

91. In conclusion, he thanked the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their efforts.

92. Mr. CISSÉ (Mali) said that no constructive debate on Namibia could be held as long as South Africa's guilt was dissociated from that of its allies and accomplices. The military supremacy which enabled South Africa to impose its illegal presence in Namibia was essentially due to the assistance provided by its NATO allies, despite General Assembly resolution 2871 (XXVI), which called on Member States to refrain from all direct or indirect relations with South Africa, where those relations concerned Namibia.

93. The reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee and the statements made by the representatives of SWAPO and the petitioners all demonstrated that South Africa was strengthening its presence in Namibia and continuing its policy of Bantustanization, mass arrests, torture and public floggings. In addition, hospitals were closed, the secondary school at Odivo was threatened with closure and the transnational corporations, in conjunction with South Africa, were continuing their systematic looting of the Territory's wealth.

94. However, although the United Nations was powerless in the face of the challenge of the Pretoria régime, the Namibian people had taken up the challenge by embarking on a struggle for liberation. They had never had any illusions as to the outcome of the contacts which the Security Council had decided to establish with the Vorster régime, nor had they been tricked by the charade of constitutional evolution in Namibia. The puppet chiefs in the Advisory Council, which had been established in 1973 in order to break up the Namibian nation and had been rejected by the people, were becoming aware of their isolation and the same fate awaited the multiracial constitutional talks that had been proposed. The electoral boycott organized in 1973 on the occasion of the so-called consultations for the establishment of a legislative council for Ovamboland had demonstrated the Namibian people's determination to reject any constitutional evolution that did not lead the country to complete and immediate independence with respect for its national unity and territorial

integrity. SWAPO would continue to fight as long as South Africa maintained its armed forces in Namibia. South Africa had already been forced in certain regions to replace its police forces by regular army personnel.

95. Recent positive developments in the Territories under Portuguese domination had shown that the victory of the Namibian people was inevitable. The events that had taken place during the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly also demonstrated that South Africa was being forced into a corner. The international community must therefore redouble its efforts to mobilize world public opinion so that the Namibian people might receive all the assistance they needed in their struggle against the odious policy of the South African occupying authorities. Support must also be given to the commendable efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal authority for the Territory, particularly to prepare the people so that they would be able to administer their State when the time came. In that connexion, his delegation warmly welcomed the recent establishment of an Institute for Namibia, which would play a leading role in training and educating Namibians.

96. His delegation would like to see greater dissemination of news on Namibia in general and on the work of the Council in particular. The annual observance of Namibia Day, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII), provided a solemn occasion for denouncing all the forces that impeded United Nations action against the South African occupation régime. His delegation noted with satisfaction the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia which had recently been enacted by the Council (*ibid.*, para. 84). In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the Council for the important work it had accomplished and to Member States for their contributions to the various funds aimed at supporting the Namibian people in the just struggle against the white racists of South Africa.

97. The CHAIRMAN announced that the general debate on item 65 had thus been concluded.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

2110th meeting

Monday, 11 November 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2110

AGENDA ITEM 68

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (A/9623 (part V))

GENERAL DEBATE

1. Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, pointed out that chapter IV of the Special Committee's report, dealing with agenda

item 68 (A/9623 (part V)), had been prepared pursuant to paragraph 13 of General Assembly resolution 3117 (XXVIII) and taking into account paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 3163 (XXVIII). Other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly had also been taken into account, in addition to information provided by representatives of the national liberation movements of the colonial Territories in Africa who had participated as observers in the proceedings of the Special Committee relating to their respective countries.

2. In its conclusions (*ibid.*, para. 6), the Special Committee had indicated its concern at the fact that no measures had been taken in southern Africa to put an end to, or to restrain the activities of, those foreign interests which continued to deprive the Territories of the resources which they needed for a viable independence. The Committee believed that there had been no change in the activities of foreign interests in southern Africa, where foreign investments exceeded \$6,000

million and virtually monopolized local industries. Those interests continued to manipulate agricultural production to encourage only those export crops which yielded the highest profits, reducing the Territories to the role of supplier of raw materials to the colonial Powers. Their economic activities were directly linked to the perpetuation of colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

3. On the basis of its conclusions, the Special Committee had felt it necessary to recommend to the General Assembly in paragraph 7 of its report that it should reaffirm the inalienable right of the peoples of colonial Territories to self-determination and independence and repeat that the activities of foreign interests constituted a major obstacle in the way of independence. It requested the Assembly to condemn the colonial Powers and those who supported the economic interests and to call upon the colonial Powers and other States to adopt measures designed to regulate the activities of their companies and nationals in the Territories so as to put an end to those activities. It further requested, *inter alia*, that the General Assembly should appeal to all Governments and the organizations within the United Nations system to bring new pressure to bear upon the colonialist and racist régimes in southern Africa to grant independence to the peoples of those Territories forthwith and to extend assistance to the national liberation movements.

