



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda items 64, 65 and 102:	
Question of Namibia (<i>continued</i>)	
Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (<i>continued</i>)	
Question of Southern Rhodesia (<i>continued</i>)	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	43
Agenda item 64:	
Question of Namibia (<i>continued</i>)	
Hearing of petitioners (<i>continued</i>)	45

Chairman: Mr. Théodore IDZUMBUIR
 (Democratic Republic of the Congo).

AGENDA ITEMS 64, 65 AND 102

Question of Namibia (*continued*)
(A/7623/Add.2 and Corr.1)

Question of Territories under Portuguese administration
(*continued*) (A/7623/Add.3, A/7694)

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*)
(A/7623/Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. SHAMMAS (Kuwait) said that Western colonialism in Africa was similar to Zionist colonialism in Palestine. His country had always defended the right of the people of Palestine to sovereignty and it would not fail in its support for the struggle of the peoples of Africa to attain freedom and independence.

2. In theory, the people of Namibia enjoyed all the rights of national sovereignty, but in practice they were denied the most fundamental human rights. Nothing could be done to enable the people of Namibia fully to exercise their right to self-determination until the Government of South Africa was forced to relinquish its illegal control over the Territory. His delegation supported the armed struggle of the people of Namibia to liberate their country and considered that the Security Council should take appropriate steps to ensure that South Africa complied with its resolutions.

3. His delegation was deeply disturbed about the illegal measures adopted by the racist régime in Southern Rhodesia to consolidate its rule over that Territory, to prevent the African people from exercising their right to self-determination and independence and to impose on them

the odious practices of *apartheid*, which constituted a crime against humanity. His delegation advocated the use of force by the administering Power to overthrow the illegal régime and it favoured action by the Security Council to tighten the sanctions imposed on the régime and to extend those sanctions to South Africa and Portugal.

4. Portugal not only gave support and assistance to South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia but was determined to continue the colonial war against the peoples of the Territories under its administration; in fact, it was the only European country which had not yet renounced colonialism as an instrument of its national and foreign policy. It was a matter of regret that some Western countries, although they had refrained from practising colonialism in its traditional form, were supplying arms to Portugal, which used them to suppress freedom in the Territories under its domination. His delegation would support any measures the Security Council might adopt to bring Portugal to its senses.

5. The questions covered by the current debate in the Committee had been dealt with at length at previous sessions. What the Committee should now do was not to engage in fresh deliberations but to recommend appropriate action to resolve the situation.

6. Mr. MELLBIN (Denmark) reiterated the views expressed during the general debate in the General Assembly (1771st plenary meeting) by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, who had stressed his country's insistence that the problems of Namibia, the Territories under Portuguese administration and Southern Rhodesia should be solved through the strict application of the principle of self-determination. His delegation regretted that there had so far been no perceptible progress towards a solution of the colonial problems in question on the basis of that principle. On the contrary, in some cases steps had been taken to consolidate colonial domination or to introduce or expand the policy of *apartheid* in colonial Territories.

7. Against that background, it was understandable that the lack of progress should be a source of anger and frustration. It should not be forgotten, however, that the United Nations had taken a number of important steps to bring about favourable developments in the situation in colonial Territories. Rather than accepting defeat, therefore, the United Nations should attempt to make the most of existing opportunities in the field of decolonization. If the United Nations was to succeed in that undertaking, it was important to avoid disagreement or dissension between States which pursued a common goal but which sometimes disagreed on the means of achieving that goal.

8. His delegation was convinced that any other course would prove futile and would merely be to the advantage of the Governments and authorities which upheld the colonial system in southern Africa; thus it would not ultimately further the cause of freedom but would be against the interests of the peoples concerned and the United Nations. The great Powers must assume the role and responsibility incumbent on them not only under the United Nations Charter but also by virtue of their political and economic potential.

9. One of the most important measures adopted by the United Nations in the matter of decolonization had been the action taken against the illegal régime in Salisbury. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, the Security Council had imposed mandatory sanctions in an effort to achieve a peaceful solution consistent with the ideals and principles for which the international community stood. It was true that the desired results had not yet been achieved, mainly because a few countries had failed to honour their commitments under the Charter. There was, however, no reason for giving up; on the contrary, the defiance of the few should strengthen the determination of the others to continue to apply the measures which had been adopted against the Ian Smith régime. It should be made quite clear that the international community would not abandon its efforts until the régime had been overthrown and the situation in Southern Rhodesia had been settled in accordance with the objectives set by the Security Council. Denmark, for its part, had scrupulously endeavoured to observe the sanctions adopted by the Security Council; it had co-operated to the best of its ability with the Committee established in pursuance of Security Council resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 and it would co-operate fully with that body in its efforts to devise more effective measures to ensure full implementation of the resolution.

