



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1465th

MEETING: 20 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1465)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Congo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-3)	1

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 20 March 1969, at 3 p.m.

President; Mr. K. CSATORDAY (Hungary).

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El Kony (United Arab Republic) took a seat at the Council table.

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1465)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-3).

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia

Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-3)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at this morning's meeting, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to take a seat at the Council table in order to participate in the discussion of the item on our agenda, without the right to vote.

2. Mr. YOST (United States of America): I should like to join with our colleagues in expressing our appreciation to Ambassador Bérard for the distinguished fashion in which he carried on our consultations last month. I also wish, Mr. President, to welcome you. It is with great pleasure that we continue our deliberations under your Presidency.

3. Today's meeting of the Security Council on Namibia, at the request of forty-six Members of the United Nations, is truly of historic importance when we consider the train of events that has brought us here.

4. Since 1947, the question of Namibia, or South West Africa, has been repeatedly considered by the General Assembly. Early and unsuccessful efforts were made to place this Territory, along with other League of Nations Mandates, within the United Nations Trusteeship System. The International Court of Justice, in Advisory Opinions, stated that the Mandate under which South Africa administered the Territory had not lapsed and that South Africa was under an obligation to account to the United Nations, which inherited the supervisory functions formerly executed by the League of Nations. Efforts were also made, by the adoption of resolutions and the establishment of commissions, to make it possible for the people of Namibia to exercise their inherent right of self-determination, as provided in Chapters XI and XII of the Charter. All of these efforts and appeals by the international community were rebuffed by the Government of South Africa.

5. In 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), in which the Assembly decided that by virtue of the breach of its obligations and its disavowal of the Mandate, South Africa had forfeited its Mandate in Namibia.

6. Having decided that that Mandate had been terminated, the General Assembly also decided that the Territory came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. What is this responsibility? First, we submit, it is to be informed of, and to keep the world fully aware of, developments affecting the vital interests of all Namibians; second, to promote those interests by all peaceful and practicable means; and third, to seek to assist the Namibians in the exercise of their right to self-determination. It is a cause of deep regret that the United Nations has to date been prevented from exercising its responsibilities in Namibia.

7. Among other provisions, resolution 2145 (XXI) called on South Africa not to take any further steps which might

tend to alter the international status of the Territory. Under the guise of "steps to promote self-determination of the people", South Africa soon appeared to have embarked on what amounted to piece-meal annexation of the Territory.

8. In 1967, we learned that South Africa had enacted the so-called "Terrorism Act". This measure was soundly condemned by the international community and its application to Namibia considered to be illegal. In 1968, the United Nations demanded the release and repatriation of Namibians held in connexion with this Act. Also in 1968, an additional step in the direction of annexation was taken when South Africa adopted the "Self-government for Native Nations of South West Africa Act". According to statements made by South Africa, the provisions of this Act were arrived at through consultation with the people of Namibia and, therefore, represented a valid form of self-determination. My Government in the past has been unable to accept this assertion and is still unable to do so. We should like to know, for example, who were the people consulted, about what propositions, and by what means?

9. More recently, we understand that still another bill has been passed by the South African Parliament concerning Namibia—the so-called "South West African Affairs Bill". This Bill appears to be a further effort to consolidate South Africa's control over Namibia by giving the South African Parliament and central government departments wide powers over the affairs of Namibia. We have urged South Africa not to enact this legislation.

10. These actions which I have briefly outlined show that South Africa is not only attempting to annex Namibia, but is also extending its heinous policy of *apartheid*—a policy which has been condemned by all here present—to that Territory.

11. The United States voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). We believe that South Africa's actions, which I have briefly summarized, demonstrate that the General Assembly was correct in determining that South Africa had forfeited the right to administer Namibia and in concluding that the United Nations should assume responsibility for the Territory.

12. The United States shares the objective of the members which have taken the initiative in bringing this matter to the Council. We, like them, are firmly dedicated to the achievement of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia. For its part, the United States is willing to take every peaceful and practical step under the Charter which would assist, or would be likely to assist, in the achievement of this goal.

13. Earlier, I stated that this meeting of the Council was of historic significance. Although the Security Council met on two occasions in 1968 to consider South Africa's actions in illegally arresting and bringing to trial thirty-seven Namibians, this is the first time that the Council has met to consider the situation created by South Africa's refusal to implement resolution 2145 (XXI) of the General Assembly. In this new setting, we shall perform the highest service to the Namibian people if we seek ways and means by which a

peaceful solution to the problem may be possible. And the South African Government, for its part, must be prepared to re-examine its provocative behaviour. If I may paraphrase President Nixon, the need now is to lower our voices all round so that we begin to understand each other.

14. In this connexion, I am happy to state that the United States supports the draft resolution which we have before us. I should like to pay special tribute to the statesmanlike way in which consultations which led to the present text were conducted. As a result, we anticipate that the draft resolution introduced this morning by the representative of Zambia will command broad support within the Council, crossing regional and ideological lines.

15. The United States is able to support the text of the draft resolution before us because it wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. As we have repeatedly made clear, we believe that it would be inappropriate in this situation to consider measures contained in Chapter VII. In our judgement, this is not a situation which can sensibly and humanely be remedied by mandatory sanctions. Such measures would be likely to prove ineffective and hence to weaken rather than strengthen the prestige and authority of the United Nations. For the same reason they would, far from improving the lot of the Namibians, run the risk of making their situation even worse than it is today. With these considerations in mind, we wish again to make clear, despite our strong condemnation of South African behaviour in this regard, the limits beyond which we do not feel that it would be either wise or feasible for this Council to go in present circumstances.

16. Despite the fact that South Africa has no legal right in Namibia, my Government believes that South Africa remains accountable to the United Nations for all of its actions in the Territory and for the well-being of the people there so long as it remains in *de facto* control. We think that it would help if the South African Government, which has often protested that its actions in Namibia are misunderstood, would receive, without any conditions, a special representative of the Secretary-General to discuss Namibia, or would make some other gesture which would have the effect of acknowledging its responsibilities to the international community. In other words, the time has come for South Africa to make a fresh effort, in co-operation with the United Nations, to resolve the problem. My Government believes that a just and peaceful solution, ensuring the rights and interests of all of the parties, is still possible, and to that end I pledge the support of the United States for all appropriate steps.

17. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, before stating the position of the Soviet Union on the matter being discussed by the Security Council, may I say that the Soviet delegation fully associates itself with those who have already expressed their gratitude to your predecessors, the former Presidents of the Security Council, Ambassador Jakobson and Ambassador Bérard.

18. In saying this, the Soviet delegation is not merely following the usual protocol ritual and the long-standing

practice of the Security Council; we regard it as a pleasant duty to reaffirm the sincere esteem and the friendly feelings we have for Mr. Jakobson and Mr. Bérard as representatives of countries with which the Soviet Union has relations of friendship and co-operation.

19. France and Finland lie in different parts of Europe and the languages spoken by their peoples are different and there are other differences between them and us. But the USSR, France and Finland have a good deal in common. It is not simply a geographical connexion, not simply the fact that they belong to the same geographical region of the world. Long-standing ties of continually developing co-operation in the most varied fields bind the Soviet Union to its northern neighbour, Finland, and to France, a country in the extreme west of Europe, whose great people has made an invaluable contribution to the heritage of world civilization and human progress. In our countries, we are firmly convinced, there is a general desire and determination to ensure that Europe becomes a continent of peace and fruitful co-operation between nations on an equal footing, that it shall be a decisive factor in stability and the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security throughout the world. It is towards that goal that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Europe are constantly and steadfastly striving. Their efforts and their sincere desire have been recently confirmed in the appeal of the socialist countries to all the States of Europe, which was adopted recently at a conference in the ancient and beautiful capital of your country, Mr. President, that of the fraternal Hungarian People's Republic.

