

2105th meeting

Tuesday, 5 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Buyantyn DASHTSEREN (Mongolia).

A/C.4/SR.2105

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

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/Add.4, A/C.4/L.1066)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

1. Mr. SCARABÔTOLO (Brazil) said that his delegation had been one of the most staunch defenders of the inalienable rights of the majority of the Namibian people to self-determination and self-government since the question had first been introduced in the Committee. It had been one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the Assembly had, *inter alia*, established the *Ad Hoc* Committee for South West Africa, and it had consistently condemned the ruthlessness with which South Africa had imposed its will on the people of Namibia in violation of the Mandate entrusted to it. The international status of Namibia, which had been confirmed by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,¹ could not be abolished by unilateral action on the part of South Africa.

2. In spite of the continuing efforts of the United Nations to bring about a peaceful and reasonable settlement, the situation in Namibia was deteriorating because of South Africa's refusal to abide by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). The question of Namibia was closely linked to that of Southern Rhodesia in that both had their origin in illegality. The régimes governing both Territories used similar methods to perpetuate their rule, as was clearly shown in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9624 (vol. I), A/9624 (vol. II) and A/9624/Add.1) and chapters VIII and IX 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/Add.2 and 3), dealing with Southern Rhodesia and Namibia respectively. Those documents showed that, since the termination of contacts between the Secretary-General and the South African Government, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII) and Security Council resolution 342 (1973), the illegal South African administration was attempting to strengthen its position through fragmentation of the Territory of Namibia, repression and intimidation of the African population and replacement of local police units by units of the South African army. The illegal Smith régime had been using parallel methods in Southern Rhodesia since the unilateral declaration of independence. Both illegal régimes pursued the same objectives, namely, the establishment and entrenchment of white supremacy in both Territories and the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia and Zimbabwe for the benefit of the white minorities.

3. His delegation rejected the recent statement by the so-called Executive of the white National Party of South West

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.*

Africa (A/9775-S/11519, annex) offering to undertake discussions on the constitutional development of Namibia as merely another attempt to maintain white South African supremacy in that Territory. His Government welcomed the Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 84) and had decided to make a concrete contribution to the United Nations Fund for Namibia to finance the Institute for Namibia recently established by the Council (*ibid.*, para. 73).

4. The national liberation movements in Zimbabwe and Namibia had no alternative but to resort to armed struggle in order to achieve independence and self-determination for their peoples. The situation in southern Africa constituted a grave threat to the moral authority and credibility of the United Nations. That situation could be solved only through independence with majority rule in Southern Rhodesia and the immediate termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia.

5. Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that for over 25 years the United Nations and the international community had endeavoured to persuade the racist régime in South Africa to leave Namibia and to abide by the principles of justice, international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the clear ruling of the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 had failed to persuade that régime to change its policy of obstinacy and arrogance, which was a challenge to the prestige of the United Nations. The support it received from world Zionism and certain major Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, enabled the minority régime in South Africa to continue its occupation of Namibia and its suppression of the majority native population by repressive measures. The situation could deteriorate and become violent if United Nations resolutions aimed at achieving a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia were not implemented.

6. Chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee and the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia provided evidence of increased arbitrary, repressive, terrorist, *apartheid* measures against the people of Namibia, which forced many of them to flee for refuge to neighbouring countries. The reports also mentioned that more than 20 major corporations were engaged in the exploitation of the mineral and other natural resources of Namibia.

7. The complicity between the racists and Israel was well known. Capitalist Zionist investments were employed in the pillage of the natural resources of Namibia. The reciprocal diplomatic representation of Israel and South Africa had been raised to ambassadorial level and chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee contained evidence of increased collaboration between the two countries in military, economic, trade and other areas.

8. Mr. GANOR (Israel), intervening on a point of order, said that the remarks of the Syrian representative were extraneous to the item under consideration.

9. Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic), proceeding with his statement, invited the members of the Committee to refer to documents of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* dealing with relations between South Africa and Israel,² which fur-

² A/AC.115/L.383, A/AC.115/L.389 and 390 and A/AC.115/L.393.

nished proof of his allegations. The relationship between Zionism and *apartheid* was a natural one, since both were racist. The unholy alliance between the two Governments was indicative of their intention to trample on international opinion. Zionist news media condemned nazism but Israel supported the neo-Nazi régime in Pretoria.

