



Chairman: Mr. Vernon Johnson MWAANGA
(Zambia).

Requests for hearings (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received a communication containing a request for a hearing concerning Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea, submitted by Mr. Peter Paypool on behalf of Mr. Tendako Ena and himself, and a second communication from Mr. J. J. Hummel which related to the request.

2. He had also received a communication containing a request for a hearing concerning the Territories under Portuguese administration, submitted by Mr. Francisco Alexandre, President and Secretary-General of the Union of Angolan Students (UNEA). If there was no objection, he would suggest that, in accordance with previous practice, those communications should be circulated as Committee documents and considered at a later meeting.

*It was so decided.*¹

*Request concerning Territories under Portuguese
administration (Agenda item 63) (A/C.4/728/Add.2)*

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that a request for a hearing concerning Territories under Portuguese administration had been submitted by Mr. Paul Touba, representative of the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile (GRAE) (A/C.4/728/Add.2). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to grant the request.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 62

**Question of Namibia (continued) (A/8023/Add.2,
A/8024, A/C.4/727/Add.2 and 3)**

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (continued)

4. The CHAIRMAN, recalling that at its 1883rd meeting the Committee had granted a request for a hearing concerning Namibia (A/C.4/727/Add.3) from Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), said that the petitioner and his colleagues were present and ready to make their statements.

¹ The communications concerning Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea were subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/730. The request concerning Territories under Portuguese administration was subsequently circulated as document A/C.4/728/Add.3.

If he heard no objection, he would invite them to take a seat at the Committee table.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Nujoma, Mr. Shipanga, and Mr. Geingob, representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), took seats at the Committee table.

5. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) expressed his organization's gratitude to the Committee for having given it an opportunity of expressing the views of the oppressed peoples of Namibia and of making a statement about the dreadful situation in that country.

6. SWAPO also expressed its profound appreciation to the delegations whose Governments had formally declared their unequivocal opposition to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria and which supported the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence. He also wished to pay a tribute to the Governments of Finland, Sweden, Norway, Iceland and Denmark whose Prime Ministers, meeting at Oslo recently, had condemned the illegal presence in Namibia of South Africa's occupation forces and which had formally notified the South African Government of their non-recognition of that illegal occupation. In his organization's view, that was one positive step towards the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966.

7. When the racist régime of South Africa had been entrusted by the League of Nations in 1920 with the international obligation of administering his country, the Mandate had stated clearly that South Africa should promote to the utmost the moral and material well-being and social progress of the indigenous population. It had further stated that no military or naval bases should be established in the Territory. Despite that clear definition of South Africa's duties, that country had reduced Namibia to the status of a police State. It had also established military bases there and used the police and army to suppress the indigenous population and to implement the oppressive, inhuman and discriminatory laws specifically designed to deny the basic human rights of Africans in the land of their birth. One of the most important airbases established by South Africa in Namibia was the Caprivi Strip, from which South African military aircraft operated against the freedom fighters of SWAPO and joined the Portuguese troops in Angola to suppress the Angolan freedom fighters. It was also at that base that the illegal Smith régime had hidden its airforce when the unilateral declaration of independence had been made.

8. Today, Namibia was a battleground; there was compulsory military training of all able-bodied whites. In

addition, shooting clubs where white women and white school children were trained in the use of fire-arms had been provided for by South Africa throughout the Territory and all police stations had been converted into "anti-guerrilla detachments". The bulk of South Africa's armed forces were deployed in Namibia, supported by large numbers of citizen forces and commando units composed of volunteers and draftees.

9. The Namibian people were making supreme sacrifices in the war of liberation. Over one thousand Namibian patriots were languishing in notorious South African gaols such as Robben Island, serving long-term and life sentences. Hundreds more were detained in concentration camps for indefinite periods, where they were subjected to brutal treatment and torture. The atrocities of the South African armed forces against the African civilian population knew no limits. Entire African communities of the Okavango River basin and the people of the east and west Caprivi areas had been forcibly removed from their villages and farmlands and thrown into concentration camps. Peasants were forbidden to till the land and their livestock had been confiscated by the fascist authorities.

10. Recalling that his organization had already drawn attention to the poisoning of water by South African forces in the areas where guerrilla forces were operating, he said that South Africa had once again resorted to such crimes in Mbambwata, Western Caprivi and some parts of the district of Grootfontein. In spite of those brutal acts, the Namibian people continued to fight for liberation.

