

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records *

UN LIBRARY

DEC 6 1976



UN/SA COLLECTION

FOURTH COMMITTEE

37th meeting

held on

Wednesday, 1 December 1976

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

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.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.4/31/SR.37

6 December 1976

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 85: QUESTION OF NAMIBIA (A/31/23/Add.1 and 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))

1. Mr. SEALY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, in defiance of the international community, South Africa had further militarized Namibia. It currently had over 50,000 armed men in the Territory as military, para-military and police personnel, as well as several military bases. It had on several occasions used the Territory to launch armed aggression against the neighbouring Republics of Angola and Zambia. In addition, it had established a five-kilometre-wide "no-go" or free-fire zone along the border with Angola, which had resulted in the forced removal of thousands of Namibians, the destruction of villages and the maiming or killing of innocent persons. The promulgation of legislation extending the sphere of action of South Africa's military forces beyond its borders posed a threat not only to the States in the region but also to international peace.

2. In view of that situation, it had been expected that, when the Security Council resumed its consideration of the question of Namibia in pursuance of its resolution 385 (1976), it would adopt a firm attitude in that respect. Yet three permanent members of the Security Council had opposed the imposition of a mandatory arms embargo on South Africa, pursuing their own narrow national interests to the detriment of the interests of the international community as a whole. His delegation therefore condemned the South African arms build-up in Namibia and urged the Security Council to take appropriate measures to put an end to that grave threat to the peace.

3. For its part, the South African régime's illegal administration in Namibia continued to violate the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Namibia. Under the 1967 Terrorism Act and the 1920 Removal of Undesirables Act, it was continuing arbitrary arrests and deportations, restricting the rights of assembly, association and expression, and banning and brutally dispersing political rallies. In addition, SWAPO members who had not been accused of any act of violence had recently been arrested and sentenced to death.

4. In that atmosphere of violence and repression of the people of Namibia, South Africa had convened the Turnhalle constitutional conference, at which the Nationalist Party of South Africa and 10 "population groups" were represented but SWAPO, which was recognized by the United Nations as the legitimate representative of the people of Namibia was excluded. The results achieved so far demonstrated that the constitutional conference was a monumental exercise in Boer bad faith. The statement made in the declaration of intent issued on 12 September 1976 to the effect that every population group would be guaranteed the greatest possible say in its own affairs and in national affairs confirmed the apartheid régime's position on Namibia, which was that there should be separate independence for the white population and each of the so-called 11 homelands. On that basis, the independence to be granted to Namibia in 1978 would implement the Odendaal Plan of ensuring a continuing supply of cheap black labour for farms, mines and industries owned by the white population in the rich central portion of the Territory and the creation of economically non-viable black "nations".

/...

(Mr. Sealy, Trinidad and Tobago)

5. In order to enable the people of Namibia freely to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the South African régime must first withdraw its troops from the Territory so as to permit the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision and control for the whole of Namibia as one political entity, permit the return of all Namibian exiles and release Namibian political prisoners.

6. It was necessary to end South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia, with its exploitation of Namibia's resources either singly or in conjunction with foreign economic interests and its policy of repression of basic human rights. Although it was to be hoped that negotiations between the parties involved would produce a peaceful solution, the attitude of South Africa seemed to indicate that the liberation of Namibia would not be achieved without suffering for the people. All peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples and Governments should support the creation of a free and united Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO.

7. He commended the efforts made in the past year by the United Nations Council for Namibia and welcomed the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia. Although his Government had not yet made a financial contribution to the Institute, it had recently welcomed the first two Namibian students for training in Trinidad and Tobago. It was to be hoped that other students would soon be able to take up the scholarships offered by his Government to Namibian students.