4. In the light of the position adopted by the General Assembly that foreign economic and other interests were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the African Territories, the Special Committee hoped that the Fourth Committee would fully support its recommendations.

5. Mrs. JOKA-BANGURA (Sierra Leone) recalled that in the previous year's debate some of the members of the Committee had expressed the opinion that too much emphasis had been put on the disadvantages accruing from foreign investments in the colonial Territories. However, the facts had proved beyond a doubt that the activities of such economic interests had been nothing but an impediment to the process of decolonization. With the exception of some of the smaller colonial Territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific, foreign economic interests had been negative in their effect on the lives of the indigenous peoples. Foreign monopolies followed policies which totally disregarded the legitimate interests of the inhabitants of those Territories and exploited the available cheap native labour to deplete the natural resources of the areas. In southern Africa, those interests had developed only the most profitable sectors of the economy, thus reducing the Territories to the role of suppliers of raw materials.

6. Companies investing in the Territories did not devote any of their profits to the improvement of the economic, cultural and social conditions of the indigenous populations. Illiteracy and infant mortality remained widespread. Everyone would agree that such a policy was contrary to the inherent rights and the legitimate interests of the indigenous peoples. Nevertheless, a number of States, including the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Belgium, had taken no steps to put an end to or to restrain the activities of, monopolies which were under their jurisdiction.

7. Angola and Namibia were regarded as among the richest Territories in southern Africa. Could anyone say that their wealth had brought them prosperity? On the contrary, it would seem that their economic potential had made it more difficult for them to attain independence.

8. According to a press report, the cease-fire in Angola marked the beginning of a struggle between political and financial interests competing for control of the Territory, which was potentially one of Africa's richest countries. It was reported that, from all indications, the United States was still

well in the lead. A United States company, Gulf Oil Corporation, was pumping oil in Cabinda at the rate of 150,000 barrels per day, which was already enough to give Angola one of the world's largest *per capita* trade surpluses. All along the coast of Angola, other companies held concessions to prospect for oil. But oil was not Angola's only source of wealth. Though its economy was not yet developed, it had an abundance of mineral deposits.

9. As a result of the influence of powerful American interests in southern Africa, as early as 1970, according to a secret memorandum prepared by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Kissinger, the United States had begun to prepare to adopt a "more realistic" policy in the area while trying not to alienate black African opinion. The chief assumption of Mr. Kissinger had been that white rule would continue for the foreseeable future and he had proposed that, while maintaining its public opposition to racial repression, the United States should relax political isolation and economic restrictions on the white States.

10. Mr. Kissinger had suggested the possibility of adopting a more flexible attitude towards the Smith régime in Rhodesia and towards the Portuguese Territories. He had suggested at the same time that the black States of the area should be persuaded that the independence of the Territories could not be brought about by violence and that the only hope for a prosperous future lay in the establishment of closer relations with the white-dominated States to persuade them to change their attitude. He had also suggested that, while the arms embargo against South Africa would have to be enforced, equipment which could serve either military or civilian purposes could be sold to that country and that exchange programmes with South Africa could be conducted in all areas including the military. Without changing the official position that the South African occupation of South West Africa was illegal, he had suggested that an accommodation between South Africa and the United Nations on that issue should be encouraged.

11. Mr. Kissinger had thought that, in that way, the United States would safeguard its economic, scientific and technological interests in the white States and expand its opportunities for trade and investment.

12. What had been revealed about the policy of the United States might well be true of the policy of other Western Powers. When such policies existed, there was little point in repeating that in southern Africa the worker earned a higher wage than in other African countries. What good had those wages been to Africans in Angola, Namibia and Rhodesia? It was better to be poor and free than rich and enslaved.

13. It had also been said that monopolies could not be prevented from investing wherever they wished and that no Government could legislate against their activities. Yet, there were many well-known instances in which States had imposed sanctions against other States, which none of the companies concerned had dared to flout.

14. Where there was a will, there was a way. The progressive forces in Portugal did not need the protection of certain Powers now that the war in Angola had come to an end. Those forces were to be commended for trying to foil attempts to turn Angola into another Congo.

15. The process of decolonization was irreversible. The world community must condemn all economic and other activities which were impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and encouraging racial discrimination and *apartheid*, particularly in southern Africa.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, the list of speakers for the debate on the item would be closed on 12 November at 6 p.m.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 65

Question of Namibia (*continued*) (A/9623/Add.3, A/9624 (vol. I), A/9624 (vol. II), A/9624/Add.1, A/9725 and Corr.1, A/9728, A/9775-S/11519, A/9786-S/11526, A/C.4/771, A/C.4/779, A/C.4/L.1066 and Corr.1)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*concluded*)*

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Gerson Veii, representative of the South West Africa National Union, took a place at the Committee table.

