

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTIETH YEAR

1827th MEETING: 5 JUNE 1975

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS NOV 28 1983

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda @/Agenda/ 1827)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia	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.

1827th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 5 June 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdul **Karim** AL-SHAIKHLY (Iraq).

Present: *The* representatives of the following States: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1827)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation **in** Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Security Council at its 1823rd to 1826th meetings, I shall now invite the representatives of Bulgaria, Burundi, Cuba, Dahomey, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, India, Liberia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, United Arab Emirates, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber in order that they may participate in the current discussion without the right to vote. When any one of them wishes to address the Council, he will of course be invited to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ghelev (Bulgaria), Mr. Mikanagu (Burundi), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Neugebauer (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Boaten (Ghana), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Dennis (Liberia), Mr. Ogbu (Nigeria), Mr. Matin (Pakistan), Mr. Datcu (Romania), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Djigo (Senegal), Mr. Blyden (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussein (Somalia), Mr. Humaidan (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mwaanga (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a further decision taken at the 1823rd meeting, I now invite the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fonseca Martinez and other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took places at the Security Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT? I wish to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter dated 4 June 1975 [S/11710 and Corr.1] from the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania, requesting the Council to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to the Reverend Canon Burgess Carr of the All-Africa Conference of Churches. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to him. At the appropriate time I shall invite the Reverend Canon Burgess Carr to make his statement.

It was thus decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Bulgaria and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. GHELEV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The head of the Bulgarian delegation, Mr. Grozev, deeply regrets that he is not in a position to express the views of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the important question which is on the agenda of this series of meetings of the Council. Owing to a temporary indisposition, Mr. Grozev has appointed me to tender his apologies to the Council. I shall therefore proceed to read out the statement which Mr. Grozev would have delivered before the Council today.

6. Mr. President, I should like first to extend my thanks to you and to the other members of the Council for giving the Bulgarian delegation this opportunity of expressing the views of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the question of Namibia. I should like at the same time to address my warmest congratulations to you personally, Mr. President, the representative of Iraq, a country with which Bulgaria has established and is developing friendly relations and the broadest co-operation. We are convinced that under your skilful guidance the Council will be successful in adopting a decision which will assist the people of Namibia

to recover its freedom and **independence** in the nearest future.

7. Namibia continues to be one of the most striking, and at the same time the most intolerable, examples of colonialism and racism. The United Nations has adopted many resolutions condemning **the** illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the colonial policy of the Pretoria **régime** and the *apartheid* system which it is endeavouring to entrench in Namibia.

8. Guided by the understanding that there can be no compromise where the sacred right of the peoples to independence and self-determination is concerned, the United Nations has long since confirmed the right of the Namibian people to be free and independent and to exist as a national entity in a single territory.

9. The United Nations has also long recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia for the exercise of its right to independence under the guidance of its sole representative, the national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

10. We are all familiar with the efforts of the Secretary-General to facilitate the solution of this important international problem.

11. We also recall that, for its part, the International Court of Justice, in its Advisory Opinion of 21 June **1971**,¹ did in fact confirm the resolutions of the United Nations by stipulating that the continuing occupation of Namibia by South Africa represents an illegal act and that South Africa is obliged to withdraw from the territory and to terminate its occupation.

12. The Security Council has adopted many resolutions clearly and unequivocally **recognizing** the guilt and the heavy burden of responsibility of South Africa and also the importance of demanding an accounting from that **country**. As far back as 1972, in its resolution 310 (**1972**), the Council noted that the persistent occupation of Namibia by South Africa was not only at variance with the Charter and the decisions of the United Nations, but that South Africa's behaviour created conditions which represented a grave danger to peace and security in that region of the world. Furthermore, in its most recent resolution on Namibia, resolution 366 (**1974**), the Council explicitly required that South Africa formally declare its willingness to pay attention to the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations as well as of the views of the **International** Court of Justice and to declare that it recognized the territorial integrity and the unity of Namibia as a nation.

13. The right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, the role of its liberation movement, SWAPO and its capacity to represent the Namibian people have been repeatedly reaffirmed by other international forums enjoying unquestioned

authority, such as, for example, the conferences of non-aligned countries, Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization, the World Peace Council, the Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, the Conference on Namibia in Brussels, the Oslo Conference and many others.

14. The attitude of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) which supports the people of Namibia and SWAPO with characteristic firmness in the struggle against colonialism is entirely understandable. The declaration adopted by the Council of Ministers of the OAU at its Ninth Extraordinary Session, held at Dar es Salaam from 7 to 10 April 1975, testifies to the political maturity of the African countries which have worked out their strategy and their tactics at the present stage of the struggle against colonialism.

15. The participation of a large number of African countries in this debate is significant. It testifies to the urgency of the problem and the grave concern of Africa over developments in Namibia. The statements made by many Ministers for Foreign Affairs, who have come especially to take part in this debate, and the statements by the heads of the other African delegations clearly reflect that concern.

16. Africa is once again looking to the Security Council, thus expressing its faith in the Organization and its desire to look to the United Nations for assistance in arriving at the only just solution of an international problem which should long since have been resolved and which can brook no further delay.

17. We have heard the voice of the people of Namibia in the person of its devoted son, the President of the national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [**1823rd meeting**]. The weight of irrefutable evidence he presented to the Council proves one thing alone, namely, that South Africa is continuing its policy of **colonization** and occupation of Namibia, refusing to **recognize** the lawful rights of the people of that country and offering a permanent challenge to the demands of the United Nations. In these circumstances, the people of Namibia have no choice but to step up their national liberation struggle under the guidance of SWAPO.

18. The situation in Namibia and the debate in the Security Council so far have very clearly shown that South Africa is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia, establishing the theory and the racist practice of *apartheid* which has been recognized by the United Nations as a crime against humanity, and attempting to divide the people of Namibia, to break its territorial integrity and to trample underfoot its right to **self-determination** and independence.

19. By so acting, the Pretoria **régime** is demonstrating an unprecedented contempt for the clearly expressed will of the international community. South Africa's behaviour vis-a-vis Namibia, as well as vis-a-vis its own people, represents a crime against humanity.

There is no other way to describe its policy, a policy which is absolutely unjustifiable.

20. It was quite rightly that the representatives of the African countries and the President of SWAPO rejected the most recent attempt by South Africa to present its policies as acceptable to Africa and to the United Nations. The South African regime, which by its very nature is incapable of understanding what the sacred right of a people to self-determination and independence means, is doing everything possible to gain time by endeavouring to engage in "deals" with the United Nations regarding that right of the people of Namibia.

21. There is no question but that these attempts are doomed to failure. The pity of it is, however, that there are forces which in practice are supporting South Africa and encouraging its policy of imperialism, racism and *apartheid* and which are preventing the Security Council from taking the necessary actions and measures against South Africa.

22. The last bastion of colonialism in Africa, the Pretoria regime, cannot long hold out, because no one can stem the irresistible onward march of human **civilization**.