20. Allow me, then, to welcome you, Mr. President, and to say that I am sure that your rich and varied experience, your deep knowledge of international relations and your tact and ability, for which you are well known in United Nations circles, of maintaining friendly and businesslike contacts with all your colleagues in the United Nations are a guarantee that you will successfully carry out the highly important and responsible task of President of the Security Council. The Soviet delegation is particularly glad to greet you on this auspicious occasion when your country is celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The heroic deeds of the Hungarian proletariat and peasantry in 1919 are written in letters of gold in the history of the international working class movement. After the Second World War the Hungarian people embarked upon the broad path of socialist development. Rejoicing together with you at the successes achieved by the Hungarian people in building socialism, the Soviet delegation once again wishes you, and the fraternal Hungarian people as a whole, prosperity and happiness.

21. During the last two decades the national liberation struggle of the peoples has attained vast proportions and has been crowned with remarkable success. In Africa, Asia and in other continents former colonial territories which had no rights have been replaced by dozens of young sovereign States. This important historical fact of the post-war period is clear evidence of the invincible drive of the peoples towards freedom, national independence and the complete eradication of the shameful centuries-old system of colonialism and imperialism.

22. In the light of these events reflecting the profound social, economic and national liberation processes of our time, the colonial policy of the South African racist authorities towards the vast Territory which they hold illegally in southern Africa—Namibia and its indigenous population—is all the more intolerable.

23. For the Soviet Union, a country which from the first days of its existence has taken a firm stand against all forms of social and national inequality and discrimination, against colonial and racist oppression, and has firmly supported national freedom and national independence, the fate of Namibia and its people cannot be a matter of indifference. Our own impatience towards colonialism and racism, and our complete solidarity with the peoples fighting for their liberation, determine the Soviet Union's stand on the Namibia question.

24. That stand has frequently been explained fully by Soviet representatives during the debates on the question on Namibia in the Security Council, at sessions of the General Assembly and in the Committee of Twenty-Four.¹ It is determined by the very nature of the Soviet State and its Leninist foreign policy, one of the fundamental points of which is to provide all possible support and assistance to the liberation movement and to co-operate brotherly with the oppressed peoples against imperialist oppression and colonial exploitation.

25. The Soviet Union has always firmly and consistently advocated the decisive condemnation of the racist colonial régime of South Africa and of those imperialist States which, in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations organs, are either openly or indirectly supporting that régime.

26. The events subsequent to the decision taken at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly to terminate South Africa's Mandate for the administration of South West Africa (resolution 2145 (XXI)), and the recent events in that country, which is now called Namibia, fully confirm the correctness of the position of principle taken by the USSR on that question.

27. The brilliant speeches by the representatives of Zambia and Algeria at this morning's meeting, full of incontrovertible facts concerning further crimes committed by the Pretoria authorities against the people of Namibia, rang out as a fully justified indictment of the inhuman racist régime of South Africa and its supporters. The clear statement of the representative of Senegal contained a stern and angry condemnation of the policy of racism and *apartheid* carried out by the criminal South African Government.

28. That was the voice of free Africa, a voice which the South African racist leaders cannot but reckon with and which must be listened to attentively by those who, notwithstanding the numerous resolutions of the United Nations, are continuing to maintain relations and contacts with the South African racists and helping them to carry

¹ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

out their policy of violent racism and *apartheid*, which is abhorred by the peoples and condemned by the United Nations.

29. The militarist, fascist and racist régime of Pretoria, ignoring the clear-cut decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and disregarding world public opinion, is carrying out in Namibia an unbridled policy of colonialist arbitrariness, *apartheid* and racial discrimination towards the indigenous population of that country.

30. The events of recent months bear witness to the fact that the South African racist régime is becoming increasingly aggressive. The Government of South Africa is forcing through the notorious "Odendaal plan", the purpose of which is to deprive the Namibian people of its unity and territorial integrity by means of the compulsory transfer of the indigenous African inhabitants to specially created reserves called "bantustans". Following the creation of the "bantustans" of Ovamboland and Katutura in uninhabited areas that are hardly suitable for human habitation, the South African troops forcibly expelled from the Caprivi strip about 1,000 Namibians who subsequently, fleeing from persecution and terror on the part of the authorities, were compelled to leave their homeland and settle in neighbouring African countries.

31. There has been an intensification in Namibia of arrests, evictions, trials and sentencing of Africans, whose sole fault consists in the fact that they will not be reconciled to the position of colonial slaves in the second half of the twentieth century and are resisting the colonialists. According to press reports, South African police and army reinforcements are carrying out punitive operations in the territory of Namibia.

32. All these acts of violence against Africans by the racists are for one single purpose: to break the will of the people of Namibia to fight for its freedom and independence, and to pave the way for the strengthening of the unlawful annexation of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa.

33. It is in that light that we must consider the new "South West Africa Affairs Bill" which the Pretoria authorities intend to bring into force on 1 April of this year. Under this racist colonial law, Namibia will, in fact, be turned into the fifth province of South Africa.

34. These are just some of the facts which eloquently testify to the deteriorating situation in Namibia as a result of the further escalation of the colonial-racist policy pursued in that country by the South African racist régime.

35. In analysing the causes of the annexationist policy of the régime towards Namibia and its flagrant disregard of the General Assembly resolutions and also of the Security Council resolutions 245 and 246 (1968), the Soviet Union considers, as before, that all this is a direct consequence of the stand taken on that question by some Western countries and their monopolies. They, and above all the monopolies of the United States and the United Kingdom, are providing every assistance and support to the militarist racist-Fascist régime in the south of the African continent.

36. In the course of this discussion, there has been an attempt to define the South African régime as the "foster child of the developed countries". In fact the racist South African régime is the last born child of the colonial system of imperialism. We know that the natural resources of southern Africa have for a long time attracted the close attention of the imperialist monopolies, while the important strategic position of that area is an attraction for the military authorities of many Western countries. There in southern Africa, under the protection and with the direct help of those countries, there has been created a special kind of military-political triangle, known among the Africans as the "unholy alliance", comprising the Republic of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Portugal, which is a member of NATO. The territories and colonies of this "troika" are a stronghold of colonialism and racism on the African continent. This stronghold is used as an instrument for protecting the interests of the imperialist monopolies which are exploiting the African population and despoiling it of its wealth. The members of this triangular military racist bloc carry out co-ordinated punitive operations against the peoples of the Portuguese colonies and Southern Rhodesia and Namibia, endeavouring to frighten the young independent countries of Africa with the threat of war and armed reprisals. The leading role in this bloc belongs to the racists of South Africa.

37. In a TASS communiqué issued in connexion with the talks held in October and November of last year between the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Wilson, and Smith, the head of the Southern Rhodesian racist régime, it was stressed that there were grounds for the fears of the Governments of many African States, and also of the leaders of the national liberation movements of the peoples of southern Africa, concerning that bloc of racist States which is a constant threat to the independent African States and bars the way to the national liberation movement in Africa.

38. But the "unholy alliance" does not operate by itself. It enjoys increasing economic and military support from the leading States members of NATO and their monopolies. The material basis for the military policies of the South African racists is to be found in the thousands of millions of dollars invested by British, American, West German and other imperialist monopolies, which contribute to the South African economy for the sake of obtaining extremely high profits through the inhuman exploitation of African labour, including that of the population of Namibia.

39. For example, we know that the investments of British monopolies in the economy of South Africa constitute more than \$3,000 million and are increasing. The volume of trade between the United Kingdom and South Africa is continually growing, particularly with respect to British purchases of South African goods.