11. Some Member States had become partners of South Africa in its defiance of the United Nations. France was the chief supplier of all types of armaments to the Vorster régime, thus openly defying the United Nations resolution banning the sale of arms to South Africa. His organization was pleased, however, to note France's recent decision to ban some arms which could be used to suppress Africans. The second supplier of arms was the United Kingdom, which furnished aircraft, tanks and armoured cars to South Africa and actively supported that country's manufacture of ammunition and explosives. Other countries directly involved were the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland. All that was being done in the Territory for which the United Nations had direct responsibility and it was deplorable that the Organization had failed to protect the integrity of the Territory and the lives of its citizens. The military occupation of the Territory was a serious blow and did irreparable damage to the prestige and authority of the Organization.

12. It was clear that the Namibian people were fighting not only against the South African occupation force, but also against all those countries which were aiding and abetting the racist régime militarily, economically and diplomatically. His organization strongly condemned those countries' involvement in the suppression, exploitation and slaughter of the Namibian people: they were well aware that a genuine racial war was rapidly developing in southern Africa, since the fascist and racist Pretoria-Salisbury-Lisbon axis had made clear its intention of waging aggressive wars not only against the colonized and oppressed peoples of southern Africa but against the peoples and countries of

independent Africa. The Vorster régime had on several occasions openly threatened Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania with military aggression. Vorster had also stated that South Africa would make sallies into independent African States which supported the national liberation movements to southern Africa. Thus, the racist South African régime posed a serious threat to international peace and security and to inter-racial harmony throughout the world.

13. SWAPO had noted with alarm the report in *The New York Times* of 13 October 1970 that certain States members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), namely, Malawi, Rwanda, Lesotho, the Ivory Coast, Niger, Dahomey, Madagascar, Gabon and Ghana, were being sought out to collaborate with the racist South African régime against the African majority in Namibia and South Africa. SWAPO was adamantly opposed to any capitulation to South Africa's policy of white supremacy; it refused to believe that any dialogue with the white minority régime, either under the guise of negotiation or of "outward-looking" policy and "good neighbourliness", would in any way alleviate the suffering of the African inhabitants of Namibia and South Africa. The diplomatic and economic marriage between the racist Government of South Africa and Malawi had not prevented the South African Government from making its oppressive and inhuman legislation even more rigorous. Until South Africa ended its occupation of Namibia, the good-neighbour" policy of South Africa would remain, for his organization, a meaningless and hypocritical political gesture.

14. In spite of the fact that they were fighting well-equipped South African armed forces, the Namibian people's resolve in their fight for freedom and independence remained as firm as ever. It was for the United Nations to decide whether to remain passive or to discharge its solemn responsibilities towards the people of Namibia.

15. SWAPO believed that the United Nations, in its twenty-fifth anniversary year should strive to re-establish its prestige with regard to the colonized and oppressed peoples. The only effective way in which it could accomplish that aim was to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI). SWAPO therefore wished to make the following proposals. Firstly, Namibia's independence should be given top priority by the United Nations which should use all its resources to implement rapidly resolution 2145 (XXI) by enhancing the administrative authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia. That could best be done by appointing a permanent commissioner who would devote his full time and energy to initiating new and practical plans for fulfilling the mandate of the Council for Namibia—the immediate establishment of a United Nations administrative presence in Namibia. Secondly, SWAPO reiterated its previous suggestion that the Council should initiate a special educational programme, to be funded directly from the United Nations budget. Thirdly, in accordance with its decision to issue travel documents to Namibians, the Council should also proceed to work out a specific procedure for levying taxes on all foreign companies operating in Namibia. Fourthly, SWAPO renewed its earlier proposal that the Council should sponsor an international conference on Namibia with a view to promoting support for the Namibian

people's legitimate fight. Fifthly, SWAPO called upon the United Nations to take effective measures to secure the immediate and unconditional release of all Namibian political prisoners and to ensure that SWAPO freedom fighters captured in the heroic armed resistance to the South African colonial occupation were treated as prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949.² Sixthly, SWAPO proposed that all States should sever diplomatic, economic military and other ties with fascist South Africa.

