

PART II

- 1) ZIMBABWE
- 2) SEYCHELLES ISLANDS

1. ZIMBABWE

1. Since the rejection of the so-called "Settlement Proposals" by the African people of Zimbabwe last year, the minority racist regime of Ian Smith has been very active in attempting to reverse the massive "NO" vote into a "YES" vote. Smith and his allies in Southern Africa as well as his British friends have been bribing and putting pressure on many Zimbabwe Chiefs to petition the British Government for a ratification of the Anglo-Rhodesian Settlement Proposals on the grounds that the "NO" vote was the result of intimidation by anti-settlement Zimbabweans. In order to facilitate the implementation of this manoeuvre, the rebel regime has arrested and detained without trial several hundred leaders which opposed the "Settlement Proposals". In Salisbury, Bulawayo and several towns, the settlers have formed groups of Zimbabweans to organize a so-called "Rhodesia Settlement Association". These groups of Zimbabweans, financed by the Smith regime, are running up and down the country, canvassing for African signatures on petitions to the British conservative government to implement the Anglo-Rhodesian Agreement in spite of the overwhelming majority of African votes against it. According to the Johannesburg Star of July, 1972, the group is led by a W.M. Mungatire, a supporter, of the Rhodesian Front Party of Ian Smith. The "Settlement Association" is also being supported by business circles led by Roy Welensky and Pat Bashford, leader of the so-called Center Party in Rhodesia. The organizers of this campaign are apparently paid very highly for every signed petition that they deliver. So far this new Anglo-Rhodesian trick has not moved off the ground. But the Smith regime and its friends are hoping that with a number of concocted petitions the Conservative British Government will be given "evidences" of "an African change of mind" and thereby urged to ratify the agreement.

2. In line with his new manouever, Ian Smith is also revamping the authority of the Chiefs to make them the sole political actors for the Zimbabweans. According to the London Guardian of July 6, 1972, Smith has worked out plans for elevating chiefs "to a point where they are unchallenged political leaders for most of lthe Black Majority", and they will be given powers to deal with "troublemakers". By promising more power and influence to the chiefs, Ian Smith is counting on them to endorse his plans for a new Bantustan System of African representation which is called by the Smith regime "Provincialisation". The South African style Apartheid system envisages a Bantustan legislature for Mashonaland and another for Matabeleland. Like those of the South African Bantustans, the Provincial legislatures will have very limited powers. In effect, through the manouevere of "Provincialisation", the Smith regime is attempting to formalize its Policy of "separate development" and eliminate the possiblity of Africans seeking their rightful place in Zimbabwe's Central Government through the process of self-determination and majority rule.

3. Towards the end of 1972, the rebel racist regime of Salisbury pushed through its so-called parliament a series of racist laws. Among these is the identity pass legislation which is identical to Apartheid South Africa's Pass laws. The identity pass legislation requires Africans to carry special pass at all times.

4. The identity pass law was immediately followed by so-called amendments to the existing vagrancy act empowering the regime to keep employed Africans out of cities and towns for periods of two years at a time. These two new laws give the Smith regime an effective means of influx control, similar to the South African system. The rebel regime also pushed

through so-called amendments to existing laws making it even harder for Africans to travel abroad. Missionaries and the church were also dealt with through legislation requiring all missionaries to apply for the regimes permission to live in tribal areas or even to enter tribal areas for any reason. A new postal and communications bill gives the Smith regime the right to provide separate facilities for whites and blacks at post offices. Legislation providing for the establishment of separate African assemblies, mentioned earlier as provincialisation, was also pushed through. Although the bill does not stipulate the removal of the 16 African seats from the 66 seat so-called central parliament, it is clear that this legislation is only the first step to the eventual establishment of separate parliament for blacks and whites along the lines of South Africa's Bantustan Policy. To this bend, on 26th March, 1973, the Smith regime announced the setting up of regional authorities for Matabeleland and Mashomaland. A few weeks before a series of racist laws were adopted, the Salisbury regime had enacted new regulations making it illegal for Africans to drink at bars in white areas after 7 p.m. on weekdays and after 1 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. When several hotels challenged the regulations and the high court ruled the new drinking hours to be illegal, the Smith regime amended the land tenure act which would enable it to enforce the new drinking hours regardless of the high court's decision. Apart from the Africans, the Asians and the coloured were also excluded by legislation from white suburbs. In short, through the latest series of legislation the Rhodesian white settlers have now gone a long way in introducing the South African Apartheid system in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, just as the Anglo-Rhodesian Settlement proposals failed to materialize, and despite the conspicuous absence of any form of protest or action on by Britain, the administering power, against the deterioration of the situation in Zimbabwe

it is certain that the desperate manoeuvres of Ian Smith and his allies in Pretoria and London are bound to fail. Apart from the acceleration of the armed struggle of the Zimbabwe nationalists against the rebel minority racist regime of Salisbury, the international community is reinforcing its moral political and material support to the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for self determination and independence on the basis of majority rule.

5. To begin with, the rebel regime of Ian Smith continues to be isolated effectively from the international community. It will be recalled that through the tricks and manoeuvres of its friends in the West, represented in the International Olympic Committee, rebel Rhodesia almost succeeded in participating in the Munich Olympics last August. But thanks to the firm and unequivocal stand of many members of the OAU and other friendly countries, the IOC finally decided to expel rebel Rhodesia from participation in the Olympic Games. This was a victory for African and especially for the African people of Zimbabwe.

6. At the level of the United Nations, the Rhodesian question was considered both by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Last September, Guinea, Somalia and Sudan, the three African members of the Security Council, requested a meeting of the Security Council to review the Rhodesian question. It will be recalled that since its Addis Ababa Session the Security Council had not taken up the Rhodesian issue because of Britain's insistence that the Council should await the outcome of the test of acceptability by the Pearce Commission. Accordingly, following the publication of the British Government's Pearce Commission Report last May, the Security Council was duty bound to consider the deteriorating situation

in Zimbabwe. During the debate several speakers underlined the fact that despite its obligations as an administering power Britain had failed to take effective measures to remove the rebel Smith regime and condemned UN member states and especially the United States which flouted UN Sanctions against the rebel colony. They proposed that a constitutional conference leading to independence on the basis of majority rule be convened by Britain.

7. At its meeting on 29th September, 1972, the Security Council adopted a resolution re-affirming that the comprehensive mandatory Sanctions it imposed against the illegal minority regime in Rhodesia would remain in force until its objectives were achieved. The Council called for full compliance by all states, and specifically urged compliance by the United States, which has continued to import Rhodesian chrome. The Council also asked its Sanctions Committee to examine action that could be taken in view of the persistent refusal by South Africa and Portugal to implement the UN Sanctions against rebel Rhodesia. The vote was 13 for, and none against with Britain, and the United States abstaining. For ease of reference, the two resolutions numbers 320(1972) and 321(1972) are attached to this report. Another draft resolution was, however, vetoed by Britain. This resolution would have urged Britain to convene a constitutional conference in which representatives of the people of Zimbabwe would be able to work out a settlement for the future of the territory. The vote was 10 in favour, with Britain voting against, and four abstaining, namely Belgium, France, Italy and the United States. The British vetoed resolution would have reaffirmed the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule (NIBAR) in Zimbabwe. It would also have called on Britain to ensure that any exercise to ascertain the wishes of the people of Zimbabwe be carried out on the basis of one-man, one vote.