23. The development of the world situation in recent times and the process of the reduction of tension in the world have greatly assisted the intensification of the national liberation struggle and of the struggle for international peace and security, for democracy and social progress. The collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire following the courageous struggle of the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and the Cape Verde islands, as well as the victory of the Portuguese people over fascism and the forces of reaction, has opened the way to the rapid and complete elimination of colonialism in Africa. Neither South Africa nor those who support it can impede this process. There is no doubt that, thanks to its self-sacrificing struggle, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, will win the final victory and obtain its freedom. The United Nations must play its deserved part in that struggle in order to respond to the ideals and the principles of the right of people to self-determination and independence and the complete elimination of colonialism.

24. That is why the question now before the Council and the question before world opinion is the following: is South Africa going to be allowed still more time on the insistence of those who have always opposed the **just** demands for the application of stringent measures against the Pretoria regime? More time for what purpose? So that this antipopular **régime** can continue its attempts to break the unity of the people, to dismember its territory and to trample underfoot its right to be free, so that it may continue to massacre its **sons**?

25. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, a member of the socialist community, unswervingly pursuing its policy of peace has always been in the forefront of the struggle of progressive and democratic forces against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

26. It is only the united front of all these forces throughout the world that can compel South Africa to bow to the decisions of the United Nations. This is particularly important today, when a unity of aspiration and of action on the part of the African peoples is more than essential to bring about a just solution of the problem of Namibia and to the other problems of Africa.

27. We join all those who most categorically condemn South Africa for its refusal to comply with the decisions of the United Nations and for its persistent and illegal occupation of Namibia, because it tramples underfoot the right of the Namibian people to **self-determination** and refuses to **recognize** the sole representative of that people, SWAPO.

28. We unreservedly support the people of Namibia and SWAPO in their struggle for freedom, against the colonial yoke of South Africa, and shall continue to do so. Accordingly, we warmly support the just and urgent appeal for the Security Council to impose an embargo on deliveries of all types of military equipment and material to South Africa and to impose mandatory economic sanctions against that country. Furthermore, it is essential for all countries to break off their relations with the Pretoria regime. And, if all that should prove **insufficient** to produce the desired results, we shall have to think about applying the most stringent sanctions provided for in the Charter of the United Nations in order to extirpate once for all that source of colonialism and racism and to put an end to that direct threat to world peace and international security.

29. If South Africa in its present policies continues brutally to trample the rights and freedoms of the people of Namibia and refuses to comply with the many resolutions of the Organization, then the question of its continued presence among us will inevitably arise, and with even greater urgency than before.

30. May the Security Council respond to the faith of Africa in the **Organization** by adopting a categorical and concrete decision, a decision which can make an effective contribution to the effort of the Namibian people to achieve without further delay their freedom and independence.

31. The PRESIDENT: I regret that the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria was unable to attend this meeting. I wish to convey Mr. Grozev our best wishes for a speedy recovery.

32. The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. **ALARCÓN** (Cuba) (interpretation *from Spanish*): First, I should like to say how pleased we are, Sir, to have this opportunity to appear before the Security Council under your presidency. We are pleased for two reasons. First, we are well *aware* of your personal qualities. Secondly, you represent a country, Iraq, with which my country has the most fraternal relations. Iraq has always followed an active and positive line of conduct in support of the emancipation of peoples still subjected to colonialism and racism.

34. We should like to extend our greetings, too, to the delegation of Guyana. It has always made the most constructive efforts in the United Nations in defence of the cause of the oppressed peoples of the world, and in particular in defence of the cause of Namibia. Those efforts have been epitomized during the present debate by the activities of Mr. **Ramphal** and Mr. Jackson.

35. In the circumstances of the present discussion of the item before the Security Council, long speeches are not required. It is not necessary to repeat arguments in support of facts already known to everyone, nor to reiterate the well-known principles and positions of each Government. We are taking part in this series of Council meetings not to reopen the eternal debate on Namibia which began with the very creation of the **Organization**, but because we believe that the debate in the Council has reached the point where the Council must now, in accordance with past decisions, take certain practical steps to follow up the discussion on Namibia held here in December 1974 [*181 1st and 1812th meetings*].

36. We believe that the Security Council has rarely met in circumstances such as these, where the situation before it could not be clearer, and where the action it should take has been worked out beforehand, with the agreement of **all** the members of the Council. We need only read again Security Council resolution 366 (1974) to realize that the task facing the Council today is a very specific one.

37. In that resolution the Council declared that South Africa's occupation of Namibia was illegal and arbitrary. It called upon the Pretoria regime to take a number of specific steps in connexion with that Territory. It gave that regime a time-limit within which to submit South Africa's reaction to the resolution. It even indicated the form in which that reaction should be presented. It decided to meet five months after the adoption of the resolution to consider the appropriate measures to be taken if South Africa had not complied with the decision of the Security Council.

38. For that reason we believe that, in procedural terms, the task now before the Security Council is

rather simple. Primarily it is to ascertain whether South Africa's reaction has met the conditions laid down by the Council more than live months ago. If the conclusion is negative, then the Council must do what it decided to do in the aforementioned resolution—that is, it must consider the adoption of appropriate action vis-a-vis South Africa.

39. I believe that there would be very few, if any, members of the Security Council or Members of the United Nations as a whole that would dare to assert that South Africa had fulfilled even part of the conditions laid down last December by the Security Council. The South African **régime** has not made the solemn promises it was asked to make. It has not sent any solemn declaration to the Security Council that it will do what the Security Council has asked it to do. Instead, in a communication that has been distributed to members of the Council and that contains the most recent statement by the Government of South Africa [see S/11701], it has denied that the United Nations has any right to deal with this matter. South Africa has not taken the necessary steps to withdraw from Namibia and to transfer power to the people of Namibia, nor has it indicated when or how it proposes to do that. It has complied neither in spirit nor in practice with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It has not released political prisoners. It has not abolished the application in Namibia of all racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices. It has not given any guarantees for the return of the persons exiled for political reasons.

40. On the contrary, in the statement of the **Government** of South Africa, to which I and a number of other speakers have referred, it is clear that South Africa intends to pursue in that Territory certain colonialist **manceuvres** designed to weaken the principle of **self-determination** of the Namibian people. It is persisting in the promotion of its policy of Bantustan homelands with the aim of dismembering the Territory and dissolving its territorial integrity. That is a **policy** of great cynicism if one recalls an historical fact—namely, that the problems and tensions which have existed among the Namibian people were caused by the European invasion of that Territory and came about because of the social problems arising from the seizure of land and livestock in that country by European **colonizers**, who were at the origin of all the conflicts, that, fomented by Europeans, broke out towards the end of the nineteenth century.

41. The only guarantee for the territorial integrity of Namibia, the sole guarantee for the maintenance of the national unity of that people, lies in the elimination of the regime imposed by European colonists and the removal of the foreign presence in that Territory.

