



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

1757th MEETING: 11 DECEMBER 1973

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1757)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(a) Letter dated 4 December 1973 from the Permanent Representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11145);	
(b) Report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 323 (1972) concerning the question of Namibia (S/10921 and Corr.1)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 11 December 1973, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. HUANG Hua (China).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Austria, China, France, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Panama, Peru, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1757)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. The situation in Namibia:
 - (a) Letter dated 4 December 1973 from the Permanent Representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11145);
 - (b) Report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 323 (1972) concerning the question of Namibia (S/10921 and Corr.1).

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

- (a) Letter dated 4 December 1973 from the Permanent Representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11145);
- (b) Report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 323 (1972) concerning the question of Namibia (S/10921 and Corr.1¹)

1. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): In accordance with the decision taken at our 1756th meeting yesterday, I shall now, with the consent of the Council, invite the representatives of the Niger and Somalia to take places at the side of the Council Chamber in order to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. A. Diallo (Niger) and Mr. H. Nur Elmi (Somalia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): I should like to inform members of the Council that, in addition, I have just received a letter, dated 11 December 1973, from the representative of Nigeria containing a request that he be allowed to participate, without the right to vote, in the Council's discussion of the item inscribed on the agenda, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to invite the representative of Nigeria to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, and I shall ask him to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber, on the understanding that he will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is his turn to speak.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. E. Ogbu (Nigeria) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): In accordance with the decision taken at our last meeting, I invite the President and the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. P. J. F. Lusaka (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and Mr. P. Mikanagu (Burundi) and Mr. M. Sidik (Indonesia), the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, took places at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): In a letter [S/11153] dated 10 December 1973 to the President of the Security Council the representatives of Guinea, Kenya and the Sudan have asked that, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, an invitation be extended to Mr. Mishake Muyongo. Accordingly, I propose, if there is no objection, that pursuant to rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure the Council extend the invitation requested in the letter.

5. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Council agrees to that proposal. I shall therefore at the appropriate point in our deliberations and with the consent of the Council, invite Mr. Mishake Muyongo to speak.

6. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Mr. President, before I address myself to the item on the agenda, allow me to express my congratulations, as well as those of my delegation, to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for December. My delegation would like to assure you of our whole-hearted co-operation in the implementation of your important and difficult duties. I

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1973*.

would also like to express to your predecessor, our colleague and good friend Ambassador Jankowitsch of Austria, the high appreciation of my delegation for the efficient manner in which he guided the Council's work during the month of November.

7. We are convened to consider once again the problems arising from South Africa's refusal to relinquish its illegal control of Namibia. In its search for a solution which will enable the Namibian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, the Security Council, in its resolutions 309 (1972), 319 (1972) and 323 (1972), agreed to invite the Secretary-General to initiate and maintain contact with all parties concerned. We now have before us the report [S/10921 and Corr.1] on his efforts. My delegation would like to express its thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his endeavour to pave the way towards the solution of the Namibian problem in accordance with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

8. My delegation listened with great interest to the statements made by the representatives who preceded me. We listened with special attention to the statement made by our colleague Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia [1756th meeting] in his capacity as President of the Council for Namibia, in which Indonesia has the honour to serve as a member.

9. Resolutions 309 (1972), 319 (1972) and 323 (1972) reaffirm the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, national independence and preservation of its territorial integrity. Any policy introduced in Namibia by the South African Government which is contrary to the rights of the Namibian people, and introduced while contacts with the Secretary-General were proceeding, can only be considered as proof of bad faith on the part of the South African Government. It is in this light that we must see the establishment of an Ovambo "homeland" in Namibia. On the occasion of the establishment of the Ovambo "homeland", Mr. Jannie de Wet, the Commissioner General for the Indigenous Peoples of South West Africa, was reported to have said: "You"—the Ovambo—"will be developed to complete independence."

10. In the past the creation of "homelands" has constituted an essential element in the execution of the policy of *apartheid* within South Africa itself, and it will certainly have a negative effect upon the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia. The people of Namibia themselves have indicated that they recognize this great danger. The South West Africa National Union (SWANU) and the Damara Executive Council, two political organizations representing the African inhabitants of Namibia, issued a joint declaration denouncing this policy. As reported in the *Windhoek Advertiser* of 24 September 1973, their declaration read in part: "We reject any form of racial and tribal division of Namibia. We stand for one and whole Namibia." Clearly, the introduction of the policy of "homelands" to the various tribal groups would destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

11. These acts and others raise serious doubts as to the sincerity of the South African Government when it

declares its desire to comply with the principles of the Charter and to guarantee the undisputed right of the Namibians to self-determination and independence. There is an obvious contradiction between the policies actually practised in Namibia and the explanation of those policies given by the Government of South Africa to the United Nations.

12. Particularly significant are the deviations from the guarantees of freedom of speech, of assembly and of political activity. Despite assurances to the Secretary-General that "the South African Government recognizes and accepts" these principles, and that they must apply "equally to all political parties of the Territory", the South African Government is in fact inflicting inhumane punishment upon those who dare to protest against the imposition of its policy of *apartheid* in Namibia. A press release from the International Commission of Jurists, dated 1 November 1973, reported that over 100 Ovambos had been flogged in attempts of the South African Government to stifle their public opposition. Such acts are in flagrant contradiction with the assurances given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General.

13. In that light, the suggestion that within 10 years the population of Namibia might "be ready to exercise its right to self-determination" must be viewed with the greatest suspicion. Ten years more under South African racist rule will mean another 10 years of exposing the politically articulate part of the Namibian people to the danger of possible liquidation, of endangering the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia in view of the policy of Bantustans that South Africa is introducing in the Territory.