8. The Rhodesian Question was also taken up by the General Assembly. Many speakers, including African Foreign Affairs Ministers submitted proposals for eradicating settler minority rule in Zimbabwe. Among the proposals were the restoration of democratic rights and the liberation of thousands of political prisoners; talks with the authentic leaders of the Zimbabwe people; the granting universal franchise and the convening as soon as possible, of a constitutional conference on Rhodesia under the auspices of the U.N.

9. Having considered all aspects of the problem of Zimbabwe, the 27th Session of the General Assembly adopted two resolutions on 11th December 1972. The two resolutions, 2945 (XXVII) and 2946 (XXVII) are attached to this report as annexes. It should be pointed here that unlike their predecessors, the new governments of Australia and New Zealand have adopted positive stands at the U.N. against colonialisms and minority racist rule in Africa. In particular, Australia's Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam announced on December 4 that his new Labour Government would back United Nations calls for tougher action against the minority racist regimes of Rhodesia and South Africa. In conformity with its new policy the Australian Labour Government has also taken measures to close down the Rhodesian so-called Information Center in Sydney. Moreover, the Australian Government also banned further wheat exports to Rhodesia in compliance with Security Council sanctions against rebel Rhodesia.

#### U.N. Sanctions on Rebel Rhodesia

10. Meanwhile, the Rhodesian economy, previously affected by the U.N. Sanctions, seems to be making a remarkable recovery thanks to the direct and indirect assistance of South Africa and Portugal as well as the vested interests of Western countries and Japan. In his new year

message, to the settler minority, Ian Smith, declared: "During the past year in spite of troubles associated with Pearce Commission, we sustained a growth rate more than 8%, after making allowances for inflation. This is high by any standards. It is not merely a statistic it is something tangible which we see in the many new buildings, homes, factories and development projects which are going up all over Rhodesia everyday. This means more and better job opportunities, higher incomes and higher standard of living." He went on to say: "During the past year the output of both our manufacturing and construction industries was greater than it was in the previous year. When we consider that our industrial production has virtually doubled in the short span of the last seven years, then there can be no grounds for pessimism. And there is no doubt in my mind that when once more we are able to compete fairly on world markets, our industrialists will be in a better position than many of our competitors." With regard to agricultural output, he said that it has shown an increase of about 7% over that of 1971. With regard to the mining industry he declared that it is also doing well and added that "In fact, we are hard pressed to meet the demand for our minerals." Describing the overall trade position of rebel Rhodesia he declared: "I am pleased to be able to inform you that our export improved by 14% over the 1971 performance. However, in spite of this, our balance of payment is still under strain and this will continue for sometime to come. Fortunately, the strain is from the right direction, from a high rate of growth in our economy."

11. From the above declarations of Ian Smith it is clear that contrary to expectations, the Rhodesian economy has not been seriously affected by the imposition of U.N. Sanctions. U.N. Sanctions have not had the desired effect because of many reasons. Sanctions have not been effective so far



because their application has been half-hearted. Most Western nations in particular have attempted to benefit from the sanctions by selling to or buying from Rhodesia through third parties, mainly South Africa and Portugal. Moreover, no sanctions have been applied against those countries which break sanctions. What is even more serious is that some of the great powers with special responsibility in the maintenance <sup>of</sup> peace in the world, such as the United States, have openly flouted the U.N. Sanctions. And Britain which has special responsibility over the Rhodesian issue has not shown a firm political will to make sanctions effective.

12. Accordingly, the United Nations cannot, and should not, continue with the present state <sup>of</sup> sanctions against Rhodesia in the knowledge that several member states flout at will. Instead, an effective machinery should be set up by the U.N. itself to see to it that sanctions against Rhodesia are applied effectively to the point that, if need be, sanctions should turn into full scale economic warfare in order to achieve its objectives. In this regard, it has been suggested that a special U.N. high Commissioner for Rhodesia should be appointed to coordinate and intensify sanctions against Rhodesia. In this connection, the London Observer of Nov. 12, 1971, in an editorial, accused the British Government of a half-hearted attempt at enforcing sanctions against Rhodesia. It urged Britain to support the proposals before the United Nations Security Council for a United Nations Commissioner to enforce sanctions. According to the Guardian of 22nd Nov. , 1972, several British ships "aid the Smith regime" by transporting mineral products from Beira on the Mozambique coast to the gulf ports of the United States. Most of the cargoes are insured through Lloyd's of London. The author, Patrick Keatley, suggested that as much as 24,000 tons of Chrome reached the United States that way in the past year. According the London Observer of 15th October, 1972, Mr. David Steel, the British Liberal

Party chief whip who visited Rhodesia incognito has confirmed that British goods reached Rhodesia through British subsidiaries in South Africa. Indeed, it is through such British as well as western vested interests that the the economy of the rebel Smith regime continues to be sustained and even bolstered. Apart from South Africa, Portugal and the United States who openly fout the U.N. Sanctions and Britain, through lack of political will, who allows loopholes in sanctions implementation, several countries including West Germany, Switzerland and Japan still continue to allow their nationals or corporations to violate the U.N. Sanctions. This has been confirmed by the United Nations and several other non-governmental organizations. For instance, according to a recent analysis by the London based Africa Bureau of the trade figures of Rhodesia, the following interesting data regarding the involvement of some western nations was revealed. Rhodesia's main exports since sanctions in 1968 are chrome, asbestos, nickel, iron and tobacco, meat and sugar. An analysis of the pattern of pre - UOI purchases of these commodities from Rhodesia and post -UOI increases of purchases by Rhodesia's former major customers from South Africa and Mozambique, indicated that these same products were still being sold, disguised, to the same customers. For example, in 1965 West Germany purchases US\$18,160,000 worth of Rhodesian Tobacco. In 1969, this was reduced to US\$689,000. Meanwhile, West German purchases of tobacco over the same period from South Africa increased from US\$4,000 to US\$1,167,000; and from Mozambique it increased from nothing to US\$395,000. Comparable figures for Britain were US\$52,198,000 from Rhodesia in 1965 reduced to zero in 1969. But Britain's purchases of Tobacco from South Africa increased from US\$4,029,000 in 1965 to US\$8,997,000 in 1969. Figures for Belgium and Luxembourg show a drop in the period from US\$2,527,000 in 1965 to US\$371,000 in 1969 from Rhodesia and a dramatic increase in purchases

from Mozambique from US\$4,000 in 1965 to US\$1,247,000 in 1969. Again Netherland's imports of tobacco from Rhodesia in 1965 were US\$5,001,000 which fell to US\$130,000 by 1969. But there was a major increase in imports of tobacco from South Africa from a 1965 figure of US\$1,724,000 to US\$5,914,000 in 1969.

