

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUN 29 1984

1882nd

MEETING: 28 JANUARY 1976

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1882)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918)	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.

1882nd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 28 January 1976, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Salim A. SALIM
(United Republic of Tanzania).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1882)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken yesterday [1880th and 1881st meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Jamaica, Liberia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Nigeria, South Africa and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they address the Council. I also invite the President and 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. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Camara (Guinea), Mr. Marpaung (Indonesia), Mr. Hall (Jamaica), Mr. Minikon (Liberia), Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. Botha (South Africa), and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Kamana (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the mem-

bers of the delegation took places at the Security Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like also to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, India, Jordan and Poland requesting that they be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. Accordingly, if there is no objection, I propose, in conformity with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives I have just mentioned to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representatives of Cuba, Jordan, India and Poland to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when they address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Sharaf (Jordan) and Mr. Jaroszek (Poland) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda.

5. Mr. DATCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian delegation would, from the very outset, like to emphasize the need to conclude this debate on Namibia in the Security Council by the adoption of a resolution whose form and specific provisions would give the Namibian people the support they are looking for so that they can exercise self-determination and thus achieve complete independence. This is all the more necessary since the Pretoria régime has left no doubt as to its intentions, its arrogance, its defiance and its patent lack of consideration for the United Nations or the entire international community. The statement made yesterday in the Council [1881st meeting] by the representative of the Pretoria régime is convincing evidence of that.

6. Past deliberations of the Security Council on the question of Namibia have on every occasion brought out the existence of the political, legal and moral bases necessary for a solution to this problem. This

has enabled the Council to adopt without objection, unanimously even, a rather large number of resolutions.

7. However, all those resolutions have, to our deep regret, remained dead letters. This situation is quite rightly a serious cause of concern and dissatisfaction for the people of Namibia. It is all the more incomprehensible for the international community, which continues to have confidence in the part the United Nations, and especially the Security Council, must play in solving major problems of international life, including the problem of Namibia.

8. The resolutions adopted every year by the General Assembly and the Security Council amply demonstrate the interest which the United Nations has in enabling the Namibian people to achieve independence.

9. In addition to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations with regard to the just cause of the Namibian people, the United Nations, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, assumed special and unique responsibilities and obligations, which can be discharged only with the full assistance of the Council. Such was, for example, the decision taken in that resolution, by which the General Assembly put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

10. One year later, in 1967, the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia,¹ to which it assigned the task of administering the Territory until independence and of making contact with the South African authorities in order to establish the procedures for transferring the administration of the Territory to the Namibian people.

11. As a result of those resolutions, the Security Council decided that the continued presence of the racist South African régime in Namibia was illegal and, consequently, it reiterated South Africa's obligation to withdraw from that Territory, which has an international status. Similar provisions have been restated, most recently in resolution 366 (1974) of 17 December 1974, which was unanimously adopted by the Council.

12. However, despite these decisions, the Namibian question has not been settled. Furthermore, as the debate shows, new elements have been added which are such as to heighten tension in the area and jeopardize peace and security on the African continent.

13. In our view, the Security Council should in the present debate take account of several considerations and circumstances, of which I should like to mention the following: First of all, there is the flagrant negation and suppression by the Pretoria régime of the sacred right of the Namibian people to make its own decisions in accordance with its national aspirations. In

view of the continued imposition of the colonial yoke and the negation of its inalienable rights, the Namibian people has had to resort to the only means left at its disposal, namely, armed struggle, in order to recover its inalienable right to self-determination, independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

14. Secondly, we are faced with the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa and its obstinate refusal to leave the Territory. The arguments used by South Africa to justify its presence in Namibia are absolutely inconsistent, as was demonstrated by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971² and Security Council resolutions. The Mandate entrusted to South Africa half a century ago by the League of Nations belongs to past history when peoples were not consulted as to their own destiny. It is therefore clear that such a status, which has been rejected by the Namibian people, can no longer today have any legal and moral validity. If we add to this the fact that the Security Council has confirmed the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, while at the same time placing this Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, we can see to what extent South Africa's presence in Namibia has become illegal. The illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia flagrantly disregards the will of the Namibian people and violates one of the elementary principles unanimously recognized in international life, namely, the principle of respect for the sacred right of each people to decide for itself its own path to political and social development.

15. Thirdly, South Africa continues to defy the United Nations by obstinately refusing to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which many times have called for the withdrawal of the entire illegal administration of occupation in Namibia. In our opinion, the Security Council, in adopting a new resolution on Namibia at the close of the present debate, should at the same time decide on practical measures in order to guarantee the implementation of its relevant resolutions.

16. Fourthly, I should like to refer to the intensification of steps taken by South Africa to implement its plan aimed at dividing Namibia into bantustans and extending its policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination to this Territory. It can easily be seen that South Africa, in attempting to fragment the Territory of Namibia and to impose so-called constitutional development, is merely pursuing one of its old objectives, which is that of annexing the Territory.

17. The Organization of African Unity and the United Nations have condemned these manoeuvres by stressing that the sole aim of the so-called constitutional conference is to divide the ethnic groups in Namibia and to undermine the national unity and territorial integrity of the Territory. The convening by South Africa of the so-called constitutional conference

is a flagrant violation of resolution 366 (1974), in paragraph 4 of which the Council demands the withdrawal of the illegal administration in the Territory and the transfer of power to the Namibian people with the assistance of the United Nations.

18. It is the duty of the Council, by giving effect to resolution 366 (1974), to reaffirm the right of the United Nations, in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic representative of the Namibian people, to proceed to organize elections in Namibia and to supervise them. It goes without saying that such elections cannot take place so long as South African occupation forces are present. Only the United Nations, as the legal authority in the Territory, can supervise these elections, and it must do so. That is why we consider that it is necessary to adopt vigorous measures in order to put an end to South Africa's actions which infringe on the territorial integrity of Namibia and its national unity. The United Nations has the duty to guarantee Namibia's development as a unitary and independent State.

19. Fifthly, there is the South African authorities' continuing escalation of repression against the Namibian people. Indeed, recently South Africa has intensified its acts of repression and terror against the national liberation struggle, especially after the United Nations has recognized SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people.³ The police has proceeded to make mass arrests of Namibian patriots, to imprison them without any trial whatsoever, and to use torture and intimidation. The brutality with which the Namibian population is deprived of its legitimate rights and the repressive measures of the police against SWAPO, which is leading the national liberation struggle, have been mentioned here by other speakers as well. This resurgence of repressive actions has given rise to a veritable exodus of Namibian refugees to the neighbouring friendly countries. Such practices by South Africa have quite rightly been unanimously condemned by the General Assembly as flagrant violations of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people and as an affront to human justice and dignity contrary to the principles of international law and morality.

20. Sixthly, as was stressed by the representative of SWAPO, the South African occupation authorities are more and more engaged in strengthening their military establishment in Namibia and the militarization of the Territory. What is even more serious, the Territory of Namibia is now being used as a base for the military invasion of other countries, which represents a new flagrant violation of the principles of international law. The use of the Territory of Namibia as a base for attacking neighbouring countries confirms the view that has on many occasions been reiterated by Romania to the effect that the maintenance of vestiges of colonialism and of a racist policy, by being a constant source of tension, aggression and conflicts,

is gravely jeopardizing international peace and security. Romania is firmly in favour of the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and for the cessation of all actions by South Africa which might aggravate the situation in that area.

21. In the Romanian delegation's view, these are the considerations that require vigorous action by the Security Council in order that it may fulfil its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security on the African continent. We consider that the Council must adopt practical measures to enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and thus achieve complete independence. To this end, it is of course absolutely essential that the South Africa troops be withdrawn from Namibia and that any South African presence in the Territory be removed.