42. In summary, my delegation would venture to say that South Africa has not fulfilled the conditions which the Council unanimously decided upon. Therefore the

Security Council has an obligation under that earlier decision, and even out of respect for its authority and prestige, to abide by the programme laid down in resolution 366 (1974) and to implement paragraph 6 of that resolution, which requires the Council to take appropriate action. Of course, we are aware of the possible room for manoeuvring that the term "appropriate" might offer some delegations, but we believe that the very least that can be expected of those traditionally inclined to take a somewhat generous view of the policies of Pretoria is that, no matter how flexible or mild they would like the measures adopted by the Council to be, they should agree that any decision that does not represent a practical and effective means of compelling South Africa to change its position or that cannot be included under the heading-a sufficiently clear one-of "action" would be inappropriate for the Council to take at this time.

43. As regards the practical action the Security Council should take at the present time, we have listened with interest to the arguments put forward by various representatives of African countries. We should like to say that we fully agree with the concrete proposals they have made recently. In particular I am referring to the statement made a few days ago by Mr. Mwaanga [1824th meeting], head of the Zambian delegation, and that made yesterday [1826th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Malecela.

44. We believe that looking logically at the conduct of the Security Council in relation to resolution 366 (1974), no one can deny the rightness of the proposals put forward by African delegations, nor the fact that they are in accordance with the letter and spirit of that resolution, and whatever efforts of imagination we make, that can hardly be said of other suggestions put forward in this body by some western Powers.

45. We believe that the Council can reach some kind of compromise with those delegations traditionally sympathetic to South Africa only if those delegations accept the basic underlying principle behind these meetings of the Council. They are taking place as a direct consequence of the decision adopted last December. Therefore an agreement must be reached on the basis of at least the following elements.

46. First, the Security Council must reaffirm what it decided in resolution 366 (1974) and, consequently, it must reject the letter distributed on behalf of the Government of South Africa because it does not correspond to what was requested of South Africa and because, in addition, it implies a show of disrespect for this body and for the entire United Nations system.

47. Secondly, the members of the Council must agree at least on what is the minimal action acceptable to everyone at the present time.

48. That action has, we believe, been spelled out in the statements made to the Council by the African representatives I mentioned a few moments ago: It might perhaps be possible to accept the suggestion which was made a few days ago by one delegation, a member of the Council, to the effect that a committee or a body under the Council might be created, although we believe that such a group could only be established and act within the framework of the Council's resolutions. Perhaps it could be patterned after the present Committee on Rhodesia to see to the implementation of any action which the Council might adopt in respect of South Africa, and to keep the situation in Namibia more or less systematically under review.

49. Finally, the Council should establish a date for a reassessment of developments in the Territory, in order to decide whether to repeal measures it might now resolve to impose upon South Africa, because the situation has changed in the way prescribed by resolution 366 (1974), or, if the present state of affairs still obtains, to adopt sanctions against the regime of South Africa.

50. I am aware that some may feel that the Council is not in a position at the present time to adopt the necessary effective practical action against the regime of South Africa and that this body once again, because of the position of a minority in the United Nations, may be prevented from taking the kind of action which the overwhelming majority of the international community has been requesting with regard to South Africa for many years now. In that case, we believe that the African States, which have borne the brunt of the struggle against colonialism and racism within the United Nations, should not stand idly by. If the Security Council fails to act in accordance with what was decided upon five months ago, and if the Security Council, because of the action of certain Western Powers which have supported *apartheid* and the illegal occupation of Namibia, were to be unable to discharge the great historical responsibility which falls to it today, nevertheless, we believe that many possibilities would still be open to us within the framework of the United Nations and that they should be thoroughly explored by the anti-colonialist and progressive forces in the Organization. Were the Council to fail to perform its duty, we believe that the socialist countries, the non-aligned countries, and all those of us who are truly interested in the emancipation of the Namibian people, should give serious consideration to the possibility of further action in the **course** of this year which might allow us to achieve the goals we are all pursuing in connexion with Namibia.

51. We believe that what is most important, what is truly decisive, would be the adoption of concrete measures to provide every type of assistance and practical, wide-ranging co-operation with SWAPO in an effort to help it in its liberation struggle in that Territory, including the adoption of the necessary steps to enable the Namibian national liberation

movement to secure international legal recognition as the sole representative of that Territory. We also believe that it is possible for us to **call** on other forces, which are not always **fully** represented in the Organization, but which agree with the **anti-colonialist** States in our aims with regard to Namibia. We should do everything possible in the United Nations, **in** the General Assembly and in the various bodies working against colonialism and racism in the Organization, to mobilize world public opinion through the various workers' organizations and the **other** organizations of intellectuals and students, so as to induce them to impose sanctions, with the support of the masses of the entire world, and to compel the application of those effective measures which it might be **difficult** to achieve through this body. World public opinion should also be **mobilized** to impose the appropriate moral sanctions against those States, interests and corporations which are contributing to the maintenance of **the** regime of **apartheid** among the Namibian people. We should not forget that even within those States which **are well** known in the United Nations as supporters of the policies of **apartheid**, there are institutions and organizations which ever more openly repudiate the policies of South Africa and those of their Governments which are favourable to Pretoria.

52. It would be best, of course, if the Security Council were able to discharge its responsibility. But if that is not possible, then Member States in the Organization must discharge theirs. This year, two anniversaries will be commemorated which compel us to **recall** the plight of the Namibian **people** and should encourage us to take all possible international action to help it to achieve its emancipation.

53. Thirty years ago, the world saw the defeat of fascism in Europe. From the ashes of that Nazi regime, the oppressor of many nations, there arose the **international** Organization. It is obvious that the most elementary duty of the United Nations in this anniversary year of the defeat of fascism is to see to it that no trace of that system shall persist in certain parts of Africa, as indeed it does today. We must **mobilize** all those forces throughout the entire world which 30 years ago were united in bringing about that victory to ensure that a handful of fascists does not continue to impose that same racist policy, that same unacceptable philosophy of the superiority of one race over another, that same desire to enslave the majority for the benefit of a handful of supposedly "superior" men.

54. This year, likewise, we shall be celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial **Countries** and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly*]. To celebrate it in the best possible way, all States that support the principles of that resolution should endeavour to see to it that it is truly implemented everywhere in Africa, and that it prevails over the

stubborn opposition of the racist minorities in Namibia and Rhodesia.

55. My delegation and my Government, here and now, pledge their willingness to participate in that undertaking to the best of their ability, for the sake of our brothers from the African continent.

56. Mr. SAITO (Japan): Sir, my delegation wishes first of all to congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. Under your **skilful** guidance I am sure that the work of the Council will proceed in a most smooth and constructive manner.

57. I wish also to pay tribute to the delegation of Guyana for its services to the Council in May. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. **Ramphal**, who honoured us by coming to New York to preside over the opening discussions of the important question with which we are now concerned. We wish also to express our appreciation to Mr. Jackson, who presided at the meetings earlier in the month.

58. My Government has consistently maintained the following basic position regarding the question of Namibia. First, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal, and South Africa is under obligation to withdraw from the region immediately. Secondly, the United Nations has direct responsibility for Namibia, and it should have the primary role during the **transition** to independence. Thirdly, the question of Namibia should be solved peacefully by realistic, constructive and effective approaches. My delegation is examining this most important question in accordance with the position I have now stated.

