

2106th meeting

Wednesday, 6 November 1974, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2106

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/9775-S/11519, A/9786-S/11526, A/C.4/771, A/C.4/771/Add.4, A/C.4/L.1066)

HEARING OF PETITIONERS (*continued*)*

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had agreed at its 2104th meeting to grant the request for a hearing (A/C.4/771/Add.4) submitted by the representatives of the World Peace Council (WPC).

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Romesh Chandra, the Reverend John Morgan, Mr. Jarmo Mäkelä and Mr. Tibor Pethö, representatives of the World Peace Council, took places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. CHANDRA (World Peace Council) congratulated the Chairman on his election and paid a 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 and the United Nations Council for Namibia for the progress they had made during the past year. He particularly wished to congratulate the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia on receiving the Nobel Prize.

3. WPC, comprising more than 120 representatives from different countries, fully supported the United Nations position concerning the problems before the Committee. The new world situation seemed to promise a period of victories for peace, independence, détente, justice and social progress. Who would have thought two years earlier, at the twenty-seventh session, when Amílcar Cabral had addressed the Committee for the last time (1986th meeting) that Guinea-Bissau would so soon be a full Member of the United Nations? Guinea-Bissau, which continued to act in accordance with Amílcar Cabral's ideas, symbolized the new prevailing spirit, in which the forces of liberation and peace were advancing. WPC also wished to congratulate the liberation movements of Mozambique, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe and Angola, which had contributed with their victories to the favourable new atmosphere. The progress achieved was also due to the unity of the anti-colonialist forces, including those which had emerged in Portugal itself, and it was to be hoped that such unity would increase so that, through the co-operation of those forces with the liberation movements, decolonization could be attained. Similarly, Portugal would in that way recover its former good name.

4. WPC considered that none of the problems affecting the colonial Territories could be examined without the full participation of the liberation movements. It therefore thought the current status as observers, which the representatives of those movements had been accorded, was inappropriate. They had only the right to refer to the situation in their own countries. However, that limited their role and they would have to have the right also to refer to other matters, since they were the only representatives of their peoples. In the case of Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) should have the right to speak on behalf of Namibia

on all matters dealt with by the United Nations. No one else had the right to do so. WPC urged the United Nations to take steps to that end.

5. With the intensification of the struggle of the liberation movements in southern Africa, discussions in the United Nations had entered a new stage, particularly with regard to Namibia. The régime of *apartheid* continued its unlawful occupation and was stepping up its repressive practices. Moreover, after the fall of fascism in Portugal more intensive measures had been taken to make Namibia a buffer State. Thus, the Caprivi Strip had been occupied and financial, economic and military investment increased. That situation could not be resolved only by resolutions. On behalf of the national liberation movements, WPC requested that the only possible solution should be applied, namely that the United Nations should put an end to that situation by imposing compulsory sanctions against South Africa. That was the only way to deal with South Africa's actions, which violated everything done by the United Nations.

6. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in that respect would be followed with great interest by world public opinion and the prestige of the United Nations would thereby be enhanced. Measures should be taken in every sphere to support the liberation movements and in particular to impose mandatory compulsory sanctions. Otherwise there would be violations, as in the case of the arms embargo. WPC proposed that the Security Council should hold a special meeting to consider the question of Namibia in the light of events and subsequently submit its conclusions to the General Assembly. For its part, it was ready to take steps, together with the non-governmental organizations, against those companies in the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States and other countries which were giving financial and other support to the *apartheid* régime and the unlawful occupation. Those measures would ensure the application of the relevant United Nations resolutions. The International NGO Conference against *Apartheid* and Colonialism in Africa, organized by the Special NGO Committee on Human Rights, at Geneva in September, in which many organizations and representatives of Governments and of the United Nations itself had participated, had requested the United Nations to take steps to prevent the violation of its decisions which aid to South Africa constituted. A special Sub-Committee of the Conference was closely following events in that field. Moreover, at a recent meeting, the Liaison Committee of WPC had decided to support all the efforts of the United Nations to end colonialism and racial discrimination and achieve the liberation of Namibia. Thus it could be seen that the organizations were playing an enormous role in the process in various ways. WPC thought that the United Nations should carefully consider ways in which the non-governmental organizations could take part in joint action. For that reason, the non-governmental organizations carrying out activities related to the work of the United Nations should have a status consonant with the influence they exercised. To that end, WPC recommended that the United Nations Council for Namibia should consider the possibility of convening a meeting with the organizations constituting the Bureau of the Sub-Committee of the Conference, and with the Special Committee dealing with decolonization and the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, with a view to drawing up plans.