13. With regard to Asbestos, West German imports of Rhodesian Asbestos in 1965 were valued at US\$3,344,000 and those from South Africa at US\$2,510,000. By 1969 there was no indication of imports from Rhodesia but West German imports from South Africa had risen to a value of US\$5,297,000. Comparable changes were also recorded in the imports of asbestos from Rhodesia and South Africa to Italy, Sweden, Austria, Spain and Japan over the same period.

14. Regarding Iron Ore, figures for Japanese imports of iron ore from Rhodesia in 1965 were US\$4,836,000, from South Africa US\$26,071,000. But by 1969, Japan had phased out purchases from Rhodesia and the South African figures had made a dramatic rise to US\$61,099,000.

15. Finally, regarding Chrome, France imported US\$863,000 of Rhodesian chrome in 1965 and US\$97,000 from South Africa. By 1969 France phased out purchases from Rhodesia and that same year purchased US\$652,000 worth of chrome from South Africa. Comparable figures for West Germany were US\$364,000 from Rhodesia in 1965 and US\$1,877,000 from South Africa. By 1969 she phased out purchases from Rhodesia while her purchases from South Africa increased to US\$4,277,000.

16. The above data is another clear proof of the extent of South Africa's and Portugal's involvement in thwarting the implementation of U.N. Sanctions.

As long as South Africa and Portugal openly defy the United Nations and assist rebel Rhodesia directly and indirectly they should be subject to precise pressures and penalties designed to make their sanction breaking activities very costly. Moreover, the above data reveals further how western nations as well as Japan are hypocritical about sanctions. Accordingly the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, should seriously devise better ways and means of making sanctions against Rhodesia work more effectively. Unless the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia are strengthened and applied against the ports of Beira and Lorenzo Marques and unless those countries which continue to break sanctions, directly and indirectly, are publicly exposed, the raison d'etre of sanctions, namely to help topple the rebel Smith regime, cannot be attained in the foreseeable future.

#### Acceleration of the Liberation Struggle in Zimbabwe

17. Meanwhile, since last August Zimbabwe nationalists have continued to harass and challenge the rebel minority regime of Smith through stepped up armed attacks against enemy targets. In particular ever since the end of last year there have been very encouraging developments in the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe freedom fighters have successfully attacked several enemy military targets and killed many of Smith's security forces as well as South African troops.

18. The stepping up of the armed struggle of the people of Zimbabwe created panic in Rhodesia as well as in Pretoria and Lisbon. In Zimbabwe, the Smith regime cancelled all leave over Christmas and the New Year. Most of the reservists were urgently called up and many areas of the country were

declared prohibited zones. The so-called Security forces and the territorial troops were also placed in a state of alert. Salisbury asked for urgent help from Pretoria and more than 4000 white South African troops with helicopters and armoured vehicles were immediately sent to Zimbabwe to participate in repressive operations against the people of Zimbabwe.

19. On 18 January, 1973, in an address "to the Nation", Ian Smith confessed: "There have been some unusual developments over the past few weeks and as facts and trends are now emerging... the "terrorist incursion" in the north-east of our country has developed in a manner that we had not previously experienced and as a result we have to face up to a number of serious problems." Smith admitted further that "for some months now these "terrorists" have been operating in this area, quietly and methodically "undermining" the local population. Thereafter their task was made easy through the shelter, food and assistance they received from the locals. This situation has complicated the position as far as our security forces are concerned.... There is no quick and easy way of dealing with a problem such as this."

20. According to the New York Times of January 7, 1973 "guerrilla attacks against white owned farm houses and burning of stores just before Christmas revived fears of an offensive by black nationalists" against Smith's regime. Two farms in the Centenary area, a tobacco growing area about 120 miles north of Salisbury were attacked a week before Christmas. A week later the towns of Mtoko and Mt. Darwin were also attacked, and guerrillas were reported to be moving in the whole northeastern region which borders on Mozambique. Guerrilla activities were also reported in the northwestern region, around Wankie and in the Western region on the border with Botswana. As a result a number of white farmers have sold their farms and moved into cities and towns. The Smith regime

is discouraging such moves for fear that they would trigger more panic and evacuation of certain areas. Ian Smith has in fact resorted to paying incentives for white farmers to remain in the northeastern region and is using most of the settler farms as bases of operation against the freedom fighters. The same issue of the New York Times quotes John Howman, so-called Defence Minister of Smith as having told a public meeting that until recently the only security threat had come from the northern region "but now we have a somewhat changed position - we have two additional borders to watch and protect."

21. Because of the failure by the settler "Security forces" and South African troops to defeat the freedom fighters, who have become very elusive, the Smith regime in desperation has resorted to mass arrests of people "for failing to report" the presence or whereabouts of guerrillas. The Salisbury clique has increased maximum penalties for "aiding" African nationalists or "failing to report" their presence to the police from five years imprisonment to twenty years of hard labour. Apart from the spectacular increase of the term of imprisonment, the Smith regime in panic and desperation, has resorted to executions of freedom fighters. In addition to the execution of three Africans on 7th March, 1973, another three were sentenced to execution on 27th March, 1973 for having possessed "arms of war". Moreover, the Smith regime has also imposed collective fine on villages for not assisting the regime against the Zimbabwe patriots. Thus to cover the so-called collective fine imposed on villages, Smith's troops and police are seizing cattle from tribesmen in various parts of the territory. Again "for security reasons", the panic-stricken Smith regime has ordered the closure of schools, shops, businesses and even churches in many areas of the territory. In short, due to its total failure to contain the rising tide of Zimbabwe nationalist uprisings, the Smith regime is resorting to more brutal repressive measures, which only result in funning even

more the flame of the armed liberation struggle in Zimbabwe.

22. Another desperate move of the Smith regime was its clumsy attempt to find a scapegoat in Zambia. Despite Smith's declarations, quoted earlier, and the statements of his so-called Defence Minister, the Salisbury regime accused Zambia of being responsible for the difficulties encountered by the rebel regime. Thus on 9th January, 1973, the Smith regime closed Rhodesia's borders with Zambia because "the Zambian Government had ignored repeated requests to stop guerrillas from using its territory as a base for raids into Rhodesia". However, apart from the admissions of the Smith regime that guerrilla operations were taking place in almost all parts of the territory, a communique of the Zimbabwe nationalists in early January maintained "the fact that ZANLA operations are taking place in Zimbabwe, far away from any Zambian border, confirms our long held view that Zimbabwe people are fighting within Zimbabwe itself".