22. Measures should be taken to see to it that the Pretoria régime can no longer ignore the demands of the Namibian people and no longer defy the decisions of the United Nations and the requests of the international community with regard to the transfer of power to the Namibian people. In this connexion the Romanian delegation highly values the realistic proposals made by SWAPO, which must be taken into consideration by the Council.

23. Romania is on the side of the Namibian people in its struggle, and it is giving its active multilateral support to the Namibian people's movement of national liberation, SWAPO, so as to achieve the inprescriptible right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and to assure the national unity and territorial integrity of the Namibian homeland.

24. This position has been clearly expressed during the conversations and consultations which were held between the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceaușescu, and the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, and likewise in the Romanian-Namibian communiqué. It was reiterated on that occasion that Romania gives political and material support to the struggle of the Namibian people to achieve its legitimate aspirations for the development of Namibia as a unitary, independent State.

25. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Romania is firmly in favour of a programme of concrete and effective measures to enable that Council to carry out without delay the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. Romania will continue to give its support to the Namibian people and to its liberation movement, SWAPO, to ensure full independence so that this people can embark on the road to development and economic and social progress.

26. The Romanian delegation is convinced that the present debate in the Council can achieve positive

results, especially since we note that there has been a broad convergence of views amongst the Council members with respect to their appreciation of the present situation in Namibia. We are convinced that the Council can unanimously adopt a resolution in accordance with the aspirations for freedom and independence of the Namibian people. We hope that there will be no insurmountable difficulties in arriving at such a practical solution. It is quite possible, and even appropriate, to prove by facts that the United Nations and the Security Council are in a position to ensure implementation of their own decisions on Namibia. My delegation will do its best to achieve this result.

27. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The past year has seen a most inspiring situation in Africa. A number of newly independent countries have emerged one after another. The balance of forces in southern Africa has undergone a drastic change. The struggle of the people in areas yet to achieve independence against racism and colonialism and neo-colonialism is developing in depth. There has been a new development in the struggle of the African people against super-Power interference, subversion and divisive activities. The practice of struggle by the African people has proved that the liberation struggle will eventually triumph. But their road of advance is by no means smooth. Racism and old colonialism are not reconciled to their doom and will put up a last-ditch struggle. The rivalry between the super-Powers will become more and more intense. In order to preserve its vested interests, one super-Power is supporting the racist regimes and undermining the national liberation movement. The other super-Power is stepping up its frenzied contention with the former in order to seek strategic areas in southern Africa, to scramble for Europe and to intensify its global deployment for war. The over-all situation of African unity and the struggle of the people in southern Africa is in jeopardy because of the rivalry between the super-Powers. The development of the situation in southern Africa has enabled the African people gradually to realize the danger of "letting the tiger in through the back door while repulsing the wolf through the front gate". Therefore, it is only through linking the struggle against racism with that against super-Power interference, subversion and divisive activities and for doing away with them that the over-all situation of African unity can be preserved, the continued victorious advance of the struggle for national liberation enhanced and the complete liberation of the whole continent of Africa achieved.

28. During the past year, the Namibian people have continued to win new victories on their road of armed struggle. These victories have thrown the Vorster racist régime into a panic so that it has been stepping up its counter-revolutionary dual tactics. Apart from energetically carrying on arms expansion and war preparations and its repression of the Namibian people, it has sent troops to invade Angola. We sternly condemn these criminal activities of the South African

racist régime. We also strongly condemn that super-Power which flaunts the banner of "natural ally" of the liberation movement for its frenzied intervention in Angola. We resolutely stand for the immediate withdrawal of all the foreign troops, including the South African troops, from Angola. Moreover, the Vorster racist régime has tried hard to resort to deceitful schemes. The so-called "constitutional conference" held from 1 to 12 September last under the guise of establishing a "multiracial" State was a farce stage-managed by the South African racist régime in active pursuance of its policy of "bantustans". From the very beginning this farce met with the strong opposition of the broad masses of the Namibian and other African peoples and finally ended in ignominious failure. This is another great victory achieved by the Namibian people. We are deeply convinced that the courageous Namibian people will certainly use the revolutionary dual tactics against the counter-revolutionary dual tactics, strengthen their unity and closely link their struggle against South African racism with that of the Angolan people against South African racism and intervention and aggression by the super-Powers, frustrate the super-Power intrigues and schemes and finally achieve the complete liberation of Namibia.

29. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak on a point of order.

30. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I discovered in the verbatim record of yesterday's meeting [*1881st meeting*] that you explained to the representative of South Africa that the Security Council is discussing not the question of Angola but rather the question of Namibia. However, the Chinese representative is talking all the time about Angola. If the Security Council finds it necessary to discuss the question of Angola, my delegation is ready at any time day or night to do so, but at present we are discussing the question of Namibia. For this reason it would be useful to explain to the representative of China that the Security Council is discussing the question of Namibia and not the question of Angola.

31. The PRESIDENT: Before I call again on the representative of China I should like to appeal to all the members of the Council to try as much as possible not to discuss other aspects of the problem. Obviously, I cannot restrain any member of the Council from making his statement and mentioning anything he wants to mention, and those of my colleagues who are more experienced in the Council should know this better than I, but I can make an appeal to all members of the Council to exercise maximum restraint and moderation.

32. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Before continuing my statement, I would advise the Soviet representative to listen carefully to the statement of the Chinese representative to see if he can

find any sentence that does not concern the Namibian question under present consideration.

33. In the opinion of the Chinese delegation, during the past two decades and more quite a number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions in support of the Namibian people's struggle for independence have been adopted, but until now they have not been implemented. The basic reason for this lies in the imperialist active support for the South African racist régime. We hold that the way of solving the Namibian question should be as follows: the correct position in the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions previously adopted on Namibia should be adhered to; the South African authorities must immediately end their illegal occupation of Namibia, withdraw all their troops and administration therefrom and let the Namibian people achieve their independence free from outside interference. Together with the African countries and people the Chinese Government and people will, as always, support the Namibian people and give them assistance in their just struggle until they win complete victory.

34. Mr. SAITO (Japan): The encouraging developments we have seen in southern Africa over the past two years had inspired us for a time to hope that the situation in Namibia also would somehow improve. We were disappointed, however, by South Africa's refusal last May to comply with the terms of Security Council resolution 366 (1974). This was confirmed yesterday by the letter of the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General [*S/11948 and Add.1*]. Meanwhile South Africa had organized local elections on the basis of ethnic groups in which the participation of all political forces, including SWAPO, had not been obtained. It also convened a constitutional conference in September 1975 in Windhoek, at which the "Declaration of Intent" was adopted. My delegation has observed these developments with concern.

35. Before addressing myself to the question before us, let me remind the Council of my delegation's fundamental position on the question of Namibia. I stated it here last June [*1827th meeting*], and I will summarize it today as follows. Japan maintains the view that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and that South Africa is under the obligation to withdraw from the Territory. For Japan two operating principles are paramount: it is necessary to safeguard the free exercise of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, and the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia must be preserved.

36. The Security Council is again entrusted with the responsibility of considering the question of Namibia. My delegation is of the view that it is imperative for the Council to find some formula to end the present stalemate. In order to attain this purpose, we have to be realistic and concentrate our efforts on the most pressing needs.

37. South Africa's arrangements for the local elections, in the view of my delegation, did not, unfortunately, live up to its promise that any political group in the Territory would be allowed to participate without hindrance "in any peaceable activity, including the election of representatives to the Constitutional Conference" [*see S/1170*]. As we all know, the elections were held under the prevailing racially discriminatory laws and practices, without free political campaigning by all political organizations.