16. Mr. CHADHA (India) thanked the petitioners for their statement, which contained valuable suggestions. He would like to know their views concerning the submission of the question of the question of Namibia to the International Court of Justice for its advisory opinion.

17. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that his organization considered the question of Namibia to be a political rather than a legal issue and therefore felt that the matter of Namibia's independence from South Africa should be settled within the context of the United Nations and the Security Council. However, it regarded the submission of the question to the International Court as a gesture of moral support.

18. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the petitioners for their statement. He was sure that, in drafting its resolutions and making recommendations, the Committee would take into account the suggestions which their organization had made. He asked the representatives of SWAPO to comment on the South African Government's policy of establishing Bantustans in Namibia.

19. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) replied that Bantustans were nothing more than concentration camps from which Africans would be allowed to leave only to work in mines and do slave labour. Furthermore, they were designed to divide the Africans along ethnic lines and to destroy the unity of the Namibian people. SWAPO had from the outset rejected the idea of Bantustans or any institutions that divided Namibia on a tribal basis. It demanded unconditional dependence for Namibia as a whole.

20. Mr. KARIM (Pakistan) thanked the petitioners for their statement. He noted that the United Nations Council for Namibia had expressed a preference for the projected international conference on Namibia to be held in Europe and he would like to know the view of SWAPO on that point.

21. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) replied that his organization felt that it was important for the Council to organize such a conference, which would draw the attention of world public opinion to the dangerous situation developing in southern Africa. In his organization's view, it would be well for such a conference to be held in central Europe where it could be covered extensively by the information media and where trade unions and national and international organizations could participate.

22. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria) asked the petitioners for their views on the support for the Namibian liberation movements which had been expressed at the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lusaka from 8 to 10 September 1970.

23. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that his organization appreciated the support voiced by the Heads of State or Government at Lusaka. Thanks to that expression of support, the Namibian people had felt that they were not alone in the fight against racism and colonialism in southern Africa. SWAPO would be grateful if those countries could provide material assistance directly to the liberation movement or indirectly through OAU.

24. Mr. NEKLESSA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked Mr. Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, for his statement and proposals. His delegation attached great importance to statements and proposals by the Namibian people, who were fighting against the South African racists.

25. Referring to recent statements by certain States that they would not encourage their nationals, or their companies operating in Namibia, to make investments there, he asked the petitioners whether they felt that such measures were the most effective means of exerting pressure on South Africa and of bringing about the liberation of the Namibian people or whether more radical steps were needed.

26. Mr. SHIPANGA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that his organization was aware that some countries had been discouraging their nationals from investing in Namibia. While his organization appreciated any constructive steps that were taken, it wished to point out that the measures in question fell far short of expectations. There were still companies operated by nationals of some of the States in question in respect of which no statements had been made and which were continuing to exploit Namibia's resources. He read out an article from an anti-*apartheid* newspaper published in London referring to warnings made by President Nixon to United States companies already operating in Namibia. It was clear from the article, however, that such warnings would not have the desired effect and that other measures would be required.

27. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) asked the petitioners to identify the arms which the freedom fighters faced in Namibia. He also wished to know what other companies had recently been investing in Namibia.

28. Mr. SHIPANGA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that the majority of the arms used in Namibia were French and included Mirage fighters and Alouette helicopters. British Buccaneer bombers were wreaking havoc in the rural areas. It was not known where the water poison had come from, but a large chemical complex near Johannesburg was managed by technicians from the Federal Republic of Germany. The Italian Fiat company was the source of the Impala jet fighters being used in Namibia. Together with its partner, the Lockheed Corporation, it was supplying technical know-how to the South African armaments industry.

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75 (1950), No. 972.

29. In addition to the United States, United Kingdom and South African companies operating in Namibia, investments had recently been made by two Canadian companies which were prospecting for copper, lead, zinc and petroleum.

30. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) drew the petitioners' attention to an article which had appeared in the press of the Federal Republic of Germany on 23 July 1970 concerning the future of the guerrillas after the death of Chief Kutako and asked for their opinion on that subject.

31. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) replied that, although SWAPO's membership came from all ethnic groups in Namibia, it was not involved in the question of appointing a successor to Kutako, since the appointment would be made strictly from within the Herero tribe.

32. Mr. RAKOTOSIHANAKA (Madagascar) reassured the petitioners that his Government maintained no diplomatic relations whatsoever with South Africa and had no intention of doing so. His delegation had always denounced *apartheid* and would continue to support fully the fight of the Namibians to free themselves from the domination of the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa.