59. South Africa's reply to the Council [see *S/11701*] once again fails to **recognize** the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and does not agree to South Africa's immediate withdrawal from Namibia **and the** transfer of power to the people there.

60. In view of the position that my delegation has taken over the years, we are disappointed with South Africa's reply. Our disappointment is all the greater because Prime Minister Vorster's statement last fall, and his subsequent contacts with some African leaders, kindled the hope that his Government might at last be **willing** to adopt a less rigid position regarding southern African questions, and in particular the question of Namibia.

61. My delegation deplores the fact that South Africa has not responded to the Council's demand for concrete commitments regarding its withdrawal from Namibia and the transfer of power to the people there. South Africa's reply to the Council, in the view of my delegation, fails to satisfy the terms of Security Council resolution 366 (1974).

62. In defending South Africa's illegal occupation, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa actually denied in Cape Town on 27 May 1975 that it is an occupation, claiming that South Africa is merely administering Namibia "with the consent and at the wish of the people concerned". He added that if South Africa were to withdraw "prematurely" it would thereby create the risk of disorder and even internal strife.

63. It should be noted, however, that the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility over Namibia, and therefore it is the United Nations, not South Africa, which would be called upon to deal with any situation that might develop as a consequence of South Africa's withdrawal.

64. Moreover, I would remind the Council that resolution 366 (1974) addressed four specific demands to South Africa, including the release of all Namibian political prisoners and the abolition of the racially discriminatory Bantustans and homelands, pending the transfer of power to the people of Namibia. South Africa's response was vague and equivocal.

65. Despite the negative elements in South Africa's reply regarding most of the vital issues in the Namibian question, there are some parts which might be worthy of careful study and thorough examination. First, the reply **recognized** the international status of Namibia and the right of its "peoples" to **self-determination**. Second, it referred also to the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia. Third, the Prime Minister expressed his willingness to discuss the progress and developments in the Territory with the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee of the OAU and also with the personal representative of the Secretary-General.

66. My delegation sincerely hopes that South Africa will spare no effort to assist the people of Namibia in achieving independence as a unitary State under one government and that it will not take any action which threatens the territorial integrity and unity of the Territory pending the transfer of power.

67. We wish to emphasize that elections to enable the **people** of Namibia to determine freely their own future must be held under the auspices of the United Nations and under its supervision. In such elections **SWAPO's** participation must be assured. An act of free choice by the people of Namibia from which the United Nations is excluded is unacceptable to my delegation.

68. My delegation has taken note of the South African Prime Minister's statement that his **Government** is in agreement with the most important aspects of the United Nations point of view and that it has no quarrel with the **OAU's** position on self-determination, independence and the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the Territory. In addition to his willingness

to discuss Namibian developments with the **international** organizations **directly** concerned with the problem, the **Prime** Minister said that African leaders who wish to visit Namibia to acquaint themselves with conditions there would be very welcome to do so, either personally or through their representatives.

69. Provided that there is some indication that common ground exists for a discussion of the transfer of power to the Namibian people, it might be worth exploring these offers. It would also be useful for the Security Council to seek clarification through such discussions of the ambiguous points in South Africa's reply and in fact to ascertain whether we can depend upon South Africa's good faith in helping to achieve the aims of the United Nations in Namibia.

70. The recent important developments in southern Africa, particularly the emergence of new independent States from Territories previously under Portuguese administration, deepen our conviction that a peaceful and just solution for Namibia will be achieved.

71. Last year, by unanimous vote, the Security Council adopted resolution 366 (1974). In the event that the Council should decide on appropriate measures under the Charter to induce South Africa to comply with this resolution, it would be desirable that the Council again take unanimous action, thereby consolidating the advance made last year. My delegation is prepared to give its co-operation to this end.

72. Bearing in mind those two points, my delegation suggests that the Security Council consider the following course of action: first, reaffirm Security Council resolution 366 (1974), in particular its confirmation of the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, and respect for the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia; secondly, with a view to ascertaining the intentions of South Africa regarding compliance with resolution 366 (1974), authorize an appropriate body to initiate contact with South Africa; thirdly, request all Member States to provide their assistance and co-operation for this purpose; fourthly, meet before the end of January 1976 to examine the report by the body entrusted with this contact and, in the event of non-compliance by South Africa, to take further appropriate measures under the Charter; **fifthly**, combined with such contact, adopt a new resolution or reaffirm previous Security Council resolutions, calling upon all States, in particular the major arms-exporting States, to refrain from the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition and military equipment to South Africa until it complies with the Council resolutions regarding Namibia.

73. In conclusion, I wish to state that we are fully aware of the gravity of the situation in Namibia. We hope that the Security Council will take appropriate measures which will help induce South Africa to accept the aims of the United Nations for Namibia.

74. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, allow me **first** of all, speaking on behalf of the Soviet delegation, to warmly welcome you as the representative of a friendly country on your assumption of the high office of the presidency of the Security Council and to wish you all possible success in carrying out the responsible duties which are incumbent upon the President of the Council. I should like also to congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Jackson of Guyana, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guyana, Mr. **Ramphal**, who so actively and with such good results conducted the work of the Council last month.

75. Pursuant to its earlier decision, the Council is once again discussing the problem of Namibia, in order to ascertain whether South Africa has complied with the provisions of resolution 366 (1974). As we know, in that resolution the Security Council resolved that, if South Africa should fail to comply with the provisions of that resolution, it would consider what further measures should be taken in regard to South Africa in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. This decision was adopted by the Council unanimously.

76. The international political significance of the question of Namibia is widely known. It is further indicated by the active participation in the Council's present consideration of the question by the representatives of such a large number of African and other States Members of the United Nations, a number of which have been represented at a high level, by their Ministers for Foreign Affairs. The Security Council has also heard the parties directly concerned, in particular the representative of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma [*1823rd meeting*].

77. The substantial statements of the African representatives have merged into a single, powerful and convincing voice, the voice of Africa, on the substance of the problem of Namibia. It is a voice of protest and of just condemnation of the racist **régime** of South Africa.

78. The thorough explanation of the essence of the problem and the convincing arguments adduced in the statements we have heard have made possible a comprehensive consideration and a better understanding on the part of the Security Council of the present state of the problem of Namibia. It is perfectly clear what situation today confronts the Council as regards the racist policies and practices of South Africa vis-a-vis Namibia. In its resolution 366 (1974), the Council demanded that South Africa **officially** declare that it would implement the United Nations decisions on Namibia. Today it is clear to one and all that South Africa is openly and cynically ignoring those decisions of the United Nations and is refusing to implement them. In its resolution the Council demanded that South Africa should **recognize** and respect the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia. In response, the South African leaders have

in essence reaffirmed their policy aimed at breaking the unity of the country and at perpetuating the policy of dismembering the country into separate Bantustans.

79. The Security Council in its resolution demanded that the South African authorities should withdraw from Namibia their administration and police, whose presence there was illegal. The reply to this was a categorical refusal on the part of South Africa to comply with the Council decision that it should withdraw from Namibia.

