



UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/9204
14 May 1969

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL IN PURSUANCE OF RESOLUTION 264 (1969)
ADOPTED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL AT ITS 1469TH MEETING ON 20 MARCH 1969
CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

1. This report is submitted to the Security Council in pursuance of the request made to the Secretary-General by the Council in paragraph 9 of resolution 264 (1969) "to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible".

2. The operative paragraphs of resolution 264 (1969) read as follows:

"1. Recognizes that the United Nations General Assembly terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence;

"2. Considers that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and the previous decisions of the United Nations and is detrimental to the interests of the population of the territory and those of the international community;

"3. Calls upon the Government of South Africa to immediately withdraw its administration from the territory;

"4. Declares that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

"5. Declares that the Government of South Africa has no right to enact the 'South West Africa Affairs Bill', as such an enactment would be a violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"6. Condemns the refusal of South Africa to comply with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI); 2248 (S-V); 2324 (XXII); 2325 (XXII); 2372 (XXII); and 2403 (XXIII) and Security Council resolutions 245 and 246 of 1968;

"7. 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;

"8. Decides that in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations;

"9. Requests the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible;

"10. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter."

3. Immediately upon the adoption of the resolution by the Security Council on 20 March 1969, the Secretary-General transmitted its text by telegram to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of South Africa.

4. In a note dated 25 March 1969 the Secretary-General transmitted the text of resolution 264 (1969) to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies, drawing particular attention to operative paragraph 7 wherein the Council invited all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the resolution.

5. With a note dated 5 May 1969, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations transmitted to the Secretary-General a letter dated 30 April, with annexes, from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa in reply to the Secretary-General's telegram of 20 March. (The communication from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, together with its annexes, is reproduced in annex I below.)

6. In response to his note of 25 March, the Secretary-General has received, as of 14 May 1969, acknowledgements from the Permanent Representatives of Burma, Colombia, Madagascar, Nepal, Nicaragua, the Philippines and the United Kingdom, as well as replies from Japan and Kuwait, the substantive portions of which are reproduced in annex II below.

7. Further reports by the Secretary-General on this question will be issued as relevant information is received.

ANNEX I

Letter dated 30 April 1969 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the Republic of South Africa addressed to the Secretary-General

Your Excellency,

With reference to your telegram of 20 March 1969, transmitting to me the text of a resolution adopted by the Security Council at its 1465th meeting on 20 March 1969, I have the honour to enclose the text of a statement made by me in the South African Senate on 20 March 1969. I also enclose an extract (translated from the Afrikaans) from a public address by the South African Prime Minister on 21 March 1969. In addition I wish to invite your attention once again to my letter of 27 March 1968, as well as to the documents mentioned therein.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurance of my highest consideration.

(Signed) H. MULLER
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

/...

TEXT OF STATEMENT MADE BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN MINISTER OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN THE SENATE ON 20 MARCH 1969

MR. PRESIDENT, thank you for giving me the opportunity to make a statement. I wish to deal with aspects of the South West Africa question raised as a result of the proposed United Nations Security Council meeting.

In repeatedly stating that attempts by the United Nations to terminate our administration of South West Africa were illegal, we based our stand on sound legal principles. None of our critics has been able to prove our arguments legally inadequate. Similarly we hold that there is no legal basis for the activities of the so-called Council for South West Africa or for Security Council intervention. These activities and attempts to terminate our administration of the Territory are not only illegal, but they are also totally unrealistic in the light of the peaceful evolution which South West Africa has been enjoying and in the light of South West Africa's close economic and political association with the Republic over more than half a century. Nowhere does one find any indication as to how the interests of the peoples of South West Africa are to be served by the action envisaged in various United Nations bodies. Instead, ignoring the true facts of conditions in South West Africa and the multinational character of the Territory's population, the General Assembly has simply continued to build on its illegal resolution of 27 October 1966, and has been devising various means to create the impression that a situation exists in South West Africa which constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The so-called United Nations Council for South West Africa has become one of the instruments to further this aim. It has, of course, willing partners in a number of countries which are bent on using South West Africa to achieve their own political aims. These various elements have recently made appeals to the Security Council, alleging that our presence and certain developments in South West Africa constitute a threat to international peace. In view of the fact that the Security Council is apparently acquiescing in these requests, it is interesting to examine the factual basis for invoking Security Council discussion of the matter. In a communication dated 28 February 1969, the so-called Council for South West Africa lists five alleged illegal actions which are, inter alia, relied upon to substantiate the Council's view that the situation in South West Africa

