

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1492<sup>nd</sup>** MEETING: 30 JULY 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1492) . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 24 July 1969 from the representatives of Chile, Colombia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9359) . . . . .	1

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-SECOND MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 30 July 1969, at 3 p.m.

*President:* M. Ibrahima BOYE (Senegal).

*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/1492)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 24 July 1969 from the representatives of Chile, Colombia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9359).

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in Namibia

**Letter dated 24 July 1969 from the representatives of Chile, Colombia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Yugoslavia and Zambia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9359)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In a letter dated 30 July 1969, the representative of Chile asked to be invited to participate in the Council's debate on the question before it. If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the Council agrees to invite the representative of Chile to participate in the Council's debate, without the right to vote in accordance with the rules of procedure and the practice of the Council.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Piñera (Chile) took a place at the Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now proceed to consider the question of the situation in Namibia, submitted by the representatives of eleven States in their letter of 24 July 1969 [S/9359].<sup>1</sup>

3. In this connexion, I draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/9352,<sup>1</sup> containing a letter

dated 23 July 1969 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia addressed to the President of the Security Council and to document S/9204,<sup>1</sup> containing the report by the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 264 (1969) adopted by the Security Council at its 1465th meeting on 20 March 1969 concerning the situation in Namibia.

4. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. President, before taking up the item on our agenda today, my delegation wishes to express to you its gratitude and appreciation for the able way in which you have presided over the meetings of the Security Council.

5. The repeated refusal of the Government of South Africa to comply with the recommendations of the United Nations, particularly with those contained in Security Council resolution 264 (1969), has led a group of States, Colombia among them, to request this meeting in order to consider the situation created by this defiant attitude towards the lofty interests of international peace and the authority of the international Organization.

6. On 23 July 1969, I had the pleasure, in my capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of addressing to you, Mr. President, the letter contained in document S/9352, in which I expressed the grave concern felt by all the members of that Council about the reaction of the Government of South Africa to Security Council resolution 264 (1969). I further stated:

"The United Nations Council for Namibia, which bears responsibility for administering the Territory until independence, finds itself unable to discharge its tasks effectively and to carry out its basic functions under the terms of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) owing to the South African Government's open defiance of these resolutions and of the United Nations authority in continuing the illegal occupation of the Territory."<sup>2</sup>

7. I also conveyed to you our concern about the fact that the Government of South Africa is continuing to adopt measures designed to dismember the Territory of Namibia and illegally prosecute those Namibians who do not meekly submit to the terrorism instituted by the measures of the Pretoria régime. As stated in that letter, since the Security Council's adoption of resolution 264 (1969), the Government of South Africa has taken fresh measures with a view to establishing "homelands" to facilitate its undisguisable

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1969.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, page 136.

annexation intentions. The Council for Namibia also noted with deep concern the arbitrary trial now in progress against eight Namibians, conducted under the "Terrorism Act".

8. The delegations of the eleven States which constitute the United Nations Council for Namibia also requested you, Mr. President, to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council, in the firm conviction that some effective step must be taken to prevent South Africa from unjustifiably refusing to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly

9. The item now before us has been extensively discussed in the General Assembly and the Security Council. This case has covered a great deal of ground over the last 20 years and is certainly a good example of the frustrations which still occur where anti-colonialist policy is concerned.

10. The South African Government's systematic confrontation of the world Organization makes that country a defective Member of this United Nations club dedicated to peaceful settlements, harmony and cordiality.

11. The Government of South Africa does not merely confine itself to ignoring the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council but also assumes the right to pass judgement on the United Nations and hold the Organization up to world opinion as being unequal to its responsibilities and the performance of its obligations and duties.

12. Document S/9204 of 14 May 1969 contains the text of the statement made on 20 March 1969 by the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs in that country's Senate, in which anyone can easily read the grave charges made by that official against the world Organization. He says that, instead of furthering peace, the United Nations sometimes does exactly the opposite, namely tries to create feelings of enmity and to increase international tension.