14. The National Convention, uniting representatives of all the African nationalist parties in Namibia, including the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the National Union of Democratic Organizations, SWANU, the Rehoboth Baster Volkspartei, and the other groups which together represent the vast majority of the people of Namibia, has expressed its opinion on the current South African policies in the following terms. It is, it said, its goal "to unite the suppressed people of Namibia in one national unity and to fight for the total and complete independence and freedom of the Territory; to oppose all forms of tribalism, race discrimination and other forms and actions aimed at the segregation of the people of Namibia". This statement of the National Convention released on 16 April 1973, makes clear the sentiments of the people of Namibia. Any régime which fails to take notice of such expressions of the will of the people cannot, in good conscience, claim to be assisting them in their development towards the free exercise of their inalienable rights.

15. Even more to be regretted is the introduction in Namibia by the South African Government of the so-called advisory council. In his communication to the Secretary-General which deals with the composition of the "council", the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs admitted that many of the groups approached to nominate members to that body refused to do so, and that rump groups, not representative of the entire spectrum of opinion within each tribe, were then allowed to provide representatives for

this least representative of assemblies. The "council" cannot truly represent the wishes or the needs of the vast majority of the people of Namibia, and will only serve to continue the illegal and oppressive rule of the South African administration in the Territory.

16. After the recent dialogue between the Secretary-General and the South African Government there is no possibility of a misunderstanding with regard to the true value of the South African Governments's proposals or to the precise degree of its desire to adhere to the principles of the Charter.

17. Indonesia sincerely desires a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. We had hoped that the efforts of the Secretary-General would lead to the discovery of a way to resolve the impasse created by South Africa's obduracy. After examination of the report of the Secretary-General, and after making a comparison between South Africa's statements and its acts, however, we are forced to arrive at the conclusion that such a hope must now be viewed as unrealistic. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the International Conference of Experts for the Support of the Victims of Colonialism and *Apartheid* in Southern Africa have both recommended that the contacts between the Secretary-General and the South African Government be terminated except, as the Conference put it, to arrange for the immediate transfer of power in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966. Indonesia supports that recommendation. The people of the Territory have also expressed themselves clearly and unequivocally through their representatives in the National Convention. It would be futile, as well as contrary to the principles of self-determination to which the United Nations is committed, if we were to attempt to pursue a policy which has been overwhelmingly rejected by the representatives of the people of Namibia themselves.

18. In the circumstances, it is difficult to see what purpose would be served by a continuation of the present dialogue between the Secretary-General and the South African Government. In view of the actions taken by the South African Government in Namibia to express the legitimate right for freedom of the people of that Territory, we agree to the view expressed in the consensus of the Council for Namibia that

"To maintain contacts with the South African régime would mean an acceptance of its policy on the part of the United Nations". [*S/10921 and Corr.1, annex II, para. 5 (b).*]

So long as that Government pursues policies which violate the "inalienable and imprescriptible right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, national independence and the preservation of their territorial integrity, on which any solution for Namibia must be based" [*Security Council resolution 323 (1972), para. 4*] it is very difficult to continue a dialogue with them without strengthening their hand and giving the impression to the world of legitimizing their illegitimate occupation of Namibia. Indonesia is in agreement with those who oppose the idea of continuation of these talks and will therefore vote in support of the draft resolution in document S/11152/Rev.1.

19. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to greet you in your capacity of President of the Security Council for the month of December and representative of the People's Republic of China, the great country with which the Yugoslav peoples and Government have very good relations which they will strive to promote still further to the mutual benefit and in the interests of broader international co-operation, peace and progress. My delegation promises you the fullest co-operation, and, knowing full well your abilities and unfailing courtesy, we are confident of the Council's successful work during this month.

20. I also wish to avail myself of this opportunity to express my thanks to Ambassador Jankowitsch, Permanent Representative of neighbouring and friendly Austria, for successfully carrying out his function of President for the month of November.

21. We have again met today to consider, on the basis of the Secretary-General's last report, the situation in Namibia, a Territory which was placed, by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, under the administration of the United Nations, but which—in spite of that decision and a number of other decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and of the famous advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971²—has been under the illegal occupation of the racist régime in South Africa ever since.

22. The world Organization—through a number of its organs and, more particularly, through the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Committee of 24 and the Council for Namibia—has so far made a series of unsuccessful efforts with a view to putting an end to this intolerable situation. One of the last steps was the adoption—in Addis Ababa, on 4 February 1972—of resolution 309 (1972) inviting the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with all the parties concerned with a view to establishing the necessary conditions which would enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

23. My delegation—representing a country where unreversed support for the struggle of peoples for liberation from the colonial yoke is a fundamental tenet of foreign policy—was selected to become one of the members of the Group of Three of the Security Council which was entrusted with the task of assisting the Secretary-General in carrying out his mission. I should merely like to report here that since its establishment the Group of Three has presented, among other things, two basic aide-mémoires, one in order to help the Secretary-General in his arduous task of conducting contacts with the Government of South Africa, and the other to help prepare the subsequent mission of his Representative and put it in the correct framework. The contents of both aide-mémoires are well known to the members of the Security Council as well as to all those concerned so I shall not quote from them on this

² *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

occasion. On the basis of resolution 309 (1972) and the two aide-mémoires, the Secretary-General undertook to carry out his highly responsible task. The subsequent events and views of the Secretary-General are presented in his latest report.