40. The United States monopolies continue to have wide economic and trade relations with South Africa. According to official figures, more than 200 United States firms are operating in South Africa. The flow of their investments into the South African economy is continually increasing.

41. Quite recently, with the knowledge and agreement of the authorities, a direct airline was opened between the

United States and South Africa. This act was in direct contravention of General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) which calls upon Member States to refuse landing and passage facilities on their territories to all aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa.

42. These are facts, and they cannot be glossed over.

43. The countries and peoples of Africa, and all peace-loving States, cannot but be watchful of the growing co-operation between South Africa and Western Germany. This co-operation, the extent and the forms of which are continually being extended, is becoming a serious threat to the cause of the national liberation of the peoples of southern Africa, including the people of Namibia, from the yoke of colonialism. With the assistance of a West German monopoly, dozens of industrial enterprises have been built in South Africa or converted to modern technology. West German investments in South Africa already amount to hundreds of millions of dollars. The rate of inflow of West German capital into the South African economy, is higher than the rate of inflow of capital from other imperialist countries. We know too that the Federal Republic of Germany regularly grants long-term loans to the Government of South Africa, mainly for the development of its military-industrial complex. In February of this year, South Africa received from West Germany a loan of 100 million West German marks. That was the tenth loan granted to South Africa by West Germany. The volume of trade between those countries is expanding. According to incomplete data, the volume of trade last year exceeded the 1967 level and amounted to over \$500 million.

44. In expanding its economic links with South Africa, West Germany is actively accelerating the development of its military co-operation with the South African racist régime. With the active co-operation and assistance of Bonn, the army of Pretoria is being equipped with modern weapons. These actions of the Government and monopolies of the Federal Republic of Germany are a direct violation of Security Council resolutions 181 and 182 (1963) and 191 (1964) which called for the establishment of an embargo on the sale and shipment to South Africa of arms, ammunition of all types, military vehicles, and equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa. Particularly sinister is the co-operation of Bonn and Pretoria in the development of missiles, the most dangerous type of weapon of our time.

45. In December last year, at the St. Lucia missile range (to the north of Durban), the first guided missile of the "ground-to-ground" type was tested. This test was the culmination of five years' work at the missile research institute near Pretoria, which was carried out with the assistance of West German specialists and paved the way for the mass production of missiles for the armed forces of South Africa. This constitutes a direct threat to the African countries.

46. The United Nations resolutions on Namibia are being infringed not only by West Germany but also by some other West European countries—members of NATO. They are selling to South Africa warships, armoured cars and aircraft. The South African racists have been granted

licences for the production of a Belgian rifle by their West European friends and patrons. And under licences obtained from United States monopolies, fighter aircraft are being produced in South Africa.

47. In accordance with United Nations resolutions, South Africa has forfeited any right to administer the Territory of Namibia. Yet, in violation of those resolutions, the South African colonialists continue to commit lawless acts in Namibia. They squander the natural wealth of that country, handing over vast tracts of land in Namibia as concessions to foreign monopolies. In December last year the American petroleum company "Standard Oil", the headquarters of which, as we know, is at San Francisco, was granted a concession in Namibia of an area of 35,000 square miles. At the beginning of this year the British firms "British Petroleum" and "Shell", and also the American firm of "Gulf Oil", obtained concessions in Namibia from the South African authorities for a term of seventeen years, which would seem to indicate that the oil monopolies obviously expect that Namibia will not be liberated for at least seventeen years.

48. Assistance is also afforded to the South African racists by the Israeli aggressors. We know that as a result of Israel's aggression against the Arab States navigation through the Suez Canal has been stopped for over a year, so that ships sailing from Europe to Asia or the Far East and back are obliged to use South African ports. Up to 8,000 vessels a year call at these ports. And the South African racists prosper at the expense of the misery of the Arab peoples and of costlier transport for the peoples of Europe. The profits made by South Africa during that period on ships calling at its ports and on servicing them have led to a sharp improvement in South Africa's balance of payments. According to figures given by *The New York Times* of 24 January this year, South Africa's balance of payments, which showed a deficit of \$360 million in 1966-1967, had attained a surplus of about \$141 million in the 1967-1968 financial year. Such is the direct assistance tendered by Israel.

49. All these facts concerning the economic, trade and military and political relations of South Africa with the Western countries clearly and unquestionably confirm that it is those links and that co-operation which are the main cause of the cynical disregard by the Government of South Africa, a country which is a Member of the United Nations, of the decisions of this Organization concerning the question of Namibia and of the continuing unbridled terror which that racist régime uses against the Namibians.

50. Consequently, the régime of Pretoria, by its refusal to implement the resolutions on the question of Namibia adopted by the Assembly and the Security Council, has thrown out a direct challenge to the United Nations. But to say only that is not enough. The truth is that we have to add the fact that the Western countries, having taken on the ignoble task of acting as the main trading partners and military suppliers of the South African racists, and continuing to maintain relations of all kinds with South Africa, are addressing a no less blatant challenge to the authority of the United Nations, undermining its prestige and authority, and bringing disillusionment to the African peoples.

51. During the debates on the question of Namibia, more particularly at the last two sessions of the General Assembly, the USSR delegation, on the instructions of the Government of the Soviet Union, set out in detail a programme of measures which, with the help and participation of the United Nations, would in our view accelerate the achievement of the final goal: the liberation of Namibia and the provision for the people of that country of the conditions which would enable them to decide their own fate according to their own wishes. That programme is well known to the Members of the United Nations and of the Security Council.

52. We are still of the opinion that, until the Western countries put an end to their relations with the racist régime of South Africa and cease to provide assistance to it, it will be impossible to solve the problem of Namibia in the interests of its indigenous population, and the hopes of Africans that the colonialist régime of South Africa might comply with the demands of the United Nations and the international community will, as before, remain an empty hope.

53. It was along these lines, as we know, that the Secretary-General of the United Nations was thinking when he stated quite recently that he could see no grounds at present for any hope that talks with the Government of South Africa on the question of Namibia could have any positive results.

54. In the view of the USSR delegation, one of the effective measures which the Security Council ought to include in its resolution should be a pressing appeal to the Governments of those countries whose nationals and firms are engaged in industrial, financial and trade activities in South Africa and on the territory of Namibia to take legislative, administrative and any other necessary measures to stop either private or State investment in the South African economy until such time as South Africa has implemented the United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

55. The Security Council resolution would have gained much if its sponsors had included a demand to all the States to put an end to trade, economic and other relations with the South African régime. Such a measure is also essential in order to put pressure on the South African Government and make it comply with the demands of the United Nations.

56. There can be no doubt that a resolute condemnation of the South African colonialist régime and of those who give it assistance and support, and also the immediate cessation of all help, support and relations with South Africa and its racist régime would be an effective way for the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole to put pressure on the South African authorities.

57. I should now like to say a few words about the draft resolution on the question of Namibia.

58. The Soviet delegation has studied the draft. First of all we should note that it has some useful features. It confirms one of the most important General Assembly resolutions on the question [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], according to which

the Mandate of the South African racists to administer the territory of Namibia was terminated, and it calls upon the South African Government to withdraw its administration from the unlawfully occupied country. As another positive factor to be noted is the fact that in the draft resolution the actions of the leaders of Pretoria designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of bantustans are considered to be contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It states that the South African Government has no right to enact a further colonial law on the Territory of Namibia in pursuance of its purpose of perpetuating its colonial occupation of that country. And lastly, the draft resolution condemns the refusal of South Africa to comply with many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the Territory of Namibia.

59. Nevertheless it must be pointed out that on the whole the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council is a weak one. It does not provide for measures concerning those States Members of the United Nations that are continuing as before to maintain broad political, economic and military relations with the South African racists. Yet such measures would undoubtedly be useful and would help to make the decisions on the question of Namibia effective. But in view of the fact that the African and some other delegations who took an active part in drafting this text have considered it acceptable to them, the Soviet delegation does not intend to object to its adoption by the Security Council as a minimum which the Council must fulfil immediately to help the people of Namibia.

60. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I should like to thank the distinguished representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his generous, warm and friendly words about me. I wish to thank him particularly for his congratulations on the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. We are proud of the achievement of 21 March 1919, when for the first time in our history the heroic Hungarian workers took the state power into their own hands through a revolution and themselves determined their own fate. It is particularly appropriate to remember this when we are dealing with the problem of a people fighting for its freedom and independence.

61. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): Before dealing with the question on our agenda, I should like to take this opportunity to thank all those members of the Council who have made such generous comments about my activities as President of the Council in January—comments which reflect the friendly relations that happily exist between my country and theirs.

62. Finland welcomes the initiative of the forty-six African and Asian States which have requested this meeting of the Security Council to examine, in the words of their letter, "the deteriorating situation in Namibia". The situation has indeed gone from bad to worse. No progress whatsoever has been made in United Nations efforts to help the people of Namibia to achieve self-determination and independence. The resolutions passed by the General Assembly in the past two and a half years since the termination of the Mandate have had no practical effect.

The General Assembly, in fact, seems to have exhausted the means at its disposal. The Government of South Africa has refused to co-operate with the United Nations. It has on the contrary intensified its control over the Territory. It has gone ahead with its plans to split it up into separate administrative units and it now proposes to enact the so-called "South West Africa Affairs Bill", thus acting contrary to its own professed recognition of the international status of Namibia. The present trend of events is detrimental not only to the interests of the population of the Territory but also, in the words of the draft resolution introduced this morning by the representative of Zambia, to the interests of the international community as a whole. It is right, therefore, that the Security Council should now take up the search for practical and effective means by which the United Nations could discharge its responsibilities for Namibia and its people.

63. Our starting point must, of course, be recognition of the fact that the United Nations General Assembly has terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence. Adoption by the Security Council of a resolution expressing such recognition will mean more than a mere restatement of what the General Assembly has already decreed. It will mean that for the first time the authority and the power of the Security Council will be fully engaged in the task of translating that decision into reality. In this, I believe, lies the real significance of the action the Council is about to take.

64. The crucial question of how and by what means this can be achieved remains unanswered. It will be recalled that the agreement reached in the General Assembly—the very wide measure of agreement—on the decision to terminate the Mandate did not extend to the means by which it could be carried out. Subsequent efforts to agree on such means were unsuccessful, and later resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, though supported by large majorities, failed to receive the backing of the leading Powers, permanent members of the Security Council. Consequently, they made no impression on the Government of South Africa.

65. As the representative of Pakistan said this morning, we can only move in unison if we are to move at all. Any future proposals submitted for the consideration of the Security Council, to be effective, should be based on the wide measure of agreement which we believe the present draft resolution commands among members. Only thus can we hope to make the influence of the United Nations felt in shaping the future of Namibia. Proposals likely to divide the Council would only dissipate its authority. We must be mindful of the fact that the responsibilities of the Security Council under the Charter are of a different order from those of other United Nations organs.

66. The termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was an irrevocable step. This will now be confirmed on the authority of the Security Council. We must now look ahead and engage in an active and concerted effort to find a just and peaceful solution of this problem. Failure to do so would mean defeat, not only for the people of Namibia, but for the United Nations itself.

67. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I should like first to join with all the members of the Council in paying respect to you, Sir, as our President. We assure you of our full assistance and loyal support.

68. At the same time, we express our respectful gratitude to Ambassador Bérard and Ambassador Jakobson. We are fortunate indeed when our Council is under the leadership of such experienced and distinguished Ambassadors.

69. May I also add my welcome to all the new members of the Council, especially to those whom I have not heard speak in the Council before. It is clear that they set a very high standard indeed.

70. I have spoken on the subject of South West Africa in this Council and in the General Assembly many times since the Judgment of the International Court was delivered nearly three years ago. At every opportunity I have urged that we owe it to the people most concerned, and also to the Organization in which we place our faith and hopes, to act deliberately after the fullest consultation, to act, if at all possible, in agreement, and, most important of all, to act within our clear capacity.

71. We must not deceive ourselves on what can be done. We have an obligation not to mislead, by raising false hopes, those who rely on us. We also have an overriding obligation not to weaken the reputation and authority of the United Nations by passing resolutions which we know very well will be ineffective.

72. More than two years ago I said in the Assembly that if we pass resolutions which we know are inoperative, we debase the currency of the United Nations. It is said that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I would add that the road to hopeless frustration is paved with useless resolutions.

73. What is more, if we adopt such resolutions about South West Africa, resolutions which are ineffective and inoperative, we are neither serving the people concerned nor having any salutary effect on the South African Government. We are doing exactly the opposite: we are giving positive encouragement to the South African Government to pursue the evil policies we all condemn; the people of Namibia lose hope in our authority; the Government of South Africa takes confidence from our frustration.

74. It is for these reasons that I have been urging and hoping for more than two years that we should be able to find means of going forward together in agreement, for when we are divided we give comfort to those whose policies and actions we detest.

75. It was for these reasons that we thought that the course adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 was mistaken. It was for these reasons that I have constantly urged that we should search for a more practical and positive course. I make no excuse for making the same plea again today. I do so because I would not wish to see this Council adopt a course which will lead nowhere, which will deceive the people who rely on us, and which will give nothing but satisfaction to those who practice racial domination and racial injustice.

76. Let me go back for a minute or two to restate the position of my Government. Almost two years ago, speaking in the General Assembly, I said:

“First of all, let me state again plainly that our motive, our aim, our determination must be to set the people of South West Africa free, free to advance to the destiny of their own choice in full self-determination. Secondly, we share and strongly support the views of this Assembly on the policies of *apartheid*. We deplore and condemn and oppose the domination of one people or one race over another. We cannot accept the South African Government’s defence of its racial policies; and, even more strongly still, we reject the application of those policies to a country which is an international responsibility. We are convinced that a political and economic and social system built on the domination of one race by another by force cannot survive.”²

77. And I went on:

“... the South African Government repeatedly and openly contested that the Mandate remained in force and that the United Nations had succeeded to the supervisory functions formerly exercised by the Council of the League of Nations.

“It is those fundamental provisions for international accountability which are at the heart of the mandate system but which the South African Government has so far persistently refused to accept.

“By word and by action the South African Government demonstrated that it was not ready to accept the essential obligations incumbent upon it under the Mandate. By repudiating those obligations, so clearly-affirmed by the International Court and by this Assembly, it forfeited its title to the Mandate. It no longer had the right to carry the sacred trust conferred upon it.

“It is well that we should restate these principles, and these conclusions and these convictions. We have no reason whatever to retreat or retract from them. They are the basis on which all future action must be justified.”³

78. I also said at that time:

“I said that we had an obligation not only to the people of South West Africa but to the people of the United Nations itself. We had, and we still have, an obligation not to raise false hopes by hasty or ineffective methods, not to deceive ourselves or anyone else by shutting our eyes to practical barriers, not to imagine that those barriers can be overcome by words alone, not to believe that an inoperative and ineffective resolution could be a substitute for deliberate and practical action.

“I urged . . . that we should consult together about methods and means, to see what was possible and what was not, to consider tactics and strategy, to consider

timing in particular. We had, and still have, a duty not to advance until the ground has been thoroughly explored, until all the legal and other aspects of the whole problem have been examined and assessed. Moreover, my Government pledged itself, if such a course were accepted, to play a full and constructive part in pursuing it.

