

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY

JAN 17 1973



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

STANDARD
FROM ROOM
TOWER

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1494th MEETING: 6 AUGUST 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1494)	1
Statement by the President	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-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 6 August 1969, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Jaime DE PINIES (Spain).

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/1494)

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).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before we begin our work, I should like, personally—and I think I am also interpreting the feeling of all the members of the Council—to welcome the Secretary-General, who is now completely restored to health. With his presence at the Council's meetings, we should all benefit by his proven competence and recognized experience.

2. I welcome the Secretary-General.

3. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President, I thank you and the members of the Security Council for those very kind words. I am very glad indeed to be able to participate in the deliberations of this Council under your distinguished leadership. Again, thank you, Mr. President.

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)

4. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the previous decision of the Council, I shall now

invite the representatives of Chile and India to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. J. Piñera (Chile) and Mr. S. Sen (India) took places at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Council will now continue its consideration of the question of Namibia.

6. Before calling on the first speaker on my list, I wish to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Equatorial Guinea, requesting that his country's name be added to the list of signatories of the letter contained in document S/9372.

7. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Finland, on whom I now call.

8. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Permit me, Mr. President, to extend to you the congratulations of the Finnish delegation, and the pledge of its full co-operation, on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for the month of August.

9. I should also like to ask the representative of Senegal to be good enough to convey the expressions of our gratitude and esteem to His Excellency Ambassador Boye for his skilful leadership of the Council during the month of July.

10. Before beginning my statement, Mr. President, allow me to associate my delegation with the sentiments of satisfaction you were good enough to express on behalf of the Council in welcoming the Secretary-General back to our midst.

11. Once again the situation in Namibia has caused the representatives of eleven States, members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to call for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. The gravity with which the Afro-Asian Member States of this Organization view the situation is underlined in the letter [S/9372] which fifty representatives of those States have addressed to the President of the Security Council in support of the request for a meeting.

12. Since the adoption by the Security Council of the resolution 264 (1969) of 20 March, the situation in Namibia has continued to deteriorate. The Government of South Africa has paid no attention to the resolution. It not only has ignored the requests of the Council but has chosen to challenge the very right of the Council to make them.

Far from heeding the call to withdraw from the Territory, the South African Government has on the contrary tightened its hold over Namibia and its inhabitants. Disregarding the demands of the Council, it has now promulgated the so-called South West Africa Affairs Act. By submitting eight Namibians to trial under the so-called suppression of Terrorism Act the South African authorities have committed yet another act in defiance of the authority of the United Nations. It is right, therefore, that the Security Council should consider the situation in the light of its earlier decision.

13. In the opinion of my delegation the main significance of the decision taken on 20 March 1969 by the Security Council was its recognition of the earlier decision of the General Assembly to terminate the Mandate. By doing that, the Security Council reaffirmed the assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility over Namibia and its inhabitants until the Territory's independence. In the words used by the Finnish representative on that occasion, the decision meant that for the first time the authority and the power of the Security Council were fully engaged in the task of translating that decision into reality.

14. The wide agreement reached on the decision to terminate the Mandate did not extend to the means by which that goal was to be reached. The resolution of the Security Council did not spell out the measures by which it would be carried out. It did not commit the Council to any particular course of action. In fact, the long and delicate negotiations which preceded the adoption of the resolution showed the limits within which the Council had to act if it wished to preserve the wide measure of agreement then achieved.

15. Disagreement on the question of how the United Nations could best discharge its responsibility towards Namibia has led the General Assembly to a situation where it seems to have exhausted the means at its disposal to influence the course of events in the Territory. The Security Council now faces the same problem. It is obvious that agreement cannot be reached on a proposal to resort to enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter. Significantly, proposals to that effect would not be likely to command the support of the great Powers permanent members of the Security Council, which is vital in view of their special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Much less could we hope to implement effectively that kind of decision without the active support of the great Powers, for they alone have the means for carrying it to a successful conclusion.

16. It is the opinion of my delegation that in this situation the Security Council can best discharge its responsibilities by proceeding on the basis of the wide agreement which has existed in the Council on this issue. Should it appear that this basic agreement cannot, at this time, be translated into a formal resolution, it might well be worth exploring whether other procedures would better serve our common purpose. This would accord with the established practice of the Security Council of seeking agreement through consultation and compromise.