24. On the basis of that report, as well as many other facts with which my delegation as well as the international community is familiar, it is clear that the reactionary régime in South Africa did not approach the contacts in good faith at all. To our great regret and indignation, Pretoria used resolution 309 (1972) as an opportunity to buy time and further consolidate its Nazi-like reactionary rule over the people of Namibia. The *apartheid* régime in South Africa has used the past two years to intensify its repressive measures against the people of Namibia in order to prevent them from realizing their right to self-determination, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Massacres and mass reprisals continue to be carried out against all those who resist the yoke of the white settlers. Particularly unscrupulous measures are being taken against the members of SWAPO, the only genuine representatives of the struggle for the realization of the legitimate rights of the people of Namibia. The illegal occupation régime continues to resort to the enactment of a number of so-called administrative measures. The most sinister and most terrorist-like of these measures has been the pursuit of the policy of separate "homelands", in a futile but bloody effort to prevent the strengthening of the national consciousness and unity of the Namibian people. Pretoria was doing this at the very moment that the United Nations was making a substantial effort by once more giving a chance to South Africa to get out of Namibia peacefully.

25. The régime in South Africa is pursuing this reactionary policy in the closest collaboration with the racists and Fascists in Salisbury and Lisbon, and with the help of the tolerant attitude and frequently the direct support of some Western countries which in this way protect their own narrow economic and military interests in the south of Africa. In the pursuit of its reactionary policy, Pretoria does not limit its actions to Namibia, but is also resorting to numerous aggressive acts against the neighbouring independent African countries, and in particular against Zambia. For those reasons the aggressive policy of South Africa constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the African continent, and consequently to the international community as a whole.

26. We are deeply convinced that what is involved in Pretoria's tenacious hold over Namibia is to a large extent the greedy and inadmissible economic interests of Pretoria and of a number of big companies from the large, developed Western countries. The operations of these companies neither promote nor facilitate in any way the development of Namibia or the welfare of its people. Big foreign companies, together with the South African racists, are interested solely in squeezing out inhumanly large profits and in doing so they resort to the most sinister forms and methods of plunder and exploitation of the natural resources and labour force of the Territory. The ransacking of the natural resources of Namibia is accompanied by the most cruel exploitation of its inhabitants,

especially through the use of the so-called contract labour system, which is very similar to slavery.

27. It is here that the information given by the South African Government to the Secretary-General in Geneva—to be found in the Secretary-General's report—is particularly revealing. I refer, of course, to the last sentence of that information given by the South African Government, which says that:

"On the basis of present developments, the Government of South Africa anticipates that it might not take longer than 10 years for the population of South West Africa to reach the stage where it will be ready to exercise its right to self-determination." [*S/10921 and Corr.1, para. 14.*]

The words "longer than 10 years" can mean any figure. And the foregoing statement does not relate to giving independence to Namibia; it is only an assessment that by that time the people of Namibia will be mature enough and ready to exercise its right to self-determination. What a brutal way to slander the people of Namibia and the whole of Africa.

28. That is the true position of the South African racists revealed in all its brutality and arrogance. They need at least 10 more years—and Ambassador Escher was told by some official South African sources during his trip, as he has privately indicated here, that what they really mean is that they need another 50 years. They need some such time to plunder and totally exhaust the tremendous natural riches of Namibia—diamonds; uranium in the largest quantities, and even more precious in times of an energy crisis; the oil that was traced by satellite sensors, and so on. Then after they lay waste the country and rob it of its best wealth, after they bleed white both country and people and completely debilitate them, then perhaps, they will be ready to leave.

29. If only because they have smoked out the true intentions of the South African *apartheid*ers in the revealing passage just quoted, the activities and the report of the Secretary-General have made a valuable contribution.

30. But, of course—and Pretoria should not entertain any illusions on this score—the United Nations and an outraged world will never accept and will not permit the rape and crippling of Namibia that Pretoria has set out to achieve, in blind defiance of all morality and reality.

31. Very recently another country, arrogantly believing that it could eternally and with impunity occupy other peoples' territories, woke up one day only to realize that the reality is different, changed; that the world has passed it by, and that the forces on whose side is morality are stronger; that they will never become reconciled to occupation and oppression; that they can and will strike.

32. In the concluding part of his report the Secretary-General states, *inter alia*, that:

"A study of the statement reproduced above shows that the position of the Government of South Africa is still far

from coinciding with that established in the resolutions of the United Nations concerning Namibia”

and that:

“... the statement does not provide the complete and unequivocal clarification of South Africa's policy in regard to self-determination and independence for Namibia envisaged in resolution 323 (1972).” [*ibid.*, para. 18.]

33. In the light of the report of the Secretary-General taken as a whole and of its conclusions in particular, and on the basis of the data we have, my delegation is firmly convinced that there is no justification at all for the continuation of the contacts between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa and that these contacts and further efforts should be discontinued. My delegation has adopted this position as a result of a serious and comprehensive study of this problem, in its capacity as a member of the Group of Three, of the Council for Namibia and of the Committee of 24 and as an active participant in the work of important international forums and gatherings where this issue has also been examined during the past period. We should only like to emphasize that the Council for Namibia, the Committee of 24 and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly at the current session, as well as the Tenth Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU and the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held recently in Algiers, have already taken a stand against the continuation of contacts. The correctness of this stand has been also confirmed by the statements made by the preceding speakers at this series of meetings of the Council, and in particular those of the President of the Council for Namibia and Permanent Representative of Zambia, Ambassador Lusaka. For those reasons the Security Council should adopt the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Peru. In this context we wish to stress that to our mind the Secretary-General's efforts have not been in vain. The matter has now been cleared up and it has become crystal clear to all that it is not possible to settle matters with the racists in Pretoria in a peaceful way at all.

34. Nothing remains to be done in such a situation but to intensify still further the struggle by all means, including the armed struggle that the people of Namibia are waging under the courageous leadership of SWAPO. We are glad to note that the present case, too, has confirmed the historical fact that the just demands of a people living under foreign yoke and subjected to colonial aggression and occupation cannot be suppressed and that the liberation movement in Namibia is achieving significant victories. A number of examples prove that this is the only way. One of the most recent and most commented-upon examples has been the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau. This young Republic has emerged from the blood of its best sons and will serve to the world as an example showing the road to be followed by all peoples under a similar colonial yoke, and particularly by the peoples in southern Africa.

