

it take part in the current session. The forces of liberation were now achieving sweeping victories in southern Africa and, in spite of murders and other repressive measures resorted to by the illegal régime, the people of Namibia were intensifying their struggle by all means available to them. The obvious duty of the international community was to support that struggle actively and to take all steps necessary to squeeze that atrocious régime out of existence as soon as possible.

40. Bangladesh never had nor would ever have any relations with that régime and would strongly and actively support any action that the United Nations took against it. It fully supported the application of sanctions against the South African régime but noted with regret that the Security Council had not so far been able to act because of negative votes by some Powers. At the same time those very Powers had condemned the illegal régime and urged it to end its unlawful occupation of Namibia. His delegation hoped that, since the régime had not acted upon their exhortation, those Powers would revise their attitude and let the Security Council take positive action.

41. In the face of the pressure exerted by the liberation struggle in Namibia and by the international community, the illegal régime had been resorting to various manoeuvres in an attempt to placate the international community, the latest of which was the sponsoring of a bogus constitutional conference inside Namibia, for which it had collected a few puppets but from which SWAPO had been excluded. Bangladesh condemned and totally rejected such manoeuvres designed to further the régime's policy of divide and rule and reaffirmed its total and continued support of, and solidarity with, the people of Namibia, led by their national liberation movement, SWAPO.

42. His delegation endorsed all the recommendations of the Special Committee and the United Nations Council for

Namibia and urged that the General Assembly should call upon the Security Council to take up again the question of Namibia, which was still on its agenda. The Security Council should consider taking all appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations, including those provided for in Chapter VII, and declare the arms embargo against South Africa as mandatory, unequivocally and without reservations. As the situation in Namibia was a threat to international peace and security, the Security Council must act to implement its resolution 366 (1974). His delegation urged that the General Assembly should again demand a total evacuation of the Territory by South Africa and require all States scrupulously to observe the arms embargo against South Africa, to desist from entering into military arrangements of any kind with the South African régime, and from the sale or supply of military materiel to South Africa, and to co-operate with the United Nations Council for Namibia in order to accelerate the process of emancipation of Namibia.

AGENDA ITEM 89

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*)* (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.2, A/10050-S/11638, A/C.4/L.1092 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.1093)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

43. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to two draft resolutions on the question of Southern Rhodesia, appearing in documents A/C.4/L.1092 and Corr.1 and A/C.4/L.1093. The following Member States had since become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1093: Bangladesh, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Mozambique, Romania, Rwanda and Yugoslavia.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

* Resumed from the 2145th meeting.

2149th meeting

Monday, 20 October 1975, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2149

AGENDA ITEM 87

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.3, A/10024 (vols. I and II), A/10050-S/11638, A/10229, A/C.4/784/Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. AL-WALI (Iraq) said that the situation in Namibia showed up the odious exploitation of man by man. The South African Government, acting as if the Mandate given to it by the League of Nations was to last forever, had taken steps to integrate the Territory into South Africa, had plundered the indigenous population and asserted its

authority in the area. Recalling the United Nations resolutions terminating the Mandate of the South African Government for Namibia and placing the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,¹ he said that the veto exercised by three permanent members of the Security Council at the 1829th meeting of the Council, on 6 June 1975, had only served to encourage the racist South African Government to pursue its ignoble policy.

¹ *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.*

2. Every year, since the founding of the United Nations, the General Assembly had considered the question of Namibia, and the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Fund for Namibia had been set up to administer the Territory and prepare it for independence at a time when South Africa was taking a supremely arrogant attitude towards the international community.

3. Since 1965, in fact, the South African leaders had been saying that the question of Namibia was not within the competence of the United Nations and that the Pretoria Government could therefore make no commitment in that respect; and it was a fact that that Government disregarded all United Nations resolutions, defying the wishes of the international community. In so doing, it enjoyed the support of régimes similar to its own. He recalled that the General Assembly, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII), had condemned the unholy alliance between the Portuguese imperialism of that time, the régime of *apartheid* and zionism. But many other countries still collaborated with South Africa in the exploitation and repression of the people of Namibia—even though the majority had discontinued all co-operation or had reduced it—thus helping the usurpers to violate the minimum rules applicable to any human being and to persist in their policy. It could not be denied that any State which helped the South African Government could only be considered an accomplice in a crime perpetrated against the international community.