10. His delegation had always advocated the peaceful settlement of international problems. The United Nations, which had been entrusted with the maintenance of international peace under the Charter, had established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer that Territory and to induce the South African Government to implement United Nations resolutions. However, it could not fulfil its task or bring pressure to bear on the South African Government while Western and Zionist monopolies continued to co-operate with that régime. Nor could the Council fulfil its role while major Powers adopted a hostile and unco-operative attitude to United Nations attempts to liberate Namibia. The liberation of Namibia called for the adoption of strong measures and sanctions against the South African Government in accordance with chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The Namibian people had suffered much and had the right to use all means to obtain their freedom. They deserved the support of the international community and he invited United Nations organs and the specialized agencies to assist them in their struggle for independence. His country, which was also fighting racism, pledged its support to the people of Namibia and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) until victory was achieved.

11. Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia) said that the statements of the representatives of SWAPO at the 2100th and 2103rd meetings were a reminder to the Committee of the urgent need to appeal to the Government of South Africa to discontinue its practices of torture. On the basis of those statements, his delegation also appealed to countries that still co-operated with South Africa in the Territory to discontinue that co-operation, which reinforced the illegal occupation of Namibia.

12. The proposal by the South African Government for talks on the constitutional future of Namibia was part of a persistent pattern intended to mislead world public opinion. The South African Government had never been prepared to negotiate in good faith to implement the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, and there was no evidence that it was prepared to change that pattern. On the contrary, South Africa in the past 12 months had given every indication that it intended to continue those policies, which had justly earned the condemnation of the international community. The measures of repression taken by the illegal régime fully demonstrated its contempt for the Namibian people's efforts to exercise its inalienable rights to self-determination. The institution of such barbarous penalties as public flogging showed the illegal régime's inhumanity and its fear of the resistance which the people were mounting. The spearhead of that resistance had been provided by the freedom fighters of SWAPO, whose increasingly effective action had resulted in the replacement of police units by army units as the Pretoria Government continued its ultimately futile attempts to eradicate indigenous resistance to its colonialist and racist policies.

13. There was also a concerted effort by South Africa to exploit the economic sector of Namibian society. As stated in chapter IV of the report of the Special Committee, Namibia could be considered as the most exploited Territory in history, because at least one third of its gross national product was exported as profits by foreign mining companies (see A/9623 (part V), annex, appendix IV, para. 7). The extent of that type of exploitation became apparent when the meaning of such activities was examined in terms of the valuable, irreplaceable resources that were the rightful heritage of the Namibian people. As the representative of the Netherlands

had noted in his statement at the 2102nd meeting, the racist régime was undoubtedly following a concerted policy of stripping the Territory of as much of its non-renewable resources as it could in as short a time as possible. The Decree on the Natural Resources of Namibia adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 84) forbade such exploitation and was intended to prevent it and to penalize those who attempted to continue such exploitation. The policy of exploitation was also being pursued by South Africa to provide itself with sorely needed raw materials for its own industrial and military development. Unfortunately, that programme carried the additional threat of a future nuclear-armed South Africa. Even more ominous, however, was the attempt to bind Namibia to South Africa with economic chains when the political chains were weakening. As the Committee and the General Assembly had often made clear, economic colonialism was no more acceptable to the international community than any other kind.

14. It was therefore more urgent than ever for the United Nations to take effective action to assist the indigenous inhabitants of the Territory in their struggle. In that connexion, the establishment of the Institute for Namibia offered an opportunity to provide assistance to all who desired to aid the Namibian people. The purpose of the Institute was to enable Namibians to undertake research, training, planning and related activities with special reference to the struggle for freedom of the Namibians and the establishment of an independent State of Namibia. His delegation wished to express its appreciation to the Government of the Republic of Zambia for providing a temporary home for the Institute until it could be transferred to Namibia itself. The Institute would provide young Namibians with the means of carrying out the struggle. That was most important in view of the fact that many talented Namibians, if left without opportunities to exercise their talents in the service of their people, might well be tempted to go elsewhere. By extending their assistance to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Fund for Namibia through the Institute, members of the international community would be affirming, in a concrete manner, their commitment to the ideals of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). That assistance need not take the form of monetary contributions alone: technical advice, the services of skilled personnel as teachers or researchers and other contributions in kind would also be most useful and welcome.