17. Whatever course is chosen by the Security Council, to be effective it must have behind it the full weight of the

undivided authority of the Council. Failure to achieve this would not advance the cause of the people of Namibia, to which the Security Council has committed itself by its decision of 20 March.

18. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I wish to thank the representative of Finland for the kind words he has addressed to me.

19. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, before I turn to the subject before us, allow me very simply but very sincerely to thank the previous speakers for their extremely kind words about Ambassador Boye. I shall not fail, on his return, to convey to him the tribute they have so kindly paid him.

20. Mr. President, my delegation is happy to offer you its congratulations on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for this month. Knowing your unfailing courtesy, your affability and your sense of responsibility, we know in advance that you will preside over our debates in a fair and impartial manner.

21. I would also be failing in my duty if I did not add that my delegation shares the satisfaction which you have expressed so well, Mr. President, and which all the members of the Council feel at seeing the Secretary-General among us once again. We warmly wish him a complete recovery.

22. As certain delegations have pointed out, in the space of less than four months the Council is again called upon to consider the question Namibia, at the request of the delegations of the eleven States constituting the United Nations Council for Namibia, because of the gravity of the situation prevailing in that country.

23. It will be recalled that, last March, the Council adopted resolution 264 (1969), which in clear terms called on the Government of South Africa immediately to withdraw its administration from the Territory of Namibia, because the Council judged that the occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria authorities was illegal and detrimental to the interests of the population of the Territory and those of the international community. For our part, we had hoped that the Pretoria authorities would have complied with the provisions of the Security Council resolution. Unfortunately, as in the past and with the same arrogance, they have continued to defy the resolutions of the Council, as can be seen from the statements made by the Prime Minister of South Africa and his Minister for Foreign Affairs immediately after the adoption of resolution 264 (1969).

24. After all, the debates held for many years on the subject of Namibia, we would be inclined to think that everything has been said about this problem and to note with regret the helplessness of the international community and, of course, the arrogance of the Pretoria authorities.

25. Despite all the resolutions adopted by both the General Assembly and the Security Council, as everybody knows, South Africa has, purely and simply, annexed the Territory of Namibia.

26. As we have already stated here, we should have liked to see the great Powers exert pressure on the Government of South Africa to make it respect the most elementary rules of international morality. It seems, however, that South Africa is unwilling to listen to reason and rejects all the advice offered to it.

27. Thus, as you see, every alley seems to have been explored. It only remains for us to ask the Security Council and particularly its permanent members to assume the responsibilities conferred upon them by the Charter, by responding firmly to Pretoria's refusal to comply with the decisions of the Council.

28. In fact, we find that, since the adoption of resolution 264 (1969), the situation in Namibia has grown steadily worse. As everybody knows, the South African Government has refused to comply with the provisions of that resolution. It is pursuing its atrocious policy of *apartheid* in Namibia and strictly enforcing there inhuman laws such as the Terrorism Act and Suppression of Communism Act. The most serious endemic diseases are still ripe among the indigenous population. Immoral practices are still imposed in the prisons and family units are split up, with heads of families separated from their wives and children.

29. The Council for Namibia has just recently noted with profound concern the arbitrary trial currently being conducted against eight Namibians under the Terrorism Act. South Africa, whose wealth—it should be remembered—was acquired by the sweat of the indigenous population, really wants, if not to exterminate, at least to eliminate a large part of a whole race after reducing it to the status of beasts of burden.

30. My delegation felt it necessary to mention these few facts, so that the international community may at last realize the seriousness of the situation in that part of Africa.

31. We say all this without hatred. We should have liked to see a multiracial society living there in perfect harmony, based on respect for human dignity, since we feel that a race-oriented society should not exist because it is contrary to our universalist outlook.

32. Unfortunately, the attitude of the Government of Pretoria is one of defiance of the United Nations, which it regards with the greatest contempt. South Africa is deliberately and systematically violating the principles of the United Nations Charter. The international community must clearly state whether this so-called republic still meets the requirements for belonging to the United Nations family.

33. The fears unequivocally expressed in the reports of the Council for Namibia, pointing out the great danger that violence and racial warfare may be unleashed if the South African Government persists in its refusal to comply with the decisions of the United Nations, should make all those who are not sufficiently aware of the gravity of the situation reflect, while there is still time.