23. Nevertheless, Smith's blockade and blackmail against Zambia failed miserably. Contrary to rebel Rhodesia's expectations on 4th February, 1973 Zambia responded to Rhodesia's act of blackmail by closing its borders until the Salisbury regime accedes to majority rule, thereby stopping all exports through Rhodesia, including copper exports. As a result, and despite the great sacrifices it entails, Zambia decided to reroute all her imports and exports. Zambia's stand and its firm decision not to open her borders with rebel Rhodesia had the unqualified support of the international community. Rebel Rhodesia's clumsy tactic of closing her borders with Zambia and her equally fruitless attempt of suddenly opening again the borders only received the condemnation as well as the derision of the international community.

O.A.U's Full Support and Active solidarity with Zambia

24. Following Smith's blockade against Zambia, the Administrative Secretary-General of the OAU visited Zambia to make an on-the-spot assessment of the situation. On January 23, 1972, the Secretary-General held discussions with H.E. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, President of Zambia and with the Hon. E. Mudenda, the Foreign Minister. The discussions centred on OAU's assistance to meet Zambia's contingency requirements. On the basis of the discussions, the Zambian Government subsequently submitted to the Secretary-General of the OAU the detailed list of Zambia's requirements, which were immediately circulated to all member-states of the OAU. Moreover, the Current Chairman of the OAU, His Majesty Hassan II of Morocco, sent message to all Heads of State and Government of the member-states of the Organization urging them to provide Zambia with urgently needed assistance to meet her emergency requirements. The full text of the message of the Current Chairman is attached to this report.

25. During its Twentieth Ordinary Session, the Council of Ministers considered Smith's blockade against Zambia. In its statement on current political issues the Council paid a "tribute to the courageous stand of the Government and people of Zambia" and assured Zambia "of its full support and active solidarity". The full statement of the Council of Ministers is attached to this report.



In its report to the Security Council, the mission said, among other things that "in its assessment the key to the solution of the problem dealt with in Resolution 326 (1973) lies in the application of majority rule in the territory of Southern Rhodesia, the strict implementation of mandatory sanctions against the illegal regime of Southern Rhodesia, and the implementation of relevant resolutions of the Security Council with regard to the whole area." The mission also stressed that Pretoria's involvement in sending its troops to Rhodesia has further aggravated the situation. Subsequently, the Security Council adopted two resolutions on 10th March, 1973, the full text of which are attached to this report.

On 6th March, 1973, Roy Welensky, speaking to business executives in Salisbury, was reported to have declared "the terrorist threat is the greatest problem facing Rhodesia". He suggested that the Smith regime should form a full time army of 8,000 men to "combat terrorism". But Welensky and the settlers would realize, sooner than latter, that let alone 8,000 men the whole settler population of 240,000 cannot cope up with the development of the armed struggle. The struggle for majority rule by the people of Zimbabwe, who outnumber the white settlers 20 to 1, will continue, by peaceful or violent means, until final victory is achieved. A positive and timely development in that direction was the formation of a united action front, under the auspices of the OAU, between ZAPU and ZANU in Lusaka in March, 1973. The full text of the ZAPU-ZANU agreement, entitled Strategy for the Liberation of Zimbabwe is annexed to this report.



## 2. The Seychelles Islands

1. In another British Colony, the Seychelles Islands, the Nationalist forces are intensifying their struggle for independence. Because of the strategic position of the Seychelles, the colonial power, Britain and the United States as well as South Africa are secretly working together to consolidate their presence and influence in the islands with the view to strengthening their strategic position in that part of the India Ocean.

2. Britain has already a naval base in the Seychelles. The United States is reported to be active in pursuing military interests in the Seychelles. In fact the United States is setting up a naval base. In co-operation with Britain, the Pretoria regime is actively engaged in setting up diverse South African businesses, and is especially engaged in building the tourist industry for South African white tourists. Thus the building up of a series of military bases by NATO powers, backed by Pretoria's economic invasion, would certainly lead to the strengthening of the anti-African forces which will eventually consolidate the position of the minority racist regimes in Southern Africa.

3. So far the Seychelles People's United Party (SPUP) is the only nationalist party which is committed to fighting for independence. The other party which is the ruling party, the Seychelles Democratic Party (SDP) is known to be in good terms with Britain, the colonial power. The Democratic Party is also known to have assisted the establishment and strengthening of the said imperialist forces in the Seychelles. In return the British and their allies are reported to have given the Democratic Party financial, political and other assistance with the view to maintain and consolidate its position as a "ruling Party.!"

4. Having examined the situation in the Seychelles islands and after listened to the statement of the President of the SPUP, Mr. F. A. Rene, the 21st Session of the Liberation Committee recognized the SPUP. As the only movement which is fighting for independence of the Seychelles, the SPUP will have the political and material support of the OAU to help it attain independence as soon as possible. Meanwhile, Mr. James Mancham, leader of the ruling Seychelles Democratic Party visited several African countries to protest at the decision of the Liberation Committee to recognize the SPUP. Mr. Mancham also raised the matter during his visit to the OAU headquarters where he was told of the firm commitment of the OAU to the total elimination of colonialism and racism from the African continent, including the Seychelles Islands.

STRATEGY FOR THE LIBERATION OF ZIMBABWE

This Agreement was signed under our hands this seventeenth day of March, Nineteen hundred and Seventy three.

H.W. CHITEPO  
REPRESENTATIVE OF ZANU

J. Z. MOYO  
REPRESENTATIVE OF ZAPU

In the presence of the O.A.U. Ad Hoc Committee for the conciliation consisting of:-

1. HON. E.H.K. Mudenda M.P.  
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
ZAMBIA.

2. MAJOR KWAME BAAH  
COMMISSIONER FOR FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS, GHANA.

3. Hon. Vincent EFON  
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
CAMEROUN.

4. HON. B. NABWERA M.P.  
ASSISTANT MINISTER OF  
FOREIGN AFFAIRS? KENYA.

6. HON. I.A. SEPETU M.P.  
JUNIOR MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
TANZANIA.

6. MAJOR H.I. MBITA  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
OF OAU LIBERATION COMMITTEE

B. POLITICAL COUNCIL OF ZIMBABWE

1. That a Political Council of Zimbabwe be created;
  2. The Political Council of Zimbabwe shall be responsible for, among other things;
    - (I) Propaganda, mobilization and diplomatic activities,
    - (II) welfare of the civilian population,
    - (III) administration and consolidation of areas of operation.
  3. The Political Council of Zimbabwe shall also work out a programme of Political Integration.
  4. The Political Council of Zimbabwe shall consist of:-
    - (I) Chairman
    - (II) Vice-Chairman
    - (III) six members to be provided by ZANU, and
    - (IV) six members to be provided by ZAPU.
  5. The Chairman of the Political Council of Zimbabwe shall be provided by ZAPU and the Vice-Chairman by ZANU.
- ZANU and ZAPU have agreed on:-
- (I) The establishment of an atmosphere of peace and fraternity among their forces;
  - (II) The immediate cessation of all acts of hostility or attacks in the press, the radio and other mass media;
  - (III) The fact that from now onwards, in order to gradually achieve unity, their Press Release and all Propaganda work shall give emphasis on the newly created bodies (J.M.C PC) to make them known to the people of Zimbabwe
  - (IV) The implementation of this agreement.