35. In their struggle the people of Namibia are not alone. They enjoy the moral, material and political support of a

great number of countries members of the international community. This support found particular expression at the Tenth Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity and at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Algiers, as well as at the recently held Summit Meeting of Heads of State of Arab countries.

36. Since 6 October the Middle East has not been the same. Very soon, much sooner than the oppressive and racist régimes of Pretoria, Salisbury, and Lisbon are wont to believe, the south of Africa will not be the same.

37. At almost the very end of its stay in the Security Council, my delegation is pleased that, after a meaningful effort, the Council and the United Nations will proceed with the unchanged, even invigorated, policy of full support for the people of Namibia and joint battle with that people for its liberation, independence, territorial integrity and unity.

38. In that struggle the peoples and Government of Yugoslavia will continue, as they have done in the past, to lend to the people of Namibia their full moral, political and material support.

39. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Mr. President, permit me first of all to welcome you to the presidential chair of this Council and to promise you the full co-operation of my delegation.

40. Let me also thank and congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Jankowitsch of Austria, for his very efficient handling of the work of this Council during the month of November.

41. My Government's position on the subject of Namibia has been made clear on several occasions in the United Nations during recent months. It was set forth in some detail in my delegation's reply of 21 September 1973 to the questionnaire circulated by the Secretary-General on 12 June 1973 regarding the compliance of Member States with United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia. In the course of the present session of the General Assembly it has been given further expression by the Australian delegation both in the Fourth Committee and in the Assembly itself.

42. The Australian Government remains totally opposed to the continued unlawful occupation and administration of Namibia by the Government of South Africa. There is no doubt in our minds that South Africa has no further mandate in Namibia and that its administration of the Territory should be terminated. We regard the South African presence as prejudicial to the future progress of the Territory and to the rights and interests of the great majority of its people, including their inalienable right to self-determination, and also as an affront to the United Nations.

43. Australia has no material interests in Namibia. There is no Australian Government investment or other economic interest, nor are we aware of any private Australian investment. Our only interest lies in the early and peaceful transition of the Territory into a future which will meet the

desires of the majority of its people and which will discharge the United Nations from a responsibility that it has for so long, too long, been prevented from carrying out.

44. The Australian Government has avoided any action which could help to entrench South Africa's illegal position in the Territory. We do not recognize the Government of South Africa when it purports to act on behalf of Namibia. Furthermore, my Government has declared that it will co-operate with the United Nations and with all its agencies in actions designed to bring South African occupation and control of Namibia to an end.

45. My delegation, as a member of the Special Committee of Twenty-Four, joined in that Committee's consensus on Namibia adopted on 29 June of this year. An important element in that consensus, as indeed also in the draft resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee on 4 December,³ was the strong conviction that no useful purpose would be served by continuing the contacts between the Secretary-General and the Government of South Africa. My delegation was not entirely happy with that part of the consensus, and we felt constrained to express some reservation about it, even while sharing fully the general feeling of frustration and disappointment over the equivocal nature of the South African Government's responses to the Secretary-General's requests for clarification of its attitudes and intentions.

46. We would not argue with the proposition that continuing a dialogue with South Africa on the future of Namibia serves no useful purpose at the present time. But there is a difference between deciding to terminate contacts and leaving them in abeyance: the one conveys an impression of finality; the other leaves a door unlocked which could conceivably be reopened—in this case not necessarily to the detriment of the majority of the Namibian people. Thus, in my delegation's view, it is not simply a question of the usefulness or uselessness of carrying on a dialogue with South Africa at this time. It is rather a question of whether or not we in this Council should retain some degree of flexibility against the possibility of future change in circumstances and attitudes, and also—and I believe we should consider this carefully—whether or not the United Nations should be seen to be assuming the responsibility for slamming and locking the door.

47. In the light of those considerations, we find ourselves able to vote in favour of draft resolution S/11152/Rev.1, as introduced at the preceding meeting by the representative of Peru.

48. The PRESIDENT (*translation from Chinese*): The next speaker is the representative of the Niger. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. DIALLO (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, since I am addressing the Security Council for the first time I hope you will allow me to congratulate

you most warmly. You are a worthy representative of the most populated country in the world, which, because of its pragmatism and determined efforts, will no doubt find the real way to development of the less endowed.

50. May I, as Chairman of the African Group for December, also express my gratitude for your giving me an opportunity to present to the Council, whose work you direct with competence and dignity, Africa's position on this important question of Namibia, which has been of concern to our Organization for so many years.

51. In fact, it was in 1920 that the defunct League of Nations placed Namibia under South African Mandate and gave South Africa the task of promoting in every possible way the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territory and to that end of developing their capacity to administer themselves, of taking into account the political aspirations of the population and of assisting them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. More than 50 years have passed since then and, although the winds of decolonization are blowing throughout the world, the inhabitants of Namibia still live under the worst form of colonization, the most savage repression and abominable *apartheid*.

52. In the 27 years since the United Nations replaced the League of Nations, everything has been tried to persuade South Africa to allow the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, pursuant to the relevant Articles of the Charter and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia; General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia and entrusted it with the administration of the Territory until its independence, to be attained by June 1968 at the latest; and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 confirming that South Africa has no legal right over Namibia.

53. Today the Security Council is examining the report of the Secretary-General on the contacts he has had with the South African authorities pursuant to resolution 323 (1972). It was during the historic meetings at Addis Ababa, in January-February 1972, that this Council decided, in its resolution 309 (1972), to request the Secretary-General to establish contacts with all the parties concerned with a view to enabling the people of Namibia freely to exercise their right to self-determination and independence.