/...

constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. These illegal actions are, and I quote:

- "1. the calculated destruction of the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of the country by establishing bantustans, among others that of Ovamboland;
2. the forcible removal of indigenous people from their native location in Windhoek to Katutura;
3. the arrest, deportation, trial and conviction of Namibians, in contravention of General Assembly resolution 2324 (XXII) of 16 December 1967 and Security Council resolutions 245 and 246 (1968);
4. the displacement of over a thousand Namibians from the Caprivi Strip who subsequently took refuge in Zambia;
5. the projected removal of children from Hoachanas about which the Council has recently received reports."

Let us briefly examine these charges. As regards the first allegation, the peoples of South West Africa have never formed a homogeneous entity and they themselves wish to retain their identities. The differences which exist in South West Africa exist naturally and historically, just as a multiplicity of ethnic groups in other countries did not come about by reason of governmental policy. The South African Government therefore simply follows the most practical policy determined by the historic circumstances and facts as they exist in South West Africa. It is therefore fallacious to speak of the unity of the people of South West Africa. Has there ever been any unity between the people of the Eastern Caprivi and, for instance, the Rehoboth Basters, or between the Bushmen and the Herero or between the Ovambo and the Nama? The unity to which the Council for South West Africa refers does not exist and has never existed and cannot be brought about by governmental fiat as any attempt to do so would necessarily entail the use of force which would revive the internecine warfare which was still fresh in the memory of all the population groups at the time of the inception of the Mandate.

As for the Council's allegation that the South African Government is destroying the territorial integrity of the country, I wish to make it clear that the Government is destroying nothing - it is preserving and safeguarding the right

of self-determination of each and every population group in South West Africa. We have maintained the separate international status of South West Africa. As far as their political development is concerned, the peoples of South West Africa themselves will decide their own future. We will not force groups, which do not wish to be together, into artificial units. On the other hand, if different groups wish to come together of their own volition at some stage or other of their development, they are free to do so. There is therefore no question of keeping peoples apart who wish to come together. The principle of self-determination to which the South African Government is committed, leaves the way open for unlimited possibilities compatible with the choice which each population group may eventually wish to make. What our detractors have in mind is the opposite, namely the destruction of the right of self-determination of the peoples of South West Africa.

It is likewise wrong to speak of the establishment of Ovamboland as a Bantustan in the sense implied by the Council. Ovamboland was established by the Ovambo people more than two centuries ago in the same way that Swaziland or Botswana or Lesotho was established. Thus the Ovambo and, for that matter, the Okavango and the East Caprivi people are today living in the homelands which they chose. The South African Government recognizes this historical fact. No other policy of a democratic nature is possible and no other policy is desired by the peoples concerned, in particular the Ovambo, who constitute more than 50 per cent of the indigenous peoples of South West Africa.

An important aspect that needs to be emphasized here is that these developments in South West Africa did not flow from any sudden or impulsive decisions by the South African Government - these matters have for a long time been debated and there ought to be no doubt as to the purpose underlying the envisaged changes. For instance, in a public speech at Windhoek on 29 August 1967, the South African Prime Minister made it clear that the purpose of the proposed changes was for better administration and not for incorporation of the Territory. The Prime Minister stated that the changes would not affect the separate international status of South West Africa. The reorganization would also have been completely lawful under the former Mandate as it fell within the concept of administration and legislation as an integral portion of South Africa aimed at the promotion of the welfare of the inhabitants of South West Africa.