PREAMBLE:

## Considering

- (a) That the people of Zimbabwe are one, and our Organizations have the same objective;
- (b) that the objective of achieving the unity of our movements could best be attained through combined action;
- (c) the grave necessity to wage a more effective revolutionary armed struggle, for the attainment of that objective;
- (d) the current phase of the mass resistance of our people to the settler machinery of oppression;

Conscious of the increasing danger to the attainment of these objectives posed by internal and external forces which are determined to pause, promote or accommodate splitist divisionary or disruptive elements in the Zimbabwe revolutionary struggle;

Determined to give effect to our Benghazi Declaration of January 18th, 1972, and our subsequent joint document dated 11th February, 1972, whose essential purpose is to attain simultaneously the unity of the Zimbabwe people, and a more effective prosecution of the armed revolutionary struggle and having signed the Mbeya Protocol establishing the JMC on March 23, 1972.

.....//.....

We the External Missions of ZANU/ZAPU having reviewed the JMC as established at Mbeya in March 1972, now decide:-  
that a Political Council for Zimbabwe be created.

A. JOINT MILITARY COMMAND (J.M.C.)

1. That a unified military command be created;
2. That areas of joint action of the J.M.C. shall be among other things:
  - (i) recruitment and training
  - (ii) logistics and supplies
  - (iii) Operations
  - (iv) Military Intelligence and information.
3. The joint military command shall be responsible for planning and conducting the war in all its aspects and shall remain subject to the general directives of the Political Council of Zimbabwe.
4. The joint military command shall consist of:-
  - (i) Chairman,
  - (ii) Vice Chairman,
  - (iii) Six military cadres selected by ZANU,
  - (iv) Six military cadres selected by ZAPU.
5. The Chairman of the J.M.C. shall be provided by ZANU and the Vice-Chairman by ZAPU.
6. The J.M.C. shall work out as soon as possible programmes for familiarization, recruitment, training, deployment and assessment of the means of the struggle and joint operations.



"THE SITUATION CREATED IN ZAMBIA THROUGH THE CLOSING OF HER BORDER WITH SOUTHERN RHODESIA HAS GIVEN RISE TO A GENERAL SENTIMENT OF REPROBATION IN INTERNATIONAL OPINION AND IN AFRICA IN PARTICULAR STOP FROM THE VERY ONSET OF THE CRISIS HOWEVER SEVERAL AFRICAN HEADS OF STATE HAVE SENT US MESSAGES EXPRESSING THEIR INDIGNATION AND STRESSING THE NECESSITY FOR AN EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION ON THE PART OF OUR ORGANIZATION IN ASSISTANCE TO ZAMBIA STOP

WE THEREFORE FEEL THAT IT IS INCUMBENT UPON US IN OUR CAPACITY AS CURRENT CHAIRMAN OF THE OAU TO DRAW THE ATTENTION OF THEIR EXCELLENCIES THE HEADS OF STATE OF THE OAU TO THE CRISIS BEING PRESENTLY UNDERGONE BY ZAMBIA AS A RESULT OF THE ILLEGAL DECISION BY THE IAN SMITH REGIME TO CLOSE THE BORDER WITH ZAMBIA WITH THE DELIBERATE INTENTION OF BLOCKING THE FLOW OF ZAMBIAN GOODS? AND TO PARALYSE HER ECONOMY THEREBY CAUSING HER COLLAPSE STOP

IN THE FACE OF THIS NEW CHALLENGE TO AFRICA OUR ORGANIZATION HAS NOT FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE HER ACTIVE SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF ZAMBIA IT IS THUS THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE OAU VISITED ZAMBIA ON THE 22ND OF FEBRUARY LAST TO EXAMINE THE SITUATION ON THE SPOT AND TO CONFER WITH HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT KENNETH KAUNDA AND HIS GOVERNMENT ON THE FIELDS AND THE NATURE OF THE ASSISTANCE THAT ZAMBIA IS ENTITLED TO EXPECT FROM OUR ORGANIZATION WHEREAS THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE OAU MEETING IN ITS 20TH SESSION IN ADDIS ABABA FROM THE 5TH TO THE 10TH FEBRUARY VEHEMENTLY CONDEMNED THE ACT OF INTIMIDATION PERPETRATED BY THE MINORITY REGIME OF IAN SMITH AND CALLED UPON THE AFRICAN POPULATION TO REACT AGAINST ANY ATTACK LEVELLED AT THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA BY THE SALISBURY REGIME STOP THIS CONDEMNATION WAS EMBODIED IN A RESOLUTION STOP

IT WAS IN THIS VERY RESOLUTION THAT THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS COMMITTED ITSELF IN THE NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION TO BRING MORAL SUPPORT TO ZAMBIA AND TO ASSIST HER MATERIALLY IN THE DIFFERENT FIELDS SO AS TO ENABLE HER TO FACE THE SITUATION STOP

IN OUR CAPACITY AS CURRENT CHAIRMAN OF THE OAU AND DESIROUS OF ENDOWING ALL THE DECISIONS OF THE OAU WITH TANGIBLE CONTENTS WE ARE MOST URGENTLY APPEALING TO ALL THE MEMBER STATES OF THE OAU AND INVITE THEM TO SUPPLY ZAMBIA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WITH THE ASSISTANCE SHE NEEDS

IMMEDIATELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEETING HER MOST URGENT REQUIRMENTS STOP  
THIS IS ESSENTIALLY A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF LORRIES WHICH WOULD ENABLE  
HER TO SECURE THE REGULAR FLOW OF HER IMPORTED GOODS THROUGH THE PORTS  
OF DARESSALAAM AND LOBITO STOP

BECAUSE OF THE DRAMATIC CONSEQUENCES INVOLVED FOR THE ZAMBIAN  
ECONOMY AS A RESULT OF THE RHODESIAN BLOCKADE WE ENJOIN EVERY MEMBER STATE  
OF THE ORGANIZATION TO CONTRIBUTE IN PROPORTION TO THE MEANS AVAILABLE  
TO THEM IN THE ASSISTANCE TO A MEMBER STATE WHO HAS CONSENTED TO MAKE  
MOST LAUDABLE AND ACCLAIMED SACRIFICES FOR THE CAUSE OF AFRICA STOP