15. During the past year, the Council had made extensive efforts to carry its work to new areas and to disseminate information on its purposes as widely as possible. To that end, Indonesia had participated in missions undertaken by the Council and was particularly pleased that the Council had obtained the formal assurance of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that it would accept and abide by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 (see A/9624 (vol. II), annex VI, paras. 22 and 23).

16. His delegation was also pleased with the continued close co-operation between the Council and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Special Committee and the specialized agencies. Paramount among those co-operative efforts had been the drive to secure representation of Namibia in relevant meetings of the specialized agencies and other United Nations institutions. That effort had met with some success in the past year and it was hoped that the well co-ordinated efforts of the entire international community would continue in order to eradicate colonialism and racialism in Namibia.

17. Finally, his delegation warmly welcomed the intention of Finland to become a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

18. Mr. DORJI (Bhutan) wished to reaffirm his delegation's positive attitude towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It regretted, however, that the United Nations Council for Namibia had not been able to enter and take over the administration of the Territory, where, according to the Secretary-General's introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (A/9601/Add.1), conditions continued to deteriorate. That gloomy picture showed that the efforts of the United Nations system had not yet yielded fruitful results in securing self-determination and independence for the people of Namibia. His delegation deplored the continuing negative attitude of the white racist Government of South Africa, which continued to defy the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Failure of that Government to transfer authority over Namibia to the United Nations, without further delay, would impose a serious threat to international peace and security. His delegation regretted that Security Council resolution 276 (1970) was still being violated. All Member States must adhere to the decisions of the United Nations in order to create a peaceful and favourable environment in Namibia.

19. Bhutan wished to pay a tribute to the freedom fighters of Namibia and pledged its support of their legitimate struggle. While his delegation upheld the views and suggestions contained in the documents under consideration, his delegation, with respect to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, regretted that Bhutan could at present extend only moral support to the liberation movement of Namibia for the attainment of the people's legitimate rights. Although it was not in a position to render financial and material assistance at the present time, it looked forward, however, to seeing the speedy independence of Namibia and its legitimate representatives seated at the United Nations.

20. Mr. KENNEDY (Ireland) said that his delegation wished to pay a tribute to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Seán MacBride, for his long and brilliant record as an international lawyer, experienced and skilled diplomat and recent winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.

21. The statements by the representatives of SWAPO at the 2100th and 2103rd meetings confirmed the Secretary-General's statement in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization (*ibid.*) that conditions continued to deteriorate in Namibia. The obstinacy of the South African Government in the face of successive appeals from the United Nations was a matter of grave concern because it threatened to provoke a violent reaction that would seriously endanger international peace. The legal position of Namibia had been clearly established by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 and by the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. South Africa was extending its laws, including such repressive legislation as the *apartheid* laws, into the Territory. The use of such unacceptable methods as mass imprisonment of dissidents, outlawing of workers' strikes, and even public floggings, deprived the local population of the right to free expression, self-reliance and fundamental human rights. Yet the South African Government maintained that it recognized the international status of Namibia. All would agree at the present stage that much clearer evidence of that recognition was needed, particularly since all evidence in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9624 (vol. I), A/9624 (vol. II) and A/9624/Add.1) was to the contrary.

22. His delegation deplored the fact that the fraudulent "homelands" or Bantustanization policy had been extended to Namibia. Its effect was to partition the Territory and thus erode its territorial integrity and prevent the native population from effectively participating in the affairs of the Territory as a whole. Furthermore, there had been numerous reports of

suppression of political activities of the native population, destruction of trade union activity, curtailment of freedom of movement and control of the press. All that seemed to indicate a desire on the part of the South African authorities to suppress aspirations towards self-determination or freedom of political expression among the Namibian people. His delegation still hoped that the Government of South Africa would heed the overwhelming opinion of nations and peoples throughout the world to begin soon the process of restoring the Territory of Namibia to its rightful owners and to respect the decisions of the United Nations in whose care the Territory had been placed as a sacred trust. It would be dangerous to delay that process too long because the sounds from Namibia were the ominous drumbeat of deep-felt discontent.