54. In the minds of the authors of the resolution, as well as during the discussion that preceded its adoption, it was clearly a matter of overcoming the deadlock created by South Africa by its refusal to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions, to accept resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) and to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia in accordance with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

55. Africa has never opposed the use of peaceful means for the settlement of disputes when those means are likely to be successful—and this despite the reservations and the

³ Subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 3111 (XXVIII).

doubts we entertain regarding the usefulness of any contacts with South Africa. Thus it was that the African members of this Council did not wish to oppose the adoption of resolution 309 (1972).

56. From the first visit of the Secretary-General to South Africa and Namibia, the position of the Pretoria authorities has been rigid, to such an extent that the Secretary-General's first report concerning those contacts was very significant in that it contained only one recommendation to the Security Council, namely, that he be allowed to recruit a personal representative.

57. Ambassador Escher was appointed and sent on his mission to South Africa and Namibia and was able to establish many contacts which, in fact, did nothing but confirm what we already knew. It is clear that South Africa wished to avail itself of the so-called dialogue with the United Nations to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia with its abject policy of *apartheid*, of "homelands" that are nothing but concentration camps, cheap labour reserves—in a word, places of despair and of injustice. What is more, the South African authorities took advantage of the time offered by those contacts to create a so-called advisory council with puppet representatives of various regions under a regional administration or authority designed to do nothing other than to constitute privileged minorities that would assist in breaking up the national unity and the territorial integrity of Namibia.

58. The only useful proof revealed by the report of Ambassador Escher is that of the unshakable will of the population of Namibia to accede to self-determination and independence in unity.

59. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that it was because the questions which our colleague Mr. Gabre-Sellassie of Ethiopia put in the course of the 1678th meeting of the Security Council, on 28 November 1972, were not replied to in the report of Ambassador Escher after his visit to South Africa that the Heads of State and Government of Africa, meeting in Addis Ababa on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of OAU, considered that contacts with South Africa were harmful to the interests of the people of Namibia and decided that they should be brought to an end. They felt that once again South Africa had lost an opportunity to become reconciled with free Africa and the rest of the world.

60. The questions Mr. Gabre-Sellassie posed were the following:

61. Does South Africa accept United Nations responsibility in the self-determination process and does it accept the establishment of an effective United Nations presence in Namibia?

62. Does South Africa accept the exercise of self-determination by the people of Namibia as a whole, with unity and territorial integrity?

63. Does South Africa accept that whatever rights it might have had under the Mandate of the League of Nations have been terminated?

64. The report of the Secretary-General which is before the Council confirms South Africa's tendency to maintain itself in Namibia with the blessing of the United Nations. On analysing South Africa's proposals, as presented in the Secretary-General's report, we see that they do not differ in any way from those made by that country at the time when the United Nations came into being; nor do they differ from the policy which South Africa has applied in Namibia since that time.

65. First of all, South Africa wishes to gain acceptance of the division of the Territory into "homelands", "Bantustans", and "regions", which not only is contrary to all United Nations decisions and to the will of the Namibian people who were consulted but also would consolidate the division of national unity and territorial integrity.

66. Secondly, South Africa wishes to gain acceptance of the creation of the advisory Council, which was presented to Ambassador Escher as a concession to the United Nations but the unavowed purpose of which was to affirm the direct authority of Vorster over the international Territory of Namibia and divide it up through privileged puppet minorities.

67. Thirdly, South Africa is attempting to make the United Nations go back on its decision in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) that terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. It wishes to create a situation which will lead to the decision of the International Court of Justice of June 1971 being forgotten. Thus, Vorster would have us believe that in 10 years' time the Namibians will, perhaps, arrive at a stage where they will be able to govern themselves.

68. That argument has been debated at length in the United Nations and in 1960, by its resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly decided that the argument that a colonial people was not ready to exercise its right to independence was an unacceptable pretext. Every people has an inherent right to self-determination and independence, and can exercise it at any time. The people of Namibia have proved, through their contacts with the Secretary-General and his Representative, Ambassador Escher, that they are sufficiently mature to take over their own responsibilities completely.

69. Furthermore, the General Assembly considered this problem in 1966, and in 1967 it established the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was specifically charged with the administration of Namibia and with preparing the Namibian people for independence. Perhaps what is to be regretted is that independence—which, according to the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia, should have been achieved in June 1968 at the latest—in becoming more doubtful, if one takes into account daily events and the meagre results of contacts.

70. In May 1973 the Heads of State and Government of African countries had occasion to examine the Secretary-General's report and they considered, as I said earlier, that the present situation in Namibia and the direction of the policy of South Africa were harmful for the people of

Namibia. There is nothing in the report to indicate that South Africa is prepared to comply with United Nations decisions or to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 1971, or to carry out the transfer of power to the United Nations Council for Namibia as called for in General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V).

71. One even wonders whether those contacts were intended, as some have maintained, to be a face-saving device for South Africa if it agreed to be persuaded by peaceful means to withdraw from Namibia, or whether, on the contrary, the purpose of the contacts was to have the United Nations accept something that it has never ceased to refuse and condemn.

72. The positions of South Africa in regard to Namibia are clear if one considers the policy which it has carried out and continues to carry out despite contacts with the United Nations. In fact it is no secret to anyone that before, during and after the visit of the Secretary-General and his Representative, and despite the most formal promises of the South African authorities to take no measures of reprisal against persons because of their political opinions, arrests, detentions and torture have increased in South Africa and Namibia. It is also significant to note that a state of emergency was proclaimed in Namibia at the exact moment when contacts were requested by the Security Council and that despite the assurances given to the Secretary-General limitations on freedom were increased.

73. We have all heard about the public floggings, a return to mediaeval practices, ordered by so-called tribal courts with the encouragement of South Africa. Those measures of repression accompanied the application of administrative measures aimed at dividing the Territory and at its final and definite annexation by South Africa.