8. Mr. NICINSKI (Poland) said that the responsibility assumed by the United Nations with regard to Namibia had once again been challenged by the illegal South African régime with new acts of terror and intimidation against the indigenous population of the Territory. Consequently, the Security Council had recently had to devote much of its time to the situation in Namibia. In January 1976, the Council had unanimously adopted resolution 385 (1976), which had condemned the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa and called for the holding of free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations for the whole of Namibia as one political entity. As it had done in other cases, South Africa had ignored that resolution and was continuing its policy of bantustanization, which constituted a serious threat to the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia. The so-called constitutional conference organized by South Africa in Windhoek was a deception designed to perpetuate South Africa's rule over the Territory. SWAPO and the United Nations Council for Namibia had condemned and rejected that conference because it did not respect the basic principles of self-determination and independence laid down by the United Nations and because it was an attempt to impose a neo-colonialist solution. The Security Council had recently met again to consider the question of Namibia and, although a large majority of Member States had requested that strong and effective measures be taken against South Africa, the draft resolution submitted in the Security Council had not been adopted because of the negative votes of three permanent members.

/...

(Mr. Micinski, Poland)

9. Poland's consistent support for the cause of the liberation of the people of Namibia reflected the fundamental position of the Polish People's Republic of firm solidarity with the peoples fighting for their freedom and for the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism. That position had been clearly reiterated in the debates held on the subject in the Security Council and the General Assembly.

10. Recent developments in southern Africa clearly showed that the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa created one of the most serious hotbeds of tension on the African continent. In order to perpetuate its illegal domination over the Territory and exploitation of its resources, the racial régime of Pretoria had built up considerably its military forces in Namibia. The South African régime had recently escalated the killings, mass arrests and torture of Namibians. In the northern part of Namibia, a number of villages had been destroyed and their population removed by force in order to create the so-called free-fire zone along the border with Angola. The most evident example of the fact that South African policy in Namibia constituted a direct threat to the peace and security of the independent African countries was the aggression committed against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia, which had been condemned by the Security Council in its resolutions 387 (1976) and 393 (1976).

11. At the same time, positive changes had taken place in the southern part of Africa, owing to the struggle waged by the national liberation movements and the accession to independence of several African States, particularly Angola and Mozambique. In Namibia SWAPO, which was the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people and was gaining increasing international support, had intensified its legitimate struggle for freedom and independence.

12. The Polish delegation endorsed the position adopted by the Council for Namibia in its report to the General Assembly (A/31/24) to the effect that any talks regarding the independence of Namibia should be held between South Africa and SWAPO under the auspices of the United Nations, for the sole purpose of discussing the modalities for the transfer of power to the people of Namibia. In that regard, it also supported the conditions laid down by SWAPO.

13. Urgent and effective measures were necessary to make the South African régime withdraw from Namibia and to achieve a solution consistent with the aspirations of the Namibian people and the will of the international community as a whole. In particular, intensified efforts were necessary to persuade South Africa's allies among the Western countries to desist from military deliveries and economic activities in the Territory of Namibia. In that connexion, the recommendation of the Council for Namibia that the

/...

(Mr. Nicinski, Poland)

General Assembly should call on the Security Council to take up the question and, in view of South Africa's failure to comply with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), to impose a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, was very important.

14. Mr. ROBINSON (Guyana) said that the current debate on the issue of Namibia was happening at a time of change in southern Africa. The fall of the Portuguese empire and the independence of Mozambique and Angola had caused the frontiers of oppression and racism to recede. However, the recent use of the triple veto in the Security Council on a draft resolution containing proposals aimed at accelerating Namibia's accession to independence, the sham Turnhalle constitutional conference and the intensification of the Vorster régime's reign of terror over the Namibian people were all part of a grand scheme to frustrate Namibia's accession to independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

15. Despite the pronouncements of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the Vorster régime had at no time taken any step towards relinquishing its illegal occupation of Namibia and had tried to confuse the international community by gimmicks and sham proposals. The most recent of those had been the so-called Turnhalle conference, which had been condemned not only by SWAPO but by all States that acknowledged the right of the Namibian people to pursue their destiny as a free people in a unitary State. Nevertheless, South Africa felt encouraged to pursue its racist policies because of the support it was receiving from some States, particularly in the West. It was possible, however, that even that support was waning, to judge from a statement recently made in the Security Council by the representative of a Western country to the effect that his country had followed a consistent policy of support for African solutions to African problems and respect for the role of the Organization of African Unity.