38. Thus, the composition of the constitutional conference was largely determined by the restrictions South Africa imposed upon the election of the delegates. My delegation, therefore, feels that it is impossible to accept the claim that its decisions reflected the views, freely expressed, of the entire population of the Territory on the machinery by which it would decide its future.

39. In the light of these developments, my delegation cannot fail to express its growing concern over the possibility that South Africa one day may in fact confront the Organization with a fait accompli, which it would claim to be the result of the free exercise of self-determination by the people of the Territory.

40. These developments of recent months lead my delegation to believe that the Council, while reaffirming the people's right of self-determination and the territorial integrity of Namibia, should call for free and democratic elections, under United Nations supervision, ensuring the participation of all eligible voters, to decide the future of Namibia.

41. As I stated during our deliberations on the situation in Namibia in June last year, Japan remains convinced that elections to enable the people of Namibia to determine freely their political future must be held under the supervision of the United Nations, that all Namibian political organizations must be allowed to campaign and state their views and engage in political activities free from fear and intimidation, and that all Namibians in exile for political reasons should be allowed to return freely without risk of arrest or detention and be assured of the right to participate in the process of self-determination, including political campaigns and elections.

42. My delegation has noted with satisfaction that the working paper which has been circulated among members of the Council includes provisions for such elections under United Nations supervision. In addition detailed arrangements would be necessary in order to safeguard such free and democratic elections, and this leads me to suggest that negotiations between a representative of the United Nations and the South African Government should take place on the date, the timetable, and the modalities of the election, and supervision by the United Nations. Either the Security Council could propose that the United Nations Council for Namibia accept this task or we could

request the Secretary-General or his personal representative to assume this responsibility. The statements of other speakers before the Council also have emphasized the need to hold free elections in the Territory under United Nations supervision. I thus have reason to hope that a resolution with these provisions will be adopted by the Council unanimously.

43. The unanimous adoption of a constructive resolution would demonstrate the Council's determination to continue its efforts to induce South Africa to comply with relevant United Nations resolutions. The Council would thus consolidate the advances it has made towards the achievement of the United Nations objectives for Namibia.

44. I have taken note of the letter and the statement by the South African representative in which the Government of South Africa repeated its offer to negotiate with a personal representative of the Secretary-General acceptable to both sides and also to discuss progress and developments with the leaders of Africa, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the Special Committee of the Organization of African Unity [*ibid.*]. My delegation wishes to believe in the sincerity and good faith of those statements. Bearing them in mind, I appeal to the Government of South Africa to respond favourably to the course I am suggesting.

45. My delegation is prepared to support any resolution that contains these measures and further strengthens the progress the Council has made. Let us hope that, with the unanimous acceptance of such a resolution by the Council, we shall find ourselves on the road to a just and lasting settlement of the question of Namibia.

46. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Liberia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

47. Mr. MINIKON (Liberia): Mr. President, allow me, first of all, to indicate to you how pleased and delighted I am to see you, a distinguished son of Africa, a strong advocate of self-determination and an eloquent spokesman for the cause of African liberation, presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council. My delegation is indeed hopeful that with you in the Chair, the Council will once and for all make a positive contribution to the solution of this vexing problem.

48. I am indeed gratified to have this opportunity of addressing the Council on the question of Namibia, a question in which Liberia has manifested great interest from its very inception. After so many years of debate and negotiations, the question of Namibia is still found on the agenda of the Security Council and the General Assembly annually, with no prospect of an acceptable solution in sight. My delegation is, however, heartened and optimistic that under your guidance, Mr. President, the present discussions will

produce some long overdue results which will show to the world the Council's concern and determination to use its influence in resolving this question. A lot has been said in the Council about the future of this African Territory. Our debates have brought no relief to the gallant people of Namibia.

49. A little over seven months ago, when the Foreign Minister of Liberia, Mr. C. Cecil Dennis, Jr., addressed the Security Council on the question of Namibia [*see 1824th meeting*] specifically on the question of South Africa's compliance with resolution 366 (1974), he stressed the fact that racism was a source of grave danger to world peace and security. He supported an independent and united Namibia on the basis of majority rule and warned that the responsibility for determining whether that independence would be accomplished peacefully or through more bloodshed rested on the shoulders of the South African Government. Furthermore, he gave our interpretation of paragraph 4 of resolution 366 (1974), saying that it meant the holding of elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision. Mr. Dennis then asked the Council to affirm and uphold the legal right of the United Nations to hold such elections. Finally, he called on the Council, among other things, to impress upon South Africa that it must desist from any action designed to impose upon the people of Namibia its bantustan policy under a constituent assembly chosen in an atmosphere of coercion and intimidation. The Liberian delegation's appeal to reason for Namibia's independence and its proposals for the reasonable action that is necessary to avert strife and avoid bloodshed have gone unheeded.

50. South Africa, by its constant refusal to abide by the Council's resolutions and those of the General Assembly regarding Namibia, has shown its total disregard for the interest of the people of Namibia. And the situation has deteriorated to such an extent that it provides a serious challenge to the United Nations. It is clear that South Africa has no interest in raising the educational, social and economic status of the people of Namibia. The insatiable desire for profit has been made the number one priority of South Africa. Consequently, the right of Namibia to be free and independent has been given no priority at all.

51. The Declaration of Dakar on Namibia and Human Rights [*S/11939, annex*] strongly emphasized the principle of self-determination for Namibia and the restoration of its fundamental national rights. The Security Council must not adjourn without giving some hope to Namibia for its future. Those members of the Council who usually block the passage of a meaningful resolution must consider the wind of change now blowing around Namibia and decide to exert some influence on South Africa to undertake some constructive change in the Territory.

52. Is it so difficult for South Africa's allies to convince it to declare its unequivocal acceptance of

self-determination and independence for Namibia? Is it so difficult for them to urge South Africa to accept the territorial integrity of Namibia and prescribe a solution that will retain the unity of the Territory as a whole? Is it because reasonable men have become so lackadaisical that they have failed to take reasonable action?

53. My delegation believes that a solution to the question of Namibia lies in South Africa's acceptance of Security Council resolution 366 (1974) and the provisions of the Declaration of Dakar. We believe that the winds of change for independence which have been blowing in Africa will definitely reach Namibia in one form or another.

54. Finally, we should like to urge the Council to set a definite timetable outlining how and when elections, under United Nations supervision, should take place in Namibia. In this connexion, it is imperative for the Council to urge South Africa, in the strongest terms, to abide by all the relevant resolutions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly.

55. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

56. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. President, this is the second time this month that I have had the pleasure of addressing the Council under your presidency. I am grateful both to you, Sir, and to all Council members for having afforded me an opportunity to present Poland's position on the situation in Namibia.

57. My delegation has thought it only proper to ask to be allowed to speak in this debate both because Poland is a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and because solidarity with peoples fighting for their freedom has been one of the basic principles of Poland's foreign policy. Such an attitude derives from both the ideological and political foundations of socialism and from the tradition of struggle "for your freedom and ours", so much a part of my country's history.

58. The significance of the question of Namibia, now before the Council, is that it is indeed a unique example of the remnants of bygone times. It is no more purely a decolonization issue. Neither is it a problem that can any longer be left at the mercy of those who have created it. In fact, owing to the interdependence of world affairs today and the indivisibility of world peace and security, the question of Namibia is of a three-dimensional nature.