* Resumed from the 2103rd meeting.

7. Governments alone could not apply even the most appropriate action to prevent violations of United Nations resolutions. The guarantee of effective application was concerted action by the non-governmental organizations. Hence the need to hear those organizations and ensure joint planning. No campaign of any scope could be organized unless talks were held.

8. In conclusion, he wished to thank the Committee for the opportunity it had given him to take part in its discussions and to point out the need for vigilance in order to foil the attempts of those who wished to go back to the past. However, if independence, peace and détente were to be irreversible, there had to be a union of all forces, particularly of Governments and non-governmental organizations. That was important for the struggle in Africa and for the independence struggles of all peoples. The continued unlawful occupation of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime was a threat to the peace and independence of all countries.

9. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq) thanked Mr. Chandra for his statement and said that his work on decolonization was respected and appreciated. WPC was mobilizing world opinion and the progressive forces of the world in support of national liberation movements.

10. The Reverend John MORGAN (World Peace Council) said that the colonialist nations held some peoples in temporary servitude and he expressly used the word "temporary" because colonial domination was nearing its end, as was clear from the list of new nations which had become Members of the United Nations since its inception. At the present time there were powerful social currents, and that expression had a real rather than a rhetorical meaning, for the power of the peoples was changing the world. One example was that of the Viet-Nameese people, who had paid a high price to expel the oppressors from their territory.

11. South Africa, in its philosophy and practice, was an example of a colonial mentality, supported by the interests of the large corporations of Western Europe, the United States and Japan. Peoples and Governments must be made aware of the size of the investments of those countries in Namibia. No less than 50 per cent of the investments in that Territory were from the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Switzerland and Canada also had large investments there.

12. It was essential that the body of world public opinion should realize the need for the application of the relevant United Nations resolutions. If a large majority of citizens declared themselves in favour of their application, their respective Governments would be forced to observe them. But many were unaware of the facts, as he had had occasion to realize with regret when he had travelled in Canada in September and October and had noted that people were ignorant of what was happening in Africa, Asia and Latin America. They did not understand the significance of the national liberation struggle. Moreover, white immigration into South Africa had to be stopped, because it promoted racism.

13. The non-governmental organizations could play an important role in the process of keeping peoples better informed concerning the problems of racism and colonialism. Some Governments were trying to co-operate in that respect, but the results were not encouraging and the United Nations could not carry out the task by itself. The non-governmental organizations, on the other hand, could do much along those lines, but for that purpose their role should be given greater importance in the United Nations. Support for the theoretical and practical work of the non-governmental organizations would help to bring about the liberation of those peoples still subjected to colonial servitude.

14. Mr. MÄKELÄ (World Peace Council) said that, when the United Nations had adopted General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), it had irrevocably committed itself to the achievement of the liberation and independence of Namibia and had confirmed that decision in other resolutions. Despite the heroic struggle being waged by SWAPO, the situation in Namibia was becoming worse and the failure to implement United Nations resolutions was creating a critical situation. Despite the condemnation of world public opinion, South Africa continued to occupy Namibia, thanks to the massive political, military and economic support it received, as proved by the veto in favour of South Africa of three Western Powers at the 1808th meeting of the Security Council on 30 October. If Member States respected the spirit and letter of United Nations resolutions and implemented their provisions, Namibia would be independent. Colonialism and racism constituted a world danger, against which WPC was waging a constant struggle. It was successfully campaigning to achieve political and material support for the national liberation movements in the countries which sold weapons and gave economic support to South Africa. In the Nordic countries, many activities were being carried out for the benefit of the liberation movements. In his country, Finland, peace movements were waging active campaigns for that purpose with the participation of trade unions, intellectuals and so forth.

15. Particular attention should be given to means of implementing United Nations resolutions and, to that end, close co-operation should be established between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations, since the support of public opinion was the best guarantee of compliance with United Nations resolutions. It was not enough for Governments to make official statements condemning *apartheid* and expressing their support for the national liberation movements: they must adopt more effective and practical measures, particularly in a field of education. In many of the countries which supported South Africa, the people were not aware of the causes of colonialism, *apartheid* and racism. It was of vital importance that they should know why colonialism and racism must be eliminated and why support should be given to the national liberation movements. Governments must also co-operate to enable the Namibians to receive an adequate education. WPC supported all the measures adopted for that purpose and, in particular, the establishment of the Institute for Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 73). That Institute, along with its task of training Namibians, should carry out research and publish research documents and papers so that, when the Namibians took over the public administration of their country, they could use those documents and papers as a basis for Governmental action.

16. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that he wished to know how many members of the delegation of WPC were going to speak before the Committee, since he had understood that there were 13 speakers on the list for the current meeting and some 50 delegations which wished to take part in the general debate on the question of Namibia.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would hear one more speaker from the group of non-governmental organizations and that it would hold two meetings on 7 November and two others on Friday, 8 November, in order to complete the debate.

18. Mr. PETHÖ (World Peace Council) said that his organization held the Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia in high esteem because of the activities they were carrying out for the benefit of the oppressed peoples. WPC had always been in favour of the oppressed peoples of Africa. In 1966, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly had ended South Africa's Mandate for Namibia, but South Africa had not respected the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions requiring its withdrawal from Namibia.

WPC recognized SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia and considered that United Nations resolutions must be implemented, since the situation created by South Africa's refusal to respect those resolutions was a threat to the peace and security of the area and that, for that reason, severe sanctions should be applied against South Africa.

19. With regard to the African Territories under Portuguese domination, WPC welcomed Portugal's recognition of the right of those Territories to self-determination.

20. Although the independence of Guinea-Bissau and the forthcoming independence of Mozambique were promising developments, colonialism continued to fight to maintain its domination in Angola, since that Territory was very rich in oil and had large diamond, copper and uranium deposits and the imperialist Powers and the transnational corporations were therefore trying to continue to exploit them. The transformation of the former Portuguese Territories into independent countries would be the measure of Portugal's sincerity. WPC would do everything possible to assist those Territories.

21. Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed his satisfaction at the presence of the delegation of WPC and its participation in the Committee's debate. WPC was extremely important at the international level because of its struggle for peace and freedom. In view of the importance of the statements which had been made by Mr. Chandra, the Secretary-General of WPC, and which contained many suggestions that might be of great value in the elimination of colonialism, he proposed that those statements should be issued *in extenso*.

22. Mr. DOLZHINTSEREN (Mongolia) congratulated the representatives of WPC on their statements and wished them every success in their work. He stressed the importance of co-operation between the United Nations and WPC, which was an important factor in the strengthening of the unity of all the forces struggling against colonialism and racism.

23. He supported the proposal of the Syrian Arab Republic.

24. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) congratulated WPC on the activities it had undertaken to mobilize world public opinion for the strengthening of peace and security and the achievement of world détente. WPC was making untiring efforts to eliminate racism and colonialism in all their forms and manifestations and had participated outstandingly in many international conferences, in particular the International NGO Conference against Apartheid and Colonialism in Africa, held in September 1974 at Geneva. At that Conference, important decisions had been taken for the provision of special assistance to the national liberation movements, particularly those in southern Africa.

25. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the proposal of the Syrian Arab Republic, supported by Mongolia, said that the publication *in extenso* of the statement of the Secretary-General of WPC would involve costs to the United Nations of about \$225 per page.

26. Taking those costs into account, he said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to issue *in extenso* the statement by Mr. Chandra.

It was so decided.

Mr. Chandra, the Reverend John Morgan, Mr. Mäkelä and Mr. Pethö withdrew.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

27. Mr. KHALID (Pakistan) said that the Committee was considering the question of Namibia at a time when the former Portuguese empire in Africa was coming to an end. That historic development could have induced other colonial Pow-

ers to emulate the Portuguese. Unfortunately, however, South Africa had decided to react against it by increasing oppression and repression in Namibia.

28. As indicated in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (see A/9624 (vol. I)) South Africa's régime of terror in that Territory had reached new depths. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights¹ gave gruesome details of the treatment of political prisoners in Namibia. The increased repression had not, however, succeeded in reducing that people to submission. It had only served to intensify its struggle for liberation from South African occupation. SWAPO was waging a gallant struggle on the military and political fronts. The world community was under the obligation to do everything possible to put an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia. Any plan of action for that purpose must include provisions for increased assistance to the Namibian people, the total isolation of South Africa and the mobilization of world public opinion against the occupation of Namibia by the racist régime. The United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council, had to take decisive action for that purpose and do everything in their power to prevent Namibia's resources from being pillaged.