34. After all, what is involved? Simply the full and faithful application of the United Nations Charter and respect for the will of Member States.

35. My delegation is convinced that the only way of dealing with this problem is to apply the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. That is the only course left to the international community whereby it can at last make South Africa comply with the decisions taken on Namibia by the General Assembly and the Security Council. By following this course, we shall save international peace and security in that troubled part of the world and at the same time, enable millions of human beings to regain their freedom as men.

36. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Senegal for the kind words he has addressed to me.

37. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to join previous speakers in expressing appreciation to Ambassador Boye, whose great experience, energy and tact were so notably displayed while he held the office of President of the Security Council.

38. Allow me, Mr. President, to welcome you to that office and wish you success in your duties.

39. I should also like to say that we are very glad to see our distinguished Secretary-General, U Thant, fully restored to health and with us again.

40. Mr. President, the Security Council has on its agenda the question of the freedom of the people of Namibia. The people of Namibia, like some other African peoples, are still under the yoke of colonial slavery and are waging a heroic struggle for their liberation. The Soviet Union fully and completely supports this just struggle. Its position is motivated by the very nature of the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet State, one of whose basic aims is to give all possible support and assistance to the national liberation movement.

41. Speaking at the International Congress of Communist Workers' Parties in Moscow on 7 June 1969, the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, stated:

"The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries take active positions on the broad and constantly troubled front of the national liberation movement and give firm political support and moral and material assistance to the peoples fighting for their liberation".

42. In accordance with this position, the Soviet Union strongly advocates the immediate granting of independence to the people of Namibia, as requested in the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

43. As everybody knows, the Security Council in its resolution 264 (1969) of 20 March confirmed the resolution of the General Assembly [2145 (XXI)] terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and called on the Government of South Africa immediately to withdraw its administration from that Territory. That resolution described the actions of the Government of South Africa

designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of so-called Bantustans as contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The Security Council drew attention to the fact that the Government of South Africa had no right to enact the "South West Africa Affairs Bill".

44. The Security Council also decided that, in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the resolution, the Security Council would meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

45. Over four months have passed since the adoption of that resolution by the Security Council. Yet it must be noted that the Government of South Africa is ignoring that decision of the Council. It continues to occupy Namibia and is taking measures for its complete annexation and virtual transformation of Namibia into one of the provinces of South Africa.

46. In considering the question of Namibia, no one can claim that the situation is unclear or that further investigation is necessary. Everything is absolutely clear: South Africa does not wish to leave Namibia and is disregarding the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

47. A serious situation has arisen in Namibia as a result of the unlawful occupation of that country by South Africa, the continued pursuance by South African authorities of an inhuman racist policy and the intensification of the repressive measures against the population of Namibia, aimed at crushing the national liberation movement there. In a letter dated 1 August 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council [S/9372], a large group of African and Asian States expressed serious concern about the situation in Namibia and supported the appeal from the eleven States which are members of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the effect that the Security Council should take urgent measures to examine the dangerous situation in Namibia. The representatives of a number of countries also referred to this in their statements.

48. The fact that the Government of South Africa is continuing to consolidate its annexation of Namibia and to strengthen its control over that Territory can be seen from its enactment of the so-called Development of Self-Government for Native Nations in South West Africa Act, which provides for the division of Namibia according to the principles of *apartheid* and the establishment of separate "Bantustans" for the non-white population. Under this racist law, the Government of South Africa is busy establishing such "Bantustans" and is intensifying measures to introduce racial segregation in urban areas and elsewhere.

49. The promulgation on 1 April 1969 of the colonialist and racist South West Africa Affairs Act, 1969, transferring all administrative, legislative and financial powers to South Africa, is likewise a violation of Security Council resolution 264 (1969). The Government of the Republic of South Africa, disregarding the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, is trying by this means to

"officialize" the transformation of the Territory of Namibia, which does not belong to it, into a fifth province of the Republic.

50. The Namibians are naturally unwilling to accept the usurpation of their rights to independence, and are protesting against the dismemberment of the country, the abolition of its territorial integrity and the banishment of the indigenous African population from the fertile lands to areas so barren as to be practically uninhabitable. The people of Namibia are raising their voices in protest against all these manifestations of the shameful policy of *apartheid*.

51. The South African racists are undertaking new repressions in an attempt to break the will of the Namibian people, to stop their struggle for freedom and independence and to prevent them from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination.