In addition, the separate administration of the Caprivi Zipfel dates back to the inception of the Mandate. Furthermore, in 1954 the functions in regard to the administration of Bantu affairs in South West Africa were transferred to the appropriate South African Department.

The Applicants in the South West Africa Cases actually relied, inter alia, on these two examples in contending that South Africa had treated South West Africa in a manner inconsistent with the separate international status of the Territory.

The only two judges who dealt with the Applicants' charges relative to the two examples in question rejected their claims as based on the two instances in question.

It is also significant that a third judge, Sir Louis Mbanefo, the ad hoc judge nominated by the Applicants, did not include the Applicants' charges concerning unilateral incorporation in the list of claims which, in his opinion, had "on the evidence and the law been established" and upon which "the Court should have pronounced favourably".

Another aspect which is worth mentioning is that South West Africa is in any case already relying on a multitude of South African agencies, official and private, in order to maintain the standard of living, health, prosperity, security and well-being of all the various population groups.

In a statement made by a South African representative in the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1967, the position in connexion with the envisaged rearrangements was rather fully dealt with.

In an address to the Ovambo nation the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development on 21 March 1967, offered them continued assistance in their advance towards self-government. The reaction of the Ovambo nation was one of unanimous and enthusiastic approval. The Minister's statement was generally welcomed in responsible circles, also beyond South Africa's borders, as "a step in the right direction". In October 1968, the first session of the Ovamboland Legislative Council was formally opened. All these matters were openly discussed from 1964 onwards in the South African Parliament. The South African Government has for a long time and, what is more important, in consultation with the peoples of the Territory, openly proceeded towards those goals which have recently been formalized by legislation.

The second charge, namely that the inhabitants of the old location near Windhoek were forcibly removed to Katutura, is devoid of all truth. On the contrary, 8,000 persons were resettled in far superior surroundings without a single incident. In the light of the history of the persistent refusal of certain elements in the old location to accept any resettlement proposals and their constant incitement of the inhabitants against any such plans over a period of almost ten years, it is obvious that the move could not have taken place unless the authorities had enjoyed the co-operation of the vast majority of the persons concerned. The resettlement was necessary as a result of the unhygienic conditions in the location which had become so deplorable that it would have been irresponsible for any authority to have deferred action. Initial opposition to the proposed resettlement was caused by the political agitation among a small minority of the 8,000 residents. The decision of the municipal council of Windhoek was based on concern for the health and welfare of the inhabitants and was fully endorsed by the Advisory Council of Katutura, a body elected by the 13,000 residents who had already settled there. It became clear to the political agitators in the old location that the majority of the inhabitants of the old location was no longer prepared to forfeit the advantages of living under decent and modern conditions in Katutura for the sake of questionable political propaganda. Realizing the futility of their course, the leaders of the opposition surreptitiously started co-operating with the authorities in effecting the final departure of the inhabitants of the old location. Adequate compensation for relinquishing their dilapidated structures was paid by the Municipality to the inhabitants who moved before the stipulated time. Free transport was provided. At no stage was force used. As far as transport is concerned, the further distance from Windhoek cannot have any effect in practice as almost all employers pay the transport costs of their employees who reside in Katutura where facilities include modern schools, sports grounds, children's play-grounds, crèches, beer halls and community centres, libraries, concert halls, dance halls, etc.

As regards the third allegation, it is not clear what is meant by "arrest, deportation, trial and conviction of Namibians". The Council presumably has in mind the legitimate action by the South African Government with the full support of the peoples of South West Africa against terrorists who received training in

countries like Tanzania, the United Arab Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Red China and who infiltrated South West Africa with the purpose of overthrowing law and order by violent means. The Government's attitude on this subject was set out adequately in letters which I wrote to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 15 February and 27 March 1968.