23. The rapid liberation of the Portuguese-occupied Territories had pointed the way to future progress in Southern Rhodesia and Namibia and the attitude of the new Portuguese Government should be an encouraging example to the Government of South Africa. Recent developments in the Portuguese Territories should also be a lesson to South Africa that the tide of progress could not be held back indefinitely. Although there were signs that South Africa recognized that Namibia could not be simply annexed, more than vague long-term promises were needed. There should be genuine negotiations between the South African Government and the real representative of the people—SWAPO—leading to nationwide elections and independence under the aegis of the United Nations. That, rather than the suggested negotiations between the South African Government and its nominated Bantustan leaders, was the real path to freedom.

24. His delegation welcomed the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to provide facilities for essential training for the free Namibians of the future and, in that connexion, Ireland was happy to contribute to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. The imaginative plans of the Commissioner for the Institute for Namibia at Lusaka (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 73) should also be commended. The free Namibians of the future, because of the deplorable system into which they had been born, would need all the education, training and experience that they could obtain in order to take on the burdens of self-government.

25. His delegation wished to repeat its view that the way to peace and progress in southern Africa was not through violent confrontation based on race but through the restoration of justice, human rights and self-determination. In that connexion, his delegation welcomed the constructive statement made at the University of Zambia on 26 October by the President of Zambia, Dr. Kaunda, to the effect that opposition to South Africa was not based on colour but rather on its deplorable system. At that late hour in the tragic history of Namibia, he hoped that the voice of reason and conciliation would be heard not only in the United Nations but in South Africa itself.

26. Mr. VLASCEANU (Romania) welcomed the participation of the SWAPO delegation, as the authentic representative of the Namibian people, in the Committee's work and assured it of Romania's militant solidarity with the struggle being waged by Namibia for freedom and national independence. In the light of the new conditions created by the positive developments in the Territories under Portuguese administration and the intensification of the liberation struggle in Namibia, his delegation was ready to co-operate in determining the speediest way of putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

27. Namibia was a classic colonial case and the irreconcilable confrontation between the Namibian people and the South African régime made the immediate implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples essential. In violation of the unanimously recognized principle of the sacred right of every peo-

ple to decide its own economic and social development in accordance with its national aspirations, South Africa continued its illegal occupation of Namibia and, year by year, consolidated its illegal administration, extended to Namibia its hateful policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, and pursued a policy of annexation which undermined the national unity of the Namibian people and the territorial integrity of Namibia. It continued to establish Bantustans and puppet administrations, to adopt legislation regarding Namibia and, as the SWAPO representative had shown, to pursue its efforts to suppress the national liberation struggle. The repressive measures had been intensified following the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, at which SWAPO had been recognized as the authentic representative of the Namibian people (General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII)), and following the recent developments in the Territories under Portuguese administration; that accounted for the recent exodus of Namibians via Angola. Under the circumstances, it was easy to understand why the Namibian people had resorted to the only means available to them, namely, armed struggle, which would lead to the eventual defeat of colonialism in southern Africa. It was the duty of the United Nations and of all Member States to support the struggle for independence in Namibia.

28. The United Nations must act more decisively to discharge its responsibilities towards Namibia. The South African régime, ignoring recent debates in the Security Council on the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa, and fearing the consequences of the recent achievements of the national liberation struggle in southern Africa, sought to strengthen its domination over Namibia, with the support of certain Powers which wished to protect their interests in Namibia. Such a situation represented a flagrant violation of international legality and, if it continued for long, would become a grave threat to international peace and security.

29. The United Nations should work out a practical plan of action, utilizing all the relevant provisions of the Charter, to ensure that the illegal occupation of Namibia was speedily terminated and the necessary conditions created for the independent development of Namibia. In that connexion, his delegation fully supported the legitimate request of SWAPO that the Security Council should consider the question of Namibia as a whole with a view to finding an immediate solution. It was now imperative for the Security Council, in full agreement with General Assembly resolutions on Namibia, to take decisive steps to put an end to the explosive situation because South Africa was seeking to confuse international public opinion about its real intentions by disseminating reports that it had adopted a new policy towards Namibia. An example of that was the statement issued by the Executive of the so-called National Party of South West Africa regarding the Territory's future pattern of constitutional development (A/9775-S/11519, annex), a statement which had been rejected by SWAPO and the Namibian people, as well as by the United Nations.