16. Not since the Odendaal Commission had in 1964 recommended the division of Namibia into bantustans had Pretoria's policy varied. Given that fact, the international community had reached agreement on at least one fundamental premise, namely, that Namibia should accede to independence. But that independence would be meaningless if it was not in conformity with the preconditions repeatedly enumerated by SWAPO, which had been stressed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Justice of Guyana at the 1957th meeting of the Security Council. SWAPO was willing to talk with South Africa on the transfer of power in Namibia but insisted that those talks should be held under the auspices of the United Nations. It was also demanding that all Namibian political prisoners should first be released and that South African armed forces should be withdrawn from the Territory of Namibia. His delegation endorsed those demands of the Namibian people.

/...

(Mr. Robinson, Guyana)

17. The Committee's discussion on the issue of Namibia should be guided by a set of fundamental principles: the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, the fact that South Africa had no legal jurisdiction over the Territory of Namibia, the direct responsibility of the United Nations for the administration of the Territory and, most importantly the responsibility of the Committee to make such recommendations as would accelerate Namibia's accession to independence. Those principles, which had long been espoused by non-aligned and other progressive countries, had not been put into practice because of the pre-eminence of some State's strategic and economic interests over the rights of the people of Namibia.

18. The creation of the United Nations Institute for Namibia had been necessitated by South Africa's refusal to prepare the people of the Territory for independence. One could not therefore claim to support the purposes of the Institute and at the same time fail to recognize the conditions that had necessitated its creation. It seemed to have become fashionable to support some initiatives but politically and economically expedient not to support others, even though the fundamental considerations from which they derived were similar.

19. His country would continue to give moral and material support to SWAPO, the authentic representatives of the Namibian people, and would continue to play an active role in the United Nations Council for Namibia, since it believed that no man could consider himself completely free so long as bastions of racism and oppression continued to exist in southern Africa.

20. Mr. GARVALOV (Bulgaria) said that the question of Namibia had rarely been discussed so thoroughly and so often by United Nations bodies as during the current year. It had also been debated by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity and by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, whose recommendations represented the will of the overwhelming majority of mankind. Such great interest in the question of Namibia was due to the urgency of finding a solution to that very important problem.

21. South Africa was illegally occupying Namibia, as the United Nations and the International Court of Justice had recognized; it was continuing to deprive the people of Namibia of their legitimate rights; it was continuing to wage a war of annihilation against people of Namibia and their authentic representative, SWAPO; in collusion with the Western monopolies, it was exploiting the natural resources of the Territory and depriving the people of Namibia of the right to own and utilize the wealth of their country; it was continuing to widen the application of the apartheid system, destroying the national character and territorial integrity of Namibia through the policy of bantustanization; and it was using the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring African countries, such as Angola and Zambia. Each one of those facts revealed the true nature of South Africa's policy and actions, which were contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to international law.

/...

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

22. Those irrefutable facts demonstrated that South Africa's actions in Namibia threatened international peace and security. Nevertheless, certain States were protecting South Africa, a bastion of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in that part of the world that was fighting the national liberation movements and the progressive and democratic development of southern African States in order to preserve the last vestiges of colonialism and to protect the positions and interests of imperialism. The example of Angola and the struggle of its people for independence had induced South Africa and its allies to try to block the attainment of independence by Namibia in order to keep southern Africa in its power. The so-called constitutional conference, which was being manipulated by South Africa, had only one purpose: to establish a puppet régime in Namibia.

23. It was common knowledge that South Africa and its allies were attempting to settle the question of Namibia outside the United Nations, at a forum controlled by themselves and in their own interests. That was the reason for the direct negotiations with South Africa, without the participation of SWAPO, which had been going on for some time. SWAPO had rightly questioned that approach, which did not take the legitimate rights of the people of the Territory into account.