Under the pretext of concern for the political rights and welfare of the non-white peoples of South West Africa, a campaign of terrorism and sabotage had been launched against South West Africa and South Africa from outside our borders. Because of the ruthless methods of violence employed by the terrorists in their attempt to sow murder, arson and bloodshed, South Africa has had to adopt measures which in normal circumstances would not have been contemplated but which are considered necessary to protect the civilian population and to preserve law and order in the interest of justice. I wish to reaffirm the Government's determination not to abdicate our responsibility towards the peoples entrusted to our care, the overwhelming majority of whom have demonstrated their support and assistance in combating the terrorist incursions. The most recent example of this support was the unanimous adoption of a motion on 14 February 1969, by the Legislative Council of Ovamboland in which terrorism was condemned as a threat to life and property in Ovamboland and in which the Council's appreciation was expressed for the assistance rendered by the South African Government in combating this evil.

The fourth allegation further illustrates the Council's disregard for objectivity and truth.

The matter of so-called refugees from the Caprivi Zipfel has already been raised by the Council for South West Africa in the past, when on 25 October 1968, the President of the Council called the attention of the Security Council to what it termed atrocities against Caprivians, alleging that forty-six had been killed and 117 arrested in operations against terrorists. The factual position is that when police action became necessary to maintain the peace and security of the region, as a result of terrorist activities in the area, a number of suspects were arrested with the co-operation of the inhabitants of the Caprivi and no one was killed. The unreliability of the information disseminated by the Council has thus been a feature of its pronouncements, just like the present instance; a

/...

relatively small number of the inhabitants of the Caprivi, estimated at between 500 and 600, left the Caprivi with the same ease as that with which they have been visiting friends and relations on the other side of the border since time immemorial.

In this instance, they were intimidated and misled by terrorist elements who, anticipating police action as a result of their terrorist activities, spread frightening stories of expected police action against everyone. In the meantime more than a hundred of them have returned indicating that they had to escape from the guarded camps where the so-called refugees are now virtually being detained as hostages by the Zambian authorities for the sake of world opinion.

It is interesting to note that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reported on 30 April 1968, that there were an estimated 850,000 refugees in Africa south of the Sahara and at that time guessed the number from South Africa to be 400 "in various countries". Even if the Caprivians in Zambia could, in fact, rightly be given the title of refugees, their minimal number would hardly justify "urgent consideration".

The fifth allegation relates to the "projected removal of children from Hoachanas" reported to the Council. Examination of this charge further illustrates on what flimsy grounds it is attempted to reinforce the sweeping assertions that somehow or other the situation in South West Africa constitutes a threat to international peace. In this case reliance is placed on recent allegations made by a certain person with the name of Markus Kooper. The truth is that at no stage have the South African authorities considered removing school children in an attempt to force their parents, indirectly, to follow them. The lesson which the Applicant States in the South West Africa Cases learnt as to the unreliability of petitioners in general, is too easily forgotten in United Nations circles. For instance, this very same gentleman made certain allegations concerning misdeeds and evil intentions of the South African Government in respect of Hoachanas, which featured briefly in the Pleadings of the Applicant States during the initial stages of the South West Africa Cases. South Africa dealt with the allegations and eventually the Applicant States were forced to admit that they "... have not relied upon the accuracy of statements in such

/...

petitions". What is the more significant, South Africa went so far as to indicate that it would consider, if the Applicant States should wish to call the petitioners as witnesses, whether it ought not to offer to pay their witness fees so as to allow us the privilege of cross-examining them before the International Court of Justice. Needless to say this offer was never taken up. However, the unreliable evidence of the very same individuals is now again being relied upon - it is even adduced in the move to invoke a Security Council meeting.