59. In the first place, it is a national problem of a people brutally suppressed by South Africa, which is persistently violating their human rights in its drive to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

60. Secondly, it is a matter that directly concerns the great continent of Africa. The South African military build-up in Namibia and the utilization of its territory as a base for aggression against neighbouring countries constitute a serious threat to the peace and security of the African continent. Today, it is the People's Republic of Angola that the South African régime has chosen to invade from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia; tomorrow it may be any other country of the continent. And on top of that, the representative of the Pretoria régime has the audacity to put the blame for his Government's infamous actions—as he did only yesterday—on those who have always been in the vanguard of freedom-fighting and have lent their genuine support to the oppressed people. That is but a typical example of a thief who, having been caught red-handed, tries to run away, shouting loudly: "Stop, thief!"

61. It is also not surprising, though very regrettable, that the representative of a permanent member of the Security Council, notorious for slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union, in fact took sides—and this not for the first time—with the representative of the racist régime of South Africa by joining in his calumnies, thus trying to sidetrack the debate in the Council and to divert its attention from the plight of the oppressed people of Namibia.

62. Thirdly, Namibia represents a grave international problem. It has been amply proved the past years that its continued illegal occupation by South Africa poses a serious threat to international peace and security. In consistency with its long-standing and principled policy, the Polish People's Republic has steadfastly supported the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. Today, once again we raise our voice in condemnation of the illegal and repressive occupation of the international Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa. The legacy of nazism—which sounds so familiar to us in Poland, and which South Africa seems to have inherited both in theory and practice from its Hitlerite predecessors—must no longer haunt millions of South Africans and Namibians. For, how else should one view the killings, mass arrests and detentions of the indigenous population of Namibia, particularly of members of SWAPO?

63. In order to mislead world public opinion, South Africa has organized the so-called constitutional conference, without the participation of the true representatives of the Namibian people, and continues its racist policy of "bantustanization", which constitutes yet another serious threat to the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

64. I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the brave people of Namibia which, under the leadership of its authentic representative, SWAPO, despite repressions, continues its struggle against the illegal occupation of its country.

65. The road to a solution as regards the situation in Namibia leads through the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. My delegation is happy to note the growing awareness of that fact among the membership of the Organization. But, at the same time, we find no justification whatsoever for the economic and military collaboration of certain Western countries, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), with the racist régime in Pretoria, totally condemned by the world community. We cannot fail to notice again that precisely this policy of collaboration was behind the Council's failure to act effectively against the South African régime last June.

66. New efforts are necessary to change the existing situation in Namibia. The sooner they are taken, the more stable peace there will be on the African continent. On the internal plane, these efforts first of all call for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and thus for the restoration, with the assistance of the United Nations, of the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence. On the international plane, they require intensified pressure to be brought to bear upon South Africa to compel it to effect the withdrawal of its illegal administration from Namibia and meet the demands as set forth in this Council's resolution 366 (1974).

67. Given good political will from all the members of the Security Council without exception, those goals are attainable. They are indeed expected from the Council by the people of Namibia. I can therefore only join the Administrative Secretary of SWAPO, Mr. Moses Garoeb, who addressed the Council yesterday in these words: "We come to the United Nations and indeed to the Security Council because we believe that they have an obligation to help us... and it is this obligation, more than anything else, that the Council must live up to." [1880th meeting, para. 48.]

68. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Saudi Arabia containing a request that he be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. I propose, if I hear no objection, to invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to participate in the discussion, in conformity with the usual practice and with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

69. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Saudi Arabia to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber on the usual understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when he addresses the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

70. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Indonesia. I accordingly invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

71. Mr. MARPAUNG (Indonesia): Mr. President, permit me at the outset to express the deep sense of satisfaction that it gives my delegation to see you in the Chair as the Security Council considers the question of Namibia. It is indeed most appropriate that a distinguished son of Africa should preside over our discussion of a subject that so deeply concerns all of the people of that continent. In addition, it is fitting that one who has been in the forefront of the efforts of the United Nations to promote the process of decolonization should preside over these deliberations. We are confident that, under such distinguished leadership, the Council will be able to make a significant contribution to promoting a solution of the problem of Namibia.

72. Recent developments in southern Africa, particularly the attainment of independence by the former Portuguese Territories in that region, concretely demonstrate that the era of colonialism and racialism is inevitably drawing to a close. Despite these unmistakable portents, the Government of South Africa has continued its attempts to impose its illegal rule upon the Territory of Namibia. While such measures may succeed for a time in delaying the attainment of independence by the Namibians, in the end we are confident that no efforts can prevent the people of the Territory from exercising the right of self-determination.

73. In a series of resolutions the United Nations has set forth the framework in which the goal of independence can best be achieved. As noted by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia in his statement, Security Council resolution 366 (1974) demanded of the South African Government that it "comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice... in regard to Namibia and... take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal... of its illegal administration maintained in Namibia".

74. My delegation must confess its disappointment that the South African Government continues to resist the efforts of the international community to implement the provisions of resolution 366 (1974) and other relevant resolutions in Namibia. Regretfully, we can only conclude that the Pretoria régime has continued to display an evident lack of good faith in its dealings with the United Nations and the people of Namibia itself. Despite its so-called policy of détente with the other nations of Africa, and despite the assurance

given in its letter of 27 May 1975 [S/11701] to the Secretary-General that the Namibians would be free to choose their own constitutional and political future, the South African Government has continued to pursue a contrary policy of repression and intensification of its illegal occupation of the Territory. Such police-State measures as killings, mass arrests, detentions, torture and floggings were noted in the consensus on Namibia adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in 1975⁴ and have been detailed by other speakers before the Council.

75. In addition, the South African Government has redoubled its efforts to impose the odious system of *apartheid* upon the people of Namibia, and it has also continued its attempts to implement the Bantustanization of the nation. These policies have been condemned time and again by the General Assembly and the Security Council, most recently in General Assembly resolution 3399 (XXX); yet the Pretoria régime continues in its efforts to implement them in defiance of the considered judgment of the international community.

76. It is clear that these policies are simply designed to attempt to perpetuate South Africa's control over Namibia. The "homelands" scheme, for example, would result in the fragmentation of the Territory, with 80 per cent of its African population forced into reserves in the poorest part of the country, which constitutes only 40 per cent of its geographical area. Such homelands, over-populated and lacking nearly all resources, could never constitute viable, independent States.

77. South Africa further seeks to perpetuate its rule by imposing a system of education which ensures that almost no members of the indigenous population will ever be able to obtain higher or technical education. Without the skills necessary to administering a modern State, the people of Namibia would remain forever dependent on the continuation of foreign administration in its native land.

78. South Africa also continues to encourage the exploitation of Namibia's vast wealth of natural resources, particularly by foreign-owned multinational corporations. The indigenous people receives none of the benefits of this exploitation and is in effect being robbed of its birthright.

79. The United Nations has steadfastly opposed these efforts by the illegal régime to strengthen and extend its control over Namibia. In its consideration of the question since 1946, the General Assembly has taken progressively sterner measures, including revocation of South Africa's Mandate at its twenty-first session. The legality of this act was confirmed by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971.

80. The United Nations Council for Namibia, on which Indonesia has the honour to serve, has closely monitored developments in the Territory since its inception in 1967, and has made every effort to assist the people of Namibia in its struggle for freedom and self-determination. Two recent actions, the establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia⁵ to train Namibians for self-government, and the promulgation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁶ which establishes penalties for the illegal exploitation of the Territory's natural resources, are, in the opinion of my delegation, of great importance in promoting the welfare of the people of the Territory.

81. These and subsequent actions by the United Nations have been reinforced by activities undertaken outside the framework of the Organization. The most recent of these was the Dakar International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights. That Conference exposed the serious and continuing violations of human rights that are taking place in Namibia, particularly as a result of the policies of *apartheid* and Bantustanization. By focusing international attention on these violations it is to be hoped that international opposition to South African policies will be both deepened and broadened. My delegation would like to pledge its full co-operation in such efforts.