13. After reading these views of the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, we can easily understand the contempt shown in that country for each and every decision of the United Nations. How can there be obedience to the authority of an Organization if, in the opinion of the officials of the Pretoria Government, it does nothing but increase enmity and international tension? It is deplorable that a State Member of the United Nations, such as South Africa, should constantly oppose the principles and provisions of the San Francisco Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

14. It opposes those principles because it is pursuing a policy which does not respect the self-determination of peoples, because it employs racial discrimination as a means of political domination and because in these final decades of the twentieth century it is prolonging the worst forms of colonialism.

15. It also challenges the authority of the United Nations because, impelled by its expansionist aims, it describes as illegal all the acts of the world Organization which may set

a limit on its greed for territory. The laws on the fragmentation of the Territory of Namibia constitute a flagrant violation by the Government of South Africa of its international obligations, involving not only the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council but also the international status of a Territory which has never belonged to South Africa but was entrusted to it under a Mandate. The Mandate was terminated because South Africa failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Territory and was unable to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa.

16. The General Assembly, in terminating the Mandate conferred by the former League of Nations upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa, decided that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory of South West Africa (now Namibia), and that henceforth the Territory came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

17. For this purpose, the General Assembly, in order to assume this responsibility until such time as the population of South West Africa acquired total independence, established the United Nations Council for Namibia, composed of representatives of eleven States which have repeatedly encountered the hostility of the Government of South Africa in their attempts to carry out their duties satisfactorily. That Council, in view of its inability to act, has on various occasions turned to the Security Council—an organ which certainly has appropriate means to enforce its decisions, if it so wishes.

18. Unfortunately, the resolutions of the Council have met with no better reception from the Government of South Africa than those of the General Assembly. Its recommendations have fallen into the pit of South African incomprehension and in a way have served only to intensify the bloody methods used by the Pretoria régime against the defenceless, long-suffering and victimized population of Namibia.

19. Heeding the sound suggestions of distinguished members of this principal organ of the United Nations, we have never in the resolutions adopted by the Council gone beyond intellectual persuasion. Several representatives had maintained that we should not resort to enforcement action because the way still remained open for indirect measures and diplomatic solutions. Nevertheless, the fact is that resolution 264 (1969) has been disobeyed, despite its cordial tone and very lofty objectives. We have therefore reached a point where it becomes necessary to prevent the deterioration reflected in the challenge to the authority of the Security Council and to the United Nations in general.

20. No procedure is more likely to embarrass the Organization and weaken its prestige than the adoption of resolutions which can be violated by any States with impunity. The fact that for 20 years in succession a State can violate the recommendations of the world Organization without incurring the slightest liability is a source of constant concern to those Member States which abide by the principles of the San Francisco Charter in good faith.

21. If the rebelliousness and the arrogant and defiant attitude of the South African Government were to spread, the United Nations would very soon find itself heading towards a serious crisis of authority which would destroy all the hopes placed in the system of collective security erected on the basis of discipline and obedience to common principles of harmonious international coexistence.

22. The Security Council should not allow the armed forces of South Africa to continue their illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia or let the Pretoria authorities violate human rights and irresponsibly foment racial strife. These explosive ingredients heighten international tension and create deep rifts between the members of the human family.

23. As the representative of Colombia—a country with a long tradition of anti-colonialism, which has built its democratic system upon the irreplaceable foundation of equality of opportunity and, consequently, rejecting of discriminatory practices—I would not feel at ease if I failed to express my most forceful protest against the reactionary policy of the Government of South Africa or to voice the solidarity of my people with all those who, like the indigenous people of Namibia, are struggling for their independence and for respect for human dignity.

24. The meeting we are now holding is the natural consequence of Security Council resolution 264 (1969), which in operative paragraph 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;”.

25. The Government of South Africa has already given its reply to resolution 264 (1969) and has reiterated its well-known and threadbare arguments on the illegality of United Nations actions. Thus, the Security Council is now confronted with its own promise to determine upon necessary steps and measures that should be adopted in accordance with the Charter of the Organization.

26. My delegation, in its dual capacity as a member of the Security Council and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, is determined to move forward in defence of the authority of the world Organization, as far as the Security Council itself now decides.

27. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): This is the second time in a little over four months that this Council has had to take up the question of Namibia.<sup>3</sup> The problem remains unresolved. The world power complex and its economic and military organization still form a hard crust, under which lie the dominated black populations, with all their misery and discontent but obviously determined to dislodge their oppressors.