80. Consequently, the South African racists who are illegally occupying Namibia, exploiting its natural resources and oppressing its people, have refused to comply with that decision of the Security Council and with its most recent warning. Such is the true state of affairs in Namibia and such is the appraisal of the present position of South Africa in this matter by the African countries.

81. The representative of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, described South Africa's reply as a direct refusal to comply with resolution 366 (1974). He declared that this refusal "was nothing more than a reiteration of South Africa's determination to go ahead with the imposition of Bantustans on the Namibian people so as to ensure Pretoria's domination and economic exploitation of Namibia" [*ibid.*, *paw. 66*]. The fact that South Africa's reply is unsatisfactory and unacceptable and that it is completely rejected by the African countries has been stated here by the representatives of all those countries.

82. The United Nations Council for Namibia, as was stated by its President, the representative of Zambia, Mr. **Banda** [*1823rd meeting*], likewise came to the conclusion that South Africa has virtually rejected the key provisions of the Security Council resolution. This position of the African countries is in complete accord with resolution 23 (IX) on Namibia that was adopted in Africa this year by the Council of Ministers of the OAU at its Ninth Extraordinary Session. That resolution noted that the racist regime of Pretoria was continuing its policy of systematic and violent repression of the national liberation movement and was continuing to interfere in the domestic affairs of neighbouring independent African States, making use of terror and subversive activities.

83. It is therefore entirely justified, right and proper that the African States, owing to the refusal of South Africa to implement resolution 366 (1974) and other decisions of the Security Council on Namibia, have now in full compliance with those decisions raised the question of having the Council take new and more effective measures with respect to South Africa in accordance with the Charter. It is also perfectly logical that they should expect the Council to take such decisions.

84. It is not persuasion that is needed, but rather effective measures against South Africa; not **exhorta-**

tions addressed to the South African racists, but rather decisive pressure. What is necessary is concrete enforcement measures against South Africa that would be mandatory for all States Members of the United Nations. That is the position of the African countries and that position is fully shared and supported by the delegation of the Soviet Union.

85. One cannot but agree with Mr. Nujoma when he said that since the time-limit for receiving a reply from South Africa concerning its intention to withdraw from Namibia has now expired and since South Africa is continuing its unlawful actions in Namibia, there is now a heavy responsibility on the shoulders of the members of the Council. Mr. Nujoma emphasized that the world today expects decisive action from the Council.

86. There are, however, **official** representatives of certain countries who have come to the Council and sung soothing lullabies to rock us to sleep. They are attempting to appease Africa and for that purpose attempting to discern an alleged change in the position of South Africa with respect to Namibia. On that basis they **call** for further studies of South Africa's reply and for the continuation of dialogue with the racist leaders. But it is perfectly obvious from the statements of those representatives that they have a clear desire to create illusions, both in their own minds and in the minds of others, that they wish to see in the reply of South Africa something that really is not there at **all** and thereby distract attention from the real state of **affairs** by figments of the imagination.

87. Everyone knows perfectly well that the question of dialogue with the racist regime in Pretoria is not a new one. Those who are attempting to distract the attention of the United Nations and the Security Council from the real state of affairs with the assistance of illusions have done so as far back as 1972 at the series of meetings of the Council in **Addis Abeba [1627th to 1639th meetings]**, where they did everything possible to prod the Council and the United Nations into a dialogue with the racists of Pretoria. At that time the delegation of the Soviet Union expressed serious doubts and spoke out against dialogue with the racists of South Africa, **fully** realizing that it was a futile and hopeless undertaking. Events and subsequent developments have fully vindicated the position taken by the Soviet Union in that regard. The idea of dialogue is merely a convenient pretext for the racist regime of South Africa and its protectors in the United Nations to postpone endlessly and to put off indefinitely any solution of the problem of Namibia's independence. At the insistence of the initiators of the idea of dialogue, the Secretary-General was also at one point involved in this hopeless undertaking. The fallaciousness and the unreality of the idea of dialogue with racists on the question of Namibia's independence is now obvious to all.

88. The Security Council has, however, displayed great restraint and patience. In resolution 366 (1974) the Council once again gave South Africa time and an opportunity to take a more serious and responsible approach to the problem of Namibia's independence and to make positive changes in its position. This has, however, not happened. The South African racists, with the stubbornness of the doomed, continue to cling to their old racist, colonialist policies, and continue to ignore the decisions and demands of the United Nations and the Security Council. Patience and postponement have produced no positive results, and for that reason the time has come for the Council to take new and more effective measures in regard to the racist regime of South Africa.

89. The maintenance of a racist, colonialist preserve in Namibia is a dangerous anachronism against the background of the great historical changes that continue to take place on the African continent. We are all witnesses of-and, if you will, participants in-the process of the collapse of the last colonial empire on the continent of Africa. The **decolonization** of Territories under Portuguese administration is drawing to a close. As a result of the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire under the assault of the African national liberation movements, with the active support of the socialist countries and other freedom-loving countries, both within and outside the United Nations system, and also as a consequence of the democratic revolution in Portugal itself, there has been a radical change in the balance of power in southern Africa, where the last remnants of centuries-old colonial rule and oppression had continued for so long.

90. The racist regime of Vorster, with the support of only an insignificant group of his protectors, has in fact found itself facing complete international isolation. As reaffirmation of this we have the just proposals of the African States, justified by the Charter of the United Nations, that South Africa be expelled from the United Nations and the decision adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly that the delegation of South Africa should be excluded from participation in the work of that session. What is important is that the United Nations and its principal organ for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council, should not slacken in their continuing pressure on the South African racists but, rather, that they should step up and intensify this pressure.

91. In the Council's consideration of this question, we must also bear in mind the detente that has now become a decisive factor in the development of **international** relations. It is detente that creates auspicious conditions and prospects for the further successful deployment and the culminating stages of the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples on the continent of Africa against colonialism, neocolonialism and racism.

92. The **racist régime** of South Africa with its continuing occupation of Namibia is one of the final **strongholds** of the cold war and of colonial slavery on the African continent. The ongoing assault of the African countries, with the support of all **freedom-loving** and progressive forces of the world, against this last bastion of racism is in keeping with the task of strengthening international détente and extending it to all continents, including the continent of Africa.

93. The unanimous appeal of all **Africa** to the Security Council on the question of Namibia is an expression of Africa's **faith** in the United Nations and the Security Council, a faith that stems from the understanding that racist violence in Namibia and racist violence visited upon its people is **radically** opposed to the purposes and principles of the Charter. Africa has appealed to the Council on this matter for the further reason that under Article 25 of the Charter, the Members of the **Organization** have undertaken to submit to the decisions of the Security Council and to implement them.

94. Voices are sometimes heard alleging that the Charter is at fault because thus far the decisions of the Council on Namibia and on a number of other important questions have not been implemented. But it is not in the Charter that one should seek the reasons why many important and useful decisions of the United Nations on international issues have remained on paper and continue to be a dead letter. It is not the fault of the Charter if the shameful, open wound of colonial and racist rule has not yet been healed and if in a number of regions of the world there continue to be hotbeds of tension and military danger. The fault for this rests not with the Charter but with those States Members which fail to observe the provisions of the Charter and act contrary to and in violation of the lofty and humanitarian principles and purposes proclaimed in the Charter.