82. Despite all that has been done by the United Nations and by other interested organizations and individuals, however, South Africa has retained its illegal control over Namibia. It behoves us at this crucial period in the history of southern Africa to ask ourselves why the Pretoria régime has been able to continue its policies in the face of the stern disapproval expressed time and again by the international community.

83. One of the most important reasons for this successful defiance has surely been the support which South Africa has received from certain other Member States, and from multinational corporations. In refusing to implement fully the decisions of the United Nations and, in particular, in continuing to supply South Africa with arms by which it can strengthen its illegal domination of Namibia through the construction of huge military bases and can also threaten neighbouring countries with aggression, these nations are encouraging the development of an explosive and highly dangerous situation which not only jeopardizes the peace and security of southern Africa, but may well threaten that of the globe. In this light, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to urge once again most strongly that those nations continuing to provide moral and material support to South Africa cease to do so immediately, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 3399 (XXX). In doing so, they would make an extremely significant contribution to the Namibian people's struggle for freedom.

84. While we may hope that these measures will have a salutary effect, it is clear that the international

community must strengthen its efforts and take even sterner measures if the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is to be brought to a rapid conclusion.

85. In this connexion, I feel that I must comment briefly on the statement of the representative of South Africa before the Council [1881st meeting], and on his Government's position as set forth in the letter dated 27 January from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General, which we have carefully studied. There is little I can add, Mr. President, to your own incisive analysis of South Africa's position which you made yesterday. I should like to note, however, that the Indonesian delegation could not but feel a certain sense of shock and, indeed, disbelief that after so many years the Government of South Africa continues to dismiss as unworthy of its consideration the concern that has been expressed for developments in Namibia by virtually the entire international community.

86. Once again we have heard from the South African representative that the United Nations has no competence to deal with the question of the Territory, that the people have no right to decide its own future in an open and democratic manner and that his Government refuses to pledge its respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia. Its rejection of even the moderate demands presented by the nine countries of the European Economic Community in their *démarche* demonstrates again South Africa's contempt for international opinion. While we had hoped that South Africa might at last be prepared to moderate its position with regard to Namibia, unfortunately we still find in these statements the unalloyed arrogance and self-righteousness that has previously characterized its position.

87. In response to South Africa's position, the proposal for the Security Council to call for the holding of elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision, to permit the people to freely determine its own future, discussed in detail by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia in his statement [1880th meeting], has much to recommend it, in the view of my delegation.

88. Such elections would have the great virtue of ensuring that peaceful change could take place in the Territory, for in the face of continuing South African oppression it cannot be expected that those seeking the liberation of Namibia will indefinitely continue to pursue their policy by moderate means. In this light, Indonesia supports the plan for free elections as set forth by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. The representatives of the Government of South Africa have frequently asserted that the freedom fighters of SWAPO do not enjoy the support of the majority of Namibians and that they are attempting to win by coercion what they cannot obtain from the ballot box. If they truly believe that this is the case, they should have no objection to per-

mitting fair, free and open elections to be held. My delegation is confident that free and open elections, held under United Nations auspices, under conditions which allow for the effective organization and full participation of all parties, will permit an accurate gauge of public opinion.

89. In the event of this proposal's meeting with South African intransigence, the Security Council would have to consider additional measures, consistent with the Charter, to secure compliance with the provisions of resolution 366 (1974). Whatever course of action the Security Council and the international community as a whole may choose to take, however, my delegation is fully in agreement with the representative of SWAPO who stated yesterday that "the liberation of Namibia can be brought about only by the Namibians themselves" [*ibid.*, para. 48].

90. In conclusion, my delegation would like once again to urge that the Council take concrete and effective measures which will convince the Government of South Africa of the futility of its current policies in Namibia. By doing so, the Security Council will not only be making a significant contribution to the struggle of the Namibian people for its freedom, but also to peace and security in the world as a whole.

91. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. Accordingly, I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

92. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I did not think the speakers who preceded me would be so laconic. It seems they are tired of repeating the same thing with regard to this question of granting independence to Namibia, which is, indeed, overdue.

93. But I felt that, having considered this question since we began to talk in the United Nations about decolonization, it was my duty not only to repeat what I have said time and again whenever I took the floor, whether here or in the General Assembly, but also perhaps to ginger up Members of the United Nations, especially those who could still wield influence over South Africa, to do something radical lest we go in circles and get dizzy and achieve nothing. Then it becomes very evident that we should not be able to spare some nations from adverse criticism, which we should avoid—but, after all, our patience has been tried on this subject year in and year out.

94. I remember that in the mid-1960s we had a special session of the General Assembly about this question of South West Africa, as it was called then, before it was christened Namibia. I think there was some willingness at that time on the part of the Member States that supported South Africa to do something more or less radical to contribute towards the emancipation of that Mandated Territory—at least it appeared to us to be so—but later we found that there

were considerations that militated against the liberation of the Mandated Territory. Needless to say, there was no Mandated Territory except South West Africa that had not been liberated. We are all proud that even British Crown Colonies and other colonies, such as the French and lately the Portuguese colonies, all have been liberated, have gained their freedom. What is wrong with Namibia? Do representatives remember how jubilant we were when Australia and New Zealand advised us of completing their mission in Papua New Guinea and the other Territories which were entrusted to their care in the Pacific? I do not think the people of South West Africa are subhuman. They should have gained their freedom a long time ago.

95. Needless to say, many of us, including myself, rebelled against Mandates in the early 1920s. I was a youth, but we knew that the Mandates were colonies in disguise, and I remember that we were told by the High Commissioners of those Mandated Territories that in time we would gain our independence in those Territories. I am talking specifically about the Mandated Territories of the countries of the Turkish Crescent, like Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Palestine. And had it not been for the Second World War it is very likely that many Mandated Territories would still be under colonial rule. Do we have to have a third world war to have Namibia liberated? It means there is a lack of will—not only a lack of political will, a lack of goodwill. Let us be frank with one another. I do not want to exacerbate matters in the Council by naming names or mentioning why certain States Members of the Organization are acting in an arbitrary manner, rationalizing their stand, saying that they are doing one thing and surreptitiously still supporting South Africa in so far as delaying the liberation of Namibia is concerned.

96. What is the alternative, if we do not hit the nail on the head, if we do not call a spade a spade? Let us be frank. The deterrents are three in number at least. They are economic, they are strategic and they are racial. Let us handle each factor separately.

97. Let us take the economic factor. I have heard from many sources that Namibia is very rich in natural resources. Time and again I have been told that, although it looks deserted, it contains many minerals. Well and good. Why not let the Republic of South Africa have a stake in the wealth? I do not think the indigenous population would want South African mining engineers and merchants to be out of the picture. They are clamouring for their freedom. I venture to say that they would welcome co-operating economically with South Africa and the friends of South Africa. By "friends" I mean those who support South Africa and have interests in South Africa. This economic question can be solved. Why does South Africa, from the strictly economic point of view, balk at liberating the people who have been clamouring for their independence? Is half a century not enough to

be under the yoke of the foreigner? They are indigenous people. The South Africans came from Europe originally. The others are the people of the land, the indigenous people.

98. Let us take up the strategic factor. It has become very evident that some Powers are trying to gain not only favour but power in the continent of Africa—major Powers. They know themselves who they are. Angola has been mentioned 10 or 20 times. Why should the people of Namibia pay for the conflicting interests of the major Powers? Have the major Powers not learnt a lesson from what happened in what was known as the Congo? It seems only yesterday that Lumumba was shot. I am not going to mention what happened there, as I have said, lest I exacerbate the whole issue. But what happened finally? Those Powers that had interests there had to get out of the Congo, but I believe that many of them are trading with the Congo.