10. As far as Namibia was concerned, there was sometimes a tendency to overlook or underrate the fact that the present status of that Territory derived from General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which had received wide support among Member States, and which was, in that respect, endorsed by the Security Council. Furthermore, it was generally acknowledged that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations and that the people of Namibia had the inalienable right of self-determination, freedom and independence. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), there had been no unanimous, or even prevalent, opinion within the membership of the United Nations with respect to ways and means which the United Nations could use in order to give the people of Namibia their right to self-determination. That had further limited the choices open to the United Nations in the matter and the chances of bringing to bear upon the Government of South Africa the accumulated weight of international public opinion. Denmark stood firmly by the provisions of that resolution and the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, and it would continue to pursue that policy in the manner it considered most appropriate in order to achieve the goal set by the United Nations.

11. When the question of the Territories under Portuguese administration had been discussed at the previous session, a

number of delegations, including his own, had expressed the hope that the new Government which had just taken office in Portugal would reconsider its colonial policy and would follow the example of other colonial Powers, so that the peoples of the Territories under Portuguese administration might exercise their right to self-determination in an atmosphere of peace and harmony. It was a matter of regret that the Portuguese Government has so far made no pronouncement to that effect.

12. The opinions expressed by the African States in the Manifesto on Southern Africa adopted in September 1969 by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)¹ would imply that it was still not too late for the Government of Portugal to change its policy towards the Territories under its administration. His delegation reiterated the hope that the Portuguese Government would endeavour to change its policy so that future action by Portugal in those Territories might be based on recognition of the right of all the peoples concerned to self-determination.

13. Denmark had supported General Assembly resolution 2395 (XXIII) of 29 November 1968, which had reaffirmed that right and had called upon the Government of Portugal to apply without delay the principle of self-determination, freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. Denmark's vote in favour of resolution 2395 (XXIII) and its explanation of that vote were an adequate indication of the Danish Government's position, which remained unchanged.

14. When, a few days previously, the President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon had presented the Manifesto of the OAU to the General Assembly (1780th plenary meeting) he had stressed the desire of African countries to contribute through dialogue and negotiation to the solution of the world's great problems, and the need for co-operation and concerted effort if United Nations decisions were to be translated into action. His delegation welcomed the statement by the President of Cameroon and the Manifesto, which it would study carefully. Their profound analysis, based on genuine political and human principles, had made a deep impression.

15. His delegation's position with regard to such draft resolutions as might in due course be submitted to the Committee on the items now under consideration would be in keeping with the observations which he had just made.

16. Mr. BOUNKOULOU (Congo, Brazzaville) said that it was a source of satisfaction to his delegation that, year after year, countries which had freed themselves from the colonial yoke became Members of the United Nations. It was, however, impossible to overlook the fact that millions of human beings were still suffering oppression and foreign domination and, with justifiable impatience and ever-increasing insistence, were awaiting the day when they would be able to play their part in the establishment of a world-wide community of free and sovereign States.

¹ The text of the Manifesto was subsequently circulated as document A/7754.

AGENDA ITEM 64

Question of Namibia (*continued*)
(A/7623/Add.2 and Corr.1, A/C.4/721/Add.1)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Kuaima I. Riruako, Mr. Kahepure B. Mbaha, Mr. Mburumba Kerina and Mr. Veive N. Mbaeva, representatives of the South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF), took places at the Committee table.

17. It was discouraging that, nine years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, some Powers were still following outmoded policies and persisting in the exploitation of human beings to serve their own interests. In that context, Portugal's policy was the most notorious challenge to the international community. It was obvious that, with the limited resources available to it, Portugal would be unable to carry on its colonial war against the peoples of Guinea (Bissau), Mozambique and Angola and that it could only do so because of the support and assistance which it was receiving from South Africa, the rebel minority in Southern Rhodesia and the Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Consequently, a further urgent appeal should be made to all countries to stop providing military and financial assistance to Portugal.

18. The Republic of the Congo felt compelled to denounce once again the conspiracy being organized in southern Africa through the iniquitous alliance between Lisbon, Pretoria and Salisbury, supported by the monopolies and the NATO Powers. While the struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) would end in triumph over Portuguese domination, it was no less certain that the international community had nothing to gain by simply waiting for colonialism to disappear.