95. If the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa has yet to be brought to an end, if Namibia has not yet acquired its independence as a single, sovereign State, it is not the fault of the Charter. It is because the racist Government of South Africa refuses to carry out the obligations it has undertaken under the Charter; and, in turn, this happens because certain Member States also see fit to disregard their obligations under the Charter. In fact, they attempt to conceal and to justify South Africa's failure to observe the Charter, and it is this that enables the racist **régime** of South Africa to set itself at odds with the Security Council and the United Nations at large, **against** the countries of Africa and world opinion. What must be done, therefore, is to compel the racist **régime** of South Africa to respect and to implement the decisions of the United Nations and to compel the States concerned to refrain from lending support and patronage to that racist **régime**.

96. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it consistently supports the inalienable right of the people

of Namibia to self-determination and independence on the basis of the territorial integrity and the complete sovereignty of that country. It **recognizes** the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia by all means available to it against the forcible occupation of its territory and the plunder of its natural resources. The Soviet Union continues to support all resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council providing for the earliest possible emancipation of Namibia from racist rule and the proclamation of its independence.

97. The victory over Hitler's fascism—the thirtieth anniversary of which was solemnly celebrated on 9 May 1975 by the peoples of the Soviet **Union**—represented a deathblow to the ideology of racism and racial or national supremacy. The decisive contribution to that world historic victory was made by the Soviet Union, its heroic people and its valorous armed **forces**. The **victorious** conclusion of the Second World War opened the way to the freedom and independence of **all** colonial peoples. Scores of new independent and sovereign States have appeared on the map of the world. We welcome and fully share the following view expressed by the Minister for Foreign **Affairs** of Zambia, Mr. Mwaanga, in his statement to the Council on 2 June: “[The African countries] have no quarrel with the Socialist countries, because they have always given practical support to the struggles of the African people [for freedom and independence]” * [1824th meeting, para. 38].

98. We the people of the Soviet Union are entitled to take pride in the fact that it was the Soviet Union that initiated the adoption by the United Nations in **1960** of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The anti-colonial struggle of oppressed peoples requires that everything possible be done to step up pressure on the racist **régime** of South Africa with a view to its maximum isolation in the world arena. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation in the Security Council supported the draft resolution [S/11543 of 24 October 1974] on the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

99. At the same time, in the view of the Soviet delegation the time has come to take more decisive **measures** against the racists in Pretoria, up to and including the mandatory sanctions provided for under the Charter. The delegation of the Soviet Union, together with the delegation of the African countries and other countries that respect and observe the Charter, is ready to support the African countries' proposals for the application against the racist **régime** of South Africa of the effective measures provided for under the Charter which would compel that **régime** to implement the decisions of the United Nations and to strike from Namibia its racist and colonialist fetters.

100. The **PRESIDENT**: Members of the Council will recall that at the beginning of this meeting it was

decided, in accordance with the request made by the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania to extend an invitation under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure to the Reverend Canon Burgess Carr of the All-Africa Conference of Churches. I understand that Canon Carr is present and is prepared to make his statement. I therefore invite Canon Carr, in accordance with the Council's decision, to take a place at the Council table in order to make his statement.

101. Canon CARR: On behalf of the All-Africa Conference of Churches I bring greetings to the Security Council, meeting on this solemn occasion, this awesome moment in our history. I am most honoured, also, in extending to you, Mr. President, our congratulations on the able manner in which you have conducted this debate. I extend also to the representative of the Republic of Guyana and to his Minister for Foreign Affairs our felicitations on their contribution to this debate.

102. I am privileged to have been given this opportunity to put forward the position of the All-Africa Conference of Churches on the matter of the continued shameful and illegal occupation of Namibia by the Republic of South Africa. Ever since our organization was constituted, 12 years ago, we have subscribed to the view that in order to effect change in the situations of racism and colonialism in southern Africa, situations which are obstacles not only to peace on our continent but to world peace, it has to be demonstrated that white racism, which constitutes the nexus of the problem in the region, is not just an expression of immoral or emotional prejudice; it is a system nurtured and strengthened by an international network of economic, political and military structures.

103. African Christians, therefore, have protested loudly and clearly against the misuse of the Christian message to bolster this system of exploitation and oppression. We are more than aware that it has been and still is very largely Western elements of Christian forms of thought and organization, developed through the history of the Church and in the history of European theology, which has favoured the oppressive structures in southern Africa, structures which constitute a stumbling block to national independence, unity and human freedom.

104. We meet here under the clouds of ominous threats, fears and frustrations. The Security Council does not need me to tell it that this could well be its last opportunity to serve as a midwife for non-violent change in Namibia. The unequivocal voices of previous speakers have given cogent testimony to Mr. Vorster's own prediction that the alternatives to peaceful change in southern Africa are too ghastly to contemplate.

105. I come here to speak today in the name of the Christian Church in Africa, because too often we

Christians, by our silence on the burning issues of social and political injustice and by our active support of a social order **that** denies millions of persons their birthright, have helped to sow the seeds of violence and to cause these seeds to spread, thereby hindering any possibility that non-violence could be a realistic or desirable alternative. But violence and non-violence are symptoms of an evil social order which requires radical change. No people--and certainly not the peoples of Africa, just coming into national independence and confronted by the enormous problems of human development--wishes to embark on a course of violence for the sheer joy of it. But we are driven to this position by the sheer force of the intransigence of the political order that we know as *apartheid*.

106. We in the All-Africa Conference of Churches take the view that the use of violence as an ultimate course of action is legitimate when the established authorities are instruments of injustice and oppression. That is the situation in Namibia today. At the same time we have reached agreement that the indiscriminate use of violence for the achievement of **collective** vengeance or personal gain is never justified. Consequently we have consistently endorsed and given moral and material support to the armed liberation struggle against colonialism, white racism and its odious manifestations through settler colonialism and *apartheid* in southern Africa.

107. But we have remained unwavering in our commitment to mediation and reconciliation, to which the churches have an inescapable commitment. Let me hasten to say, however, that by reconciliation we do not mean a balancing or compromise between the interests of those who are exploited and their exploiters. Nor do we mean appeasement with oppression and evil. Reconciliation is never a cover-up for injustice. Reconciliation is, rather, to be understood in relation to the fact that the divine solicitude favours the poor, the humiliated and those who because they are deprived of their inherent human rights and dignity, with which they were endowed by their Creator, must fight for justice.

108. The goal of Christian reconciliation is liberation and redemption for both the oppressed and their oppressors. It is only in so far as the churches actively support the liberation of the oppressed black people in southern Africa in their just demand for the redistribution of power and wealth that we shall gain the credibility to redeem the white minorities in the region from the stigma that **characterizes** them as racists and oppressors.