4. Despite the resolutions imposing a boycott against South Africa, foreign companies had obtained privileges in Namibia since 1971, and their activities were helping to bolster up the racist régime in the Territory—a régime that was illegal because it was based on occupation and colonization.

5. The Pretoria régime, feeling the pressure of international opinion, which had the effect of isolating it, had realized that the liberation movements in Africa were expanding in order to put an end to the racist régimes one by one, and that South Africa would soon be surrounded. In a last attempt to perpetuate its rule, it had called a constitutional conference at Windhoek in September 1975 with a view to separating Ovamboland from the rest of the Territory of Namibia and it had taken measures to reserve the richest and most fertile lands for the whites, leaving the poor land for the indigenous peoples. Promoting its policy of "bantustanization", it was striving to divide the ranks of the Namibians in order to facilitate its domination, following the maxim of "divide and rule".

6. In a speech delivered on 20 May 1975, Vorster had said that the Namibian people had the right to self-determination and independence, but that the South African Government would continue to administer the Territory as long as the Namibians consented. He wondered how far anyone could trust a Government with such contempt for man as to perpetuate the policy of *apartheid*, which was a moral outrage. If Vorster was sincere, he should return the entire Territory of Namibia to the indigenous people and to their authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which was both experienced and aware of its responsibilities as a member of the international community. He should also release all Namibian prisoners and repeal all the *apartheid* laws.

7. The independence of Namibia, whether it came about by peaceful means or through armed struggle, was very close at hand. The march of history was irreversible. Recalling that in the Middle East as well there was a policy of expansion at work, which was the doing of the Zionists—who were collaborating with the South African régime—he said that his country had always given whole-hearted support, within the limits of its resources, to the people of Namibia and SWAPO, whose struggle he commended. He paid a tribute to the President and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the excellent report submitted by the Council (A/10024 (vols. I and II)). He also paid tribute to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of which his country had the honour to be a member, for the consensus it had adopted on 18 June 1975 (see A/10023/Add.3, para. 13) and to the OAU Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa for the efforts it had made in support of the people of Namibia.

8. Mr. MARPAUNG (Indonesia) noted with satisfaction that considerable progress had been made in the struggle against colonialism in much of southern Africa during the past year. The collapse of the former Portuguese empire had not only brought freedom to millions of oppressed people but had also shown the vulnerability of the white supremacist régimes that still subsisted in the region. In that context, the case of Namibia stood out as one of the most serious instances of injustice in the area.

9. Unhappily, it must be noted that the past year had seen no substantial progress made towards alleviating the plight of the Namibian people and freeing them from the illegal occupation of South Africa. On the contrary, as the representative of SWAPO had pointed out and as the Special Committee had noted in its consensus on Namibia (*ibid.*), the Pretoria régime, in response to the efforts made by the Namibians and their valiant liberation movement, SWAPO, to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, had reinforced its illegal occupation of the Territory and escalated its reign of terror.

10. The Government of South Africa had also continued its attempts to integrate Namibia into South Africa by the application of South African acts of parliament to Namibia. Particularly to be deplored was the Publications Act, whose provisions were clearly designed to stifle the opposition, hamper the never-ending activities of the Namibians and prevent them from exercising their right to self-determination. Fearing the effect of world public opinion, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had addressed a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on 28 May 1975 (see A/10024 (vol. I), para. 312), in which he had declared that the people of Namibia were free to choose their own political and constitutional future. In practice, however, the South African régime had stepped up its reprehensible activities to repress any expression of popular wishes. The legislation announced as effecting political change in Namibia was designed to disarm increased international protest by appearing to relax oppressive regulations while maintaining equivalent restrictions under another guise. Another tactic adopted by the Pretoria régime had been the recent selection of 33 Namibians who supported its illegal occupation of the Territory to travel

abroad in an effort to secure support for its discredited policies. But as the representative of the SWAPO observer mission to the United Nations had pointed out in his communication No. 501/75, those persons could never represent the people of Namibia, since they openly supported policies of Balkanization that had been condemned by the international community. They were the tools of the colonialist régime, and it was satisfying to observe that they had been coolly received in the United Nations.