19. With regard to Southern Rhodesia, it was intolerable that there should be States Members of the United Nations which continued to ignore resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The greatest responsibility for the current situation in Southern Rhodesia lay with the United Kingdom, whose promises to take remedial action had proved to be delaying tactics designed to allow the illegal Ian Smith régime to gain time and to establish itself as a *fait accompli*.

20. After referring to statements by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Congo in the General Assembly (1776th plenary meeting), he said that it had been at the instigation of the United Kingdom that the Security Council had not resorted to force in Southern Rhodesia. His delegation felt that the inefficacy of economic sanctions must be recognized and the approach to the rebel régime at Salisbury must be more forceful and more in line with Security Council resolution 253 (1968), operative paragraph 2 of which he quoted. On the other hand, it was not too late for the United Kingdom to exercise all its prerogatives in Southern Rhodesia, including the use of force—which it had not hesitated to employ against the inhabitants of other parts of the world. The Zimbabwe people, like all peoples fighting for national liberation, could count on the sympathy, assistance and unconditional support of the Congolese people.

21. Despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the South African Government stubbornly refused to end its illegal domination of Namibia or to allow the United Nations Council for Namibia to enter the Territory to fulfil its mandate. If the United Nations was to emerge from the impasse in which it found itself, its unanimity in deploring the present situation must be *matched by an equally unanimous determination* to overcome the problem. His delegation would support any proposal designed to ensure that reason and justice prevailed.

22. Mr. MBAEVA (South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF)) recalled that an Indian representative had once told the General Assembly that most Governments were aware and ashamed of the abuses which, unfortunately, existed in their respective countries but that the South African Government was unique in that it was officially following a policy of racial segregation and discrimination which had shocked the conscience of the world. The United Nations had been very patient with the South African Government and had practised great restraint in drafting its resolutions because of a general desire to make it easier for that Government to accept reasonable resolutions.

23. He recalled General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 concerning Namibia, as also the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, and the judgement of 21 December 1962 handed down by that Court. The time had come for the United Nations to change its approach in its efforts to help the Namibians to liberate themselves. The Namibians were aware that effective implementation of the United Nations resolutions depended largely on whether they themselves could attract the support of Member States. In order to achieve that, they needed to be raised from the status of mere petitioners to that of participants in the determination of their future. The only way in which that could be done was through the establishment by the General Assembly, during its present session, of a Namibian government in exile which would be allowed to have a seat in the United Nations.

24. While the establishment of a constituent assembly—which was one of the functions of the United Nations Council for Namibia under operative paragraph 1 (c) of part II of General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V)—should be ruled out at the present stage, such a government in exile could co-operate with the Council in achieving the final liberation of the Territory.

25. The majority of States Members of the United Nations hoped to see the Organization claiming the revenue collected in the Territory, whose administration could only be financed from such moneys. It was even expected that the United Nations Council for Namibia would issue visas permitting the entry of aliens into Namibia. That would all be to the benefit of the people of the Territory, provided that they participated fully in the determination of their future, and there was no better way for them to do so than through the establishment of a Namibian government in exile. No system of representation had been devised for the proposed government in exile because representatives of all

the liberation movements would be invited to submit suggestions on its structure.

26. He therefore appealed to the Committee to decide that a conference of Namibian leaders should be convened immediately under the auspices of the United Nations to consider the establishment of a Namibian government in exile and to draw up plans for the liberation of Namibia on the basis of the agreement reached in that connexion. The United Nations Council for Namibia should also be urged to help the Namibian people in their efforts to establish a broadly based government in exile composed of the Caprivi African National Union (CANU), the National Unity Democratic Organization (NUDO), the South West Africa National Union (SWANU), the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the South West Africa United National Independence Organization (SWAUNIO) and the South West Africa Workers' Union (SWAWU).

27. The Committee should also state that the establishment of the proposed government would enable the Namibian liberation movements to join forces against the common enemy both within and outside the country; that it would enable Namibian leaders to deal directly and at higher level with certain Governments which had already intimated their readiness to assist the Namibian people if they could be sure that such assistance would be in good hands; that it would deprive South Africa of any residual responsibility it might have to represent Namibia in any organs of the international community; that it would deal South Africa a severe blow by forcing it to compete in the international political forum with the Namibian government in exile; and that it would relieve the United Nations of all responsibility for Namibian refugees.