29. Among the various constructive measures taken by the United Nations Council for Namibia in the past year, he referred in particular to the plan for the establishment of an Institute for Namibia in Zambia (see A/9624/Add. I, para. 73), the formulation of a Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia (*ibid.*, para. 84), the approval of guidelines for the United Nations Fund for Namibia (*ibid.*, para. 81), Namibia's representation in various international bodies, consultations with certain Member States and the commemoration of Namibia Day at the United Nations on 26 August 1974. Pakistan fully supported the programme of action proposed by the Council in its report (A/9624 (vol. I), part three, sect. III).

30. In accordance with the provisions contained in the United Nations resolutions on Namibia, Pakistan did not maintain relations of any kind with South Africa and made regular contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII), Pakistan had celebrated Namibia Day on 26 August with a series of commemorative activities. At the Islamic Summit Conference held in February 1974 in Lahore, 38 countries had condemned South Africa's policy of *apartheid* and its illegal occupation of Namibia.

31. Since the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility for the Territory, it was in duty bound to see that the Territory did not remain under the control of the usurper. That obligation also devolved on all Member States, as the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971² had laid down. The United Nations would be able to comply with its responsibility in respect of Namibia to the extent that all Member States observed the provisions of the advisory opinion and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in that regard.

32. Pakistan appealed to the States which maintained commercial, economic, military and other ties with South Africa to change their policy. The independence of Namibia, like that of every other Territory under colonial domination, might be delayed but could never be averted.

33. Mr. KIKIĆ (Yugoslavia) congratulated SWAPO on the successes achieved in its struggle for the independence of Namibia. The Pretoria régime, which continued to violate all

¹ E/CN.4/1111.

² *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970). Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, p. 16.*

norms of international law, had not drawn the necessary conclusions from the recent changes in southern Africa after the collapse of the fascist régime in Lisbon. It continued to maintain an intransigent attitude and to seek to exact obedience through terror. At the same time, it resorted to political machinations in order to create the impression that it was making efforts to find an acceptable solution for the problems of the Territory. One of the most recent manoeuvres was its proposal for discussions to be held between the so-called population groups on the constitutional future of Namibia, a proposal categorically rejected both by SWAPO and by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

34. It seemed obvious that South Africa had no intention of putting an end to its illegal presence in Namibia. Consequently, it was the duty of the United Nations to undertake urgent and positive action to afford moral, political and material support to SWAPO and to create conditions which would bring about the freedom and independence of Namibia.

35. In point of fact, a number of United Nations organs, such as the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, the Special Committee dealing with decolonization and the United Nations Council for Namibia had already worked in that direction. The Council, for instance, had decided to establish an Institute for Namibia for the purpose of training the persons who would be called upon to administer that State when it became independent (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 73). The success of that initiative would depend, above all, on the readiness of member States to make financial contributions through the Fund for Namibia.

36. The Council had been accepted as an associate member by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and had represented Namibia at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in Caracas. It had also issued a Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia (*ibid.*, para. 84), which it was hoped Member States would respect, thus accelerating the solution of the problem of the Territory. Yugoslavia appealed especially to those countries which had investments in Namibia to cease all their activities in the Territory.

37. The assistance furnished by SWAPO to the United Nations Council for Namibia had been invaluable. It was imperative that SWAPO, which had been designated by both the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) as the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, should be enabled to discharge in an appropriate manner and on a continuing basis its representational activities and it would therefore be appropriate to grant it financial assistance.

38. In that regard, mention must be made of the uncooperative attitude of certain permanent members of the Security Council towards United Nations activities directed at the liberation of Namibia. The events in the session of the Security Council which had examined the relationship between South Africa and the United Nations could be adduced as an example. The position of the three permanent members of the Security Council who had opposed expulsion amounted to recognition of the right of the reactionary régime in South Africa to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia, its policy of *apartheid* and direct intervention in Southern Rhodesia. Nevertheless, despite that, the days of colonialism in southern Africa were numbered and the struggle of the peoples for self-determination and independence would very soon be successful. Africa as a whole, and Namibia in particular, would continue to enjoy the full moral, political and material support of Yugoslavia.

