

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records \*

UN LIBRARY

DEC 6 1976



UN/SA COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE

33rd meeting

held on

Friday, 26 November 1976

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

later: Mr. GAZDIK (Hungary)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 25: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room LX-2332.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

76-91368

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.4/31/SR.33

1 December 1976

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 25: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/C.4/31/L.26 and L.27) (continued)

Question of Guam (A/C.4/31/L.26)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives wishing to do so to explain their vote at the previous meeting on draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.26.
2. Mr. BECKLES (Barbados) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution since the text was in line with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV); it had, however, certain reservations, particularly with regard to the fifth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5. If a separate vote had been taken on those paragraphs, his delegation would have abstained.
3. Mr. BENTINCK (Netherlands) said that the nine countries of the European Economic Community had voted against the draft resolution concerning Guam. Those countries supported the right of all dependent Territories to self-determination and independence, but they deplored the fact that the text had not taken account of the results of the referendum on the future status of Guam which had been held in the Island on 4 September 1976 and in which the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants had declared themselves in favour of maintaining a close relationship with the United States. Moreover, the nine countries of the Community rejected the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution and considered that the presence of military bases of an administering Power in a Non-Self-Governing Territory did not constitute an obstacle to the exercise by the indigenous population of the right to self-determination.
4. Mr. MANGAL (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.26. In the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), Afghanistan had always unreservedly supported the inalienable right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence. He had, however, reservations with regard to the wording of certain paragraphs and, like some members of the Special Committee of 24, would have preferred the text of the consensus (A/31/23/Add.8 (Part III)) adopted by that Committee on the question.
5. Mrs. FINBORUD (Norway) said that her delegation had always defended the inalienable right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence. It had unreservedly supported the consensus of the Special Committee of 24 on the question, but since the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.26 had not been able to prepare a text reflecting that unanimous decision, her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.
6. Mr. MOTSEPE (Botswana) said that, if his delegation had participated in the votes at the previous meeting on draft resolutions A/C.4/31/L.26 and A/C.4/31/L.27, it would have voted in favour of both.

/...

Question of French Somaliland (A/C.4/31/L.27)

6a. The CHAIRMAN invited representatives wishing to do so to explain their vote on draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.27.

7. Mr. KINI (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution out of solidarity with the people of French Somaliland, in view of the ultimate objective of the text, namely, the independence of the Territory. If, however, a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraphs 2 and 7, it would not have been able to support them.

8. Mr. YANNOPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution concerning Guam (A/C.4/31/L.26) and in the vote on the draft resolution concerning French Somaliland (A/C.4/31/L.27) because it could not agree with certain passages in those texts from the standpoint of both substance and form. It remained, nevertheless, firmly attached to the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, on which both the draft resolutions in question were based.

9. Mr. IMANISHI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.27 concerning Djibouti, although it regretted the fact that no mention was made in the text adopted of the sincere efforts made by France in order to bring about the decolonization of the Territory.

10. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/31/L.27. It welcomed the fact that Ethiopia and Somalia were among the sponsors of the text and hoped that that constructive attitude would help to accelerate the decolonization of the Territory.

11. He had taken note of the important statement made by the representative of France on 3 November 1976 concerning the modalities for the independence of Djibouti; the sponsors of the draft resolution should have recognized France's seriousness and good faith, which should have been taken into account in their text; moreover, his delegation had reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 6 and 7.

12. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had concluded consideration of the various Territories under agenda item 25. He suggested that the Rapporteur be requested to submit the report on that item directly to the General Assembly.

13. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (A/31/23/Add.1, A/31/23/Add.3, A/31/24 (Vols. I and II), A/31/45, A/31/92, A/31/155, A/31/181, A/31/190 and Corr.1, A/31/197, A/31/213, A/31/237; A/C.4/31/L.29 (continued))

14. Mr. Gazdik (Hungary) took the Chair.

15. Mr. HOYLE (Australia) said that his delegation had explained its position concerning Namibia at length at the 1038th meeting of the Special Committee of 24.

/...

(Mr. Hoyle, Australia)

He would therefore confine his remarks to events which had occurred since that time. The major developments were the statement made on 18 August by the Constitutional Committee of the Windhoek Conference and the international reaction to that statement. For its part, Australia did not regard the proposals in that statement as an adequate response to the requirement of independence for Namibia.