11. It was discouraging that, although the international community had given it every chance to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 concerning Namibia, the South African Government persisted in its policy. The General Assembly had considered the question of Namibia every year since 1946 and, at its twenty-first session, it had terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory (General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI)); the Security Council had since adopted numerous resolutions declaring that South Africa should withdraw from Namibia. However, the Pretoria régime still refused to comply with the decisions of the international community and, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated in his letter to the Secretary-General, it was unable to accept United Nations supervision.

12. South Africa's exploitation of Namibia was not limited to the political sphere alone. Education was widely utilized as an instrument of repression, as was reflected in the differences in curricula, teacher training and salary scales, and in the amount spent per pupil; as a result, Namibian children would receive an education much inferior to that provided for whites. Furthermore, the attempts to impose a completely separate educational system on each of the so-called nations recognized by the South African administration were clearly aimed at undermining the unity of the Territory.

13. Finally, the fact that blacks were restricted to the most menial work and domestic service demonstrated the determination of the régime to perpetuate white supremacy by preventing almost all blacks from attaining the level of education necessary to qualify them for professional or administrative positions. By so doing, the Pretoria régime was deliberately and obstinately pursuing a policy which would deprive the people of the skilled indigenous leadership which an independent Namibia would need.

14. Foreign exploitation of Namibia's economic resources was continuing with the encouragement of South Africa. Foreign mining companies, which dominated the economic life of Namibia, were engaged in extracting the Territory's minerals, with practically no processing done locally. As a result, foreign industries were supplied with raw materials, while the industrial development of the Territory was completely neglected. Consequently, the people of Namibia were suffering the loss of their natural resources without compensation.

15. Despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia,² which authorized the seizure of materials

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A*, para. 84.

taken from the Territory without the consent of the United Nations Council for Namibia and declared that those contravening the Decree might be held liable for damages by the future Government of an independent Namibia, South Africa had managed to attract foreign investment in the Territory. The recent withdrawal of a number of oil companies had been counterbalanced by the increased tempo of mineral exploration by foreign companies, which had been authorized to increase their participation by 50 per cent.

16. Economic exploitation of that kind resulted in the continuing impoverishment of the inhabitants of one of the richest countries in southern Africa. With 30 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product being transferred abroad in the form of profits or wages, the resources available for investment in the Territory were non-existent and the possibility of earning a living was seriously imperilled.

17. Those actions, together with the numerous others referred to in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/10024 (vols. I and II)) and the statements of delegations, clearly demonstrated the South African Government's determination to maintain and strengthen its domination over the Territory. There were no signs that it was prepared to transfer the administration of the Territory to the United Nations, as it was bound to do under international law, or to help the Namibians to exercise, at the earliest possible date, their inalienable right to self-determination, as required under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

18. During the past year, the United Nations Council for Namibia had taken steps in that direction, with the establishment of an Institute for Namibia, which was designed to train Namibians for the tasks of government and to prepare studies on various aspects of Namibian life and needs. The generosity of the Government of Zambia had enabled the Institute to be set up temporarily at Lusaka until it could be established in Namibian territory. The Institute offered all those who wished to support the Namibian people in their struggle a concrete and effective way of doing so. Its programmes would enable the young people of the Territory, who in the prevailing conditions were unable to develop their potential in order to benefit their country, to devote their energies to the task of freeing their compatriots from racism and colonialism.

19. In view of the situation and of South Africa's obstinate refusal to grant independence to the Namibians, it was more urgent than ever for the United Nations to take concrete action to help the Namibians in their just struggle. In that regard, his delegation could not but regret the fact that the vetoes of three permanent members of the Security Council at the Council's 1829th meeting had prevented it from taking effective action.