30. The ideas disseminated by South Africa were pure propaganda, as was shown by the steps that it had taken to strengthen its military presence in Namibia, especially along the frontier with Angola. Such action should not escape the notice of the Security Council; the latter should also pay special attention to the increasing role of foreign economic interests in Namibia, which seriously impeded the Territory's progress towards independence.

31. All Member States should increase their political and material assistance to the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement and intensify their efforts to gain membership of the specialized agencies for Namibia and to work out concrete programmes of assistance for the Territory. The legislative activities of the United Nations Council

for Namibia regarding the preservation of the Territory's natural resources in the interests of its people, and increased participation by the Namibian people and its liberation movement in the activities of the Council and other United Nations bodies should also be intensified.

32. In that connexion, his delegation fully supported the action taken by the Council regarding the establishment of the Institute for Namibia, as well as the Council's decision regarding the establishment and financing of the SWAPO mission in New York (see A/9624/Add.1, para. 81), which would enable SWAPO to take part in all relevant activities at the international level. His delegation was ready to co-operate in the adoption of any other measures by the United Nations with a view to the discharge of its responsibilities with regard to Namibia.

33. The people of Romania, together with all other progressive forces, were taking an active part in the struggle to sweep away the vestiges of colonialism and neo-colonialism. As the President of Romania had stressed during his meetings with representatives of the national liberation movements, when the Mission of the United Council for Namibia had visited Bucharest in May 1974, Romania resolutely supported the people in their struggle for national liberation, political, economic and social development, and the elimination of colonial domination in the African continent.

34. Romania strongly condemned the manoeuvres of the racist régime in Pretoria, which were designed to undermine the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, and actively supported the political and material struggle of the Namibian people and its legitimate request that Namibia should develop as a united and independent State. As indicated in the joint communiqué issued at Bucharest in 1973 by Romania and SWAPO (see A/9624 (vol. II), para. 38), Romania would continue to grant decisive support to the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people.

35. Mr. APALOO (Togo) expressed his delegation's solidarity with the people of Namibia, who were in the forefront of the colonial struggle, and welcomed the participation of their representatives, the leaders of SWAPO, in the work of the Committee. No one could remain indifferent to the accounts that they had given in the Committee at the 2103rd meeting of events in Namibia, or to the descriptions in chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9623/Add.3).

36. The situation in Namibia was both tragic and explosive. It was tragic for the Namibians themselves, in that it arose from the inhuman policy of oppression, repression and suppression pursued by the illegal régime, which responded to the legitimate aspiration of the people of the Territory for freedom with barbarous acts of cruelty. The people of Togo, having waged their own liberation struggle, well understood the sufferings endured by the Namibians at the hands of their oppressors. The mass repression, arrests and other acts of intimidation even surpassed the methods to which the Nazis had resorted during the Second World War.

37. Yet, in order to maintain its domination, South Africa found that repression and torture did not suffice: in its policy of "divide and rule", it resorted to Bantustanization, setting one group of Africans against another on the pretext that that action was taken by the traditional authorities. His delegation strongly condemned that policy. Yet the time would come when the oppressors would suffer more than their victims. The people of Namibia cried out to the international community and to the United Nations, which had become directly responsible for their destiny.

38. The simple reason for the sufferings of the Namibians was that Namibia possessed abundant mineral resources and cheap labour and offered a fabulous return on capital. The international community must put an immediate stop to the

international plundering of Namibia. The countries of Africa, for their part, must become increasingly committed to the liberation of their brothers in Namibia.

39. The situation in Namibia was also explosive in that it posed a threat to international peace and security. The three permanent members of the Security Council, which had at the 1808th meeting of the Council on 30 October exercised their veto in the move to expel South Africa from the United Nations, should be given the special task of convincing South Africa of the need for a speedy withdrawal from Namibia and for the immediate release of political prisoners.