16. In the first place, no definite date had been set for independence and, in addition, the development of homelands in Namibia represented an unacceptable extension of South Africa's policy of bantustanization to Namibia and an attempt on the part of South Africa to maintain its control over the substantial natural resources of the Territory. Moreover, it remained to be seen whether the South African Government and the Nationalist Party participants in the Windhoek Conference would in fact respect the wish expressed by the Conference itself that there should be an end to apartheid in Namibia and that Walvis Bay should continue to be part of Namibia after independence.

17. The principal defect of the Windhoek Conference was the exclusion of SWAPO, since there could be no equitable and peaceful solution to the conflict in Namibia as long as SWAPO was ignored by South Africa and the Windhoek Conference. Australia agreed with SWAPO that it might be desirable for the United Nations to participate in, or to serve as a framework for, talks on the future of Namibia in which all national elements would participate.

18. Moreover, Australia noted that South Africa had not complied with Security Council resolution 385 (1976) within the deadline set. It recognized, however, that the direct participation of the United States in negotiations in support of independence for Namibia was a new development which could prove to be of benefit. If South Africa spurned negotiations, there would be no alternative for Namibia but violence, and the cost would be borne principally by the Namibian people.

19. Those considerations should not conceal the suffering to which the people of Namibia were already subjected. Further repression must be prevented and the international community must take effective action to put an end to South Africa's illegal administration in Namibia.

20. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia provided a valuable record of the various activities of the Council and, in particular, revealed how active it had been during the year in projecting the cause of an independent Namibia.

21. The Institute for Namibia, which had been opened in Lusaka in August, had an important role to play. Its smooth functioning would require not only the careful husbanding of its resources, but also generous assistance from the international community. In that connexion, he said that, subject to parliamentary approval, his Government would make a contribution of 25,000 Australian dollars to the United Nations Fund for Namibia in 1976-1977.

22. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) noted that the position of the international community regarding the problem of Namibia was very clear. It was set forth in Security

/...

Council resolution 385 (1976), which, inter alia, reaffirmed two basic principles to which his delegation attached great importance, namely that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and that the only path to a solution of the problem was to hold free, democratic elections under United Nations supervision and control.

23. The South African Government's only reaction to the resolution had been the letter sent in August 1976 by the Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations (S/12180), which transmitted the text of the statement issued by the Constitutional Committee of the Windhoek Conference. The contents of the letter had not been at all satisfactory to Japan and the other members of the Security Council which had adopted the resolution. Among many unacceptable points, the fundamental defect of the letter was that it did not recognize that the future of Namibia must be decided by the free will of its people as expressed in free elections. As his delegation had said on previous occasions, the elections must be held under the supervision of the United Nations, all political prisoners must be released, all Namibian political organizations must be permitted to conduct campaigns, and all Namibians in exile for political reasons must be permitted to return freely without risk of arrest or detention.

24. In that context, the participation of SWAPO was particularly important since that organization had always maintained a leading role in the nationalist movement of the Namibian people. He therefore strongly urged the Government of South Africa to face the reality that any solution without the participation of SWAPO would never bring about a stable and truly democratic Government of Namibia.

25. Judging from the statement contained in document S/12180, it appeared that the South African Government was ready to agree to the fixing of a date for Namibian independence and that the desire to maintain the territorial unity of Namibia had been reaffirmed. It was therefore clear that the pressure being exerted against South Africa by the United Nations with the support of international public opinion had not been in vain.

26. He wished to stress that his Government had co-operated in that effort by enforcing a strict embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa and banning direct investment in South Africa and Namibia. Those measures had special significance for Japan, a country with a large population and very few natural resources. Japan's economy was essentially dependent on trade and on investment abroad, and any restrictions on its investment in areas which were rich in natural resources that it particularly needed could not fail to affect adversely some aspects of the economic life of the Japanese people. His Government and people were nevertheless proud to be making that sacrifice in a just cause.

27. Observing that preliminary contacts were said to be under way for the purpose of arranging talks among the parties concerned, including especially the Government of South Africa and SWAPO, he said that his delegation had noted with interest the statement by the representative of SWAPO setting forth conditions for entering into negotiations with the Government of South Africa. Japan, which had consistently supported a peaceful solution of the problems through negotiations, welcomed that new initiative.