20. His delegation strongly condemned the attitude of the South African régime and associated itself with those delegations which had strongly urged the Security Council to consider taking all necessary measures provided for in the Charter, including those contained in Chapter VII, in order to secure South Africa's compliance with United Nations resolutions. South Africa had flouted the will of the international community for too long and it was high

time for the Security Council to take firm action to ensure that its decisions were respected. If it once again failed to fulfil its obligations, the international community must seriously consider adopting sanctions against South Africa. Furthermore, his delegation urged those States which continued to supply arms to South Africa and whose nationals did business with Namibia not to permit such activities to continue. The Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia, which provided for the seizure of materials exported from the Territory without the Council's consent, should be strictly enforced; that would eliminate any economic advantages deriving from the illegal exploitation of the Territory.

21. Finally, his delegation hoped that those countries which had thus far aided South Africa in its defiance of United Nations resolutions would realize their duty towards the Namibian people and would make every effort to assist them in the exercise of their inalienable right. In that way, the international community could make a decisive contribution to the struggle of the Namibians for independence.

Mr. Araim (Iraq), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

22. Mr. SHAKAR (Bahrain) welcomed the four new Members of the United Nations, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe and Papua New Guinea. His delegation also had great pleasure in welcoming the representative of SWAPO to the Committee. He also paid a tribute to the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the Special Committee and expressed his gratification at the excellent reports submitted by them to the Fourth Committee (A/10024 (vols. I and II) and A/10023/Add.3, respectively).

23. Despite the positive developments in the former Portuguese Territories, the situation in Africa remained a threat to international peace and security, since the peoples of South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia continued to suffer under the yoke of racist and Fascist régimes. His delegation noted with concern that the situation had not changed, despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971. South Africa continued to defy international opinion and persisted in its illegal occupation and expansion in Namibia by means of the policy of "bantustanization" and unjust and arbitrary legislation. The Pretoria régime also indulged in various manoeuvres in order to prevent the Namibian people from enjoying their fundamental rights.

24. His delegation called for the repeal of all the repressive legislation which constituted the *apartheid* régime and for the release of all political prisoners. His delegation also reaffirmed its support for the struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the auspices of SWAPO.

25. It was unthinkable that the Charter should remain a dead letter and that South Africa should continue to refuse to transfer the Territory to the responsible legal authority, namely the United Nations Council for Namibia. Furthermore, the South African régime had endeavoured to sow confusion in southern Africa by initiating so-called constitutional talks, from which SWAPO was excluded and which were designed simply to create tribal rivalries.

26. Any solution to the problem must be based on the granting of independence and respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, and must be reached without delay through free elections held under the auspices of the United Nations.

27. His delegation whole-heartedly supported the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia, adopted on 27 September 1974, since it constituted a very important measure for the protection of the interests of the Namibian people.

28. He regretted the fact that it had not been possible to reach an equitable decision because of the veto by the Western Powers of the draft resolution on sanctions against South Africa (see A/10024 (vol. I), para. 319). Those States were prejudicing the cause of world justice and peace and thus prolonging the suffering of the oppressed peoples.

29. His country supported the appeal regarding Namibia contained in the draft resolution. The resolutions adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly had shown that the international community could no longer tolerate the arrogant behaviour of the Vorster régime. It was the duty of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular, to seek stronger ways and means of ending the illegal occupation of Namibia, securing the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, in both the spirit and the letter, and transferring power to the legitimate representatives of the Namibian people without delay, if necessary by invoking the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

30. His delegation appealed to all Member States to respect those resolutions, including those calling for the severance of economic relations with South Africa, and to put an end to the co-operation with South Africa which enabled that country to maintain its illegal occupation. Bahrain supported the appeal to the international community, the specialized agencies and governmental and non-governmental organizations to intensify their co-operation with OAU and give increased moral, political and material assistance to Namibia so that the Namibian people might finally enjoy the right to self-determination and independence.

31. Mr. HRČKA (Czechoslovakia) said that he, too, deplored the fact that the South African Government had ignored the provisions of Security Council resolution 366 (1974), which called upon it, *inter alia*, to transfer power to the people of Namibia. It should be remembered, in that connexion, that SWAPO had been recognized by the United Nations and by OAU as the official representative of the Namibian people.