99. Why should not South Africa be told, "All right, you can have interests in Namibia, but the Namibians do not want you to be their lords. They should provide their rulers from their own people." Therefore, have not those major Powers that are pulling the strings—and not so surreptitiously; it is in the newspapers day-in and day-out; we constantly read about Angola; this is a test case—learned anything from what happened in the Congo? We lost one of our Secretaries-General—may God rest his soul in peace—none other than Mr. Hammarskjöld, who was going to the Congo to try to see what could be done.

100. And their economic interests have not diminished. I think they served their interests by pulling out, because war and the preparation for war and conflict cost a lot of money. If it is only a colonialism for the sake of a clique or a circle of people in the erstwhile metropolitan countries, then this is unjust. Even the people of empires were as much the victims as were the colonized. They were serving the interests of cliques in those metropolitan Powers.

101. Let us reason here. The people in the capitals of the major Powers should know that economically speaking it does not pay to lord it over others, because the balance sheet will show a deficit in the long run, as was evident before 1914 and after 1914.

102. The strategic consideration strikes us in the eye. So let Baroody talk; let every one of us here talk. Is that a sane approach to international affairs? Had it not been for the deterrent of fear I think we would have had a third world war. Therefore, thank God for fear. But remember that fear may cause some of the leaders to become tense, and if the leaders become tense and are under pressure, they might miscalculate. The danger is not altogether eliminated. That is why we are having what the Secretary-General exhorted us to have, that is, an *ad hoc* Committee on Disarmament. It is meeting to see how we can avoid a future conflict that may engulf us all.

103. Then we come to the racial question. Now it is not *apartheid* like the *apartheid* in the Republic of South Africa proper. But all the same the white settlers there seem to be paramount—economically paramount—economically paramount and also politically paramount. They want to run the show. I suspect that in conniving with South Africa, those white settlers in Namibia want to gain time to make sure that if sooner or later the rule in Namibia should be transferred, it should be transferred to stooges, the stooges of South Africa. They may be black in colour, but they will still be stooges. We had stooges in my part of the world who served the interests of the Mandatory Powers. They were at their beck and call, whether in Palestine, Syria, Iraq or Lebanon, when those Mandates were established in the early 1920s.

104. But all those policies will backfire. How? Why? We have seen how and we have seen why. And should the Council persist in paying lip service to the liberation of people, expatiating on the necessity of the Namibians getting free as soon as possible—and who is going to define the term “as soon as possible”—the Namibians would not believe them. This question of step-by-step progress that the Middle East has been promised time and again. There should be step-by-step progress for solving the question. Good Lord, step-by-step—28 years. If in 28 years you have taken two steps, what steps have been taken with respect to the question of Namibia in about 50 years now? We shall not be around to see the results. Maybe even our grandchildren would not be around. Step-by-step. Between this table and the door there are 20 steps and each step takes 28 years. If we multiply 20 by 30 we arrive at the figure of 600 years. Whom are we fooling here?—not we, but those who say, “Well, give the South Africans time”.

105. I spoke to Mr. Muller in the mid-1960s. Mr. Muller is the Foreign Minister of South Africa. I said, “You have no place there unless you adjust yourselves to the people of Africa”. I think the people of Africa have been very patient. I am not for violence, but I would not be surprised if one day they become militant, and what would prevent all our African brothers from marching not only on Namibia but on South Africa? What will the South Africans do? Kill them from planes? The white man will kill them from the skies? I think that the conscience of the white people of Europe has awakened. They would lynch those who would kill the people of Africa from planes. That is finished. That is why the intelligence agencies are so active these days. The young men do not want to go and kill others and get killed. What for? So that they may enrich the cliques in their own countries? What for? Prestige? What kind of prestige? Victory? What empty victory. The victors in two world wars were economically defeated. They are bankrupt now. Look at their currency. It is eroding. I have seen it year-in and year-out. This applies whether it is dollar, or sterling. In fairness I must say that I remember my father who made a gesture, as an Ottoman citizen

—I was born an Ottoman—handed the authorities 1,000 Turkish gold sovereigns and received paper money for it. I was a youth at the time. Those Ottoman lire became worthless because Turkey lost the war with Germany. Every 100 or 120 became worth one. That has been happening in stages. I was in France during the 1920s. One hundred francs became one franc. Then, again, since the days of the illustrious General de Gaulle—may God rest his soul in peace—100 francs have again become one franc, but I do not know what the future holds.

106. From a practical point of view, those Member States whose representatives are seated here, why do they not tell their representatives that they will become bankrupt, or rather not they, because politicians can always manage to have posts, but the people will become bankrupt. I include myself. I have a little saved, but I find out that I still have to work now that I am 70 because the savings are eroding. It is nothing to laugh at. You are still young, but wait: you will either have to work in order to eat or, if you do not work, you will go on relief and you will “half eat”.

107. What will jolt them into consciousness, those erstwhile colonial Powers which are supporting South Africa, and make them liberate the Namibians? How can white settlers live under the indigenous Government of Namibia? Well, South Africa is across the border; let them move to South Africa—and then we will handle the question of *apartheid*, because I do not want to confuse the issues.

108. I have told my brothers from Africa time and again not to mix the issue of *apartheid* with that of the liberation of Namibia. We will handle each question separately. The white settlers are conniving with South Africa to help them to remain there because they cannot live under the rule of Africans. All right, I will talk to our African brothers to compensate them. Let them go across the border and live in *apartheid* until when we handle that question of *apartheid* when we come to it; and we will come to it time and again. No white man can have his way unless he adjusts to the situation in South Africa. I feel sorry for the white men. They have no future if they persist in their obdurate stand. And I will not be surprised if one day so as to exist they will have to put charcoal on their faces—unless they change their attitude and then they will be accepted like every other human being.

109. I want to take issue with my brothers from Africa. Every time this question of Namibia comes under consideration they have a voluminous resolution. The last one had six or seven sections. They incorporate everything. I want to tell them in public—because I do not work behind the scenes—to concentrate on the liberation of the people of Namibia, and let us set aside the racial question for the time being. We will handle it in due time when we come to *apartheid* in the Republic of South Africa. And, no doubt, we will consider the question of Rhodesia,

where I think the black population is 4 million and the white population is 250,000 or so. We have ample time.

110. I want to conclude by reading the fourth or fifth draft resolution submitted by me during the last 10 years. I think this is the last one I did and then I gave up. But I was worked up today. They are still working on working papers. I went to the documents counter and asked for a resolution and was told that there was nothing as yet. I want to read this draft resolution before I conclude. I do not want to take credit for it, but it was not hindsight; I knew what I was doing.

111. Do you remember that? It seems only yesterday—25 October 1974

[The speaker read out the text of draft resolution S/11547.]

That was a fourth or fifth concrete attempt on my part in the form of a draft resolution.

112. "Baroody, please, please, we have something better"—since 1965. Where is it? Lip service and fat resolutions, injected with all the epithets that could be used against South Africa. I can curse too, but it is not the better part of wisdom to call them names. To heck with them. That is the least I can say. As we say in Arabic, we do not want to quarrel with the guard of the vineyard, we want to eat grapes. Do not pick a quarrel with the guard. It is still the guard—the guardian—whether we like it or not; and by whom is it supported? You know by whom. They are nice people representing them here, diplomats, a good bunch. The leaders behind them send them instructions: "Do this, do not do that". But Baroody tells the truth.