24. There was a solution to the Namibian question. It lay in the proposals put forward by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, at the 1956th meeting of the Security Council. As far as the United Nations was concerned, there was also a course of action, which lay in the adoption of measures in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. It was regrettable that that course of action had not yet been taken, although the overwhelming majority of Member States had recommended it, on account of the veto of three permanent members of the Security Council. Many representatives, including those of SWAPO, had said that the United Nations could not be in a position to ascertain the effectiveness of its actions under Chapter VII of the Charter before they were actually applied with respect to South Africa, and before making sure that they were strictly complied with by South Africa's allies. It had also been argued that if the United Nations was so committed to the cause of Namibia's liberation, while its decisions had invariably met with the callous disregard of South Africa, the United Nations had no alternative but to resort to the provisions in the Charter, which were more than adequate to resolve the problem if all Member States, and particularly South Africa's allies, strictly complied with the appropriate action approved by the Security Council. The Committee must request the General Assembly to propose that the Security Council impose sanctions against South Africa, declare a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and urge all States that still maintained various kinds of military co-operation with South Africa, including co-operation in the nuclear field, to discontinue it immediately.

25. The Bulgarian delegation strongly supported the position of SWAPO and firmly believed that South Africa's nefarious role in Namibia and southern Africa must be exposed to the eyes of the whole world. To ask that South Africa should not be criticized, because that might disrupt the delicate process of negotiations, meant turning a blind eye to the monstrous plight forced on the people of Namibia by South Africa's racist régime. To ask the people of Namibia and SWAPO to consent to

/...

(Mr. Garvalov, Bulgaria)

conditions, would mean asking the Namibians to make concessions to their colonizers and occupiers, and to jeopardize their own inalienable right to independence and freedom. The United Nations had never taken a decision asking the people of Namibia and SWAPO to make such concessions. In fact it had adopted many resolutions condemning South Africa for its policies and reaffirming the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to win, by all available means at their disposal, the right to be free and independent.

26. The Bulgarian Government and people, faithful to the principles of proletarian internationalism, had always supported and assisted the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people, and would continue their steadfast policy until the people of Namibia won complete independence.

27. Mr. PASHIARDIS (Cyprus) said that the question of Namibia remained unresolved because the South African régime was deliberately turning a deaf ear to the relevant United Nations resolutions. That constituted a serious offence against the Organization. Moreover South Africa had continued to commit other illegal acts at the expense of the Namibian people. The military build-up, the demolition of villages, the forced resettlement of population, the division of the economy of Namibia into two sectors, the exploitation of human and natural resources, and the illegal detentions of SWAPO members, revealed the true dimensions of the question and provided a convincing picture of the tragedy of the victims and the sinister designs of the aggressor. The so-called constitutional conference at Windhoek had in reality been a sad travesty, aimed at establishing tribal homelands controlled by South Africa and destroying the national unity of Namibia. It had been an attempt by South Africa to disguise its sinister plans under a false constitutional cloak. But that manoeuvre had deceived no one and, instead, had revealed the slyness of the régime.

28. Cyprus, which had had the bitter experience of aggression, invasion, occupation and exploitation, understood the situation in which the Namibian people found themselves and the aims and designs of the zealots of the expansionist policy. Having experienced the most cruel methods as a result of a policy similar to that applied by the South African régime, it fully realized the concealed attempts at the destruction of a country's unity and future. It therefore fully and unreservedly supported the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and self-determination and stressed once more the necessity for the adoption of effective measures by the United Nations for the implementation of its resolutions. Written recommendations or even condemnations were reduced to empty words if the provisions of United Nations resolutions were not fully and effectively implemented.

29. After so many years had elapsed, the question of Namibia did not admit of any further analysis and did not require more resolutions. What was needed was effective measures aimed at ending a human tragedy and an anachronistic expansionist policy, thereby restoring the prestige of the United Nations.

30. Miss CHEW Beng Yong (Singapore) said that although many territories had achieved independence during the past 30 years, and others were on their way to

/...

(Miss Chew Beng Yong, Singapore)