33. Mr. ABDULLA (Southern Yemen) wondered if the petitioners could confirm reports of support given to South Africa by the Government of Israel and of the presence of Israeli troops in Namibia.

34. Mr. SHIPANGA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that there was no doubt that collaboration between the Israeli and South African Governments was increasing in all fields. It was well known that many South African whites of Jewish origin had been encouraged to fight for Israel in the Middle East war. Many Israeli military officials had visited South Africa and the Commander of the Israeli air force had visited South Africa to lecture on the tactics used in the "Six Day War". In June 1967, the *Johannesburg Star* had reported that a certain organization had contributed funds to assist Israel and, in the short time of three to four weeks, had collected the equivalent of £10 million. Despite the financial regulations governing the export of capital, Mr. Vorster had allowed those funds to be transferred to Israel.

35. Mr. SÖYLEMEZ (Turkey) wondered if the petitioners had any practical proposals to make as to how the United Nations Council for Namibia could be more helpful in furthering the cause of the people of the Territory.

36. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that the Council should establish its presence in Namibia and take over the administration from the racist régime. In addition, the Council could initiate a special educational programme for Namibian students so that, when independence came, there would be sufficient skilled administrative personnel. In addition, it should collect taxes from companies operating in Namibia and not allow them to be paid to the régime which was illegally occupying the Territory.

37. Mr. GEINGOB (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) considered that the Council should appoint

a permanent commissioner for Namibia. While SWAPO appreciated the work of the Acting Commissioner, it considered that, if the Council was to be respected and to work effectively, it needed a permanent Commissioner who could devote all his energies to the Namibian cause. The Council should act as the Government of Namibia in all legal matters. It should review treaties concluded with the Government of South Africa concerning Namibia and conclude new treaties with other countries on behalf of Namibia. Following its initiative in respect of travel documents, the Council should work out a scheme for collecting taxes from companies operating in Namibia, many of which had offices outside Namibia, particularly in New York, and use the revenue in the interests of the Namibian people. Since the resources of the liberation movement were too limited for it to afford much publicity, the Council should publish a newsletter in order to keep the public informed on the question of Namibia.

38. Mr. KIVUITU (Kenya) said that his delegation categorically rejected the allegations made in *The New York Times* which, in a subtle way, linked Kenya with the Government of South Africa.

39. His delegation believed that there was no kind of weapon which could not be used against the liberation movement. He wondered whether the United Kingdom arms being used against the liberation movements had been supplied in the past or recently.

40. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) agreed that all kinds of arms could be used against the freedom fighters. In 1959, when the South African police and army had fired on a peaceful demonstration, British armoured cars, stationed at a South African military camp near Windhoek, had been instrumental in killing twelve people and wounding dozens more. The present United Kingdom Government had stated that the arms which it intended to sell to South Africa were long-range bombers. The presence of such bombers in South Africa would constitute a threat to neighbouring independent African States. There were already Buccaneer aircraft in the Caprivi Strip only fifteen miles from Zambia, which could carry out raids on Zambia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and other States. It was therefore essential that all sales of arms to South Africa should be stopped.

41. Mr. SHIPANGA (South West African People's Organization (SWAPO)) said that the previous Government of the United Kingdom had sold Buccaneer aircraft to South Africa under a so-called unfinished contract. The recent decision of the present United Kingdom Government to increase the supply of arms to South Africa was aimed at defending the system of *apartheid*. The only enemy threatening South Africa was the Namibian people who were fighting for their freedom. SWAPO considered that the United Kingdom was encouraging South Africa to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring free and independent African States by its decision to renew the sale of arms.

42. Mr. STRULAK (Poland) welcomed the petitioners' reference to the increasing military collaboration between South Africa and Portugal. He wished to know how, in the

opinion of the petitioners, such economic projects as the Cabora Bassa dam and Cunene River schemes would affect the fight for liberation.

43. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) replied that the real purpose of the Cunene River project was to strengthen the position of the white settlers in southern Angola and northern Namibia by increasing their number by half a million on completion of the project. It should be borne in mind that many of them would join the Portuguese or South African army, thereby furthering the racist policy of oppressing and enslaving Africans in Angola and Namibia. Similarly, one million whites would settle in Mozambique because of the construction of the Cabora Bassa dam. Some of them, too, would join the Portuguese army and thereby strengthen the position of the Portuguese racists in Mozambique. Thus SWAPO was completely opposed to such schemes, which were of a military rather than an economic nature. It would do its utmost to thwart the Cunene River project and help the freedom fighters in Mozambique to destroy the Cabora Bassa dam.

44. Mr. SHIPANGA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) agreed that the Cunene River and Cabora Bassa projects were essentially of a military nature, designed to frustrate the aspirations of the African people for freedom. The United Nations should seriously consider whether the Governments of South Africa and Portugal had the right to conclude agreements relating to such projects in respect of Namibia. The Cunene River project was top secret. The only company known to be involved was the Krupp Corporation of the Federal Republic of Germany. SWAPO had warned that it considered that the Western Europeans involved in the project were contributing to the war effort of South Africa and that they would not be spared in any cross-fire between South Africans and the guerrillas.

45. Mr. SYLLA (Senegal) wondered whether there was any possibility of an amalgamation of SWAPO and SWANUF (South West Africa National United Front) and asked what type of aid SWAPO expected from the Liberation Committee of OAU.

46. Mr. NUJOMA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)) replied that neither SWANUF nor any other organization represented a political threat to SWAPO, which had taken up arms and welcomed any individuals or groups who considered that the only effective way to liberate Namibia was by the use of force against the racist régime of South Africa. SWAPO welcomed the support given to the liberation movement by OAU, but was not in a position to discuss in the Fourth Committee the nature of the assistance it would like to receive from it.

47. The CHAIRMAN thanked the petitioners for the valuable information they had provided.

Mr. Nujoma, Mr. Shipanga and Mr. Geingob withdrew.

48. Mr. BICAMUMPAKA (Rwanda), exercising his right of reply, said that he wished categorically to refute the allegations made against his country in *The New York Times* article referred to by Mr. Nujoma, President of

SWAPO. The Rwandese Government had always been in favour of the peaceful settlement of disputes, but it would be wrong to conclude from that policy that it was collaborating with the Government of South Africa. In a Decree dated 19 November 1962, the President of Rwanda had stated that no form of co-operation with the Pretoria and Lisbon régimes would be tolerated. In December 1965 that Decree had been extended to the Ian Smith régime in Southern Rhodesia and it remained in force. His delegation had consistently supported General Assembly and OAU resolutions relating to the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and had complied with appeals by the Security Council to end trade relations with South Africa.

49. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had no knowledge of any transaction with South Africa involving tanks or armoured cars. His Government had not yet taken a decision concerning the sale of arms to South Africa and had continually expressed its detestation of *apartheid*. In July 1970, the Foreign Secretary had stated that in no circumstances would there be sales to South Africa of arms for the enforcement of *apartheid* or for internal repression.

50. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received a request from the Reverend Michael Scott to appear as a petitioner before the Committee in order to make an additional statement. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee granted that request.

It was so decided.

At the Chairman's invitation, the Reverend Michael Scott, representative of the International League for the Rights of Man, took a place at the Committee table.

51. The Reverend Michael SCOTT (International League for the Rights of Man) said that, in his statement at the 1878th meeting, he had not intended to give the impression that he was acting as a spokesman of the World Council of Churches. He had in fact been asked by the head of the World Council of Churches programme to combat racism to secure support for the programme in view of the criticism that had been levelled against it in Western Europe.

52. The purpose of his participation in the Committee's work was to uncover the whole truth about the situation in Namibia and not to pass judgement or blame, except on the Government of South Africa, which deliberately propagated and practised racism as a doctrine of State. There were people who profited from racism without preaching it, while others were induced by ignorance or insecurity to act as tools of the South African régime. Thus, in the United Kingdom certain members of the present Government were influenced by powerful vested interests in South Africa. The apparent determination of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to resume the sale of arms to South Africa in defiance of the Security Council should be considered in the light of those vested interests.