“My Government made its position absolutely clear on the principles and purposes which commanded overwhelming support, and we pointed the way to concerted action which could have enabled us all to go forward together.”⁴

79. I make no excuses for repeating those words, for nothing that has since happened has diminished our convictions. On the contrary, everything that has happened has reinforced our misgivings. Meanwhile we have not hesitated to condemn the actions of the South African Government.

80. When I spoke in the Assembly last December I said:

“We were gravely disturbed by the Pretoria trial under the provisions of the Terrorism Act of 1967. We sent an observer to that trial, and we stated in the Security Council our strong objections to an act which, in the view of my Government, was offensive to the principles which should underlie the framing of criminal legislation. . . . We made it clear that what my Government particularly abhorred and condemned was that that vast retrospective criminal legislation carried the supreme penalty of death.

“In the matter of the trial itself it was a matter of great relief to us, and to all of us, that, despite that deplorable legislation, and despite the heavy sentences passed, the South African Government did not resort to capital punishment in that instance. Some of the sentences have been reduced on appeal, and it is well that no further trials of the same sort have occurred. I am sure world-wide protests, including those made here at the United Nations, contributed to those results.

“Another action of the South African Government which has rightly exercised those who have taken part in this debate was the Homelands Act. . . . My Government certainly cannot accept that the provisions of the new law serve to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants, as the South African Government was required to do by the mandate. I need not recount in detail the objectionable provisions of this legislation. The so-called homelands are mostly in remote areas with poor communications. They can scarcely provide substantive economic benefits for their inhabitants. Indeed, they seem to be intended to serve as reservoirs of labour for industry and agriculture undertaken by the white few, while the areas themselves remain largely undeveloped. The so-called native nations for which the law provides would have no voice or interest in the central Government. The new law divides the land in such a way as to give to the white population the best land, the most land per head of population, and practically all the mineral deposits of the Territory. The

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Special Session, 1504th meeting, para. 141.*

³ *Ibid.*, paras. 143-146.

⁴ *Ibid.*, paras. 150-152.

law is essentially an extension of the evil practices of *apartheid* and the system of bantustans in South Africa itself.”⁵

81. And I should add that the South West Africa Affairs Bill similarly has the effect of diminishing and so prejudicing the separate identity of the Territory.

82. Now I turn to the practical steps which we could take, limited steps, but steps within our capacity, steps in the right direction.

83. It is of some interest to look at the list of subscribers to the United Nations South African Education and Training Programme which includes in its operation those who come from Namibia. This is indeed the only practical and effective scheme which we in the United Nations have been able so far to devise to help the people of Namibia. It is certainly regrettable that in spite of all the brave words, no more than a score of countries have made any financial contribution at all to this Programme. We heard this afternoon from the representative of the Soviet Union many words, but no more. In vain we looked for the name of the Soviet Union in the list of subscribers in this scheme to help the people concerned. But, as we know, the Soviet Union is always the first to criticize and the last to contribute. From the Russian Ambassador we get rumbles, but no roubles. My country, on the other hand, has been in honourable competition with Sweden and Denmark as the main contributor to this scheme of positive aid, and I am glad to be able to say that I have been authorized to pledge a further British contribution of £50,000, subject to Parliamentary approval, for the financial year 1969-1970. With this pledge we are now ahead of everyone else, our total contribution being now some \$390,000.

84. This is the programme which can give help in education and training to the people we want to assist. This is not mere talk, but practical help. While the contributions to the Educational and Training Programme are a useful barometer of sincerity, the scheme itself is no more than one move in the right direction.

85. More important, I remind the Council of the practical proposals put forward by the delegations of Canada, Italy and the United States in 1967 at the resumed twenty-first session of the General Assembly. We pledged our support for those proposals, but the arguments for positive though limited advance were not heeded.

86. Other proposals for practical actions have been made which have not been followed up. The proposals made by Canada, Italy and the United States included a plan for a comprehensive survey of the situation in the Territory, of its human and material resources, of its various requirements, of the conditions which would enable the Territory to achieve self-determination. But such practical proposals have been put aside in favour of strong words which lead nowhere.

87. Moreover, the proposals made at the Kitwe Conference on *Apartheid* in 1967 have not been followed up.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Plenary Meetings, 1742nd meeting, paras. 32-34.

They were advocated by the distinguished Irishman, Mr. Sean MacBride. Moreover, he was speaking on behalf of a group of organizations which must surely command wide respect. They included the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the International Defence and Aid Fund. Mr. MacBride, on their behalf, proposed a detailed study, perhaps conducted by a special research and planning team, of the situation and the needs of the Territory. The distinguished Ambassador, Alva Myrdal, supported this proposal when she spoke last December on behalf of Sweden in the General Assembly. This is what she said:

“In this context I would wish to refer to the recommendations made by the International Seminar on *Apartheid* at Kitwe a year ago. Its recommendation No. 8 was concerned with South West Africa, suggesting the establishment on a full-time basis of a ‘nucleus of a research and planning team of specially qualified people, principally South Africans’. I do not want to enter here into any substantial discussion of the rather comprehensive research programme indicated in that recommendation. It is the approach rather than the work plan which, to my mind, needs to be re-examined today.”⁶

88. Why have all these proposals been neglected? Why cannot they be revived and re-examined? Would it not be best even now to avoid a draft resolution which will surely be stillborn?

89. I do not say that there is a great deal which can be done now. I dearly wish that much more could be proposed. But what I do ask is that we should consult about every practical idea, every possible proposal, every plan within our capacity. If instead we resort to the easy alternative of attempting to escape from reality by passing empty resolutions we will not be going forward at all but backward.

90. Let me sum up what I am anxious to say.

91. We all wish to see the people of Namibia set free, to advance to true self-determination and independence.

92. We respect the intense feelings of the majority and of Africans in particular on this world issue of racial domination and racial injustice.

93. But we are convinced that no good and only harm can come from passing a resolution which is ineffective. Nor do we see that the draft resolution now presented to us can prove effective. The only other comment on the draft resolution I make now is that it is well that an original intention to include language from Chapter VII of the Charter has been abandoned. I have already made it clear that my Government is not and will not be prepared to agree to commitments under Chapter VII of the Charter in this regard.

94. Yet again, therefore, we urge that we should abandon the course of empty words and turn to the possibilities of practical advance. We know that it will be hard and that it

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1734th meeting, para. 155.

may be slow, but in our view any advance is better than none.

95. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind references he addressed to the President.

96. I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic, Chairman of the Council for Namibia.

97. Mr. EL KONY (United Arab Republic): Mr. President, I am indeed grateful to you and to the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in the present debate, in my capacity as the President of the Council for Namibia. I wish to comment briefly on the present situation in Namibia, a matter which, since the creation of the Council, has all along been a source of frustration and deep concern to it. The situation as it exists today in Namibia is, by now, well known to the Security Council, for the Council for Namibia has constantly kept the Security Council informed of the developments in the Territory.

98. The Council deemed it its duty to keep the Security Council informed of the difficulties and problems which it has encountered in the discharge of its functions entrusted to it by the General Assembly. The most recent account of the situation has been given to the Security Council by the Council in its letter of 28 February. The letter stated, among other things that:

“...it should be pointed out that there has been no advance towards the exercise of the right of self-determination and the attainment of independence by the people of Namibia and that the Council for Namibia has been denied the exercise of its responsibilities...”
[S/9032].

99. The Council, as members of the Security Council are aware, had been charged with the administration of the Territory of Namibia on behalf of the United Nations until the attainment of independence. The Council so far, in spite of all its efforts, has not been able to discharge its responsibility due to the persistent policy of defiance and obstruction pursued by the South African authorities. Such policy presents a situation fraught with danger to international peace and security.