74. There was general surprise when in March last, despite United Nations reservations, South Africa announced the establishment of the so-called advisory council. Since then the world has witnessed the efforts of South Africa to implant the Bantustans of Ovamboland and the fortunate and striking failure it suffered in the course of elections to the Assembly of the so-called autonomous regional unit.

75. Africa is not alone in considering that South Africa has lost an opportunity to normalize its relations with the international community.

76. On 27 March this year, on the occasion of a lunch given by the United Nations foreign press correspondents, the Ambassador of France expressed his regret that South Africa had taken no measures likely to enable the Secretary-General to submit a positive report to the Security Council. He stated that the only way to resume the dialogue would be for the Government of South Africa to prove its intention to grant self-determination and autonomy to Namibia, but that that Government did not seem to have seized the only genuine opportunity available to it.

77. In his report the Secretary-General concludes that "the position of the Government of South Africa is still far from coinciding with that ... of the United Nations".

[S/10921 and Corr.1, para. 18.] Accordingly, it seems clear, almost two years after their establishment, that these contacts have been disappointing not only to the African countries but to the entire international community.

78. The experts who met last April in Oslo perceived the danger of continuing such contacts, which would enable South Africa not only to perpetuate its presence in Namibia but, what is even more serious, to establish military bases there for attacking neighbouring African countries.

79. In deciding to request the Security Council to put an end to the contacts of the Secretary-General with South Africa and to take steps pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, to compel the Government of South Africa to call a halt to its illegal occupation of Namibia, the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity wished to express their support for the United Nations Council for Namibia in its ceaseless efforts to discharge the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

80. I could not conclude without solemnly reaffirming the confidence of the African Group that the United Nations Council for Namibia, with the support of the Security Council and in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity and the national liberation movements, will be able to find effective means to enable the Namibians who have always considered the United Nations their only hope, to recover their rights and dignity in unity and in territorial integrity.

81. On behalf of Africa, may I express the ardent hope that the members of this august Council, inspired by the noble ideals of their brave predecessors who drafted the United Nations Charter, will, in accordance with the relevant Articles of Chapter VII of the Charter, take urgent measures to put a final end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

82. Mr. SEN (India): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your assuming the presidency of the Council for December. Next month, India will retire from the Council, and it is fitting that in the last month of our current membership we should be working with a fellow Asian in the Chair. We offer you our fullest co-operation in the discharge of your responsible task. We should also like to extend our appreciation to the outgoing President, Ambassador Jankowitsch of Austria, who brought his youth and dedication to the best service of the Council. We thank him.

83. The original mandate concerning the question of Namibia was entrusted to the Secretary-General by the Security Council on 4 February 1972, when it adopted its resolution 309 (1972). In that resolution, while inviting the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with all parties concerned with a view to establishing the necessary conditions so as to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, the Council had also called on the Government of South Africa to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in the implementation of that resolution. Since then the Secretary-General has submitted three reports, the last being his report in document S/10921 and Corr.1, of 30 April 1973.

84. We shall, of course, vote for the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Peru, as it fully reflects our views about the futility of establishing contact with South Africa or continuing any negotiations with it. The Secretary-General's report demolishes completely the theory that by removing or reducing South Africa's isolation we can make it behave in a decent or civilized manner.

85. The original resolution had two elements: the efforts to be made by the Secretary-General and, the other, the co-operation to be offered by the Government of South Africa. At the risk of repeating what has been said by the representatives who have already spoken in detail on the subject of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives, may I say that we greatly appreciate them, and I personally believe that Mr. Chacko's death was perhaps not in some small measure due to the considerable tension and over-work involved in the difficult and delicate task which the Council had set the Secretary-General and with which he was associated.

86. Now, the fact is that the South African Government has systematically taken actions to frustrate the Secretary-General's mission. Before deciding on and announcing the method by which the people of Namibia would exercise their right to self-determination, national independence and the preservation of their territorial integrity, on which alone any solution for Namibia can be based, the South African Government declared in June that elections for the Bantustan would take place on 1 and 2 August. Because of the election campaign started by the Namibians on the basis of "One Namibia, one nation", there came a wave of arrests and detentions. However, the result of this so-called election was a clear defeat for the South African Government. Of those eligible to vote, only 2.5 per cent voted. Infuriated by this defeat, the South African Government initiated a policy of terror: some of the SWAPO leaders were arrested and charged with offences under the Sabotage Act; meetings were broken up by the police, who on several occasions opened fire. This reign of terror culminated in the strike of 20 August, in which hundreds were eventually arrested and detained "for being illegally in Windhoek". A concentration camp has now been set up in a very remote place—at Omidamba on the Namibia-Angola border.

87. We are considering the report of the Secretary-General in an atmosphere of unrest and terror in Namibia. From one college alone, Augustineum College of Windhoek, 250 students have been expelled. The whole of Katutura Township has been combed by the police in a massive manhunt. People are being summarily arrested and freely flogged. According to the memorandum submitted by a delegation which included two members of the British Parliament and the SWAPO representative in the United Kingdom to the British Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, more than 100 people so far have been publicly flogged, and women and children are included among them. The men and boys were forced to stand naked while being flogged, the women and girls had to hoist their skirts up over their faces while receiving the lash.

88. The South African Government announced that that was traditional "tribal punishment". According to the latest

reports published in the *Windhoek Advertiser* of 20 November 1973, urgent applications have been filed in the Supreme Court on behalf of the Bishop of Damaraland and the Bishop of the Ovambo-Kavango Lutheran Church, Bishop Aula. In spite of the urgency of the matter, the hearing of the show-cause notice has been fixed for 22 February next year. Meanwhile, a request for a doctor to be present while floggings are administered was not allowed, because it was considered impracticable in Ovambo.