53. Lord Carrington was the Minister of Defence of the United Kingdom and a Director of Barclays Bank—the parent of Barclays D.C.O., Schweppes Ltd., which had three South African subsidiaries, and the Amalgamated Metal

Corporation (South Africa Pty. Ltd.). Mr. Anthony Barber was the Chancellor of the Exchequer and a Director of British Ropes Ltd., the parent of South Africa Wire Ropes Ltd., and of Chartered Bank, which had recently merged with the Standard Bank, the second largest bank in South Africa. Mr. Reginald Maudling was the Home Secretary and a Director of Dunlop's, which had eight South African subsidiaries. Mr. Robert Carr was Minister of Labour and a Director of the Metal Closures Group, the parent of four South African subsidiaries. Mr. Geoffrey Rippon was Minister of Technology and a Director of Drake and Gorham Scull, which had six South African subsidiaries. Mr. Peter Walker was Minister of Housing and a Director of Adwest Group, which had two South African subsidiaries, and Slater Walker Securities. Lord Jellicoe was Lord Privy Seal and a Director of James Templeton of Templeton Carpets of South Africa and of the South African Spark Plug Company. The influence of United Kingdom industrial companies on the governing party was set out in such books as *Pressure Groups and the Private Life of Public Relations* and *Who Owns Whom*. The guiding motives of the current United Kingdom governing party's policies did not necessarily serve the interests of the United Kingdom, Africa or the Western world so much as the short-term interests of a politically powerful group of investors in South Africa. The United Kingdom's veto of the economic sanctions against South Africa which had been proposed in the Security Council should be considered in that light.

54. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that the petitioner was referring to internal United Kingdom matters. It should be made quite clear that none of the persons referred to in the petitioner's statement was a director of any of the companies mentioned. No Minister of the Crown was permitted to be a director of a company.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the petitioner was referring to matters which related to the situation in southern Africa. It would therefore be in order for him to continue his statement.

56. The Reverend Michael SCOTT (International League for the Rights of Man), continuing his statement, said that he wished to make a clarification in connexion with the proposals concerning the taxation of foreign companies operating in Namibia, published by the Africa Bureau and submitted by him to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the *Ad Hoc* Sub-Committee of the Security Council. A petitioner representing the South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF) who had spoken at an earlier meeting had claimed that his organization should have been consulted first and that the proposals should not have been submitted directly to the United Nations. Those statements seemed to raise the question as to what could properly be brought before the Committee and the question of the status and representative character of SWANUF.

57. In an earlier statement he had drawn the attention of the Committee to the fact that in the past Chief Hosea Kutako and those whom the Chief had nominated to represent him had not been allowed to come to the United Nations and that, until three days earlier, no representative organization of Namibia, apart from SWANUF, had requested a hearing in the Committee. SWANUF's original

request for a hearing had been made on behalf of four persons, but only two had appeared before the Committee (1878th meeting). However, another SWANUF representative had appeared on behalf of that organization at an OAU meeting at Addis Ababa and was reported to have made an excellent impression. Since the appearance of SWANUF representatives in the Committee, SWAPO had been granted a hearing and the South West Africa National Union had expressed a desire to send representatives to address the Committee. The question of the status of the various organizations involved was thus somewhat confused and it was important that it should be clarified.

58. No one would dispute the right of any petitioner to bring before the Committee anything he considered relevant to the liberation of the people of Namibia, since opportunities for voicing an opinion on that subject did not exist under the police rule which South Africa had imposed on the Territory. Even the right of petition to the United Nations had been granted only after a hard struggle. Nevertheless, petitioners had used the opportunities afforded by hearings in the Fourth Committee to attack various organizations, representatives of liberation movements, and African Governments. Mr. Kerina of SWANUF had, on 6 April and 12 July 1966, made some particularly unfortunate attacks on the acting Secretary-General of SWAPO, Mr. Ja Otto, who had been in prison at that time and had remained in prison ever since. Mr. Kerina had referred to him as a well-known informer of the South African Government's Special Branch in South West Africa. Mr. Ja Otto had certainly not been thought of in that way by his own people or organization and had not been in any position to defend himself.

59. In 1962 Mr. Kerina, in his capacity as a petitioner, had made serious allegations against three members of the United Nations Secretariat who had given very diligent and conscientious service to the Committee on the question of Namibia. Those accusations had led to the appointment by the Secretary-General of a special commission of inquiry to investigate the matter and receive testimony from Mr. Kerina. However, Mr. Kerina had declined to support the allegations and had refused to answer any of the commission's questions. It had been necessary to disassociate Chief Hosea Kutako and other petitioners from those allegations. After many months of anxiety, the Director of Personnel had reported that the Secretary-General had come to the clear conclusion that the staff members concerned had acted throughout in good faith and that the allegations against them were not well founded. However, some lasting damage had been done to the good name and faith of persons and organizations which had been trying to help the Namibian people.