/...

(Mr. Okazaki, Japan)

28. The United Nations must continue to exert pressure on South Africa and must encourage such talks. The General Assembly could also reaffirm once again the principles established by the Security Council so as to make it clear to South Africa that an irreversible decision had been taken. A General Assembly resolution adopted with the solid support of all the countries in the world would have much more effect on South Africa than a text which appeared to contain more forthright language but showed that the General Assembly was divided.

29. He strongly urged South Africa once again to respond rapidly and positively to the will of the United Nations.

30. Mr. NARU (Pakistan) said that his delegation fully supported the contents of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/31/24). It endorsed the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraphs 89-106 of the Council's report on the United Nations Fund for Namibia (A/31/24, vol. II, annex XIII) and hoped that voluntary contributions to the Fund would be increased so as to enable the Committee on the United Nations Fund for Namibia to fulfil the task assigned to it and expand its areas of action. His delegation also wished to express its appreciation for the report of the Special Committee of 24 on Namibia (A/31/23/Add.3) and fully supported the consensus adopted by the Special Committee concerning Namibia.

31. He had heard with great concern the statement by the representative of SWAPO on South Africa's continuing repression of the people of Namibia, of its stepped-up military presence in the Territory, of the transfer of entire communities to concentration camps and of the use of Namibia as a springboard for attacks on Angola and Zambia.

32. Nine years had passed since the United Nations Council for Namibia had been entrusted with responsibility for administering the Territory, and during those nine years the racist régime in South Africa had consistently refused to grant independence to Namibia or hand over its administration to the Council. Pakistan strongly supported the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

33. His delegation wished to reaffirm the statement of 18 August 1976 by the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/31/181) regarding the so-called proposals by South Africa on the future of Namibia. Pakistan rejected the statement made by the Government of South Africa in that regard, which contained ideas and provisions that were ambiguous and equivocal and did not meet the conditions laid down by the United Nations. In fact, the so-called Windhoek Constitutional Conference was merely an attempt to perpetuate the policies of apartheid and bantustanization. His delegation wished to reaffirm its belief that the only conceivable solution for Namibia was the immediate withdrawal of South Africa.

34. His delegation was also gravely concerned at the fact that the people of Namibia and their rightful leaders were being subjected to all sorts of violence, intimidation, coercion and torture, and it condemned in unequivocal terms the violent policies being pursued by the illegal racist régime.

/...

(Mr. Naru, Pakistan)

35. The Government of South Africa had continued to militarize Namibia despite protests by the United Nations. Thus, on the one hand, it was trying to destroy the national unity of Namibia through the continued implementation of its policy of bantustanization and by convening a so-called Constitutional Conference and, on the other hand, it was trying to turn the country into a police state in order to intimidate the people of Namibia. However, the latter were engaged in a heroic struggle for their independence under the leadership of SWAPO, and, despite heavy odds, they continued to march towards the achievement of their goal, for nothing could deprive them of the right to shape their own destiny.

36. His delegation wished to reaffirm its unreserved support for Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Since that resolution had, like earlier ones, been disregarded by South Africa, the Council had met in September and October, and, after a long debate in which nearly 40 countries had participated, many of them at the level of Foreign Ministers, a draft resolution (S/12211) had been introduced by Pakistan and other delegations. Unfortunately, the resolution had been vetoed by three permanent members of the Council, who had thus effectively blocked any action against South Africa.

37. In conclusion, he recalled the message issued by the Prime Minister of Pakistan on the occasion of Namibia Day, in which he had observed, inter alia, that the time for patience was past and that the Namibian people would have to win their freedom through struggle and further sacrifice. He had added that political manoeuvres would not succeed in subverting that struggle and that South Africa must withdraw forthwith from the Territory since it was only under the auspices of the United Nations that the people of Namibia would be able to institute a free and representative government.

38. Mr. LUZIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) welcomed the participation of SWAPO, the only authentic representative of the Namibian people, in the work of the Fourth Committee.

39. Recent events in Africa, namely, the liberation of the former Portuguese colonies and the total failure of the intervention of the racist imperialists against the People's Republic of Angola, had created in southern Africa a new political situation which favoured the interests of the forces of progress and the national liberation movements. Nevertheless, the maintenance of the domination of the racist régimes in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe had become intolerable.