40. In the meantime, his delegation wished to suggest some measures that could be taken. First, since South Africa would respond only to armed force, the provision of material and moral aid to the liberation movement by all countries was essential if SWAPO was to succeed in its struggle. Secondly, a training programme for Namibians must be drawn up to enable the greatest possible number to study in other countries; it was clear that the African countries which the United Nations Council for Namibia had contacted would respond favourably to such a step. Thirdly, there was an overriding need for a public information programme directed towards the Namibian people; for that reason his delegation warmly welcomed the broadcasts of the Voice of Namibia and the publication of the *Namibia Bulletin*—projects undertaken by the Council. Fourthly, information must also be communicated more forcefully to the public throughout the world in order to convince those countries and peoples which supported South Africa of the folly of their actions. In that regard, his delegation congratulated Miss Barbara Rogers on the courageous statement that she had made at the Committee's 2103rd meeting. If action such as hers was intensified, it would be certain to effect a change in the views held in her country and elsewhere regarding Namibia. Her action confirmed his delegation's view that all whites should not be regarded in the same light.

41. His delegation welcomed General Assembly resolution 3111 (XXVIII) in which it had been decided that each year 26 August would be observed as Namibia Day. It also endorsed unreservedly all the recommendations and proposals contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/9624 (vol. I), A/9624 (vol. II) and A/9624/Add.1), which accorded with his country's firm moral and material support for the struggle in Namibia.

42. The greatest burden must be borne by the Namibians themselves and his delegation accordingly saluted their heroic struggle. The Pretoria régime offered no alternative to bloodshed in the cause of freedom. Independence could still be achieved peacefully in Namibia, on the sole condition that South Africa would withdraw unconditionally and immediately from the Territory. The day would surely come when the Namibian people would free themselves from foreign domination and aggression, and Namibia would be accepted as an independent member of the international community.

43. Mr. TCHICAYA (Gabon) said that the situation in Namibia had remained unchanged since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating South Africa's Mandate for the Territory, and that no solution appeared to be in sight. Although that resolution had been adopted by a majority of Member States and although the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 had not been disputed by the international community, those two decisions had still not been implemented.

44. His delegation was fully aware of the positive role played thus far by the United Nations Council for Namibia. However, if the Council was to be truly effective and to fulfil its mission, it must be able to work within the Territory for which it was responsible. The United Nations must therefore

create the necessary conditions to enable the Council to carry out the task entrusted to it. He recalled that the United Republic of Cameroon and the Republic of Togo, after being placed under French trusteeship by the League of Nations, had been properly administered by France from within those countries until their accession to independence. That procedure was part of the normal order of things and should also be followed in the case of Namibia. However, whereas France had understood that it must abide by the Mandate entrusted to it, South Africa, which was incapable of reasoning, foolishly defied international opinion by categorically refusing to implement the resolutions of an Organization of which it was itself a full member.

45. There were two possible explanations for South Africa's arrogance. The first was the passivity of the United Nations, resulting from the anachronistic nature of some of its organs. If the United Nations was to continue to exist, a number of ambiguities in the Charter must be eliminated and some attitudes must be changed. One provision of the Charter which called for review was that contained in Article 27, paragraph 3, relating to the right of veto in the Security Council. The exercise of the right of veto by a small number of Members was unjust and contrary to the preamble of the Charter, which stressed the equality of nations, large and small, and the maintenance of justice. Furthermore, recent events had clearly demonstrated the futility of the right of veto, which had been unable to prevent war in the Middle East, between India and Pakistan, or in Cyprus. General Assembly resolutions would have achieved as much and would have created a greater impact by having been adopted by a majority which could not be suspected of being partisan. The latest Security Council vote on the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations served only to reinforce the view that South Africa, although a full Member of the United Nations, could violate its fundamental principles with impunity because it could count on the support of the Security Council.

46. The second reason for South Africa's obstinate refusal to comply with United Nations resolutions was the external support which it received. The facts of the situation were well known and had once again been made very clear by the results of the Security Council vote on the expulsion of South Africa. In refusing to adopt the draft resolution on that subject,³ the great Powers were unquestionably giving the racists of Pretoria complete freedom to continue their criminal activities in a country over which they had no legal or moral authority. Consequently, the fate of Namibia, deprived of the support which it had rightly expected from the United Nations, was uncertain. When its people endeavoured to prevent the plunder of the Territory's natural resources, they met with oppression from the white population, aided by other white nations acting in the name of so-called Christian civilization or anti-Communism. The recent victories of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC) in Guinea-Bissau and of the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) in Mozambique demonstrated the determination of the peoples of Africa. Why, then, should not SWAPO be given the means to intensify its struggle against oppression in Namibia?