39. Mr. LUDWIKOWSKI (Poland) felt that despite the fact that United Nations bodies had considered the question of Namibia year after year, and despite copious documentation on the question and the numerous resolutions adopted on it,

the situation in Namibia had not improved. The racist and minority régime of South Africa persisted in its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia, defying the will and authority of the United Nations. The South African régime not only continued to transplant the brutal system of *apartheid* to the international Territory, with all the repressive practices it involved, but also had recently intensified its reign of terror. That situation prevailed in spite of the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971, which had ruled that South Africa had an obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory.

40. In view of the total unwillingness of South Africa to respect the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence, their only alternative was to continue their legitimate struggle, including armed struggle. His delegation wished to pay tribute to the people of Namibia who, under the leadership of SWAPO, continued to struggle against the occupation of their own country by the racist, fascist and minority régime in Pretoria.

41. The Polish People's Republic unswervingly supported the struggle of the Namibian people, for reasons arising both out of its socialist ideology and its historical experience. As a country which had undergone an extremely painful experience during the Second World War, when it had had to struggle not only for its independent existence but also for its biological survival, threatened by the policy of genocide pursued by German fascism, Poland understood very well the meaning of oppression and foreign occupation. Accordingly, like many other States which volunteered assistance to the Namibian people, Poland, together with the socialist countries and other progressive States, was consistent in its solidarity with the national liberation movement in Namibia. His delegation wished to express its satisfaction that the solidarity of world public opinion with the people of Namibia was finding stronger expression in various international bodies, and in international forums organized by non-governmental organizations. It wished to draw attention to the useful work carried out by WPC. The dissemination of information on the question of Namibia was an important factor in the support for the Namibian people. The tragedy of the people of Namibia must be known to all and, in particular, to the younger generation. As the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party had said during the current session of the General Assembly (2264th plenary meeting), Poland considered it an obligation to overcome prejudice, distrust, intolerance, chauvinism and racism; that ideal had become an essential element in its educational system. Furthermore, the mass information media publicized the events relating to the struggle against colonialism, racism and *apartheid*, as well as the question of Namibia, and his delegation felt that its practice should be followed in all States.

42. The persistent violations by the Vorster régime of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations had been strongly condemned. Nevertheless, responsibility for the situation in Namibia, including the plunder of its resources, also devolved upon the allies of South Africa who, by their deliveries of arms and the intensification of their economic activities in the Territory, bolstered South Africa's policies. Stronger urging was necessary to persuade the States allied with South Africa to desist from those dealings. The United Nations must discharge its duty to assist the people of Namibia so that they might exercise their right to freedom and independence in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

43. Mr. BELEN (Turkey) felt that there were grounds for optimism regarding the future of the Namibian people, since there was reason to believe that the twenty-ninth session of

the General Assembly would offer them the greatest promise. The current year had been the most important in the history of decolonization, since, with the independence of Guinea-Bissau and the commitment entered into by the new Government of Portugal concerning self-determination for Mozambique and Angola, there remained only two vestiges of the colonial era in southern Africa, namely, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. The situation of the latter Territory, however, was a peculiar one. Despite resolutions by the General Assembly and the Security Council and the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971, Namibia was still subject to the control of South Africa, in flagrant disregard of the United Nations. The United Nations had done everything possible to achieve a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. For instance, in 1972, in its resolution 309 (1972), the Security Council had authorized the Secretary-General to establish contacts with the Government of South Africa. The racist leaders of South Africa, however, had tried to stand in the way of the wish of the Namibian people to rule themselves, even by intensifying their repressive policy at the very time when the contacts were taking place. The results had clearly shown the impossibility of reaching an understanding with a Government which persisted in its policy of *apartheid* and illegal occupation. For that reason, the United Nations Council for Namibia had recommended during the previous year that those contacts should be broken off and, for the same reason, the Security Council had decided, in its resolution 342 (1973), not to proceed with the proposals in its resolution 309 (1972). Since that time, the conflict had been intensified between the Namibian people and the Government of South Africa. The conflict was also between an illegal Government and the United Nations, which was more than ever determined to secure respect for its principles and ideals.

44. The annual reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee contained specific documentary information on the cruel methods of repression applied in Namibia. However, the Namibian people were resolutely continuing their struggle for freedom and, accordingly, he wished to pay tribute to SWAPO for its determination and courage in its fight for independence, which Turkey whole-heartedly supported.