60. In the most recent statements made on behalf of SWANUF in the United Nations on 28 August and 23 October 1970, the proposal concerning the convening of an international conference on Namibia, which had been made by the United Nations Council for Namibia, had been condemned on the grounds that it would not offer Namibians an opportunity to meet in order to solve certain fundamental problems and because it had been the presence of non-Namibians acting as international experts which had impeded the work of the Council for Namibia. Mr. Mbaeva, another petitioner from SWANUF, had gone so far as to say

that those who proposed that such a conference should be held in Europe were claiming to be participating in the liberation fight of the Namibian people in order to obtain subsidies for their own ends at the expense of the Namibian people and revolutionaries who were fighting on African soil. SWAPO, on the other hand, had agreed to the convening of a conference in Europe. SWANUF's claim to be represented in the Council for Namibia and to receive a monthly subsidy from its budget needed careful comparison with the merits of other Namibian organizations.

61. Petitioners should not be condemned on the grounds that their efforts in the cause of African liberation had been restricted to discussions in the Fourth Committee. However, he wished to appeal to them not to make use of the hard-won right of petition in order to make ill-considered attacks on those who were trying to help the Namibian people to free themselves. Blanket condemnation of European experts, irrespective of what they might have to contribute, served only the cause of *apartheid*. Indiscriminate attacks did not serve the cause of justice or freedom, but the cause of the enemies of the common people everywhere. The Presidents of the United Republic of Tanzania and of Zambia, who had recently addressed the General Assembly (1867th and 1872nd plenary meetings), had spoken not only on behalf of Africans, but on behalf of all mankind when they had called for the liberation of subject peoples and for freedom from war and want. The peoples of the world would rally to that call, and not to calls prompted by racism. He therefore appealed in particular to petitioners from Namibia to exercise their right of petition with responsibility and regard for a cause which had been made sacred by the suffering and death of people who were not able to speak for themselves. What was said about Namibia in the United Nations would inevitably affect those people. He appealed to delegations to assist petitioners in any way possible and to contribute to the cause of the liberation of the Namibian people.

62. Mr. KASSE (Mali) said that, according to a recent *Agence France-Presse* report, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had stated that his Government had never discontinued arms sales to South Africa, not only because it was fulfilling previous agreements, but also because of its reservations on the trade embargo on South Africa which had been proposed in the Security Council. He asked the United Kingdom representative how it was possible to reconcile his own statement in the Committee with that of the Prime Minister.

63. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said that he had no knowledge of any such statement by the Prime Minister.

64. Mr. KIVUITU (Kenya) asked the United Kingdom representative whether it was possible for a Minister of the Crown to hold a substantial interest in a company, even if he had resigned from the directorship.

65. Mr. HAMILTON (United Kingdom) said that a Minister must sever all commercial interests on taking office. A Minister who held a substantial interest in a company would therefore relinquish it on appointment.

66. Mr. OUCIF (Algeria) asked the petitioner to give further details of Ministers of the United Kingdom Government who were also directors of companies.

67. The Reverend Michael SCOTT (International League for the Rights of Man) said that there were some seventy United Kingdom Members of Parliament who held shares in, and had been directors of, companies which had interests in South Africa. In one instance, a member of the House of Lords had expressed indignation at being asked to list his interests in Southern Rhodesia. If the Committee wished, he could supply the Secretariat with a full list of holdings by Members of Parliament in South African companies and their subsidiaries.

68. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq) proposed that the Reverend Michael Scott's statement should be reproduced *in extenso* in the summary record of the meeting since it would be of great assistance in accurately evaluating the situation in Namibia. He also proposed that the list of Members of Parliament and their holdings in South African companies referred to by the petitioner should be circulated as a Committee document.

69. The CHAIRMAN announced that the estimated cost of reproducing the petitioner's statement *in extenso* in the summary record of the meeting would be \$200. If there was no objection, he would take it that the proposal made by the representative of Iraq was adopted.

It was so decided (see paras. 51-53, 56-61 and 67 above).

70. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Reverend Michael Scott for his participation in the work of the Committee.

The Reverend Michael Scott withdrew.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.