17. Mr. VEII (South West Africa National Union) expressed his delegation's satisfaction at having been given the opportunity to participate in the Committee's debate. That had been possible thanks also to the surprising decision of the South African régime to issue the necessary passports to the delegation of the South West Africa National Union (SWANU). SWANU was also glad to have the opportunity to thank the Governments and peoples that had for 28 years been demanding the independence of Namibia for their support of the national liberation movement of Namibia in its struggle against one of the most brutal colonial systems in existence. SWANU appealed to the General Assembly to ask its President to urge the Pretoria Government to release all the South African and Namibian political prisoners who were detained in Robben Island and the central prison at Pretoria.

18. It was important for the United Nations to understand how the process of Bantustanization was being perfected and applied by the Fascist régime in Pretoria as a means of social control in Namibia. By means of conspiracy, bribery and violence the South African administration had managed to establish three tribal structures in Ovamboland, Kavango and Caprivi, but it had failed in the Rehoboth Baster Gebiet, where the lackeys of the illegal administration had been defeated in two elections by representatives of the People's Party of the Gebiet. The South African régime was determined to resettle between 150,000 and 200,000 people in Bantustans or "homelands". However, its plans had met with strong opposition and it had been driven to violence, to organizing so-called "national conferences" and even to establishing an "Advisory Council", which was responsible for propagating its version of "self-determination" and "self-government". Those plans had been unsuccessful, and both the people and the political organizations of Namibia had been strengthening and broadening their opposition to the policy of *apartheid*. In view of that situation, even the white settlers had expressed interest in the revolutionary work of the liberation movement and had tried to open communications with it.

19. The first fight of the Namibian liberation movement had been against German colonialism at the beginning of the century, a struggle which had cost it dear in material losses and in loss of life. For that reason, the population of the southern part of the country had not yet reached the level at which it had stood before that war of extermination and pillage, as a result of which their herds had been confiscated and the people themselves had been driven into poverty and forced labour. Instead of putting matters to rights, South Africa had extended its policy to the northern part of Namibia. The League of Nations had done no more than address a mild warning to South Africa. Until the mid 1950s, the African population had offered only weak opposition to the policy of South Africa, but the situation had changed considerably in 1959, with the establishment of SWANU and the Ovamboland People's Organization (OPO), which had later become the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO). SWANU had struck out on a new path, and the people had

begun to participate directly in national politics through political organizations instead of through their tribal chiefs, as they had before. The South African administration had reacted with its usual colonial violence by suppressing political demonstrations, as in the case of the Katutura massacre in 1959. In addition, it had begun to use intimidation and to restrict the activities of the leaders of the political parties. However, the Namibian people, including its peasants, workers and students, had not given up the fight. At that juncture, it had been decided to form political organizations for each region of the country. Of those organizations, those that had been most successful recently were the Democratic Co-operative Development Party (DEMKOP) in Ovamboland, the People's Party in the Rehoboth Baster Gebiet, the National Unity Democratic Organization (NUDO) and the Namibia People's Democratic Organization (NAPDO). The greatest obstacle to the unity of those organizations was "tribalism". Nevertheless, two national conferences had been held in which, for the first time, all the important political leaders of the struggle for liberation had participated. Thanks to the unity that had been achieved with such pains, it had been possible to draw up a clear and definite liberation programme. The achievement of unity had been the most difficult task because of the spectre of "tribalism" and "regionalism", which the South African régime was using to foment divisions within the liberation movement.

20. The meeting of the National Convention held in April 1973 had recognized that the South African régime was committed to dividing the country into small states through a military and political strategy aimed at serving its own interests rather than those of the African population. The Convention had therefore declared its opposition to all divisive elements that worked against the struggle for national liberation and the creation of a united Namibia. Furthermore, the Convention had laid down in its Constitution the following objectives: to unite the oppressed people of Namibia under a united national front and to fight for complete freedom and national independence; to oppose all forms of tribalism and racialism, and eradicate all forms of economic exploitation based on class, race and colour and all actions aimed at the segregation of the people of Namibia; to promote the social, moral and educational progress of Namibians; and to establish democratic principles, rights and freedoms in Namibia and collaborate with all organizations having similar aims in Africa.