IT IS OUR MOST ARDENT DESIRE THAT YOUR HONOURABLE GOVERNMENT  
SHOULD ESTABLISH DIRECT CONTACTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF  
ZAMBIA IN ORDER TO JOINTLY DETERMINE BOTH THE VOLUME AND THE WAYS AND  
MEANS BY WHICH THE ASSISTANCE IS TO BE GRANTED AND TO INFORM THE SECRETARY  
GENERAL OF THE OAU STOP

WE ARE CONSEQUENTLY CONVINCED THAT YOUR EXCELLENCY IS AWARE  
OF THE COMMUNITY OF DESTINY OF MEMBER STATES OF OUR ORGANIZATION WILL  
SPARE NO EFFORT IN SEEING TO IT THAT THANKS TO AFRICAN ASSISTANCE ZAMBIA  
SUCCESSFULLY FACES THE TEST INFLICTED UPON HER BY THE ENEMIES OF AFRICA  
STOP

KING HASSAN THE SECOND OF MOROCCO  
CURRENT CHAIRMAN OF THE OAU STOP

RESOLUTION 320 (1972)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 1666th meeting on  
29 September 1972

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968 and subsequent resolutions in which all States are required to implement and make effective the economic, political and other sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) decided upon by the Council in furtherance of the objective of ending the rebellion in that territory,

Taking into account its resolutions 314 (1972) of 28 February 1972 and 318 (1972) of 28 July 1972 concerning the co-operation and obligations of States and the measures necessary to ensure the scrupulous observance and strict implementation of sanctions,

Deeply concerned that, despite their obligations under Article 25 of the Charter, several States continue to violate sanctions covertly and overtly in contravention of the provisions of resolution 253 (1968),

Gravely concerned about the detrimental consequences which violations could cause to the effectiveness of sanctions and, in the wider sense, to the authority of the Council,

Deeply concerned by the report of the United States that it has authorized the importation of chrome ore and other minerals from Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe),

Condemning the refusal of South Africa and Portugal to co-operate with the United Nations in the observance and implementation of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe),

1. Reaffirms its decision that sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) shall remain fully in force until the aims and objectives set out in resolution 253 (1968) are completely achieved;

2. Calls upon all States to implement fully all Security Council resolutions establishing sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) in accordance with Article 25 and Article 2 (6) of the Charter;
3. Urges the United States to co-operate fully with the United Nations in the effective implementation of sanctions;
4. Requests the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the Question of Southern Rhodesia to undertake, as a matter of urgency, consideration of the type of action which could be taken in view of the open and persistent refusal of South Africa and Portugal to implement sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and to report to the Council not later than 31 January 1973;
5. Further requests the Committee to examine and submit a report to the Security Council not later than 31 January 1973 on all proposals and suggestions made at the 1663rd to 1666th meetings of the Council for extending the scope and improving the effectiveness of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe).

## RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(on the report of the Fourth Committee (A/8933))  
2945 (XXVII). Question of Southern Rhodesia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia  
(Zimbabwe),

Having examined the relevant chapters of the report of the  
Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the  
Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence  
to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General,

Having invited, in consultation with the Organization of  
African Unity and, through it, representatives of the national  
liberation movements of Zimbabwe to participate in an observer  
capacity in its consideration of the situation in the Territory,  
and having heard the statements of the representatives of the  
Zimbabwe African People's Union and the Zimbabwe African  
National Union,

Having heard the statement of a petitioner,



Recalling its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration, as well as all other resolutions relating to the question of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the enjoyment of their rights, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the objectives of resolution 1514 (XV),

Bearing in mind that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as the administering Power, has the primary responsibility for putting an end to the illegal racist minority regime and for transferring effective power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule,

Noting with satisfaction the rejection by the African population of Zimbabwe of the "proposals for a settlement" agreed upon between the Government of the United Kingdom and the illegal regime, and mindful that those "proposals for a settlement" had been negotiated without consulting the genuine political leaders of the African population of Zimbabwe,

Reaffirming that any attempt to negotiate the future of Zimbabwe with the illegal regime on the basis of independence before majority rule would be in contravention of the inalienable rights of the people of that Territory and contrary to the provisions of the Charter and of resolution 1514 (XV),

Deeply deploring the arbitrary and unlawful imprisonment and detention of, and the denial of fundamental human rights to, political leaders and other individuals of Zimbabwe by the illegal racist minority regime.

Deploring the persistent refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom to co-operate with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly,

Deeply disturbed by the continued presence and intervention of South African forces in the Territory, which assists the racist minority regime and seriously threatens the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring African States,

Mindful of the conditions necessary to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise freely and fully their right to self-determination and independence,

1. Reaffirms the principle that there should be no independence before majority rule in Zimbabwe, and affirms that any settlement relating to the future of the Territory must be worked out with the full participation of the genuine political leaders representing the majority of the people of Zimbabwe and must be endorsed freely and fully by the people;

2. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland not to transfer on accord, under any circumstance, to the illegal regime any of the powers or attributes of sovereignty, and requests that Government to ensure the country's attainment of independence by a democratic system of government in accordance with the true aspirations of the majority of the population;

3. Urges the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, to convene as soon as possible a national constitutional conference where the genuine political representatives of the people of Zimbabwe would be able to work out a settlement relating to the future of the Territory for subsequent endorsement by the people through free and democratic processes;

4. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to bring about the conditions necessary to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise freely and fully their right to self-determination and independence, including;

- (a) The unconditional release of all political prisoners, detainees and restrictees;
- (b) The repeal of all repressive discriminatory legislation;
- (c) The removal of all restrictions on political activity and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights;

5. Condemns the continued presence and intervention of South African forces in the Territory in violation of the decisions of the Security Council and calls upon the administering Power to effect the immediate expulsion of all such forces from the Territory;

6. Further calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to ensure that, in any exercise to ascertain the wishes and aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe as to their political future, the procedure to be followed should be in accordance with the principle of universal adult suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of one-man one-vote, without regard to race, colour or educational, property or income considerations;

7. Requests all Governments, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to extend all moral and



material assistance to the people of Zimbabwe;

8. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to comply with the provisions of the present resolution and to report thereon to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session;

9. Requests the Special Committee to keep the situation in the Territory under review.

## RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On the report of the Fourth Committee (A/8933) 7

2946 (XXVII). Question of Southern Rhodesia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe),

Gravely disturbed by the further deterioration of the situation in Zimbabwe, which the Security Council, in its resolution 277 (1970) of 18 March 1970, reaffirmed as constituting a threat to international peace and security,

Deploring the fact that measures taken so far have failed to bring the rebellion in Zimbabwe to an end, owing primarily to the continued and increasing collaboration which certain States, in particular South Africa and Portugal, in violation of Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations and of the relevant decisions of the United Nations, maintain with the illegal régime, thereby seriously impeding the effective application of sanctions against the illegal régime,