89. In the circumstances there is no doubt that any meaningful talks with the representatives of the Pretoria régime is impossible. The wider question of the independence of Namibia has already been discussed in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, but we consider that it would be useful if the Secretary-General was requested to watch the situation and report to the Security Council as circumstances warrant. The Secretary-General, being the highest executive officer of an Organization to which South Africa still wishes to belong, has a task to perform and we should not deprive him of our support and confidence if there is some chance, however slight, that progress can be made on this problem, even if South Africa has left the freedom fighters no other option but to undertake a prolonged and agonizing campaign for freedom.

90. We do not consider it necessary, at any rate at this stage, to comment on the substance of the problem. Understandably, several speakers, particularly our African colleagues and the President of the Council for Namibia, have already brought us up to date on the tragic developments in Namibia since the Council last discussed them about a year ago. It seems to my delegation that at times instead of showing our disapproval, in many ways open to us, of those who encourage South Africa, we have indeed rewarded them. There is much need for vigilance, for when Namibia is free—as it undoubtedly will be—we would wish the people of Namibia to look upon us as partners in our common struggle and not as mere bystanders who behaved in a whimsical way.

91. But whatever we may do, the pain of the Namibians will be removed and their dignity restored. There will be detractions, dissensions, and temptations, but nothing can reverse the trend towards equality in all respects so noticeable in the whole of Africa.

92. Mr. BOYD (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before stating Panama's position on the substance of the item under discussion, I should like to express the satisfaction of the delegation of Panama at seeing the representative of the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Huang Hua, as President of the Security Council during the final month in which we shall be serving on the most important body of the world Organization.

93. We also wish to place on record our appreciation of the intelligent, skilful and courteous manner in which the representative of Austria, Ambassador Peter Jankowitsch, presided over the delicate and complex meetings of the month of November 1973, when this Council took far-reaching decisions on the composition of the United Nations Emergency Force which, on the Council's instruc-

tions, is now in the Middle East discharging an important mission of peace.

94. Latin America has always played a very important role in the process of decolonization of the African continent and, because it is a happy coincidence, it is only fair to recognize that the present President of the General Assembly, Ambassador Leopoldo Benites, has for more than 10 years participated, in an outstanding and untiring manner, as many other prominent representatives of the western hemisphere have done, in the vindication of the just claims for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, to which the peoples of Africa are entitled.

95. At the historic meeting in Addis Ababa, on 31 January 1972, on behalf of our delegation, we stated that "Side by side with its African brothers Panama shares their suffering at any attempts to undermine the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of these nations. My delegation condemns all forms of colonialism in Africa". [1631st meeting, para. 29.] In the Security Council the voices of the five African and Latin American members always should be heard in unison to condemn all forms of colonialism.

96. In Addis Ababa, in 1972, where we unreservedly condemned the odious policy of *apartheid*, we enthusiastically joined the representative of Argentina, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, in his efforts to try to find a solution for the case of Namibia, the result of which was the adoption of Security Council resolution 309 (1972).

97. Panama has always supported every measure to strengthen the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we firmly believe that the United Nations Fund for Namibia plays a very important role in training the people who aspire to achieve independence and sovereignty for their nation. My delegation considers that since the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, given on 21 June 1971, the presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal from every point of view, and that the occupation of Namibia by South Africa is a fact which contributes to unrest in the area and is a threat to peace and security in that part of the world.

98. The efforts of the Secretary-General, which are recorded in document S/10921 and Corr.1, show that the position of the Government of South Africa is quite different from the one indicated in United Nations resolutions on Namibia. The efforts of the Secretary-General, in regard to the question of Namibia, deserve the appreciation of the Council even though they were unsuccessful.

99. My delegation, given the facts which we are compelled to face, is in full agreement with the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the delegation of Peru [S/11152/Rev.1], in which the Council declares that no further efforts will be made to seek an accommodation with the Government of South Africa with a view to finding a solution to the problem of Namibia on the basis of resolution 309 (1972).

100. In conclusion, the delegation of Panama wishes to announce that it will support any measures which this

Council may take to put an end as soon as possible to the intolerable situation which South Africa maintains in Namibia.

101. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan): Mr. President, my delegation would like to extend to you its warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December and to wish you a successful term of office. My delegation would also take this opportunity to extend affectionate felicitations to your predecessor, Ambassador Jankowitsch of Austria, for the able and efficient manner in which he performed his duties during a period of delicate and important deliberations.

102. We have had the opportunity to listen during these two days to the extensive and able survey of the question of Namibia in the context of the report of the Secretary-General as well as of his previous reports since the adoption of resolution 309 (1972) in Addis Ababa on 4 February 1972.

103. My delegation is appreciative of the efforts of the Secretary-General in carrying out his difficult mandate. During his early contacts with the authorities of South Africa, the Secretary-General faithfully tried to establish

"... the necessary conditions so as to enable the people of Namibia, freely and with strict regard to the principle of human equality, to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;" [resolution 309 (1972)].

104. By 17 July 1972, the date of his report to the Council [S/10738], the Secretary-General had already learnt that in Eastern Caprivi and Ovamboland in Namibia the Government of South Africa had already taken fresh steps to apply its policy of the so-called "homelands". Once more, and reluctantly, the Council, by resolution 319 (1972) of 1 August 1972, extended the mandate of the Secretary-General. Consequently, the Secretary-General presented his report in document S/10832 of 15 November 1972. During the discussions with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Vorster, the Prime Minister of South Africa, asserted that it was not the appropriate stage to go into a detailed analysis of South Africa's policy of self-determination and independence. This reply was fortunately counter-balanced by the rejection, by the overwhelming majority of the people of Namibia, of the South African administration of the "homelands" policy and by the demand for national independence and preservation of national integrity of their country.