28. This Council has made relentless efforts to solve the question of Namibia; but confronted with the hardened and

defiant attitude of the Pretoria régime, we must concede that the prospects for the future of that country are more sombre than they have ever been.

29. Prior to the adoption of its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, which revoked the mandatory power of South Africa over Namibia, the General Assembly alone had adopted well over forty-five resolutions on the inhuman conduct of the Government of South Africa towards Namibia.

30. My delegation is perturbed by the fact that, although the South African Government is no longer the *de jure* Government with authority to administer Namibia, it still continues to make the work of the United Nations impossible by refusing to let the United Nations Council for Namibia discharge its duties with the speed and urgency that was expected of it.

31. This meeting of the Security Council has been called because of South Africa's defiance of Security Council resolution 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969 and many other decisions of the United Nations.

32. The importance of resolution 264 (1969) was that, unlike many others preceding it, it represented a step forward in international action against South Africa. It clearly stated that in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with its demands the Security Council would meet—which is what we are doing today—to adopt measures that would end further defiance by the Pretoria régime. Resolution 264 (1969) in its most generous terms warned the Government of South Africa against certain specific acts of defiance and stated unambiguously that South Africa no longer had authority over Namibia.

33. However, on the very day that resolution was adopted, the South African Foreign Minister, in an address to the Senate, claimed that the United Nations act of terminating South Africa's mandatory power over Namibia was illegal and therefore without effect. The Minister also stated that the Government of South Africa would continue to exercise its authority in Namibia as before.

34. On the following day, 21 March 1969, the South African Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster, supported his Foreign Minister's statement, in the following words:

“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.”

Since then the Government of South Africa has continued its acts of aggression by creating African concentration camps called “Bantustans”, thereby destroying the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

35. The President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in a letter to the President of the Security Council, circulated as document A/AC.131/13 of 23 July 1969, again drew the attention of the Security Council to the fact that the Government of South Africa: “has taken

<sup>3</sup> 1464th and 1465th meetings of 20 March 1969.

fresh measures with a view to establishing 'homelands' in accordance with the notorious Odendaal report which aims at dividing the international Territory and reserving the best lands for the exclusive use of non-Africans." [S/9357.] Yet operative paragraph 4 of resolution 264 (1969) was precisely intended to stop acts of this very nature. We have now been informed that another group of eight Namibians has been charged with offences under the brutal legislation known as the Terrorism Act and the Suppression of Communism Act.

36. The developments I have just outlined have made it imperative that we abandon our last illusions and truthfully admit that more effective measures are needed to solve once and for all the problem of Namibia. It is obvious that South Africa has tightened its ugly noose of oppression on Namibia. It has chosen a path of defiance. The problem before us is one of implementation of the many decisions we have made over the past twenty years. We have tried unsuccessfully to induce South Africa to be reasonable; history has taught us it was impossible to do so.

37. The stage has been set before our very eyes. Are we going to let this racist régime, with its policy of *apartheid*, continue its criminal and plunderous designs? In view of South Africa's callous disregard for the established norms of justice, our problem, as I said before, is definitely one of implementation. Continued failure to solve this problem in favour of the oppressed people of Namibia will soon—very soon—destroy the United Nations as an effective instrument for the cause of peace and justice for all mankind. Already the inaction we have displayed is dangerously undermining the confidence of many nations, large and small, in the principles of international morality and commitment. Operative paragraph 7 of resolution 264 (1969) invited all States: "to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the present resolution". That paragraph in effect envisaged both economic and diplomatic pressure. It was also an analysis of the *apartheid* policies, which derive strength from the economic power of South Africa. It is true that some members of the international community have done their best to draw to the attention of the West that the best guarantee for Western interests in southern Africa lies not in the preservation of the *status quo* but in paving the way to self-determination for all. It is our hope that all Members of the United Nations will assist in efforts of the international community to create a more favourable environment for change without violence in Namibia.

38. The increasing supply of military hardware to South Africa has only assisted in increasing its confidence in being able to continue its suppression of the majority with impunity. The assistance it is receiving from Western European Powers, in both military hardware and technical know-how, has also enabled it to increase its assistance to rebel Rhodesia, in which it has increasingly committed itself in military terms. It is obvious to any impartial observer that, should the conflict between the African majority and the rebel régime grow wider, South Africa would take over the war in Rhodesia.