113. Now I do not want to reap any benefit or any glory. I can give this text to anyone who wishes to co-sponsor it—unless, of course, he wants to put in "apartheid", "to hell with South Africa" and "they should have done this and that". They will not do anything as long as they still have behind them people and countries wielding world power. Let us face the fact. Shall I name them? No, one can read about them in the newspapers, so why name them? And they tell us: "As long as the caravan is marching, let the dogs bark". Of course, it is figuratively that the dogs bark here in the United Nations—and the caravan is marching. But here is a serious warning: the caravan will get thirsty in the sands of Africa; it will end up crippled; and if the dogs get hungry, they will feed on that caravan and there will no longer be a caravan to march on. And I do not say that with pleasure, but with sadness. Of course, all that is figuratively speaking, but there will be no future for the European or others in the whole continent of Africa if they persist. I give you fair warning.

114. When I was seventeen I said: long live Arab union. It was a dream. There were only two Arab

States that were free. Within 53 years I saw with my own eyes—and I shall die in peace for having seen it with my own eyes—20 Arab States free and Members of the United Nations. What is the Republic of South Africa? Within 50 years I saw 20 Arab States free, and now these people are manipulating Namibia and getting mischievous with the Angolans. Do not: these Angolans—whether leftists, rightists or what have you—have mothers, fathers, wives and children? Some children are being killed. And for what? For strategic gains? Those of you who wield power, leave Africa to the Africans.

115. I can never forget what Gandhi in my youth said when the British told him: "But the Indians will misgovern themselves". He retorted: "It is our privilege to misgovern ourselves". You so-called great Powers—so-called "great" because only the Creator of the universe is great—beware that even your petty interests will dissolve like a pinch of salt in a kettle of boiling water. Beware. Leave the Africans alone.

116. As for you South Africans—I saw this gentleman here from South Africa—tell your Government. You are young. Tell the old fogeys of your generation, as I tell the old fogeys of my generation, that they are finished. The future is for the indigenous people of Namibia, and the light is already on the horizon, provided the members do not repeat themselves and become peddlers of words whether in the General Assembly or in the Security Council.

117. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to exercise the right of reply. I have carefully read through the statement made by the representative of China, and the contents of that statement confirm what I stated. Most of his statement dealt with the question of Angola.

118. Furthermore, he mentioned it with his usual discourtesy and he slandered the Soviet Union as one of the great Powers which supposedly intervened in the affairs of Angola. His slanderous statement reminded us of yesterday's slanderous anti-Soviet statement made by the racist representative of South Africa, and the clear coincidence of the spirit and idea was quite evident. The slanderous attack of the Chinese representative against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union's selfless assistance to the peoples of Africa, in particular to the people of Angola and its People's Republic of Angola, which is struggling for freedom and independence, was simply an attempt to divert the attention of the Council from the problem of liberating Namibia, which is so important in Africa.

119. Putting themselves forward as fighters for the welfare of oppressed peoples, Peking and its United Nations representative here are in fact joining with the oppressors. This treacherous policy of the Peking leaders is all the more clear in their attitude towards the people of Angola. While stating their support for

the struggle of the peoples for independence and freedom from colonial imperialist forces, Peking is actually working hand in hand with the South African racists, is helping them in their armed battle of intervention in Angola, helping the racists and their international mercenary killers against the People's Republic of Angola. The racist mercenaries, encouraged by imperialism, are trying to strangle this young republic. The Peking leaders are promoting the strengthening of the South African intervention in Namibia. In other words, their policy is a direct betrayal of the interests of the African peoples, who are the victims of this imperialist-racist aggression. They are directly conspiring militarily with the imperialists and with the South African racists. They are giving military and other assistance to African racists and those pro-imperialist forces which are fighting to annihilate the new young African State—the People's Republic of Angola—and this to favour the interests of world imperialism, neo-colonialism and South African racism.

120. The United Nations recalls quite well that China has directly conspired with South Africa, and this for a long time. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly China voted, together with the South African racist régime and the Portuguese Fascists of that time, against a draft resolution calling for the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition for all time of the nuclear weapon, a resolution which was adopted by an overwhelming majority.⁷ At that time this "troika" was justly called the "triple unholy alliance." China was one of that troika favouring the use of force in international relations, and South Africa is now utilizing this. The present discussion in the Council, and the similar anti-Soviet attacks of the representative of China and the representative of South Africa have shown that this alliance still exists and is even strengthening itself. Both the South African racist and the Chinese Maoist are using crude anti-Soviet slanders and lies in order to divert the Council from its discussion of the liberation of Namibia, which is such a timely matter.

121. I will quote an extract from the American magazine *Newsweek* of 22 December 1975, page 19. It states here that recently South African scientists representing the "Brain Trust" of the Government of John Vorster openly called for establishing relations and the need for relations between China and South Africa. South Africa and China says the article, "support the same forces in the civil war in Angola."

122. And this is a report from a well-informed magazine. Even though it may appear hard to believe, it says, that the Chinese wanted to discredit their image in the "third world" by an open alliance with racist South Africa, Peking can easily co-operate behind the scenes. This is the advice of an American magazine to the Chinese. And they are following this advice.

123. These are the facts, and however the Chinese representative uses tricks he cannot hide these facts and cannot, by his usual anti-Soviet attacks, camouflage them. As regard the true position of the Soviet Union concerning Angola, it is clearly and precisely set forth in the letter of 26 January of this year from the representative of the Soviet Union to the Secretary-General. The Soviet representative Comrade Kharlamov recalled this letter in his reply yesterday [1881st meeting] to the anti-Soviet statement made by the South African representative, and I would be grateful to members of the Security Council if they would study the document, which reads, *inter alia*:

"The Soviet Union, in keeping with its fundamental political position, has extended and continues to extend moral and material support to the national liberation struggle of peoples for freedom and independence, which is fully in keeping with the decisions both of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity with regard to decolonization. This fully applies to the People's Republic of Angola, which is, at the present time, repelling the aggression of racist and imperialist forces." [See S/11947.]

Peking sympathizes with and is assisting those forces. China is trying to drag in the United Nations in order to give assistance to these forces.

124. The other day, at a meeting of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Chinese representative officially proposed that under the guise of humanitarian assistance, UNDP assistance, financial aid, should be given to both of the pro-racist and pro-imperialist groups in Angola which are waging an armed conflict in Angola against the patriotic forces in the country, led by MPLA [*Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola*], that is, against the people and Government of the People's Republic of Angola. The fact that China is helping these groups we know from an official statement made by the head of the Chinese delegation during the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

125. We reject and brush aside with contempt the infamous and disgraceful inventions of Mr. Moynihan, the United States representative, Mr. Lai Ya-li, the Chinese representative, and Mr. Botha, the South African racist. This "troika" is circulating slander against the Soviet Union to the effect that it supposedly intends to "colonize Africa" and set up its own domination over the African peoples. It is hard in our day to conceive of a more monstrous invention. The Soviet Union does not seek any economic, military, strategic or other kind of advantage in Angola. Our only concern is to assist the People's Republic of Angola to defend its freedom and independence. We, the Soviet peoples, are proud to give assistance and support to the Angolan patriots in their heroic struggle for national freedom and independence. In the past we have assisted Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau

and many other African countries. Have they really become Soviet colonies? We have only to raise this question to see and to understand the full depth and stupidity of the inventions of these three diplomats with regard to the so-called Soviet colonization of Africa. People in the United Nations are laughing at such inventions and fabrications. Some say: "It would be better if Moynihan, Lai Ya-li and Botha told these fairy tales to little children or to big fools. Perhaps they would believe them". But I doubt that even they would believe such fabrications and such fairy tales as are circulated by this "troika" of slanderers.