While dealing with these flights of fantasy of the Council for South West Africa, I would like to refer briefly to one of its make-believe acts of administering South West Africa. This relates to the issuance of travel documents to inhabitants of South West Africa. Such action would not only be illegal, but patently ridiculous. It is obvious that the travel documents are mainly intended for terrorists and agitators who are enemies of South West Africa and its peoples. Most of them have also left the country illegally and for illegal purposes. Receiving, and using in contravention of existing legal provisions, a travel document issued by the United Nations Council - in any case a document without legal status - will not alter these facts. There should be no illusions on the part of the recipients of this document. It will not be recognized either in the Republic of South Africa or South West Africa. Suitable instructions have been issued to all South African passport officials as to the procedure to be followed when anyone in possession of a United Nations Council travel document presents himself at any port of entry.

Is it too much to expect the more responsible Powers to call a halt to this farcical state of affairs?

There is, however, a further aspect, besides the factual, which deserves mention and that is that the Security Council should be urged to discuss the situation at all at a time when international situations of really dangerous dimensions abound. I consider it appropriate to recount remarks I made in this place almost two years ago. It will be recalled that war broke out in the Middle East in the early part of June 1967, and despite ominous warnings which preceded the outbreak of hostilities, the United Nations saw fit to hold an emergency session of the General Assembly in connexion with South West Africa. I pointed

out then that the chief aim of the United Nations was to maintain peace but that the Organization had disregarded the real threats to peace. In fact, the Organization was used to interfere in situations which did not endanger world peace. Instead of furthering peace, the United Nations sometimes did exactly the opposite, namely, to try to create feelings of enmity and to increase international tension. In spite of the burning danger in the Middle East at the time, the United Nations busied itself with an emergency session on South West Africa. Its only contribution at that stage had been to remove the United Nations task force from the Middle East, the force which was put there to try to maintain peace. I warned at the time that the events which pushed South West Africa off the front pages of the world Press were not without meaning and I added that even if there were no other crises in the world, it would still have been as wrong and illogical and unrealistic and dangerous to have regarded South West Africa as a threat to peace. It could not even be regarded as a lesser threat compared to other dangers because it is no threat at all. I expressed the hope that perhaps the full realization of the seriousness of actual crises in many other parts of the world would contribute more and more to restoring the true perspective in connexion with South West Africa. Today I wish to repeat the sentiments I expressed at that time. I think I can do so for even more compelling reasons. On the one hand peaceful and orderly progress has continued in South West Africa. Meaningful advances have been made in every field of human activity in South West Africa and standards have been achieved comparing more than favourably with those prevailing in any country in Africa except the Republic itself. Two-thirds of the peoples of South West Africa are now governing themselves. This is evolution not revolution. The results of our efforts are there to be seen by anyone who is genuinely interested to know the facts.

In contrast, how does this compare with the international scene? In the Middle East, United Nations efforts have not produced an amelioration in the continually explosive situation. Atrocities and revenge across the borders have become almost daily occurrences.

Viet-Nam continues to be a flash-point of conflagration in the Far East. It is estimated that between 400,000 and 500,000 have been killed on both sides in Viet-Nam since 1961. This number by the way, amounts to almost the total

/...

population of South West Africa. Civilian casualties have been particularly heavy. The war in Viet-Nam has largely overshadowed the almost equally dangerous situations within the same region. For instance, in Thailand a not insignificant United States presence and more than 110,000 Thai troops are needed to contain communist expansion. Here, as elsewhere, Peking follows the same pattern of exploiting insignificant grievances followed by terrorist infiltration.

In Laos a similar situation obtains. Although the Geneva Conference proclaimed Laos as a neutral country, the expanded influence and power of communism have already gained control of substantial parts of the country and actual fighting has been going on for a long time.

In our own continent we receive with dismay daily reports of the large-scale killings in Biafra. Hospitals and villages are being indiscriminately bombed in a war in which, according to former President Azikiwe, 1.7 million persons, mainly children, have already died - three times the total population of South West Africa. Has the United Nations forgotten the meaning of the word genocide?