45. As a founding member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Turkey was determined to do its utmost to speed up the irreversible process of the decolonization of Namibia. To that end, it was necessary for all States to comply strictly with the resolutions and appeals of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In addition, the financial contributions of Member States to the United Nations Fund for Namibia and to the Institute for Namibia to be established at Lusaka would facilitate the Namibian people's transition from the liberation struggle to an independent State.

46. His Government categorically denied a report that had appeared in a press release of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in Washington on 30 September, according to which Turkey had agreed to form part of a group within the Fund together with South Africa and Spain. He officially stated that his Government had never considered, and would never consider, co-operating with the racist, illegal Government of South Africa, with which it maintained no diplomatic, economic or commercial relations.

47. Mr. GOSWAMI (India) reiterated his Government's rejection of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the white racist régime of South Africa. However, time was on the side of the people of Namibia, and it was therefore necessary to consider the ways and means of helping them to prepare to administer their country once independence was achieved. For that reason, India attached particular importance to the part of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia concerning the Institute for Namibia (A/9624/Add.1, paras. 63-74). In

that connexion, his delegation wished to express its appreciation for the energy and initiative shown by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. It might be a good idea to adopt measures to enable the Commissioner to submit a report on the work of the proposed Institute. It was to be hoped that the Commissioner would be able to proceed immediately with the establishment of the Institute.

48. The adoption by the United Nations Council for Namibia of the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia (*ibid.*, para. 84) was a major historical event, and represented an important international precedent. He expressed the hope that the States Members of the United Nations would seek to ensure that the provisions of the Decree would be fully applied in their respective countries.

49. Considering that the Commissioner had taken up his post in February 1974, the increase in publicity on the subject of, and interest in, Namibia had been quite remarkable. Moreover, the Commissioner had discussed the cause of Namibia with most European and African Governments and many international organizations, both governmental and non-governmental. There was a need to consider ways and means to establish more co-ordinated methods of work and communication between the Commissioner's office and the Council. While the Commissioner was the chief executive of the Council under the relevant General Assembly resolutions, the secretariat of the Council seemed to operate as a separate unit. The Commissioner, who had the rank of Assistant Secretary-General, should play a more important role in the work of the secretariat of the Council. It seemed uneconomical and inefficient that the office of the secretariat of the Council and that of the Commissioner should work as two units. His delegation suggested that the Commissioner should be requested to indicate to the Committee the steps which should be taken to rationalize the work of those two offices, to ensure closer and more efficient co-operation and to eliminate unnecessary overlapping. It had been rightly stressed that SWAPO was the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, and it should therefore have the responsibility of representing Namibia at conferences of international organizations in which Namibia had the right to participate.

50. SWAPO had proposed that whenever Namibia was to be represented at an international conference or in a specialized agency or any other international organization, preference should be given to the appointment of a Namibian. Where no Namibian was available, preference should be given to a citizen from a friendly neighbouring African country. In no case should a person or persons be nominated to represent Namibia without prior consultation with SWAPO. SWAPO requested the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to make every effort to ensure compliance with the foregoing.

51. By sheer force of circumstances, Namibia would be independent in the very near future. His delegation therefore recommended that the Committee and the United Nations Council for Namibia should concentrate on the needs of an independent Namibia. Namibians should be prepared for undertaking research, training, planning and related activities, not only with reference to the struggle for the freedom of their country, but also to the establishment of an independent State. India had in the past helped peoples under colonial domination and the emerging independent countries to train experienced administrative personnel. His delegation had offered its help at the International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa, held at Oslo in April 1973, and India would give serious consideration to any request from the people of Namibia in that connexion.

52. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said that his delegation expected rapid progress to be made towards independence for

Mozambique and Angola. It consequently hoped that the international community would give increasing attention to the democratization and decolonization of Zimbabwe and Namibia. It might be necessary for the United Nations to focus on one Territory first, in the knowledge that success in either would encourage and assist the other. The sustained denunciation of South Africa's policies and the challenge to its position in the United Nations could point the way for the international community. A successful push against South Africa's position in Namibia would be in line with the United Nations rightful claim to administer the Territory pending independence, would contribute significantly to decolonization in southern Africa and would give the people of Namibia freedom, bringing the collapse of the racist system in South Africa closer. South Africa's refusal to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia and to co-operate with the United Nations in enabling the people of Namibia to attain independence was one of the main planks of the recommendation made in the Security Council, and supported by his delegation, for immediate expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations in compliance with Article 6 of the Charter.³ The fact that it had been rejected gave added urgency and importance to the Committee's work on the item before it.