Gravely concerned that, despite the appeals addressed to the Government of the United States of America in the General Assembly resolution 2765 (XXVI) of 16 November 1971, that Government continues to permit the importation of chrome and nickel into the United States from Southern Rhodesia, in violation of the relevant provisions of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, 277 (1970) of 18 March 1970, 288 (1970) of 17 November 1970 and 314 (1972) of 28 February 1972,

Reaffirming its conviction that the sanctions will not put an end to the illegal racist minority régime unless they are comprehensive, mandatory, effectively supervised, enforced and complied with, particularly by South Africa and Portugal,

1. Deeply deplores the continued refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to take effective measures, in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations, to put an end to the illegal racist minority régime in Zimbabwe, and calls upon that Government to take forthwith all effective measures to bring down the rebellious minority régime;

2. Strongly condemns the policies of the Governments, particularly those of South Africa and Portugal, which, in violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and contrary to their specific obligations under Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, continue to collaborate with the illegal racist minority régime in its racialist and repressive domination of the people of Zimbabwe, and calls upon those Governments to cease forthwith all such collaboration;

3. Condemns all violations of, as well as the failure of certain States to enforce strictly, the mandatory sanctions imposed by the Security Council, as being contrary to the obligations assumed by them under Article 25 of the Charter;

4. Condemns the continued importation by the Government of the United States of America of chrome and nickel from Zimbabwe in open contravention of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 253 (1968), 277 (1970), 288 (1970) and 314 (1972) and contrary to the specific obligations assumed by that Government under Article 25 of the Charter, and calls upon the United States Government to desist forthwith from further violations of the sanctions and to observe faithfully and without exception the provisions of the above-mentioned resolutions;

5. Requests all Governments which so far have not done so to take more stringent enforcement measures to ensure strict compliance by all individuals and bodies corporate under their jurisdiction with the sanctions imposed by the Security Council, and urges all Governments to refrain from taking any action which might confer a semblance of legitimacy on the illegal racist minority régime;

6. Draws the attention of the Security Council, in view of the further deterioration of the situation resulting from the intensified repressive measures taken by the illegal racist minority régime against the people of Zimbabwe, to the urgent need to widen the scope of sanctions against the illegal régime to include all the measures envisaged under Article 41 of the Charter and, having regard to their persistent refusal to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council, to the need, as a matter of priority, to consider imposing sanctions against Portugal and South Africa;

7. Invites all Governments, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, the United Nations bodies concerned and non-governmental organizations having a special interest

in the field of decolonization to take steps, as appropriate, to give widespread and continuous **publicity** through all the media at their disposal to the work of the United Nations, with particular reference to the application of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, and requests the Secretary-General, having regard to the mandate entrusted to him in General Assembly resolution 2909 (XXVII) of 2 November 1972, to take concrete measures in this connexion, including the preparation and publication of a special issue of the periodical

Objective: Justice devoted to the efforts of the Organization in this regard.

RESOLUTION 328 (1973)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 1694th meeting,  
on 10 March 1973

The Security Council,

Having considered with appreciation the report of the Security Council Special Mission established under resolution 326 (1973) of 2 February 1973,

Having heard further a statement by the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Zambia,

Recalling its resolutions 277 (1970) and 326 (1973),

Reaffirming that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Gravely concerned at the persistent refusal of the régime of South Africa to respond to the demands contained in its resolutions 277 (1970) and 326 (1973) for the immediate withdrawal of its military and armed forces from Southern Rhodesia and convinced that this constitutes a serious challenge to the authority of the Security Council,

Bearing in mind that the Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering Power, has the primary responsibility for putting an end to the illegal racist minority régime and for transferring effective power to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of the principle of majority rule,

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Zimbabwe to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the legitimacy of their struggle to secure the enjoyment of their right as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Endorses the assessment and conclusions of the Special Mission established under resolution 326 (1973);

2. Affirms that the state of tension has been heightened following the recent provocative and aggressive acts committed by the illegal régime of Southern Rhodesia against the Republic of Zambia;

3. Declares that the only effective solution to this grave situation lies in the exercise by the people of Zimbabwe of their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV);

4. Strongly condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its persistent refusal to withdraw its military and armed forces from Southern Rhodesia;

5. Reiterates its demand for the immediate withdrawal of South African military and armed forces from Southern Rhodesia and from the border of that territory with Zambia;

6. Urges the Security Council Committee established in pursuance of resolution 253 (1968) concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia to expedite the preparation of its report undertaken under Security Council resolution 320 (1972), taking into account all proposals and suggestions for extending the scope and improving the effectiveness of sanctions against Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe);

7. Requests all Governments to take stringent measures to enforce and ensure full compliance by all individuals and organizations under their jurisdiction with the sanctions policy against Southern Rhodesia and calls upon all Governments to continue to treat the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia as wholly illegal;

8. Urges the United Kingdom as the administering Power to convene as soon as possible a national Constitutional Conference where genuine representatives of the people of Zimbabwe as a whole would be able to work out a settlement relating to the future of the Territory;

9. Calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to take all effective measures to bring about the conditions necessary to enable the people of Zimbabwe to exercise freely and fully their right to self-determination and independence including:

(a) The unconditional release of all political prisoners, detainees and restrictees;

(b) The repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislation;

(c) The removal of all restrictions on political activity and the establishment of full democratic freedom and equality of political rights;

10. Decides to meet again and consider further actions in the light of future developments.

## RESOLUTION 329 (1973)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 1694th meeting,  
on 10 March 1973

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968,  
requesting assistance to Zambia as a matter of priority,

Recalling further its resolution 277 (1970) of 18 March  
1970, as well as resolutions 326 (1973) and 327 (1973) by which  
it decided to despatch a Special Mission to assess the situation  
in the area and the needs of Zambia,

Having considered the report of the Special Mission (S/  
10896 and Add.1),

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representa-  
tive of Zambia,

Affirming that Zambia's action to divert her trade from  
the southern route reinforces Security Council decisions on  
sanctions against the illegal regime of Southern Rhodesia,

1. Commends the Government of the Republic of Zambia  
for deciding to abandon the use of the southern route for its  
trade until the rebellion is quelled and majority rule is estab-  
lished in Southern Rhodesia;

2. Further takes note of the urgent economic needs of  
Zambia as indicated in the report of the Special Mission and  
its annexes;

3. Appeals to all States for immediate technical, finan-  
cial, and material assistance to Zambia in accordance with resolu-  
tions 253 (1968) and 277 (1970) and the recommendations of the  
Special Mission, so that Zambia can maintain her normal flow  
of traffic and enhance her capacity to implement fully the manda-  
tory sanctions policy;



4. Requests the United Nations and its specialized agencies, in particular, UNDP, UNCTAD, ICAO, ILO, UNIDO, UPU, FAO, IMCO, WMO, ITU, WHO and UNESCO, to assist Zambia in the fields identified in the report of the Special Mission and its annexes;

5. Requests the Secretary-General in collaboration with appropriate organizations of the United Nations system, to organize with immediate effect all forms of financial, technical and material assistance to Zambia to enable it to carry out its policy of economic independence from the racist regime of Southern Rhodesia;

6. Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider periodically the question of economic assistance to Zambia as envisaged in this resolution.