109. There is one further consideration which conditions our attitude towards the matter under discussion by the Council. Even while we continue to fight injustice and terrorism against the masses by the minority regimes in southern Africa, we feel that the words spoken by President Kenneth Kaunda last

May, when he opened our third assembly, have particular relevance to this discussion. He urged African leaders, whether free or still oppressed, to be united more than ever in developing the spirit of forgiveness. This spirit must be promoted and nourished even under the most tempting conditions, like those existing now in our part of the world. This commitment to reconciliation and this challenge to cultivate the spirit of forgiveness make it imperative that we should be sensitive to any signs of a change of heart among those who wield power in southern Africa. I regret to have to say that we have looked in vain for signs that the rhetoric of detente promulgated by South Africa is matched by concrete actions leading to the dismantling of the structures and policies that **continue** to make that country a pariah in the world of decent and wholesome society.

110. The changes brought about in what has been described as petty **apartheid**, evidence of which I have seen this morning on the press wire, and the changes South Africa says it is prepared to make, are peripheral and only remotely marginal to the complete restoration of the inherent dignity and personhood of black people in South Africa and in Namibia.

111. What do black people demand? A few months ago, **just** at the time the Council was giving its ultimatum to South Africa, we heard the authentic voices of the oppressed in South Africa in a black renaissance convention **organized at** Hammerskraal. This event demonstrated that the goals of the movement for liberation outside South Africa are not lost to the emerging generation of young intellectuals and workers and the masses of the people inside that country. The struggle of the liberation movement continues to expose the inconsistencies of **apartheid** and especially of Mr. Vorster's dialogue and detente **manceuvres**.

112. Because of the liberation movement a spirit of black consciousness has developed and is spreading like wildfire throughout that country. It was that spirit that was the immediate inspiration behind the black renaissance convention. The convention condemned the separate development policy of which the **Bantustans** represent the final solution. Three hundred participants dedicated themselves to striving for a totally united and democratic South Africa free from all forms of oppression and exploitation, a society in which all people participate fully in the government of the country through the medium of "**one** man, one vote", a society in which there is an equitable distribution of wealth and power, an anti-racist society.

113. They went on record as declaring legalized racism in South Africa a threat to world peace, and therefore they called upon all countries in the world to withdraw all cultural, educational, economic, manpower and military support for the existing racist Government **and** all its racist institutions. They also called on the Government immediately to recognize African trade unions and urged workers and peasants

to combine in order to overcome the most blatant forms of exploitation. The black renaissance convention was held inside South Africa, and the participants comprised not extremist radicals but a middle stratum of black urban intellectuals. The **organizers** were black churchmen, pastors and priests. I underline this fact in order to demonstrate that our support in the All-Africa Conference of Churches for the **liberation** movements outside South Africa is based on the grass-roots support those movements enjoy among the broad masses of the people inside that country.

114. Whether they are outside South Africa or inside it, black people are unanimous with regard to the ultimate objectives of the liberation struggle. They demand freedom now. They want their land. They want political and economic power, and they want to be the masters of their own destiny. In **other** words, they want revolution, a complete and radical change of the system.

115. The All-Africa Conference of Churches is fully committed to doing everything possible to promote the black consciousness movement inside South Africa as a means of furthering the noble objectives of the armed liberation struggle being waged by the liberation movements.

116. It is these two aspects, the building of awareness among the oppressed within South Africa and moral and material assistance to the liberation movement, that we believe will create conditions favourable for forgiveness and reconciliation in South Africa.

117. An identical set of dynamics is also at work in Namibia. At about the same time as the black renaissance convention was being held in South Africa, there was a corresponding "Blacks, let's unite" conference in Namibia. Here 50 blacks came together -to quote from the objectives of the **conference**— to "reaffirm our standing in **our** fatherland, to **reaffirm** our objection to neo-colonial rulers, and above all, despite our so-called ethnic differences, to think of a future, **a** common future for us all".

118. They were inspired, in this first conference of its kind; to search for and to find, among themselves, an intense desire on the part of all blacks to unite in their endeavour to shake **off** the yoke of **apartheid**. The Chairman of this conference said, in his opening speech:

"Yes, we do recognize that we have been born Coloureds, **Hereros**, Damaras, Namas, Ovambos, Okavangos, and you name them, but our common history of suffering, our common experience of oppression, and our common fatherland, can and must mould us together."

119. While we hear so much from Mr. Vorster and his apologists for the Bantustan policy about separation, ethnicity, native nations and tribalism, it is both

impressive and inspiring that within South Africa itself and within Namibia, black people are shaping their own identity, not along the lines of these ancestral ethnic divisions, but around a common experience of suffering from oppression and the experience of struggling for liberation. This current development exposes even the most persuasive white liberals, and certainly the Bantustan puppets, as being entirely out of step and out of touch with the reality of the situation around them.

120. Recently I was in Swaziland, where I picked up a South African newspaper which carried an article with the caption "Urban Blacks Are Upset". The article began:

"Most urban blacks are firmly against the idea of their interests being represented to the authorities by the homeland leaders when they have their own seasoned leaders."

It went on:

"South African black observers see the claimed success, if any at all, of the detente bandwagon, not only as specious but also highly misleading as long as such detente is not encouraged at home. And until white South Africa understands this truism, the Prime Minister's journey towards meaningful detente with black Africa may be a difficult one."

121. The point I am endeavouring to stress here is that it is not the factors of ethnic origin that provide the watershed for African identity in South Africa or in Namibia; rather, it is blackness. But let me quickly add that blackness in this context has no colour connotations. As the protagonists of the black consciousness movement would themselves quickly point out, the obsession with colour as ascribed to blackness is a white phenomenon. In black consciousness thought, black people are a group of people formed together by a common experience of suffering and of struggle against suffering. It is something positive, shaking off the negative **characterization** of non-white. It also implies a search for new values, rejecting everything that dehumanizes them as Africans and forces them into regarding themselves as non-beings. Black consciousness transcends the particularities of culture, since culture was never meant to serve as a basis for discrimination or polarization, but rather as an enriching factor, something dynamic and enabling, adapting itself to the forward march of the human race.

122. This is not all esoteric. The "Blacks, let's unite" conference in Namibia represented a considerable step forward in **politicizing** the black consciousness movement, making it one in which black people can become aware of the potential power they wield as a group, both economically and politically. It is a call to unite in order to resist oppression and

the denial of human rights. It leads to solidarity with our fellow oppressed, wherever they may be, disregarding race and language and colour. It inspires the courage and the will so essential to the engagement in the struggle for liberation, justice and peace.

123. With this background, it is no wonder that the "Blacks, let's unite" conference began the process of radically restructuring the defunct national convention which Mr. Vorster was setting up and promoting as an alternative to SWAPO. It established the Namibia National Convention, overthrew the celebrated chief of the **Hereros**, along with his advocacy of the Balkanization of Namibia, and elected a new Executive Committee whose membership includes two from SWAPO. They fully endorsed the conditions put forward by SWAPO to the South African **Government** as the basis for any talks or any search for a negotiated settlement for the problem of Namibia.