126. The Soviet Union categorically condemns the aggression of the South African racists against the People's Republic of Angola and, together with most of the African countries, who have recognized that country, we are firmly in favour of immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Angola of the armed forces of the racist régime and of the detachments of Fascist mercenaries, those international murderers who are ready to kill their own fathers if you just give them a little more money for it.

127. I emphasized that the new young sovereign State in Africa which was born in the pangs of an armed struggle for its freedom and national independence has been recognized by most of the African countries, but who has recognized the groups which are fighting against it? Who has established relations with those groups? This is the clearest evidence that these groups do not represent the Angolan people. Those who are giving them assistance, or trying to give them assistance, are placing themselves in a position that is not only awkward but also shameful. The Angolan people should be given normal conditions so that it can, independently and without any outside intervention, determine the ways and means of its own development in conditions of peace, freedom and independence.

128. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Every part of the statement made by the Chinese representative just now is closely related to the question of Namibia which we are now considering. Upon hearing the mention of the word Angola by the Chinese representative, Mr. Malik rudely interrupted the Chinese representative. This reminds us of a Chinese saying: "He who does not perform evil deeds does not fear the knock on the door at night." The reason why Mr. Malik is so afraid of the mention of Angola lies in his guilty conscience because of Soviet expansion there.

129. Mr. Malik has slanderously accused China of standing together with South African racists and imperialist forces to interfere in Angolan internal affairs, and has distorted and slandered China's foreign policy. This is utterly futile. China's foreign policy is open and above-board; so is China's position with regard to the South African racist régime. It can in no way be vilified by Mr. Malik's fabrications and slanders. The statement of Mr. Malik is a typical

customary practice of a thief crying "Stop thief!" as well as a clumsy trick to divert attention from the Soviet Union's own acts of aggression. We should like to put the following questions to Mr. Malik: Who opposes the OAU resolution and supports one of the three Angolan organizations against the other two? Who undermined the joint transitional government of the three Angolan organizations and violated their agreement of unity and cease-fire reached on five and eight occasions respectively? Who has sent military personnel, shipped in large quantities of sophisticated weapons and single-handedly provoked the civil war causing killings among the Angolan people? Who has taken advantage of the Angolan question to sow discord and create dissension among the African countries and undermined African unity? The leaders of quite a number of African countries as well as African just public opinion have made unequivocal replies to these questions. They pointed out penetratingly that the root cause of the civil war which divides Angola is Soviet intervention and that, owing to its intervention in Angola, the Soviet Union has become a monger of death, discord and chaos. The facts have turned out to be so. Soviet social-imperialism is the arch-criminal which has singlehandedly stirred up the civil war in Angola and undermined African unity.

130. It must be pointed out that the so-called "Soviet support for the liberation movement" chanted by the Soviet Union is in essence the pseudonym for "neo-colonialism". Its tactics and the tricks of the colonialists are entirely one and the same thing. One of their tactics is to undermine unity and to divide and rule. It undermined the unity among the three Angolan liberation organizations and provoked the civil war. Furthermore, it is attempting to undermine the unity of OAU. Another trick is to gain profit from instigating the Angolan people to fight among themselves by offering money and guns and sending foreign troops to fight in the forefront. This is the latest display of the ugly neo-colonialist behaviour of Soviet social-imperialism.

131. The crimes committed by Soviet social-imperialism in Angola cannot in any way be denied. Its criminal activities have opened people's eyes and enabled more and more people to see clearly the true features of Soviet social-imperialism, to see how despicable this super-Power is—this super-Power which is always chanting the tune of "supporting the national liberation movement"—to see how low it has sunk in tracing the footsteps of the old Czar, in carrying on aggression and expansion, and to see what wild ambition it has in contending for world hegemony. Though it may behave arrogantly for a while, in the final analysis it is merely lifting a rock to drop it on its own feet and will end up in ignominious failure.

132. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the representative of the Soviet Union to exercise his right of reply I must say that, while I understand that as Presi-

dent of the Council I cannot confine the limits of this discussion, I should like to launch a very solemn appeal, as the representative of my Government and as the representative of an African State, the UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA, that it is the desire of the African States in the Council debate to discuss the question of Namibia. Throughout the discussion it is our hope—and we appeal to all the members of the Council—that members will as far as possible confine their remarks to the discussion of Namibia. If I may quote the most eloquent expression used yesterday by my brother from SWAPO, he said that we do not want to have this debate “hijacked” from the discussion of Namibia into a discussion on Angola. Therefore, I make this appeal to all the members of the Council that we should confine the discussion to the question of Namibia. And now, as PRESIDENT, I call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

133. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I fully agree with you. But I want only to point out that in this case we are not talking about discussing the question of Namibia. We finished that at today’s meeting, since there are no more speakers. We are talking about my reply to the provocative, slanderous intervention made by the Chinese delegation against the Soviet Union. I have nothing to add to what I already stated in my first reply, but I want to stress, in connexion with the regular tirade of demagoguery, hatred and anti-Soviet attitude of the Chinese representative, that the one who is guilty is the one who co-operates with the Fascists and not the one who sincerely and whole-heartedly assists the freedom fighters and those who are fighting for national independence, the patriots of the Angolan people, and its legitimate Government.

134. The Chinese representative, as usual, raises questions. There is a Russian proverb that says that “one strange person can raise so many questions that 100 wise men would be unable to answer them”. I am not compelled to reply to the Chinese representative, but I shall meet him halfway.

135. In answer to his first question, I shall say that we are together with most of the African countries on the Angolan question. China is acting together with the racists and the imperialists and the CIA hirelings on the Angolan question. That is known to the entire world now.

136. To his second: we are giving aid and assistance to the lawful Government of Angola upon that Government’s request.

137. To his third: we have supported the active idea of creating a national Government of Angola, but who undermined that idea? It was not the Soviet Union. That was the infamous and slanderous assertion of you, Sir, from China. It was undermined by those who are in the pay of foreign espionage. We have assisted many countries and peoples in their struggle for na-

tional liberation, not to make those peoples and countries, colonies of the Soviet Union, but to help them to become free, independent and sovereign. That can be confirmed by everyone who is a decent, objective politician and diplomat. It can be denied and distorted only by slanderers and liars. But if it has already come to that, I feel it necessary to point out that we even helped China with armaments in its just struggle for national independence and freedom against the pro-imperialist forces in China, but China certainly did not become a Soviet colony as a result. On the contrary, China has now, by its ingratitude, declared itself as “enemy number one” of the Soviet Union. That is also a historical fact. That is all that I wish to say.

138. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In our reply, the Chinese delegation put forward a number of facts in connexion with the Soviet Union’s frenzied intervention in Angola, and posed a number of questions to Mr. Malik. However, Mr. Malik dared not reply to the questions put by the Chinese delegation at all, and instead resorted once again to slanders and calumnies. This has served precisely to demonstrate Mr. Malik’s political degradation and his guilty thief’s conscience.

139. The PRESIDENT: Before I adjourn the meeting, I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Mali containing a request that he be invited, in accordance with rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to participate in the discussion on the item on the Council’s agenda. Accordingly, if there is no objection, I propose, with the consent of the Council, in conformity with the usual practice and with the relevant provisions of the Charter, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

It was so decided.

140. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Mali to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when he addresses the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Cissé (Mali) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

Notes

- ¹ See General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967.
- 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.*
- ³ See General Assembly resolution 3111 (XVIII).
- ⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 23, chap. X, para. 13.*
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A, para. 73.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, para. 84.
- ⁷ See General Assembly resolution 2936 (XXVII).

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

如何获取联合国出版物

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

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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