40. The Soviet people were profoundly concerned over the tragedy that was being experienced by the indigenous people who were victims of racist tyranny in that region.

41. The ending of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa was one of the most pressing international issues of the day. A speedy and equitable solution of the problem depended not only on the liberation of the Namibian people from the tyranny and slavery imposed by racism and colonialism, but also on the

/...

(Mr. Luzin, Ukrainian SSR)

establishment of lasting peace throughout the area. The inhuman policy of apartheid pursued by the South African Government and the use of Namibian territory as a springboard for acts of aggression against the independent African States constituted a serious threat to international peace and security. The African peoples knew from experience that racism and colonialism were often a source of armed conflict.

42. The racist leaders in Pretoria were deliberately disregarding the many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia, and especially Security Council resolution 385 (1976), demanding that South Africa should hold free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision, abolish repressive laws, release all political prisoners and put an end to its policy of bantustanization. There was still no sign that the racists agreed to submit to the will of the international community. Instead, in defiance of the United Nations, the independent African States and all justice-loving peoples, they were pursuing their policy of annexation and strengthening their military potential.

43. The veto which South Africa's allies had cast in the Security Council to prevent the adoption of the draft resolution providing for the application of sanctions against the illegal Pretoria régime merely encouraged that country to pursue its odious policy.

44. The plundering of Namibia's vast natural resources by Western monopolies, with the active co-operation of South Africa, proved that the imperialist partners of that country cared very little for the welfare of the peoples of southern Africa. The United Nations had for years been condemning the activities of Western interests in Namibia, as one of the main obstacles to the liberation of the Territory. In fact, the scores of international companies which had invaded the Territory were contributing to the survival of the Vorster régime by transferring to it a share of the super-profits which they earned through the exploitation of cheap indigenous labour.

45. His delegation condemned the attempts of the South African colonizers to destroy Namibia's national unity and territorial integrity by intensifying their policy of bantustanization and by setting up a provisional puppet government. That was the real purpose of the "constitutional conference", which was no more than another farce staged by the Pretoria leaders in order to deceive the Namibian people and the international community. Needless to say, that manoeuvre by the Pretoria régime was doomed to failure because the indigenous population was fiercely opposed to it. Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, had rightly stated in the Special Committee of 24 that those so-called constitutional talks were aimed solely at strengthening the bantustan system and keeping the country's wealth in the hands of the white settlers.

46. South Africa was trying to strengthen its hold on Namibia by intensifying the police and judicial terror which reigned there. The secret police had practically unlimited powers and were particularly ruthless in their pursuit

/...



(Mr. Luzin, Ukrainian SSR)

of SWAPO members. His delegation strongly protested against those repressive measures and against the sentencing of innocent Namibian patriots, who were constantly accused of "terrorism".

47. The racist régime in Namibia was able to survive only on account of the complicity he had mentioned and the consistent support of the international imperialist forces, and on account of the interdependence of the economic and strategic interests of South Africa and of the Western Powers in southern Africa.

48. The irreversible process of liberation of the African continent compelled the racists to resort to all kinds of manoeuvres and, with the support of the Western Powers, feverishly to build up their military potential. Thus, all along the northern frontier separating Namibia from Angola the occupying forces had established a so-called security zone whose only purpose was to isolate the Namibian patriots from the national liberation movements of the continent. The racists were massing their troops, equipped by NATO with the most sophisticated weapons, along that frontier and were driving the population into the interior.

49. The Special Committee of 24 had indicated in its report (A/31/21/Add.3) that South Africa was building up its base at Grootfontein so as to make it one of the strongest military bases in Africa. The sales of nuclear reactors to the Vorster régime, the visit of the South African Prime Minister to Israel to purchase the most up-to-date weapons, the obvious complicity of the NATO leaders with their South African counterparts, clearly showed that the imperialist circles were trying to maintain colonialism in that part of Africa by all possible means.

50. It was the duty of the United Nations to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racists and to support the Namibian people in their struggle for national independence. His delegation supported the just claims of the Namibian people and was convinced that the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its current session would contribute greatly to the final elimination of the system of colonial enslavement and apartheid.

The meeting rose at 12 noon