52. In Namibia, as can be seen from United Nations documents, arrests, detentions and trials of the indigenous population are constantly taking place. The Pretoria authorities are trying the Namibian patriots for refusing to bow to the inhuman system of *apartheid* and opposing colonial oppression. The most recent of such prosecutions was the so-called "trial" of eight Namibians by the Supreme Court at Windhoek.

53. The repressive measures of the South African authorities against the Namibians are closely connected with the punitive operations carried out by the racist-colonialist bloc—the "unholy alliance". South Africa is playing the leading role in this bloc, used by imperialism to stem the tide of the national liberation movement which is reaching South Africa and to crush the national liberation and democratic movement in order to consolidate its position in the remaining colonies, regarding them as bridge-heads against the independent African States. The bloc of militant racists in South Africa thus constitutes a direct threat to the independent development of the States of Africa which have started on the path to self-sufficiency and freedom.

54. The recent discussions in the Security Council on the question of Southern Rhodesia and of Portugal's acts of aggression against Zambia have shown that the régimes of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, with the support of a number of Powers and international monopolies, are constantly committing new crimes against the African peoples.

55. In the course of the present examination of the question of Namibia in the Security Council, certain representatives from Africa and Asia have pointed out that the settlement of this question will depend to a large extent on the position of the great Powers, the permanent members of the Security Council. This is true. The aggressive expansionist policy of the Republic of South Africa towards the peoples of southern Africa and particularly Namibia and South Africa's stubborn opposition to the decisions of the United Nations are the direct results of the position taken on this question by certain great Western Powers, including the permanent members of the Security Council.

56. The flow of hundreds of millions of pounds sterling, dollars and marks as direct or other forms of investment in South Africa is the material basis of the militant policy pursued by the racist colonialist régime. It is sufficient to recall that these investments in pounds sterling, dollars and marks have reached the figure of \$6,000 millions and are still growing.

57. The members of NATO are taking an active part in the programme to expand the armed forces of South Africa. They are providing it with warships, aircraft and armoured vehicles and granting it licences for the production of various types of military equipment. With their help, South Africa has been able to construct new munitions factories. The strengthening of co-operation between South Africa and Western Germany, including co-operation in the production of the latest weapons, calls for particular vigilance. This co-operation is all the more dangerous for the African peoples because of the ideological similarity between West German neo-nazism and the racist fascist policy of the ruling circles in South Africa.

58. Who can believe that the Western Powers, with their close ties with the Republic of South Africa, cannot exert influence on it and in particular persuade it to settle the question of Namibia? The self-evident conclusion is that they are not even trying and that the policy and actions of the Pretoria régime and its invariable disregard of the decisions of the United Nations are the direct result of their close co-operation with the régime of the Republic of South Africa.

59. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, today the Soviet delegation would like once again to confirm its full support for the struggle of the people of Namibia for their liberation.

60. During the discussions of the question of Namibia, both in the Security Council and at the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet delegation set forth in detail a programme of measures to accelerate the attainment of the final objectives—to liberate Namibia and

give the people of that country the opportunity to decide their future as they see fit. The recent turn of events in Namibia has confirmed the correctness and validity of the Soviet Union's position of principle on this matter.

61. The Soviet Union considers that the Security Council must adopt effective measures to ensure that the people of Namibia are granted independence; this would be the logical legal and political conclusion of the termination of South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia.

62. The USSR delegation will proceed on this assumption in determining its attitude towards the proposals to be submitted for the Council's consideration.

63. The liberation of South Africa—one of the last areas of colonial domination—is of great importance for the future of Africa and the cause of peace. The struggle being waged by the peoples of that area is dealing heavy blows at the alliance of fascist and racist régimes and foreshadows new large-scale victories for the African revolution.

64. All men of goodwill, all advocates of democracy are in favour of the liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism and the adoption of decisive international measures to support the patriots in the last remaining colonies and all oppressed peoples.

65. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I particularly wish to thank the representative of the Soviet Union for the kind words he has addressed to me.

66. I have no more speakers on my list. Does any member of the Security Council wish to speak?

67. As no other representative has asked to speak, I wish to inform the members of the Council that, following informal consultations, it appears that all members agree that the Council should meet to continue the debate on Friday, 8 August, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.