In Eastern Europe the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet military might is still fresh in our minds. The Soviet action violated almost every principle of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of solemn declarations concerning human rights and fundamental freedoms. The world has been waiting in vain for serious international reaction to this deed. Instead, many of the countries who are in the forefront when it comes to condemning South Africa for alleged breaches of human rights, have found it expedient to acquiesce in the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia. The Soviet aggression - involving 600,000 troops - has already been forgotten and perhaps forgiven and Czechoslovakia's bondage has simply been accepted.

Recent clashes between Russian and Chinese troops north of Vladivostok are ominous signs of a further build-up in the power struggle of the great Powers. It also underlines that communism cannot live in peace even with itself.

Again back in Africa - one can ask what role has the United Nations played to relieve the plight of the Indians in East Africa.

What action has the United Nations taken to stamp out terrorism? Not only is this danger overlooked, but in certain instances the United Nations is conniving at terrorism thereby undermining the security of the world.

These are examples of friction points which spring to mind immediately. These are by no means all.

To sum up: there are everywhere signs of an intensification of tension in the relations between nations and States. Armed confrontations between States are increasing. The rivalry between the aggressive giants is worsening. International gangsterism and lawlessness increase with impunity. One has only to consider aircraft piracy and hijackings which have occurred at an average of one a week since the beginning of 1969, to appreciate what the consequences would be for international travel and communications all over the world should this scourge continue.

The protracted human carnage in various parts of the world continues unabated. Irreparable damage is being done to the economies of countries which can least afford it. War is slowing down the economic growth of many of the less-developed peoples of the world. The stagnation of social and economic development in many areas of the world remains an invitation to anarchy. Two thirds of the world's population constantly face the indignities of poverty and the sorrow of disease. Millions face starvation and violent death.

These are the real problems of the world and in a statement I made to the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 1967, I appealed to the Organization that we should devote our attention to their solution. I emphasized that the solution of the basic evils of poverty, ill-health and illiteracy was vital for alleviating the suffering and want of the world's peoples. I repeated these sentiments during the 1968 session of the General Assembly and I indicated in broad outline how we could go about achieving those aims. The astonishing request of the Council for South West Africa, based as it is on factual inaccuracy and on inadequate legal grounds, should be seen against the situations of world-wide significance which I have referred to. Only then can the degree of futility and the depth of cynicism inherent in the Council's request be fully appreciated.

In conclusion I wish to say this: South Africa has made many efforts to find a reasonable basis for a settlement of the South West Africa question, but these efforts have come to nought as a result of the continual emotional demands of irresponsible States who do not have the interests of the peoples of South West Africa at heart but wish to use the South West Africa situation to achieve their

own political aims. We are proud of our achievements in South West Africa and of the fact that the peoples of that Territory already enjoy a standard of living which compares more than favourably with the rest of Africa. We have never felt that we have anything to hide or to be ashamed of in regard to our administration, policies and objectives in South West Africa. Full details of our administration and results achieved, running into thousands of pages and supported by expert testimony, were for example given to the International Court of Justice during the proceedings in the South West Africa Cases. Our representatives actively participated in the 1966 debate in the United Nations. In 1967 we published and widely distributed a detailed survey of South West Africa covering all the important fields of human activity in the Territory. Early in 1967 we invited the envoys of all Governments accredited to South Africa to visit all parts of South West Africa and to see conditions for themselves. I have kept the Secretary-General of the United Nations fully informed about our attitude on the illegality of the United Nations action in respect of South West Africa and we have also furnished him with an analysis of terrorist activities and measures which we took to combat terrorism together with an exposition of progress made in South West Africa in various fields of human life. In accordance with our declared attitude of being willing to enlighten whosoever is objectively interested in the well-being of the inhabitants of South West Africa, we indicated to U Thant our willingness to receive his personal representative provided he was mutually acceptable, and provided also we could be assured that factual information made available to him would not, as so often in the past, be ignored.

Unfortunately the United Nations seems to take no interest in any information or findings favourable to South Africa. Wild assertions of alleged tyranny are, on the other hand, automatically accepted as gospel.