becoming independent, there were unfortunately some Territories for which the road to independence had been difficult, and Namibia was one of them. The question of Namibia had been debated in the General Assembly and in the Security Council for more than 10 years. In October 1966 the Assembly had terminated the Mandate exercised by South Africa over Namibia, and in May 1967 it had established the Council for Namibia, in resolution 2248 (S-V), to administer the Territory until independence. It had requested the Council to enter immediately into contact with the South African authorities in order to establish procedures for the transfer of the Territory's administration with the least upheaval. Since 1967 the Security Council had repeatedly condemned South Africa's refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia. In its resolution 301 (1971) it had agreed with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that, since the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal, South Africa was under the obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and to put an end to its occupation of the Territory. In January 1976 the Security Council had adopted resolution 385 (1976) in which it declared that, in order for the people of Namibia to be able freely to determine their own future, it was imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations should be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity. It had also demanded that South Africa make a solemn declaration to accept the provisions of the resolutions for the holding of free elections in Namibia, comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, and recognize the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia. The Security Council had further demanded that, pending the transfer of power, South Africa comply fully with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, release all political prisoners and abolish the application in Namibia of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices, particularly the policy of bantustanization. The General Assembly had also adopted numerous resolutions in the same vein. In its resolution 3399 (XXX) it had strongly condemned South Africa for its manoeuvres to consolidate its illegal occupation by organizing a so-called constitutional conference, with a view to creating divisions among ethnic groups and furthering its policy of bantustanization.

31. The delegation of Singapore, consistent with its support for the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and for the principle of the right of colonial peoples to self-determination, had supported and would continue to support United Nations efforts to bring about an early end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. It also fully endorsed the General Assembly's and the Security Council's resolutions demanding that free national elections be held in the Territory under United Nations supervision.

32. South Africa's response to the demands of the international community had not been satisfactory. Clearly, the Windhoek constitutional conference had not been representative of the people of Namibia, since some political parties, including SWAPO, had not participated. Nor had the conference met the requirements for the

/...

(Miss Chew Beng Yong, Singapore)

exercise of the right of self-determination and independence laid down by the United Nations. SWAPO had been recognized as the authentic representative of the Namibian people and should be included in any efforts to bring about the transfer of power to the Namibian people. As pointed out in the working paper on Namibia prepared by the Secretariat (A/31/23/Add.3, annex, para. 36), the Declaration of Intent adopted at the end of the Windhoek conference had made no mention of independence, a unitary State, majority rule or a central parliament. Further, although the Declaration did not postulate sovereign independence for each population group in Namibia, it did in essence envisage the attainment of independence by Namibia as a loose confederation of ethnic States, with the whites retaining the most valuable land areas. Thus, it would appear that the Declaration represented only a refinement of South Africa's policy of apartheid and separate development. Her country was opposed to the policy of separate development and bantustans for a number of reasons, including the fact that it created ghettos for the black population, since the most valuable land areas and resources would be retained by the whites, and that it was designed to perpetuate racial prejudice and discrimination and would undermine the territorial integrity of the country.

33. Her delegation, like many others, considered that South Africa must be made to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations. In that connexion, it appreciated and supported the efforts being made by certain countries, including those in the region, to help bring about a peaceful and early settlement of the question of Namibia and hoped that the day would not be far off when Namibia became an independent State and took its place in the international community.

34. Mr. DALTON (Argentina) expressed his Government's continuing concern about the systematic failure to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning Namibia. South Africa should comply with the provisions adopted by the United Nations, withdraw from Namibia and allow its people to exercise their inalienable rights freely, under direct United Nations supervision. His country deplored the attempts to jeopardize the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia and maintained that the solution of the problem required the free and active participation of all parties legitimately concerned with the question. Consequently, it could not accept the proposal contained in the Declaration of the so-called Windhoek constitutional conference.

35. His country had supported all United Nations efforts to pave the way for a peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia. In that regard, it had co-sponsored three resolutions, adopted unanimously by the Security Council, which sought to create the conditions for an agreed settlement through direct negotiations between Pretoria and all interested parties. Unfortunately, the intransigent attitude and persistent illegal conduct of the Government of South Africa had made it impossible to implement those resolutions. Argentina also supported all efforts made by Member States, individually or collectively, to facilitate a negotiated and peaceful solution of the problem.

/...

(Mr. Dalton, Argentina)

36. His Government had recently made a significant financial contribution to the Fund for Namibia, which reaffirmed its support for the task of improving the lot of the people of the Territory.

37. In conclusion, he referred to the role that should be played by the Security Council, which was constitutionally the only United Nations organ that had a real opportunity to ensure compliance with the resolutions on Namibia. The General Assembly and the International Court of Justice had performed their tasks by defining the situation prevailing in the Territory and indicating the practical steps that should be taken to resolve it. Consequently, it was for the Security Council to assume its full responsibility and take the concrete steps necessary to put an end to the illegal occupation of the Territory.