47. His delegation had previously stated that force should not be used in settling conflicts and that the most effective weapon was dialogue. However, dialogue was interpreted by South Africa as a sign of weakness and was therefore ineffective in the present case. Consequently, three steps must be taken to resolve the situation. First, the United Nations Council for Namibia must report to the General Assembly and subsequently to the Security Council that it could not carry

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

out effectively its task of administering South West Africa until the Territory acceded to independence, unless it was able to do so from within the Territory itself. Secondly, the Security Council should be called upon to recognize the gravity of the situation and to propose measures to be taken against South Africa if it persisted in refusing to allow the United Nations Council for Namibia to establish itself at Windhoek; such measures could even include a new request for South Africa's expulsion from the United Nations on the grounds of violating the principles of the Charter, as provided for in Article 6. Thirdly, the international community should provide SWAPO with aid and support in its struggle for freedom.

48. Africa had never entertained racial hatred against the whites of South Africa or Southern Rhodesia; it felt that both the black and the white populations of those two countries had the same rights and the same responsibilities and should live together as brothers, in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. The United Nations should be the means of promoting such coexistence.

49. Mr. GANOR (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and some other Arab delegations had made the ritual derogatory references to Israel and to the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, *zionism*. Such remarks were extraneous to the subject under consideration. It would appear that those delegations could not address themselves to any subject without using it as a vehicle for propaganda and for venting their hatred.

50. Mr. MUKHTAR (Sudan), speaking on a point of order, said that the representative of Israel always raised a point of order whenever co-operation between Israel and South Africa was mentioned. In his statement in the General Assembly (2255th plenary meeting), the Israeli Foreign Minister had not mentioned the situation in southern Africa; Israel considered that the only problem which existed in the world was that of the Middle East. He invited the representative of Israel to state his country's attitude towards South Africa. Israel often referred to the sufferings of its peoples in the past and he asked whether the representative of Israel would state his Government's position with regard to the sufferings of the people of Namibia. Did it support or condemn the occupation of Namibia?

51. Mr. GANOR (Israel), continuing his statement, said that the report of the Special Committee on *Apartheid* (A/9622) had been discussed in the Special Political Committee, where the representative of Israel speaking at the 918th meeting, had fully refuted allegations bracketing his country with South Africa.

52. Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Committee had the right to examine the activities of Israeli firms in Namibia and the actions of the friends of the criminal régime in South Africa and to denounce all collaboration between imperialism and racism. Chapter IX of the report of the Special Committee (A/9623/Add.3) contained information relating to co-operation between Israel and South Africa in economic, political, cultural, military and other areas in violation of United Nations resolutions. He had quoted specific figures and had not spoken in hatred. He challenged the representative of Israel to refute those figures and to denounce *apartheid* and the occupation of Namibia by the racist Government of South Africa. The solution of the problem of Namibia called for objectivity, logic and understanding, which *zionism* did not possess.

53. Mr. ARAIM (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, rejected the accusations of the representative of Israel that Arab delegations had sought to exceed the scope of the discussions in the Committee. Their statements were intended to make world public opinion aware of the close links which existed between world *zionism*, imperialism and racial segregation. Could the representative of Israel refute the fact that *zionism* was as racist as *apartheid*, or that there was close co-operation between the Zionist Government and the minority régime in South Africa? Victory over *apartheid* in South Africa would be a victory for Arab nationalism.

54. Mr. GANOR (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statements were becoming repetitious and that their tenor showed their principal motivation.

55. Mr. JAZZAR (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, invited delegations to refer to the documents of the Special Political Committee which revealed the true attitude of the Israeli Government and its unholy alliance with the racist, segregationist régime in South Africa.

56. Mr. FARGHAL (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that racism and imperialism were closely related in Namibia and elsewhere. United Nations documents contained evidence of racist, imperialist collaboration between Israel and South Africa. He challenged Israel to refute the contents of those documents.

57. Mr. MUKHTAR (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, asked why the Israeli delegation did not clarify its position on the questions under consideration in the Committee as it had done in the Special Political Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.