Mr. President, we wish to live in harmony with all our neighbours. We wish to see our neighbours prosper and their inhabitants reap the benefits of economic progress and we are more than willing to aid them. We in southern Africa are developing a pattern of peaceful coexistence that can make a real contribution to peace and progress on our subcontinent. Our peoples do not pose a threat to one another or to anyone else. As I stated on another occasion - left in peace, the peoples of southern Africa can assure for themselves a bright future. This being

our policy in respect of our relations with our neighbours, the more do these principles also apply to those committed to our care - in particular the peoples of South West Africa.

The peoples of South West Africa rely on our continued guidance and assistance in their development towards self-determination and greater prosperity for all.

Our duty is clear and we have no intention of failing or deserting them.

Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to Hon. Senators for the opportunity to make this statement. Thank you.

EXTRACT FROM PUBLIC ADDRESS BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER
ON 21 MARCH 1969 (TRANSLATION FROM THE AFRIKAANS)

"... South Africa's point of view was most aptly put yesterday by our Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. H. Muller. ... I don't want to go over the matter again - I cannot set out the position better than he himself did in the Senate yesterday, but I would like, on behalf of South Africa, to give a reply tonight to the decision that was taken. That reply is simply this: South Africa has a duty towards the inhabitants of South West Africa. We do not plan to leave them in the lurch, nor do we have any intention of allowing ourselves to be prescribed to from without as to where our duty lies and how we should acquit ourselves of it.

But I should also like to reply to a friendly suggestion that was put forward by the United States of America on that occasion to the effect that we should receive a representative of the United Nations in South Africa unconditionally. I am sorry but I cannot do that, and to avoid all misunderstanding in that respect, I want to set out my position on this matter very clearly.

Last year, after the adoption by the Security Council of its resolution in respect of terrorists in South West Africa, the Secretary-General approached us to ascertain whether we would be prepared to receive a representative from him to discuss this matter. Following on from this, we made it clear that South Africa was not prepared to discuss the release of terrorists.

We added, however, that South Africa was always prepared to enlighten whomsoever was genuinely interested in the welfare of the inhabitants of South West Africa, of what was being done for them. ... In that spirit we were also willing to receive a personal representative of the Secretary-General, if we could be assured that factual information put at his disposal would not simply be ignored as had often happened in the past.

But in addition, the representative - and I want to emphasize this because of what has happened in the past - would need to be acceptable to both sides. This offer was not accepted by the Secretary-General. And in the spirit of the precedent created by the late Dag Hammarskjöld's visit to South Africa in 1960, we are still prepared, without prejudice to South Africa's juridical and other standpoints, to discuss matters of mutual concern regarding our relations with the United Nations, with the Secretary-General or his representative.

On such an occasion ideas can be exchanged to see if a basis can indeed be found for discussions on different aspects of our relations with the United Nations. But if that discussion is to be conducted in the spirit that the United Nations has already taken over South West Africa, and that they now want to come here to hear when they can have the Territory, then I am not at home for such discussions.

If others are genuinely seeking information, if they really have something to discuss, then I am prepared to have discussions with any representative of the Secretary-General who is acceptable to us. This is and remains our viewpoint."

ANNEX II

Substantive portion of replies received from Governments

JAPAN

9 May 1969
/Original: English/

In view of operative paragraph 7 of the resolution, wherein the Security Council invited all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the resolution, the Government of Japan recently expressed to the Government of South Africa its deep regret at the fact that the Government of South Africa continues to take various measures which are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations resolutions, in particular General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. The Government of Japan again urged the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the United Nations resolutions relevant to the question.

KUWAIT

31 March 1969
/Original: English/

... the Government of the State of Kuwait has no diplomatic or other relations with the Government of South Africa and, therefore, is unable to exert any influence with that Government to obtain compliance with the provisions of resolution 264 (1969), adopted by the Security Council at its 1465th meeting.