53. The United Nations Council for Namibia had recently noted the coincidence between the political manoeuvring of the South African authorities concerning the supposed political and constitutional evolution of the Territory on the one hand, and the strength of international pressure in South Africa on the other hand. The South African Government insisted that relations between the various population groups in South West Africa were continuing to improve. If that was so, it was surprising that the year had begun with a wave of political arrests and had continued with a considerable exodus of Namibians to Angola and Zambia. Important changes had occurred in the military situation as a result of the constructive new policies of the Government of Portugal. Namibia had become the buffer between Angola and South Africa and attempts were being made to recruit Ovambos for border militia to operate against SWAPO forces. Police units in the Territory had been replaced by army detachments, particularly in the Caprivi district. The scale and nature of military activity in the Caprivi Strip gave cause for concern, and reports that napalm and incendiary weapons had been used against SWAPO activities in the area warranted international investigation.

54. Some encouraging changes had taken place in the business and investment field including a loss of confidence by both South African and foreign business interests. However, further progress would not be achieved if foreign investment was to follow the path of South African investment. South Africa's exploitation of the Namibian uranium deposits was an example of the inroads being made on the national inheritance of the Namibian people. South Africa had not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex), yet it was extracting ore from the Rössing uranium mine to be treated in South Africa by the Nuclear Fuel Corporation. Furthermore, there were suggestions that South Africa intended to develop its nuclear technology and the export of enriched nuclear materials to the point where they would rival gold as a major foreign exchange earner. The Rössing uranium reserves were estimated to contain one sixth of the cumulative world demand until 1985. South Africa's action was a flagrant violation of the principle of permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources and offered a dismaying insight into the pre-conditions South Africa had in mind for self-determination in the Territory.

55. As well as current developments, it was important to bear in mind the every-day lives of Namibians under South Africa's iniquitous policies. The contract labour system had disrupted family life throughout South Africa and was one of the essential elements of *apartheid* in Namibia. It provided cheap labour for the economy and discouraged black families from settling in the main employment areas, relegating them to the 'homelands'. In the political field, there were corresponding punitive provisions of an extraordinarily repressive nature. All gatherings, meetings and assemblies were prohibited, with the exception of sports gatherings, church services, statutory meetings or meetings called by heads of *kraals*, unless authorized in writing by the native commissioner. Individuals could be banned from authorized meetings. It was an offence to say or do anything which might undermine the authority of the State, the local government, officials of government bodies or a chief or headman, or to make an intimidating statement. However, it was an offence to boycott an approved meeting called by an official, chief or headman or to fail to obey any lawful order given by a chief or headman or to treat him with disrespect. Provision was made in the regulations for public flogging. The South African Minister of Justice had full powers over individual mobility and could forbid people to enter, remain or leave their 'homeland' or any part of it. There could be no stay of orders given under the regulations, nor could civil or criminal actions be instituted against those who carried them out or against the State. Persons suspected of committing an offence, intending to do so or having information concerning an offence could be arrested without a warrant and detained until the authorities were satisfied that all questions had been truthfully answered. Detainees could not consult legal advisers unless they obtained special permission.

56. In such conditions, it was hardly surprising that a Namibian national liberation movement should exist or that the South Africans should try to remove any evidence of resistance to their forceful occupation of the Territory. It was well known that over 300 arrests of leaders and supporters of SWAPO had been made at the beginning of 1974, most of them charged only with not being in immediate possession of residence permits or valid travel documents. The illegality of the arrests had become increasingly apparent and illustrated South Africa's fear of the legitimate political activities of SWAPO in Namibia. Early in 1974, his delegation had been concerned at the escalation of repression following the Security Council's decision to discontinue contact with the South African Government. His Government had therefore decided to employ its continuing diplomatic relationship with South Africa to attempt to reduce the risks to Namibian patriots and politicians. Accordingly, in mid-March, the Australian Ambassador to South Africa had lodged a protest with the South African authorities concerning the recent arrests which, in the Australian Government's view, were a serious breach of the understanding given by the Government of South Africa to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In that context, he added that Member States should not agree to accept such undertakings on a unilateral basis in the future, unless the United Nations envisaged a suitably serious response in the event of a breach of faith by South Africa. The detainees of January and February had subsequently been released, with the exception of Mr. David Meroro, the National Chairman of SWAPO. Australian and other diplomats were following the prosecution of the national leader, whose trial had recently been postponed until 13 January 1975.