38. Mr. QUARTIN-SANTOS (Portugal) said that the problem of Namibia had become increasingly serious during the past year. South Africa was persisting in its illegal occupation of the Territory and its repressive policy against all the forces opposed to its presence, particularly SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people; it had organized from Namibia acts of aggression against neighbouring States and was pursuing its policies of bantustanization, discrimination, exploitation and denial of the fundamental rights of the African population. At the same time, the presence and activities of the South African armed forces in Namibia had been intensified.

39. The Territory and people of Namibia were under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. That fact constituted the corner-stone of any satisfactory solution of the question of Namibia. Consequently, any measure aimed at allowing the Namibian people to exercise genuinely and freely their right to self-determination and independence should be supervised and controlled by the United Nations. The convening of a so-called constitutional conference by the Government of South Africa was illegitimate and designed only to gain time and prepare the ground for a solution that would not take into account the fundamental decolonization principles adopted by the United Nations or the international status of the Territory. However, that conference had shown that South Africa did recognize that something had to be done to cope with the radical changes which had occurred in the balance of power in southern Africa as a result of the independence of Angola and Mozambique and the growing opposition of the Namibian people.

40. With regard to the efforts made by the international community during the past year, he stressed the importance of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), whose provisions constituted the framework for an acceptable and lasting settlement of the dispute, and the work of the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, the twenty-seventh session of the OAU Council of Ministers, the Dakar Conference on Namibia and Human Rights, the Special Committee of 24 and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

41. It was essential that South Africa, whose administration of Namibia was illegal, should withdraw from the Territory, that all types of political activity

/...

(Mr. Quartin-Santos, Portugal)

should be permitted in the Territory, that repression and intimidation should cease and that all political prisoners should be released. His Government upheld the right of the Namibian people to independence, territorial integrity and strict respect for their traditional frontiers and believed that a peaceful settlement of the problem was still possible, but realized that it was up to South Africa to create the necessary conditions by observing the aforementioned principles. Otherwise, Portugal would be forced to acknowledge that the Namibian people and their national liberation movement, SWAPO, had no alternative but armed struggle. Portugal hoped that it would be possible to avoid a confrontation in Namibia, in the interest of international peace and security, since as indicated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal at the 23rd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, it would be a tragedy if new conflicts were to break out in southern Africa or interests external to the African countries were to dictate solutions to current problems.

42. Mr. STRASSER (Austria) said that for 10 years South Africa had ignored the appeals addressed to it by the international community and had continued its policy of illegal occupation of Namibia, thus preventing its people from acceding to national sovereignty and independence. Namibia thus constituted one of the chief political anomalies on the map of Africa. Nowadays, there was a near consensus of international opinion on the need to liberate Namibia. One of the main moving forces in that respect was the increasingly active opposition of Namibians led effectively by the internal and external forces of SWAPO.

43. The South African Government claimed that its administration was necessary for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Territory, that it was carrying out a useful role and that it respected the wishes of the population. However, the basic concept of a mandate of South Africa had been rejected 10 years ago by the international community. The policy followed by South Africa in administering the Territory consisted in fostering divisiveness, nourishing tribal conflicts, furthering separate development and repressing the opposition. As for the assertion that the will of the people was being respected, the only means of justifying such a claim was to hold free elections with the participation of all sectors of the population and all political groups.

44. South Africa proclaimed its desire to achieve a peaceful solution of the question. However, the facts contradicted that assertion because the repression had been stepped up considerably in recent times. The ways of achieving such a peaceful solution had already been indicated to the South African Government: they included the holding of free elections and the initiation of a direct dialogue with SWAPO, both under the auspices of the United Nations. SWAPO had agreed to both those possibilities.

45. In order to persuade South Africa that change was unavoidable, the General Assembly should make it absolutely clear that it regarded the question as most serious, that it could not be deceived and that it was determined to fulfil its responsibilities in the Territory. International pressure on South Africa should be considerably intensified. To that end, the General Assembly had already

/...