39. Rousseau once declared: "To be poor without being free is the direst condition into which a man can fall." It is

my humble submission that to be poor without peace for one's family, to suffer the pangs of poverty in conditions of oppression, is to be poor indeed. That is the fate of well over 30 million people in southern Africa still under colonial and minority domination. Political oppression is a negation of human rights. It is a negation of the cause of social justice and equal economic opportunity for all. To agree to manufacture arms destined for South Africa is to assist in the violation of human rights for the majority. To agree to manufacture arms destined for Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) or to assist in any way in facilitating the flow of weapons is to assist the minority régimes in their oppressive policies. To continue to pour out money to assist the minority régimes to strengthen their economies without due regard to the economic and social welfare of the majority in Namibia is also a negation of the very principles on which the United Nations was founded.

40. It must be clear by now that South Africa has not complied with our decisions and will not comply with them unless Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is applied. The *Windhoek Advertiser* of 21 March 1969, published after the adoption of Security Council resolution 264 (1969), cynically stated:

"So the United Nations Security Council has once again urged South Africa to vacate South West Africa at once. . . . Of course its members know full well that this will never happen; so the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union voted together is merely of academic interest. The United States and the Soviet Union knew that by supporting the motion they would be making the right noises as far as the rest of Africa and Asia are concerned without having to make any physical effort or get involved in yet another confusing situation in a dry corner of this continent."

It continued:

"Britain and France also have markets in Africa, and, although these markets are valuable, their South African market is larger. . . . So everybody is seen to be making the best of an awkward situation thrust upon them by the group of Afro-Asian countries which made the proposal."

41. There are three points which a careful reading of that editorial brings forth. Firstly, and perhaps most important, it spells out clearly that South Africa will not comply with any Security Council or General Assembly decisions now or in the future unless the relevant articles of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations are invoked. Secondly, it clearly shows the hypocrisy and lip service some of the Western Powers pay to the cause of Namibian freedom. Thirdly, it also shows that the Afro-Asian and Latin-American nations, genuine in their desire to see Namibia free, have become unfortunate and unwilling victims of imperialist intrigue and sabotage in the United Nations. For while we preach the values of freedom and justice, the importance of stability and peace to economic development, there appear to have developed different standards of judgement as to the right of people to be free. These standards of judgement are based on the colour of the individual. In Namibia, as in the rest of southern Africa, the

white people have clearly refused to accept the change in world history. For them colour is the basis of power. Colour gives expression to the rights of the white people to enjoy the benefits of freedom, while the black majorities remain restricted by all forms of institutional impediments to their development.

42. The reaction of the world has been a gloomy catalogue of duplicity and connivance. The objectives of the white minority régimes are quite clear and the dangers inherent in their approach to life do not need any search. We in independent Africa have clearly indicated our acceptance of a non-racial world as the best approach to the establishment of a decent world order, decency being based on respect for the human individual and his dignity. The responsibility now is for the white people in Africa and indeed in the Western hemisphere to accept the challenge: whether the international community will be colour-blind in its approach to international problems. We regard this as the greatest challenge of the remainder of this century.

43. My delegation regards this meeting of the Security Council as crucial, and it is our hope that it will mark a turning point in the history of the peoples of Namibia and all of southern Africa. We also hope that this meeting will permit us to rededicate ourselves to the principles by which man can be enabled to live a fuller and more human life. Let us build this peace, this freedom, this justice, on firm foundations which will bear the pressure for a change in an

increasingly complex world. We are convinced that there is no other way of dealing with this problem but to apply Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

44. May I, in conclusion, express the hope that those who oppose our call for the application of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against South Africa will, in the course of this debate, offer us a more attractive alternative which should inescapably and effectively be aimed at compelling South Africa to comply with the General Assembly and Security Council decisions relative to Namibia.

45. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I have no more speakers on my list.

46. The month of July, during which I have had the honour to preside over the Security Council, is now coming to an end. I should like on this occasion to express my profound gratitude to all the members of the Council and the Secretariat for the invaluable assistance they have given me in my task.

47. Following consultations with the members of the Council and with the President for the month of August, it has been agreed that the next meeting of the Council will take place on Monday, 4 August, at 3 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.*