21. He pointed out that the statement by the representative of South Africa at the 1800th meeting of the Security Council did not substantially depart from South Africa's declared policy. On the question of workers who sought employment in South Africa, referred to in that statement, all that needed to be said was that those workers sought employment in South Africa because of a combination of factors which were the direct result of colonialism and imperialism. The South African representative had also been deliberately vague with regard to the right of the Namibian people to independence and self-determination. His statement that the South African régime had made suggestions or proposed to have discussions with Namibian leaders had been nothing but a convenient lie. He had not informed the Security Council that in September of the current year the South African régime, through its so-called Minister for Community Development and Public Works, Mr. Du Plessis, had made a similar proposal which had been rejected because the condition had been that each of the so-called ethnic groups should elect its own representatives and no provision had been made for the participation of political parties. SWANU had rejected the proposal because, first, the Namibian people as a whole had stated, through the National Convention, that they wanted to form a unitary State in an undivided Namibia and had rejected all forms of Balkanization of the country. That position had been communi-

* Resumed from 2106th meeting.

cated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations when he had visited Namibia in 1972.¹ Secondly, the Namibian people were not prepared to accept anything short of total independence on the basis of one man, one vote. Thirdly, the South African régime was continuing to occupy Namibia illegally. Fourthly, the Pretoria régime still insisted on excluding the true representatives of the Namibian people from the talks on the future of the Territory. Fifthly, the people of Namibia demanded that the policy of "Bantustanization" should be stopped before they participated in any talks and were prepared to fight and even to die for their convictions.

22. The truth was that the Pretoria régime was neither willing nor prepared to participate in meaningful negotiations leading to complete independence and self-determination for Namibia. Like British imperialism in its day, South Africa considered the existence of a free and prosperous Namibia to be a threat to its security. That was why it had transplanted its administration to Namibia, in application of the doctrine of territorial annexation and military aggression. The South African régime was going ahead with its plans to hold "elections" in January 1975 in order to decree the so-called independence of Ovamboland.

23. SWANU urged the Committee to reject the content of South Africa's statement, which was nothing but the continuation of the unacceptable policy of *apartheid*. SWANU had no doubt that the Namibian people would free themselves from the colonial yoke of the South African régime and its imperialist friends. It was no coincidence that the three Western Powers, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, whose multinational corporations had large investments in

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1972*, document S/10738, para. 29.

the mining industry of Namibia, at the Security Council 1808th meeting had vetoed the Council's draft resolution on South Africa.² It was obvious that those three nations put their economic interests above the human dignity and freedom of the people of South Africa and Namibia.

24. One of the most difficult issues in the case of Namibia was that of the recognition of the organizations of Namibian people. SWANU would not ask for recognition at the expense of SWAPO, which, after all, was also a member of the National Convention. Similarly, it did not think that recognition of the National Convention compelled the United Nations or the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to choose between SWAPO and the Convention. The question was, rather, to find a solution to the existing situation in which a constituent part was being recognized while the whole was not. A satisfactory solution to that situation would benefit all concerned.

25. Any negotiation, discussion or dialogue between the Fascist régime of South Africa and the United Nations should include the participation of the representatives of the people of Namibia at all stages. It should be borne in mind that that principle had been established by the General Assembly itself in its relevant resolutions.

26. SWANU also paid tribute, on behalf of the National Convention and the oppressed people of Namibia, to the courageous people of Guinea-Bissau and to the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO); they had rendered an invaluable service to the struggle of the Namibian people by contributing to the weakening of colonialism and imperialism in Africa.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

² *Ibid.*, *Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1974*, document S/11543.

2111th meeting

Thursday, 14 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2111

AGENDA ITEM 68

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in southern Africa (continued) (A/9623 (part V))

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq) said that chapter IV of the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/9623 (part V)) contained evidence of continued exploitation of the peoples of colonial Territories by multinational corporations. Neither the colonial Powers nor those corporations had made any attempt to abide by General Assembly resolution 3117 (XXVIII) or other relevant United Nations resolutions. Colonialist encouragement of investment by multinational corpor-

ations in colonial Territories was motivated not by a desire to improve the standard of living of the people of those Territories but rather by the possibility of exploiting cheap indigenous labour. There was no indication of progress or improvement in the standard of living of peoples under colonial domination and it was a well-known fact that in the African colonial Territories non-African workers received much higher wages than Africans. The profits of the multinational corporations were either sent to their headquarters outside the colonial Territories or used to increase exploitation, but were never used for the benefit of the Territories themselves. Despite the statements made by Western Powers in the Committee regarding the role of multinational corporations in the advancement of colonial peoples, his delegation believed that those corporations were interested only in continuing their exploitation.

2. Colonial domination continued even after countries achieved independence, through long-term concessions which enabled the multinational corporations to continue their exploitation. After independence, his country had had to continue its struggle to rid itself of the monopolistic control of