100. As the United Nations has terminated the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory and declared that South Africa has no right to administer the Territory, the presence of South Africa in Namibia is therefore illegal. This illegal presence constitutes a foreign occupation of Namibia, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It is an act of aggression which the United Nations has the responsibility to suppress by all the means provided to it by the Charter. Furthermore, the presence of South Africa in the Territory and its continued exercise of the powers of administration over the Territory is an encroachment on the jurisdiction of the United Nations and constitutes defiance of its authority. Such occupation of the Territory by the South African authorities is furthermore an impediment in the way of the freedom of the people. The increasing conflicts resulting from such actions, as reflected

in the report of the Council for Namibia, no doubt constitute a serious threat to world peace.

101. Consequently, if we want the people of Namibia to be free and independent the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory becomes the most fundamental demand.

102. For its part, the Council for Namibia has stated its views on the present situation, time and again, in the following terms: “It is only if all necessary measures are taken for the removal of South Africa’s presence from the Territory that the Council can be expected to discharge its primary function effectively.”

103. The Security Council does not need any proof that the South African Government has no intention to withdraw from the Territory. That Government is consolidating its illegal control over the Territory by various means. Its policies, methods and actions point to one fact: that it is determined to annex the Territory of Namibia to its own. Its decision to create separate homelands is designed to destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia, and to facilitate its illegal annexation. In this regard I wish to draw the attention of the members to the Council’s letter contained in document S/9032 which enumerates the illegal acts taken by South Africa and which are aimed at destroying the territorial integrity of Namibia. Among them were the forcible removal of African people from their native locations, the establishment of Ovamboland as one of the homelands for the Africans and the displacement from the Caprivi strip of about 2,000 Namibians who subsequently took refuge in Zambia.

104. The United Nations has promised the people of Namibia sovereignty in freedom, and independence in liberty. It has not, so far, been able to move an inch towards the fulfilment of its promises. Instead of moving in the direction of peace, the problem of Namibia is fast drifting towards racial war, violence and bloodshed. Instead of exercising their right of self-determination and enjoying freedom in their own homes, the people of Namibia have been denied their homes and dispossessed of their properties. This injustice is inflicted on them because they are not white. A white, because he is white, if he enters Namibia, a country which he has never known, owned or possessed, can have all the rights; while an African, because he is an African, is denied his citizenship rights, even though he is the real owner of the land.

105. The situation in Namibia, as the Council sees it, constitutes a flagrant aggravation of the already serious threat to international peace and security. The United Nations must exercise its responsibility resolutely and without delay to avert this threat.

106. In conclusion, allow me to recall the statement of the Prime Minister of South Africa, a statement which breathes defiance and challenge to the United Nations:

“As far as the question of what we are going to do about this decision”—namely, the General Assembly resolutions—“and what the Government’s advice to you . . . is, I say: go on with your work. We will continue

to administer South West Africa as we have done, and we will carry out what has been planned.”

107. The Council for Namibia has spared no effort, and has indeed exhausted all the means that lie within its power, to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

108. There is a prevailing sense of disappointment and frustration, not only on the part of the people of Africa, but also in many other countries and in the international community.

109. The Security Council, which is the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace, and which is empowered by the Charter with the necessary means to enforce peace, is now called upon to put an end to this serious and deteriorating situation.

110. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, I congratulate you on taking over the presidency of the Security Council and assuming the responsibilities of that high office, and I assure you of my delegation's firm intention to co-operate fully with you in the performance of your duties, as it has with your predecessors.

111. I associate myself with the tribute you paid at the opening of today's meeting to Ambassador Jakobson of Finland and Ambassador Bérard of France, who presided over the Council in January and February respectively. Your eloquent and felicitous words make it unnecessary for me to say more.

112. At the request of a large number of States Members of the United Nations, the Security Council is today considering the question of Namibia. After more than two decades of debate on this question in the Organization, there is little or nothing to say that has not been said before in one form or another about the reprehensible and notorious conduct of the Government of South Africa and the stubborn arrogance with which it ignores and flouts the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

113. A great deal can be said, however, concerning the suffering people of Namibia, the direct and defenceless victims of the expansionist and oppressive designs of South Africa. The national unity and territorial integrity of the Namibian people are being threatened by the acts of an illegal administration forcibly imposed upon it.

114. The more obstinate South Africa becomes in its hostile behaviour, the more obstinate we must be in our practical efforts to fulfil our individual and collective responsibilities and in using the legal instruments available to us to try to ensure that the people of Namibia can effectively and safely exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and to full independence and sovereignty.

115. This is the first time since the General Assembly, on 27 October 1966, adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia—formerly called the Territory of South West Africa—and since it

assumed direct responsibility for the Territory until independence, that the Security Council has considered this question as a whole. For that reason the Council has not so far given recognition to resolution 2145 (XXI), apart from mentioning it in the second preambular paragraph of resolution 246 (1968), which was adopted on 14 March 1968.

116. A declaration by the Council recognizing the action taken by the General Assembly is, in our opinion, an essential preliminary to our consideration of such steps or measures as the Council may adopt, in exercise of its powers and in conformity with the provisions of the Charter, to give the Namibian people the opportunity to become master of their own national destiny. The occupation of Namibia by South Africa is illegal precisely because a decision of the General Assembly has terminated its former Mandate.

117. In the conviction that every step in the right direction, however small it may be or seem to be, definitely helps to bring the hour of Namibia's independence nearer, my delegation has joined those of Colombia, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia in submitting to the Council the draft resolution contained in document S/9100, so ably and eloquently introduced this morning by Ambassador Mwaanga on behalf of the sponsors.

118. There is therefore no need for me to refer to the provisions of the draft resolution. The representatives of Zambia, Nepal, Pakistan and Senegal have made a detailed and convincing analysis of the text and of its positive features. I should be failing in a fundamental duty, however, if I did not affirm that the draft resolution undoubtedly represents a great deal less than what many Members of the United Nations, and particularly the African States, expect from the Security Council. While admitting this, I must point out that one of the important reasons for submitting the draft resolution in its present form was our awareness of the situation prevailing in the United Nations and a realistic appraisal of what action was at present possible. Confronted as we were with the need to choose between more vigorous formulae, which would serve only to draw attention to a profound division among members of the Council on a matter as important as that of Namibia, and formulae such as those submitted, which might secure much wider support and thus represent the universal conscience, we honestly believe that the latter alternative is the better, at least for the present. We think that the other alternative, a resolution which would not be supported by the votes of important members of this body, would merely gratify South Africa and that is not our intention. We want to serve the people of Namibia in their just and legitimate desire for full independence and unrestricted sovereignty.

119. What I have just said, together with my statements at the meetings in February and March 1968 [*1392nd meeting, para. 101-107*], establishes the position of my delegation.

120. It only remains for me to express the hope that the draft resolution which my delegation has sponsored with other members of the Council will receive wide support.

121. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Paraguay for the generous remarks he so kindly addressed to me.

122. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to associate itself with the congratulations expressed to you, Mr. President, by previous speakers and to assure you that my delegation will unfailingly co-operate with you in the performance of your duties as President of the Council. My delegation also wishes to compliment Ambassador Jakobson and Ambassador Bérard, of Finland and France respectively, on the manner in which they guided the debates of the Council during January and the private consultations in February.

123. This is the first occasion on which my delegation has spoken on the question of Namibia in the Security Council. The position of the Spanish delegation has, however, been reflected in the discussions of the General Assembly and the Fourth Committee. As my delegation had the opportunity of stating its views in those debates, it does not now intend to give a further account of the history of this subject in the United Nations. We hold that there was a decisive moment in that process and that it occurred with the adoption on 27 October 1966 of resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated the Mandate for South West Africa and thus ended twenty years of fruitless efforts to induce the Government of South Africa to accept the facts of the new international community. My delegation voted in favour of that resolution and is therefore prepared to co-operate in giving effect to any measures which may be necessary for its full implementation.