32. In spite of repeated appeals, the South African Government continued to ignore world public opinion and to defy the United Nations, whose competence it refused to recognize in the case despite General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which had been confirmed by Security Council resolution 366 (1974) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

33. In a statement made on 20 May 1975 and in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations

several days later (*ibid.*, para. 312), the South African Government had declared its willingness to let the inhabitants of Namibia determine the constitutional future of the Territory themselves. That letter, however, made it clear that the South African Government had given SWAPO only a secondary role in the process of determining Namibia's future.

34. Furthermore, although South Africa had declared that it intended to respect the integrity and unity of the Territory, recent events proved that it dreamed only of intensifying repression in Namibia and of keeping it divided by a process of "bantustanization" which served only to strengthen the tribal and separatist tendencies of the country, as the representative of SWAPO had pointed out in the Security Council at its 1823rd meeting, on 30 May 1975. In its efforts to weaken Namibia and tighten its hold over the Territory, South Africa knew that it could count on the help of a number of Western States and transnational companies for which Namibia represented a free enterprise paradise. The taxes paid by those companies to South Africa helped South Africa to strengthen its occupation forces in Namibia.

35. His delegation supported the position of SWAPO and OAU, namely, that the question of Namibia could not be resolved until South Africa had evacuated the Territory and had recognized the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in compliance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It, too, deemed it advisable to organize free elections without delay under United Nations auspices, to apply scrupulously the embargo and the sanctions imposed on South Africa, and to call upon States Members of the United Nations to sever all diplomatic relations with South Africa in order to make that country accept the just demands of the people of Namibia. Such measures were all the more important in that Namibia served as a bridge-head for operations directed against the liberation movements of Angola.

36. There was proof that South Africa was continuing to strengthen its military apparatus; its military budget, which was in excess of R 700 million, currently represented 13 per cent of the national budget. South Africa was equipped with new types of armaments purchased in Western countries and it had set up new military bases in Namibia. Furthermore, the fact that South Africa had not yet signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (see General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII)) aroused justified fears in the international community.

37. Czechoslovakia approved the decisions adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, which had been held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975 (see A/10217 and Corr.1), and would continue to support the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence.

38. Mr. KOLOS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the United Nations had adopted numerous resolutions with respect to the question of Namibia. It had recognized and confirmed the right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence and had officially terminated South Africa's Mandate for Namibia. During the

current year the question of Namibia had been considered by various bodies; resolutions had been adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session, by the Special Committee, by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and by OAU. In December 1974, the Security Council had adopted resolution 366 (1974), in which it had demanded that South Africa should make a solemn declaration that it would comply with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations in regard to Namibia. But in view of the evident bad faith on the part of South Africa, the African countries had requested the Security Council at its meetings in May and June 1975 to adopt new and more effective measures. His own country had submitted a similar request at the 1829th meeting of the Security Council. The previous year his country had supported a draft resolution aimed at excluding South Africa from the United Nations.³ That draft resolution had failed to be adopted because of the vetoes by three Western countries, whose assistance encouraged South Africa to defy United Nations resolutions and world public opinion. Those countries and various large monopolies were interested in maintaining the minority régime in South Africa so as to be able to continue to exploit the people of Namibia and the natural resources of the country with impunity. The simple fact that the profits derived by those monopolies from the sale of mineral ores had quadrupled between 1963 and 1973 gave an idea of what was at stake.

39. Alarmed by the intensification of the struggle of the Namibian people for independence, conscious of changes which had taken place in southern Africa, and feeling banned by world public opinion, South Africa was changing its tactics and was speaking of organizing a constitutional conference, of initiating a free dialogue, but that was in fact only a pretext for further delaying a solution to the problem of Namibia.

40. In the view of his delegation, the General Assembly should at its thirtieth session adopt more decisive measures against the racist régime of South Africa. His country gave its unqualified support to the consensus on Namibia adopted by the Special Committee on 18 June, in which the special Committee urged the Security Council to take appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to compel South Africa to comply with United Nations resolutions (see A/10023/Add.3, para. 13).