57. Australia had sought to give practical expression to the views expressed by its Minister for Foreign Affairs on Namibia Day on 26 August 1974, through a contribution of \$A 5,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, \$A 5,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, \$A 15,000 for the United Nations Educational and Training Programme

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

for Southern Africa and \$A 150,000 for humanitarian aid in the current financial year to African liberation movements recognized by OAU.

58. Australia had no material interests in Namibia and there was no evidence of any private Australian investment in the Territory. Normal economic relations had been allowed to continue with South Africa, but, in the past year, the Australian Government had discontinued all official promotion of trade and investment there. Obviously, there was no question of Australia trading in arms or military equipment with South Africa. Since early 1974, Australia had discontinued officially sponsored trade missions, trade displays, exhibitions and fairs. The Australian Government had recently announced that it had approached the leaders of Australian corporations with subsidiaries or associate companies in South Africa concerning the adoption of improved standards of pay and conditions of work for their non-white employees in South Africa. As the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs had pointed out, such action showed his Government's concern that Australian companies might inadvertently be bolstering up the *apartheid* system by relying on the discriminatory labour laws against non-whites in South Africa.

59. In terms of economic policy, the ultimate action of the United Nations to force South Africa to comply with the universal decision that it should withdraw from Namibia would be the imposition of economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. His Government would support any decision to that effect in the United Nations, provided that the sanctions were also observed by South Africa's major trading partners.

60. He had been pleased to act as spokesman for the Special Committee at the meeting commemorating Namibia Day on 26 August 1974. All members of the Special Committee were agreed that South Africa's continued abuse of Namibia was a critical challenge to the authority and prestige of the United Nations and that the commitment of the United Nations to justice was nowhere more evident than in the case of an international Territory for which all Members shared responsibility. The United Nations was confronted not only with the policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* but also with the illegal occupation of an international Territory by a country which was still a Member of the United Nations, in open defiance of the authority of the Security Council, the resolutions of the General Assembly and the wishes of the Namibian people themselves. Perhaps what united Members most was their common concern over the general manifestation of South Africa's appalling pretensions to white supremacy. His delegation had therefore joined with other delegations in the Special Committee in calling on all Member States to pledge their full and continuing support for the people of Namibia in their resistance to the repression inflicted upon them by South Africa. His delegation had no doubt about the ultimate out-

come of their resistance. The only question was what price South Africans placed on peace and whether they were prepared to find themselves commonly outlawed.

61. The basic tenet of Australian national policy was that South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia must be terminated forthwith and that Australia would join in any responsible action to oust that presence and allow the Namibian people to come to independence as a unified nation. Conversely, the Australian Government would avoid taking any action which could further entrench the illegal occupation of the Territory or give recognition to the Government of South Africa in its claims to act on behalf of Namibia.

62. It might be decided that there was scope for renewed action in the Security Council, in which case his delegation would seek to play a constructive role in the adoption of measures which could reinforce the authority of the United Nations. In the United Nations Council for Namibia there was considerable scope for continuing the work recently undertaken to provide for Namibia's future as an independent country, particularly with regard to the operating and funding of the Institute for Namibia at Lusaka, which would help to prepare future Namibian administrators for the task of running their own country. His delegation commended Zambia's generous co-operation and the arrangements made for Namibia to be represented by its own people and their interim agents in the United Nations Council for Namibia in a number of important international bodies and conferences. The Australian Government recognized without qualification travel and identity documents issued by the Council.

63. The representative of Finland had stated at the 2103rd meeting that his Government was ready to join the United Nations Council for Namibia and Australia whole-heartedly supported Finland's candidacy. He stressed that there was no question of rivalry between Australia and Finland on the matter; their candidacies were complementary and co-operative and in no sense competitive. His delegation felt that Australia's recent experience in transferring authority and preparing for independence in its own colony could be of some assistance to Namibia. In any event, Australia was willing to serve Namibia through the Council if that was acceptable to the United Nations.

64. He paid tribute to the representatives of SWAPO for their contribution to the Committee's consideration of the item and their work in Namibia. He also congratulated the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia on winning the Nobel Peace Prize and commended him for his dedicated work throughout the year. The United Nations must plan for Namibia's imminent emergence as an independent country in a practical way and must make it impossible for South Africa to plan otherwise with impunity.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.