(Mr. Strasser, Austria)

recommended a number of measures, including cessation of new investments in South Africa and a mandatory arms embargo, which the Austrian delegation had supported. His delegation also welcomed the recommendation that the United Nations Council for Namibia strengthen its relations with SWAPO and take further steps to mobilize political support for that organization.

46. Furthermore, the Austrian delegation welcomed the entry into operation of the United Nations Institute for Namibia and applauded the Zambian Government for the generous assistance it had provided. Similarly, it was gratified that UNDP had established an indicative planning figure for Namibia for the period 1977-1981.

47. The Government of Austria attached great importance to measures designed to obtain a greater dissemination of information about Namibia and supported the various assistance programmes of the United Nations. Austria had continued to offer scholarships to students from the Territory and had contributed to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. Moreover, pending parliamentary approval, Austria would substantially increase its contributions for 1977.

48. His delegation welcomed the sincere efforts undertaken by some States to bring about a peaceful solution by exerting their influence on the South African Government. Nothing should be left untried in order to achieve a speedy and just solution. It was indeed heartening to observe that concern about Namibia and its future seemed now truly universal. South Africa must realize the seriousness of the situation and must understand that it was not just a "biased and unfair" majority that demanded its withdrawal, but that all the Members of the United Nations were united in such a request.

49. His delegation was convinced that the future of all races in Namibia would be best served if hatred and frustration ceased to grow and if the free and independent development of a united multiracial Namibia were allowed, so that all races could develop freely and without fear. A heavy responsibility was incumbent on those parts of the population which had made Namibia their home since the beginning of the century and had undoubtedly contributed massively to its economic development. Nor was it possible to doubt the important role those populations could play in the future development of a free and independent Namibia. But a new and even more important contribution was now required: a contribution to racial harmony, a contribution to the achievement of human dignity and equality among Namibians of all races.

50. Finally, his delegation endorsed the demand pronounced by the Security Council that South Africa should accept the holding of free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It also associated itself with the request that South Africa should take up a dialogue with SWAPO on the future of the Territory.

51. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) recalled that a decade ago the General Assembly had terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and had assumed responsibility for the Territory. It had confirmed that decision in 1967 through the establishment

/...

(Mr. Torres, Philippines)

of the United Nations Council for Namibia and in 1970 through the establishment of the United Nations Fund for Namibia. Nevertheless, the United Nations had not succeeded in dethroning the pretenders lording over the fate and destiny not only of the Namibians themselves but also of the natural resources of the Territory. Recently, the South African régime had convoked a so-called constitutional conference for the sole purpose of dismembering the Territory, which, if successful, would leave the Namibians destitute with their economy in tatters.

52. His delegation welcomed the determined ongoing efforts to find peaceful solutions, acceptable to all concerned, to the explosive confrontations in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa and hoped that they would succeed. However, care should be taken to ensure that the formulas offered should conform to the legitimate demands of the African people. Proposed solutions should not be dictated by expediency or solely by considerations regarding the balance of power. They should first and foremost be just solutions, consonant with the Charter and with the expressed desires and aspirations of the African people. The right of the Namibians to self-determination and independence should be upheld and the Philippines joined in the demand for the withdrawal by South Africa from Namibia to enable its people to achieve freedom and independence, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

53. In the case of southern Africa, the Philippines had scrupulously implemented United Nations decisions, including the application of economic sanctions, the severance of diplomatic and consular relations and even the observance of sanctions in the field of sports.

54. The policy of the Philippine Government regarding Namibia was abundantly clear: it was committed to the national unity, independence and territorial integrity of the international Territory of Namibia and was opposed to its use as a base for intervention against neighbouring independent States; it reiterated its call for free elections under United Nations supervision and control; it continued to support SWAPO, the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, which must be represented in any negotiations involving the future of Namibia. The Philippine Government continued to support financially and morally the cause of the Namibian people and had contributed to and would continue to contribute to the various United Nations funds such as the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Institute for Namibia. Similarly, it supported the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

55. Finally, he urged all those who continued to support South Africa to abandon their stand so as to enable the Namibians to become free and to enjoy what was rightfully theirs.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.