AGENDA ITEM 89

Question of Southern Rhodesia (*continued*) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.2, A/10050-S/11638, A/C.4/L.1092 and Corr.1, A/C.4/L.1093)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (*continued*)

41. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) pointed out that the following delegations should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1092 and Corr.1: Bahrain, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Jamaica

³ Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1974, document S/11543.

and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The sponsors of that draft resolution emphasized the unity of the freedom fighters in the African National Council, the movement of national union established in 1974. They also sought to adopt a conciliatory tone in order to obtain the accession of all countries, especially that of the United Kingdom, whose support for the initiatives of the four heads of State of southern Africa they had welcomed. The draft resolution took into account the relevant provisions of the Dar es Salaam Declaration adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its ninth extraordinary session, held from 7 to 10 April 1975, in which the African countries had chosen the path of negotiation to settle the question of Namibia. It also emphasized the need to prevent advertisement for, and recruitment of mercenaries for Southern Rhodesia. The Federal Republic of Germany had given assurances in that regard which the Committee had duly noted.

42. The text of draft resolution A/C.4/L.1093 reproduced that of the previous year (General Assembly resolution 3298 (XXIX)), with minor changes in form. The growing co-operation of certain States with Southern Rhodesia was condemned; the attitude of the United States, which continued to import chrome and nickel despite the decisions of the Security Council, was mentioned; and all States were called upon to implement the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly and comply with the sanctions imposed by those bodies.

43. Mr. AL-SAID (Oman) supported draft resolutions A/C.4/L.1092 and Corr.1 and A/C.4/L.1093, which reflected his country's concern to see constructive measures adopted at last. He recommended that the Committee adopt those draft resolutions unanimously.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

2150th meeting

Tuesday, 21 October 1975, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mrs. Famah JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone).

A/C.4/SR.2150

AGENDA ITEM 87

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9998-S/11598, A/10023/Add.3, A/10024 (vols. I and II), A/10050-S/11638, A/10229, A/C.4/784/Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. VLASCEANU (Romania) welcomed the delegation of Papua New Guinea to the Committee and expressed pleasure at the participation in the Committee's work of the Acting President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Muyongo. His delegation had already had the pleasure of welcoming the National Chairman of SWAPO, Mr. David Meroro, at the 226th meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on 16 October.

2. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in disregard of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions was well known and had been strongly condemned by the international community. For more than 10 years, OAU and the United Nations had spared no effort to assist the Namibians to obtain their freedom and independence. To that end, the United Nations had already taken concrete steps, in particular by establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was entrusted with the task of protecting the interests of the Namibian people. However, those efforts had not been enough, because South Africa continued its occupation and its exploitation of the resources of the Territory, aided by foreign companies. Despite recent favourable developments in the situation as a

result of the accession to independence of the Portuguese Territories, South Africa continued to violate the international status of the Territory and to fragment it; the "bantustanization" plan and the so-called constitutional conference, organized on an ethnic basis which were examples of the efforts made by South Africa, had been categorically rejected by the Namibian people and by the United Nations Council for Namibia. Those efforts, which had been preceded by a wave of repression and terror, were creating a situation of tension that represented a dangerous threat to peace and security on the African continent and throughout the world. It was for that reason that his delegation shared the deep concern expressed in the Committee and declared itself in favour of an urgent settlement of the question.

3. In the light of the resolution adopted by OAU at the twenty-fifth ordinary session of its Council of Ministers, held at Kampala from 18 to 25 July 1975 (see A/10297, annex I), in which the Council condemned the so-called constitutional conference, and the statement issued on 29 August 1975 by the United Nations Council for Namibia (see A/10024 (vol. I), para. 214), the Committee should urge all Member States not to recognize the manoeuvres of the South African régime, to refrain from any contact with its representatives and to adopt firm measures to safeguard the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia.

4. At the same time, it should seek to discourage those foreign economic interests and Member States which continued to help South Africa to perpetuate its illegal domination over Namibia.