope my colleagues on the Council will also be ready and available for action if the Council should find itself faced with, shall we say, a breach of or threat to the peace.

207. If I may, however, be allowed to presume that this is indeed our last meeting of the year, I would say that I believe that the Security Council has during the past two years done much to vindicate itself in the eyes of its critics—and, as we know, we do have critics—throughout a crucial period during which it has been called upon to address itself to a variety of difficult and critical questions. If my delegation has been able to make a contribution to these activities and these decisions over the past two years, that in itself gives us a sense of satisfaction and of modest achievement.

208. In any event, my delegation and I look back on a period of fruitful co-operation with all our colleagues on the Council. We have enjoyed and benefited from a closer relationship with the permanent members of the Council and with their particular problems than is normally given to the rest of the membership of the United Nations. We have also profited greatly from the opportunity of working closely from time to time with our non-permanent-member colleagues in finding solutions to difficult questions. We have particularly valued that association for the mutual respect, understanding and tolerance—not to mention friendship—it has engendered.

209. In short, we shall look back—and probably even look back with nostalgia, as my Indonesian colleague has suggested—on our membership of the Council over these past two years as a memorable and exhilarating, even if sometimes demanding, experience. I should like to regard this as a kind of heritage that we retiring members can hand on to our successors, in whom we have full confidence and for whom we wish continued success, along with the rest of the Council, in fulfilling the functions laid down in the Charter for this vital organ of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.