28. The Committee should also decide that the question of Namibia remained an international problem for which all States Members of the United Nations had an equal responsibility and that the United Nations had no obligation to abide by a regional decision relating to a territory under its direct responsibility. It should further declare that the United Nations should take no decision affecting the future of the Namibian people without proper consultations with their representatives.

29. Mr. KERINA (South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF)) sincerely thanked those Governments which had given moral and material support to his organization in its struggle in Namibia. He said that SWANUF welcomed the extraordinary policy statement made by the President of Botswana before the General Assembly (1764th plenary meeting), in which he had made clear his attitude towards *apartheid* and the presence in Namibia of the South African colonial Government. The question now was whether the African Governments, supported by the entire membership of the United Nations, would protect the territorial integrity of the Republic of Botswana against the South African régime's political and military forces. The SWANUF appealed to the African States to draw up a special resolution to guarantee Botswana's territorial integrity and national security—a measure which would also in effect guarantee Namibia's national security and territorial integrity.

30. He was grateful to the Zambian Government for having sheltered 2,000 refugees from the Caprivi area, and

he referred to the feeling of unity with Namibia shown by the Governments of that country and Botswana, not only by the sheltering of refugees but also by the issue of special passports for Namibian students. He also paid a tribute to the Governments of Kenya, Somalia and the United Arab Republic for their efforts on behalf of Namibian students, and to the socialist countries for their hospitality to a SWANUF delegation.

31. The SWANUF had now united certain hitherto separate trends. He referred to the career of Mr. Veive Mbaeva, the founder of the South West Africa National Union and the leader of the Windhoek rebellion of 1959, and to Mr. Kuaima Riruako, a young Namibian leader who was still suffering the consequences of the tortures inflicted upon him while a prisoner of the South African authorities.

32. The SWANUF called upon its African brothers and its friends in Asia, Latin America, the socialist States and all those countries which had supported its struggle over the past decades to continue that support by means of a resolution endorsing their efforts to establish a Namibian government in exile. In the opinion of SWANUF, such a government would assist in achieving the unification of all Namibians in the struggle against South African colonialism and would prevent the South African régime from balkanizing Namibia by means of Bantustans.

33. The formation of such a government would have far-reaching consequences throughout southern Africa, particularly at the present time, when the South African National Party was split into two factions, one of which wanted South Africa to remain under European control in accordance with the past interpretation of *apartheid*, while the other preferred the new outward-looking policy of Vorster.

34. The question of a Namibian government in exile would require considerable consultation among Namibians and the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as among individual Member States. The time, however, was ripe for that step towards the total liberation of Namibia. The Governments of India and of other countries which had mentioned the matter were willing to assist in the fulfilment of that dream. A government in exile would also enhance the image of the United Nations Council for Namibia and would strengthen Namibian representation on that body.

35. Only through armed revolutionary struggle was there any hope of liberating Namibia and fulfilling the aspirations of its people for the development of their vernacular languages and their own legal concepts, history and political outlook so that they might be able to achieve a better understanding of the African cultural heritage, form a national consciousness and provide the country with its own form of democracy. The Namibian people were prepared to take up the responsibilities of government, even in exile, and to struggle relentlessly until that government had been established in its own land. He called on the Governments of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the socialist States and all other countries which had supported the cause of SWANUF to provide the latter with military training for its young men in order that the South African régime in Namibia might be overthrown.

36. The Namibian people would achieve their freedom and independence no matter what the cost, and their brothers in Botswana and Zambia would not forget them in their struggle.

37. In conclusion, he thanked the Algerian and Ethiopian Governments for their efforts in support of the emancipation of Namibia.

38. Mr. NGOUBEYOU (Cameroon) asked the petitioner for information on the present state of the relations between his movement and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

39. Mr. KERINA (South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF)) said that the Council for Namibia, although physically prevented by the South African Government from entering the Territory, had taken positive

steps towards doing so. He described relations between the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Namibian people and leaders as excellent. Specific measures were being developed to implement the mandate's provisions, including means to ensure that Namibians were adequately represented on the Council. He hoped that there would be an increase in the number of Namibians who were working in the secretariat of the Council, so as to facilitate the compilation of data which would be useful to the United Nations in its work.

40. Mr. MBAEVA (South West Africa National United Front (SWANUF)) said that he had valuable information which he would submit to the Chairman as additional documents.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.