124. We all know these demands. They call for the release of all political prisoners, whether they are held in Namibia or in South Africa. They call for the lifting of the banning order against the President of SWAPO. They call for the setting aside of the R-17 Emergency Regulations still existing in the north of Namibia, which were brutally enforced during the recent elections in Ovamboland. They call for all **Namibians**, of whatever political organization, now in exile, to be able to return freely to their home country without fear of arrest or other form of **victimization**. They call for the withdrawal of South Africa, of all of its troops, police and political administration from the Territory of Namibia: and they call for an immediate end to the proceedings against the National Chairman, David **Mereru** of SWAPO.

125. These actions were taken inside Namibia, and I mention them here in the hope that we can lay to rest once and for all the objections of those who would try to confuse us by claiming that there is a difference between the position of SWAPO inside Namibia and SWAPO led by our esteemed and distinguished brother, Mr. Sam Nujoma, outside Namibia.

126. That is absolutely false, and for those who may not be fully informed it could be dangerously divisive propaganda. The strongest and most persistent voice in Namibia calling for an end to South Africa's illegal occupation has been, and still is, that of SWAPO. The men and women linked to SWAPO, inside and outside Namibia, are the ones who have paid the tremendous price for their witness for freedom.

127. The Security Council does not need to be reminded by me of the public floggings, the political arrests, the torture of prisoners, the constant embarrassment and harassment and intimidation that SWAPO members have undergone. It is they who are the martyrs in the pursuit of independence for Namibia, and their words must be heard as the authentic voice of the Namibian people. It is a voice that we all know

Prime Minister Vorster does not wish to hear. He prefers to establish what he calls "reasonable leaders" that South Africa can manipulate and control. But his very opposition should solidify in our minds the legitimacy of SWAPO and of its struggle for the freedom and independence of Namibia.

128. It is not my intention to **make** a long address, but it is important to **recognize** that one of the things that South Africa is still trying to protect for itself are the vast mineral riches of Namibia. In its exploitation of the patrimony, the wealth and the people of Namibia, South Africa has as its partners the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Japan, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and many other great Powers, some of whose use of the veto in the Council has prevented you from taking the kind of decisive action that this question requires.

129. The search for profit has been made the **first** priority for those nations. Consequently, the right of Namibia to be free and independent has been given a very low priority. Even though the United Nations has repeatedly called for an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia, and has called on States not to give any legitimacy to the occupying Power, we see numerous companies that have received contracts from South Africa to mine its minerals and to search for its oil. Simply by signing a contract with South Africa, those companies and their nations give credibility and legitimacy to South Africa, as **if it** had a legal and moral right to administer the economic life of that land. Their activities serve as a signal to South Africa that "business as usual" will continue, and this has aided and abetted the racist regime in Pretoria in its intransigence and obstinacy in flouting the moral will of the international community as reflected in the resolutions that have been adopted time and again by the Council. It is a signal that the Council must reverse.

130. It must be made clear to South Africa now that it cannot expect "dollar and cents diplomacy" to continue, any more than it **can** expect political diplomacy to sanction its illegal occupation of Namibia.

131. In this regard, I have the honour to report some small but significant victories that have been won in this area. Inspired by the call of the World Council of Churches and the All-Africa Conference of Churches, United States church bodies, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, have worked over the last three years to get American oil companies exploring off-shore in Namibia to withdraw. As a result of numerous conversations with management, public statements, resolutions at stockholders' meetings, submissions to the Council for Namibia and other such actions, by February 1976 Continental Oil, Phillips, Getty, Texaco and Standard Oil of California will all have withdrawn from Namibia. I wish I could report the same for companies operating in European countries. Several of those companies have noted that in their explorations that the issue of "sovereignty"

was unclear. One of them even went so far as to refer specifically to the immorality and criminality of the social and political order prevailing in Namibia as a major factor in its decision to refrain from further exploration for oil.

132. This is an important precedent for other foreign investors in Namibia to emulate. SWAPO has called for all investors to withdraw immediately from Namibia. The decree on national resources of the Council for Namibia has forbidden the mining or distribution of Namibia's natural resources without that Council's permission. We urge support from the Council for **SWAPO's** appeal, and an endorsement of the declaration on national resources of the Council for Namibia.

133. There is a cruel injustice and blatant burglary occurring in Namibia. For more than half a century, that country's mineral wealth has been robbed by South African and foreign companies, while massive profits have been streaming out, as the backs of its people bleed, bestowing opulence upon those claiming to be their benefactors. The African peoples of Namibia are victims of starvation wages, discriminatory treatment in their places of work, separation from their families and every other manner of inhuman **exploitation**. Africa will find it hard to forget this rape of its land and its peoples.

134. Let me conclude with the observation that the clear frustration which **characterizes** white politics in Namibia at the present time is, for me, a sure sign that the international community is on the verge of a ghastly catastrophe.

135. Mr. **Vorster's** "New Deal" for Namibia is, in the words of a prominent Namibian church leader, "a New Deal to safeguard what can be saved for the whites in the political chaos which is prevalent in our country". He went on to say: "Mr. Vorster has said that the people of the country will decide their own future. But, we ask, who are these people? The black man in Namibia has become used to being told that he is not included among 'people', and therefore the logic speaks for itself that what Mr. Vorster means here is that it is the white people of Namibia who must decide upon their future and the future of the other ethnic groups in that Territory". This is a nuance which I consider it important to emphasize, especially because it is voiced from within Namibia itself.

136. You have heard in the Council appeals for patience, for time to cultivate better relations between the races, appeals for dialogue to allow for meaningful change to occur—appeals which all sound well. But, we ask, what is the motivation behind these appeals? And we answer that as long as this demonic system prevails, no such dialogue can bring about the change requisite and necessary to affirm the full humanity, dignity and freedom of the Namibian people.

137. In no uncertain terms, therefore, we urge the Security Council to condemn colonialism and neo-colonialism in Namibia. The Council must make clear to the advocates of Mr. Vorster's "New Deal" that the wounds of colonialism are **still** raw and festering, and that black people in Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO and inspired by the churches, have reached a stage where they can in no way be expected to be satisfied with a few rights dished out to them by the "boss".

138. Therefore we urge the Council to call upon the Republic of South Africa to withdraw immediately from the Territory of Namibia. We urge this Council to take measures that would put into effect **all** the articles and

provisions included in **Chapter VII** of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to compel South Africa to **recognize** that the Council means business this time. We urge the Council to insist upon immediate independence, full territorial integrity and an immediate halting of the Bantustanization of Namibia.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

Notes

¹ *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.*

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何获取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN **UNITED** NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications **may** be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, **Sales** Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER **LES** PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS **UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies **sont** en vente dans **les librairies** et **les agences** depositaires du monde **entier**. **Informez-vous** auprès de votre **libraire** ou **adressez-vous à** : Nations **Unies**, Section **des ventes**, New York ou **Genève**.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу : Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS **NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas **están en venta** en **librerías y casas** distribuidoras en todas **partes del mundo**. **Consulte a su librero** o **diríjase** a: Naciones Unidas. **Sección de Ventas**, Nueva York o **Ginebra**.