124. In the same spirit, my delegation supported resolution 2248 (S-V), in the belief that it embodied the essential minimum principles for a solution to the problem of South West Africa. In my delegation's opinion, the setting up of the United Nations Council for Namibia was a desirable first step once the Mandate of the Republic of South Africa had been terminated, because of the possibility that there might be an administrative vacuum until the Territory gained its independence.

125. Two years have elapsed since that resolution was adopted and in that time the proposed administrative machinery has begun to operate and the United Nations Council for Namibia has taken the necessary steps to try to carry out the Assembly's instructions. This is not the place for a detailed analysis of the reports submitted to the General Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia, but we cannot but note that the conclusions in the reports submitted up to now leave no room for hope. All of them, and particularly the most recent one [A/7338],⁷ reflect the Council's sense of frustration, impatience and anxiety on account of the attitude adopted by the Government of South Africa. My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a tribute to the work of the members of the Council, who have done their utmost to perform the important mission entrusted to them by the General Assembly.

126. My delegation, by its support of the resolutions of the General Assembly, has already made its position on the

⁷ *Ibid.*, Annexes, agenda item 64.

substance of the problem clear. It now wishes, however, to state briefly once again that it considers the policy followed by the Government of South Africa up to now in relation to the territory of Namibia to be utterly unrealistic and to be in contravention of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter and the very terms of the Mandate. At the present time it is impossible not to realize that the facts of international life demand that the international community should accept the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

127. My delegation wishes to reiterate its view that, in dealing with this item and many others, the United Nations is confronted with a challenge to the authority and validity of its decisions. My delegation considers that it is essential for the maintenance of a just international order and for the survival of the United Nations that the resolutions of its principal organs should be applied if loss of prestige is to be avoided. The excuse that we need comply only with those of which we approve is not acceptable. Such an approach is contrary to the democratic principles which must prevail in the Organization.

128. In the case under discussion, my delegation is inclined to think that it is possible that the Government of the Republic of South Africa may come to understand and accept the march of time and to co-operate with the United Nations in achieving a peaceful solution to this problem. Should such co-operation not be forthcoming, the prospects for a peaceful solution will undoubtedly become even slighter and the Organization will ultimately be forced to consider the possibility of other measures in order to defend justice in the international order and to protect its own existence.

129. For those reasons of principle, my delegation is in favour of the six-Power draft resolution so ably introduced this morning by the distinguished Ambassador of Zambia. My delegation supports the principles expressed in the operative part and considers that the balanced manner in which they are presented is clear proof of the open-minded and constructive attitude of the sponsors. They have chosen the *via media* between excess and insufficiency. This is the position of the possible, of the only advance that can be made at this time, and my delegation supports it.

130. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Spain for his congratulations.

131. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Allow me, Mr. President, to express my admiration for the manner in which you have presided over the meetings of the Security Council with your accustomed good judgement, courtesy and intelligence.

132. I wish to congratulate also the distinguished Ambassadors of France and Finland, who in the two previous months have demonstrated their outstanding devotion to duty and their experience in international affairs.

133. My delegation has the honour to be one of the countries sponsoring the draft resolution before the Security Council. We also have the privilege and responsibility of being members of the United Nations Council for Namibia

and have accordingly been able to follow the progress of this matter in detail.

134. We deplore the fact that the Government of South Africa has paid little or—to be accurate—no attention to the attitude of the Assembly and the Council for Namibia or to the resolutions of the Security Council itself.

135. Since the revocation of the Mandate by the General Assembly, the situation has not improved: it has, in fact, worsened. I should say that the Government of South Africa has made the people of Namibia suffer on account of its own reaction to the action of the United Nations. To every resolution of the General Assembly, every statement by the Council for Namibia, every resolution of the Security Council, the response of the Government of South Africa is to enact retaliatory measures against the people of Namibia and to intensify its policy of racial discrimination and colonialism.

136. Naturally, this situation creates new and special responsibilities for the United Nations, because the fact that it has adopted a policy of aiding the independence movements of all peoples which have the right to self-determination means that it is compelled not to remain indifferent when, as in this specific case, its support produces a reaction from the colonialist Power. The issue is no longer a problem between Namibia and South Africa, but a confrontation between the Government of South Africa and the authority of the United Nations.

137. We are, of course, in favour of a policy of persuasion, of diplomatic solutions and of reliance on the resources of intelligence until they, too, fail. Hence the draft resolution which we have the honour to co-sponsor is not a verbal expression of strength. It is strong, not because of the wording of its provisions, but because of the justice embodied in its words and because of the wide support it has inside and outside the United Nations.

138. There are two ways in which a resolution can be strong: in its tone, or language, and in the support it has within the United Nations and in world opinion. The draft resolution now under consideration is certainly not strong in its language, but it is one which, because of the support it commands, its identification with the problems and its potential for solving them, is undoubtedly a step forward in the assistance that we must give to the people of Namibia.

139. I am aware, of course, that many of those who are more directly involved with the problem, who suffer with it in their own continent and watch it developing, must feel that our reaction is not strong enough to provide them with timely and decisive aid. In our moderation, however, they may see our desire for co-operation and our determination to be of service to their cause.

140. I entirely agree with the United Kingdom representative's opinion that such cases as this call for practical advance rather than empty words. Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the fact that the sufferings of the people of Namibia are not caused by empty words, but by the real facts of colonialism, racial discrimination and a stubborn determination to destroy their nationality.

141. No useful purpose would be served if, knowing these facts, we were to be associated indirectly with programmes which, while necessary, fail to prevent such extreme injustices as those now inflicted on the people of Namibia. We are advocates of indirect measures, but we also advocate that, at a time when persecution, hostility and retaliation are being inflicted, as they now are on the population of Namibia, the voice of the United Nations should be raised to prevent the continuance of such policies, which we must neither tolerate nor pass over in silence.

142. I realize, of course, that all the nations represented here in the Security Council are fully identified with the anti-colonialist policy which was given practical form by the United Nations in 1960 in resolution 1514 (XV) and that they all recognize and applaud the process of decolonization which has taken place throughout the world. It may be that the greatest success of the United Nations has been in the decolonization process and I believe that we do well to encourage it. Accordingly, we firmly and sincerely assert that in the case of Namibia the satisfaction of this unchanging aspiration of a people which is enduring every kind of cruelty and persecution should not be deferred indefinitely.

143. For these reasons we are sponsors of a draft resolution which is clearly not a threat but an affirmation concerning the specific case before us. It is good that all should know that the Security Council, with all the authority it possesses, acknowledges that the General Assembly's revocation of the former South African Mandate is ratified by the Council itself. It is good that all should know that this distinguished international body considers that the continued presence of South African forces in Namibia is a disruptive factor and a challenge to international peace and peaceful coexistence in the world community.

144. All these affirmations are important, as is the reiterated call upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw its forces and administration from the territory of Namibia; but if none of this comes to pass, if the voice of reason is answered by further reprisals and further colonialist and discriminatory acts, then the Security Council, as the draft resolution states, will meet immediately to determine what the most effective reply to such a further challenge might be and thus avoid the indefinite prolongation of a reign of terror in a territory which deserves a better fate.

145. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Russian*): I thank the representative of Colombia for his generous remarks to the President of the Security Council. The next speaker on my list is Mr. Liu Chieh.

146. Mr. LIU (China): Mr. President, I think the Chair is aware that I am addressing the Council as the representative of China.