105. I should like to quote the judgement on the situation and the conclusions we drew from the second report of the Secretary-General, back in December 1972:

"In the light of this summary of [our arguments on the contents of the report], my delegation is forced to draw one main conclusion: namely, that the Government of South Africa is taking cover under the pretext of a prolonged, futile dialogue with the United Nations in order both to appease international public opinion and to

consolidate her *apartheid* designs in Namibia. Its main interest in Namibia has been and continues to be cheap contract labour and exploitation of the Territory's wealth. Indeed, for over 50 years South Africa has not done anything worth while in the Territory towards the improvement of the living conditions and welfare of the inhabitants, much less towards the development of real self-government. It is therefore idle to give South Africa another chance, which she would obviously use to cause the Territory to disintegrate much further and break the backbone of the mounting liberation movement, as clearly demonstrated before and during the visit to Namibia of the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

"Time has proved that once a people decides to be independent, it will be, and invariably [the same people] acquires the art of government and standing together in the process for the sake and in pursuit of its own national existence. . . .

"In the case of Namibia the United Nations presence gives it a greater advantage than any of the African countries which bypassed the experience in self-government as proposed by the Prime Minister of South Africa.

"It is a vicious argument by South Africa to claim that "homeland development", constitutionally or economically, is better for the Territory. Tribal existence has never been a barrier to national liberation in Africa, and above all in Namibia, where only a few tribes live and where all are united in the struggle for independence. It requires no deep economic knowledge to decide that the pooling of the economic resources of the whole Territory is of more value than dividing the Territory into a number of independent economic units of 'homelands'..". [1681st meeting, paras. 115-118.]

106. We drew that conclusion as long ago as December 1972 regarding these contacts.

107. Despite all the doubts expressed in the Council, for the third time the Secretary-General was mandated to make further contacts with the authorities of South Africa with a view to seeking complete and unequivocal clarification of South Africa's policy regarding self-government and independence for Namibia. That was in resolution 323 (1972).

108. In a typically deceptive and evasive manner characteristic of all racial régimes haunted by the idea of self-preservation as privileged minorities, the racist régime has qualified every answer to the most direct questions submitted by the Secretary-General.

109. The assertion by South Africa was that it was desirous to assist the population of Namibia—they called it South West Africa—to exercise its right to self-determination and independence and that the Government of South Africa would fully respect the wishes of the whole population of the Territory and that it has no intention of imposing any constitutional system on the people. Yet, we are all aware that "homelands" have been created ever since and that the administration has been manipulated in such a

brutal way that any possibility of free determination by the people of Namibia of its own future becomes most difficult if not impossible. Nobody with a reasonable political sense can imagine that the racist régime of South Africa will work for majority rule in Namibia, and the opposite is true.

110. However, we all know that, as Ambassador Mojsov of Yugoslavia has just pointed out, there are other vicious motives behind these wild attempts of the racist régime to extend its illegal occupation. We all know that there is exploitation of the uranium mines; we know about diamond exploration, copper, oil, fisheries and plantations—all of which are being exploited by foreign concerns and taxes are being paid to South Africa in order to extend its illegal occupation of Namibia.

111. After 15 months of dialogue and probing, the Secretary-General could not persuade the Government of South Africa to see eye to eye with the United Nations with regard to the principle of self-determination and independence, let alone to accept them or apply them in Namibia. On the contrary, for the past two years, since the adoption of resolution 309 (1972) on 4 February 1972 initiating the dialogue, South Africa has taken advantage of this long period of grace to consolidate further its *apartheid* policy in the Territory and to contract illegally for further concessions to foreign concerns. We shall have to remember similar and earlier attempts by the United Nations with the South African authorities that met with the same fate as that of the Secretary-General's efforts.

112. This is why we are here today to decide officially on the termination of the contacts which actually terminated a long time ago. As early as May 1973 the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU resolved the following:

"Calls upon the United Nations Security Council to terminate the contacts of the United Nations Secretary-General with the South African racist authorities as such exercise has proved ultimately to be detrimental to the interests of the people of Namibia and prejudicial to an early attainment of independence by this Territory."

113. My own Head of State was a party to this decision, and this is the position of my delegation today.

114. This is again an occasion for this Council to make it clear beyond any doubt to the racist régime of South Africa as well as to those delegations which manoeuvred this Council into this dialogue with South Africa that this Council stands firmly by its decisions prior to resolution 309 (1972) as well as by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

115. My Government's views on the question of Namibia have been expressed on several occasions in various Committees of the General Assembly, as well as in the Security Council. The justification for repeating them today is that it was more than half a century ago that, after liberating Namibia from German rule, the international community undertook to administer the Territory as a sacred trust of civilization and to provide for the well-being and development of its inhabitants. Yet today the people of Namibia, against their unanimous will and, worse still, against the will

of the international community, are being subjected to *apartheid*, a system censured by the General Assembly as a crime against humanity and described by the Security Council as abhorrent to the conscience of mankind.

116. Since the establishment of the United Nations, the question of Namibia has been the subject of several resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and five references to the International Court of Justice.

117. The substance of all the sessions of those organs of the United Nations system points to the following: first, that Namibia has an international status for which the international community is directly responsible; second, that South Africa's presence in that Territory is illegal and, therefore, that its racist administration should withdraw; third, that South Africa has defiantly refused to heed the

United Nations requests to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the opinions of the International Court of Justice.

118. The problem that we are faced with today is a challenge to the authority of both the Council and other organs of the United Nations in connexion with Namibia. In the view of my delegation, the Security Council should take a very serious view of the situation and should, first, determine that the continued presence of South African administration in Namibia constitutes an act of aggression and, therefore, a threat to international peace and security, and, second, adopt appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to ensure the compliance of the South African Government.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.