147. The question of Namibia is not a new one. Under a different name, Namibia has engaged the attention of the United Nations since the beginning. On this issue, the position of my delegation has been consistently clear. As far back as 1947, as representative of my Government in

the Fourth Committee I stated, in regard to the status of South West Africa—and I now quote from the summary record: “The powers received from the League of Nations under the mandates System were administrative powers, not powers of sovereignty. The Administering State was a trustee, not an owner”.⁸

148. The views I thus expressed on behalf of my Government were repeatedly reaffirmed in successive sessions of the General Assembly. It was on the basis of those views that my delegation unreservedly supported General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which declared that

“... South Africa has failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory”,

and decided that

“... the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa is therefore terminated”.

149. With the virtually unanimous adoption of that resolution by the General Assembly, and with the adoption of Security Council resolution 246 (1968) reaffirming the inalienable right of the people and the Territory of South West Africa to freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the administration of Namibia came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the United Nations to discharge the responsibilities thus assumed in such a manner as to enable the people of the Territory to exercise the right of self-determination and to achieve independence as soon as possible.

150. More than two years have elapsed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). It is regrettable that the Government of South Africa has not shown any inclination to co-operate with the United Nations in regard to this Territory. The immediate issue now before the Council is to find the most effective and practical means of implementing resolution 2145 (XXI). The draft resolution now before us is the nearest thing to a consensus of this Council. As a first step, it rightly

“Invites all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the present resolution” [S/9100, para. 7].

151. Past experience to the contrary notwithstanding, the Council should nevertheless leave no stone unturned for the achievement of a peaceful settlement of this difficult problem. We are convinced that the influence of the Western Powers on the Government of South Africa, if fully asserted, could go a long way towards such a solution. We earnestly hope that the Government of South Africa will find it within its power and in its own interest to make it unnecessary for the Council to take any further steps of a more stringent kind.

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Fourth Committee, 31st meeting, page 6.*

152. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list, but with the permission of the Council I shall address the Council in my capacity as representative of HUNGARY.

153. At the initiative of forty-six Member States, the Security Council is again called upon to discuss the continuing deterioration of the situation in Namibia. The worsening of the situation must be viewed against the background of the policy of the Republic of South Africa in that country. That policy is one of a denial of self-determination, of human rights, of national independence. As we all know, more than two years have passed since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory of South West Africa, as it was called at that time. Since then, the General Assembly and the Security Council have several times been compelled to face the deteriorating situation in Namibia resulting from the refusal of South Africa to comply with the resolutions of those bodies.

154. The white-minority Government of South Africa up to this very day occupies and illegally administers Namibia. What is more, the Pretoria Government has even accelerated the forced implementation of its inhuman plans aimed at dividing that country into several regions—“homelands”, as they call them—contrary to the interest and the will of the people of Namibia. The most elementary rights of self-determination of this African people are thus suppressed. Those who resist the colonial rule of the Pretoria Government are treated as criminals by the oppressive colonial régime. These measures have been condemned by all civilized mankind, and that condemnation has been reflected in Security Council resolution 246 (1968), of last year.

155. The latest plans envisaged by the colonial authorities have shown most convincingly—if there is still need to convince anyone in this matter—that the creation of so-called bantustans is a logical follow-up on the road of the inhuman, oppressive policy of Pretoria. Their attempts to argue that these measures are designed somehow to help the people of Namibia are too transparent to be refuted. The Namibian people has never expressed a wish to be helped by the racists of Pretoria. If there is anyone to be favoured by these policies, it is the racist minority in South Africa which attempts to transform Namibia into a land of more exploitation and suffering.

156. In this respect one cannot pass over in silence the role played by certain Western monopolies which collect huge profits from the toil and sweat of cheap labour in that part of the world.

157. It is a most regrettable state of affairs that the peoples of Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies, not to mention the Republic of South Africa, have to wage their fight for self-determination, for their most elementary human rights, not only against their direct oppressors, but also against the might of powerful monopolies which have allied themselves with their masters. The substantial financial and military assistance provided to South Africa, for instance, against the clearly expressed wish of the United Nations as reflected in resolutions of the

General Assembly, by some major Powers shows convincingly the tragic line-up of forces.

158. But to present a true picture of these forces we must add that the people of Namibia does not have to fight alone against such overwhelming forces. The peoples of many continents and many countries support them in their just cause. The socialist countries have always been in the forefront of those which have offered meaningful support to the peoples fighting for their national independence. The Hungarian People's Republic is duty bound to offer its support to the people of Namibia. Although South Africans, in their statements never tire of asserting that they and they alone know the true conditions prevailing in that country, we all know the truth. The Pretoria Government, probably to underline its exclusive knowledge of these matters, has repeatedly prevented our Organization from obtaining first-hand reports from Namibia. In spite of those attempts we all know not only that the Namibian people are threatened by the inhuman *apartheid* policies, but that their progressive elimination as a separate national entity is also sought.

159. My delegation is thoroughly convinced that such a development clearly must be avoided. For this reason we have believed for a long time that the Security Council must take effective measures against South Africa should it continue its defiance of the United Nations and world conscience. It is in this spirit that we have examined the draft resolution put forward by six members of the Council. From the consultation which preceded our present meeting and from the discussion in the Council we know that the sponsors of the draft resolution wished the Council to adopt a much more effective text than the one now before us. We must express our regret that the position of those Powers whose economic and military interests we have had the opportunity to refer to in this intervention has not made it possible for a text to be adopted which would meet the requirements of the situation. The present text is unsatisfactory on many counts, as has been amply demonstrated by a number of speakers during this discussion. Nevertheless it represents modest progress. In view of this my delegation has decided to give its support to the draft resolution in document S/9100, which, let us not forget, envisages, in the event of further non-compliance by South Africa with the will of the Council, that really effective measures will have to be taken.

160. Speaking as PRESIDENT: I would add that there are no more speakers on the list, and if no other representative wishes to take the floor now, I shall ask the Council to vote on the six-Power draft resolution.

161. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I do not intend to start an argument with the United Kingdom representative about his comments on my statement. I will confine myself to some information. In my statement I spoke of \$3,000 million of British investments and \$950 million of trade. If I heard correctly, he mentioned the sum of \$950,000. It we compare these three figures, we can see what a paltry sum that contribution is by comparison with the profits which the United Kingdom derives from South Africa, including Namibia. This sum will not redeem one's sins and is

certainly nothing to brag about. This is, in fact, a case of what Shakespeare would have called "Much ado about nothing".

162. It would be better if we concerted our efforts in the Security Council and concentrated not on how to absolve ourselves by such sums, but on how to free the people of Namibia from the oppression and terror of the racist exploiters of South Africa.

163. As regards Soviet assistance for the education of Africans, I can assure the British representative that he has no cause to worry. In the Soviet Union—and my friend the representative of Zambia who was Ambassador in Moscow can confirm this—there are 1,000 Africans studying. Among them there are Namibians; so I can assure the United Kingdom representative that we spend on the education of Namibians in the Soviet Union an amount which is probably greater than the sum he mentioned.

164. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I do not wish to delay the Council at this stage to answer what I think would be generally regarded as the irrelevancies of the representative of the Soviet Union. I would perhaps point out that the only reference I made to the Soviet Union was in regard to the failure of that country to contribute to the United Nations scheme for education and training for Namibians. He saw fit now to invite additional attention to the fact that no contribution has been made by his country, whereas my country, I am glad to say, heads the list of contributors. I would assure him that an ounce of financial assistance is worth more than a ton of talk, and I only wish that the assistance which he gave under this scheme of education and training to the people of Namibia was more tangible.

165. The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak, the Council may proceed to vote on the six-Power draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Colombia, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal and Zambia, which is before the Council in document S/9100.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none with 2 absentions.⁹

166. The PRESIDENT: Since there are no further speakers, the Council has now concluded its examination of the current phase of the item on our agenda, an item of which the Council will remain seized.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

⁹ See resolution 264 (1969).