TERRITORIES UNDER SPANISH AND FRENCH DOMINATION

- 1) So-Called Spanish Sahara
- 2) So-called French Somaliland (Djibouti)
- 3) The Comoro Islands

1. So-Called Spanish Sahara

1. It will be recalled that since 1965 the United Nations had repeatedly called on Spain to implement its resolution on decolonization, 1514(XVI) with regard to the Spanish colony in the continent of Africa, the so-called Spanish Sahara (Rio de Oro). Although the Spanish Government had assured the United Nations and the OAU of its intention to organize a referendum in the territory, nothing concrete has been done up to now. Recent events seem to indicate that in fact Spain is playing all sorts of shady political manoeuvres with the view to delaying the granting of self determination and independence to the people of the territory.

2. On 20th February, 1973, the "General Assembly" of the people of the so-called Spanish Sahara was reported by Spanish official sources to have adopted a declaration addressed to the Spanish Government. The Assembly, composed of tribal Chiefs and other members nominated by nomadic tribes, were reported to have renewed the "allegiance of Spanish Sahara to the Spanish Head of State". Among the most significant points of the so-called declaration of the Assembly were the following:

(1). A declaration of inalienable right of the people of Rio de Oro to self determination through a referendum;

(2). A declaration that the people of the territory alone has the right to decide its future in complete freedom and with full independence;

(3). Relations between the people of the territory and the Spanish people are based on fraternity between the two peoples, on friendship, justice and mutual respect and

(4). The Spanish Government was asked to set up an effective procedure so as to guarantee the possibility of deciding their future in full freedom.

3. What the so called declaration means in effect is that the right of self determination and independence will be granted by the Spanish Government only if and when the people of the territory are ready for it or ask for it. That means that Spain wants to continue to colonize the territory until its rich mineral resources, especially Potash are exhausted. Until then Spain does not wish to see any "outside interference".

4. The old-fashioned colonialist move of Spain is of course, unacceptable to the people of the territory, both inside and outside the Rio de Oro as well as to the OAU and the United Nations. Accordingly, the member-states of the OAU should co-ordinate their efforts to put the necessary pressure on the Spanish Government to grant the right of self determination and independence to people of the so-called Spanish Sahara. The right to self determination and independence of the people of Rio de Oro can be exercised only if they express their will freely, without any interference from the Spanish colonial authorities in the territory and under the supervision of the OAU and the United Nations.

## 2. So-Called French Somaliland (Djibouti)

1. Despite France's repeated declarations of her adherence to the principle of the right to self determination and independence of peoples she continuous to show reluctance to granting <sup>independence</sup> to the so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti). The territory is still regarded by the French Government as an

important foothold in the scheme of French military strategy east of Suez, especially for the Indian Ocean. In particular, the territory will serve as an indispensable port of call for French Naval vessels within the context of France's so-called Blue Plan, which maps out reorganization and objectives of the French Navy, including its role in the Indian Ocean. In other words Djibouti's role would be to consolidate France's strategic position east of Suez.

2. This policy was reaffirmed on 16th January 1973, by President Georges Pompidou during his visit to <sup>the</sup> territory. Thus President Pompidou was reported to have told the people of the territory: "You are French because you want to be French and wish to remain French. No one can deny the evidence. The role of the Government of the Republic is to uphold your decision against all attempts at session, in what ever form, and you may rest assured that it will support you to the hilt." President Pompidou's assertion that the people of the territory "want to be French and wish to remain French" appears to be based on the outcome of the 1967 referendum in which the people were reported to have voted "yes" for continued association with France. Moreover, the fact that unlike the 1966 demonstrations during the visit of the late President De Gaulle, the visit of President Pompidou was reported to have taken place without much demonstration. From these, the French President seems to have concluded that there is no major opposition to the continued French presence in the territory. Hence the official French Policy is to continue French presence in the territory indefinitely. This, of course, is unacceptable to the people of the territory as well as to the OAU. France cannot for long continue to fool world public opinion by giving the flimsy excuse that so-called French Somaliland (Djibouti) will remain

a permanent French colony because of the so-called "will of the people of the territory." Accordingly, the member states of the OAU should co-ordinate their efforts and put the necessary pressure on the French Government so that France should grant the territory self-determination and independence as soon as possible, in accordance with the U.N. resolution on Decolonization, 1514(XVI).

### 3. The Comoro Islands

1. Just as the so-called French Somali-land (Djibouti), the Comoro Islands are also regarded by France as very useful in her strategy for a military presence East of Suez. Accordingly, France is very reluctant to see the Comoro Islands attain independence.

2. However, despite France's manoeuvres, the overwhelming majority of the Comoro Islands are in favour of an early independence. As a result of growing political pressure for independence, the pro French administration was forced to resign last September. Subsequently, on 3rd September elections were held whereby the coalition of pro-independence parties, led by MOLINACO, won 34 of the total of 39 seats. It is hoped that following the overwhelming victory of the nationalist forces, France will expedite the granting of independence to the Comoro Islands.

CM/502(XXI)

PART IV

N A M I B I A



#### IV. NAMIBIA

1. During the period under review, the situation in Namibia has deteriorated further. The Pretoria regime, in defiance of the United Nations and the ruling of the World Court, still continues to occupy illegally the international territory. As such, Pretoria continues to impose Apartheid by feverishly working to divide the territory into isolated and segregated areas, Bantustans. Contract labour and all what it entails are still prevalent in the territory. Thus the illegal and continued presence of South Africa in Namibia and her consequent illegal and ruthless exploitation of Namibian natural and human resources continues unabated.

2. However, despite, the continued intensification of Pretoria's policy of brutal repression, illegal arrests and torture, the Namibians have become more militant, better organized and more determined to resist South Africa's illegal occupation of their country. Last July, in a joint statement released by the headmen and the tribal executives, the Damara people of Namibia have refused to accept Pretoria's plan to grant "Partial self-government" to their designated homeland in Namibia's far northwest. Only some 10 per cent of the over 60,000 Damaras live in the prescribed area. This is part of Pretoria's scheme to divide Namibia into twelve separate areas, Bantustans, in order to diffuse organized African opposition to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. According to the Johannesburg Star of August 5, 1972, the Damars' rejection of the Bantustan plan was "an ultimatum which threatens to wreck its (Pretoria's) plans to apply its policy" of Apartheid. The statement of the Damaras described the "so-called Damara homeland" as part of a policy under which "we are being systematically disinherited and made strangers in our land." Characterizing

their situation as "a form of slavery", they maintained that the country belonged to all of its people, and could not be divided. "we are dissatisfied with South African administration and will never be satisfied with it", they declared.

3. Next to the Ovambos, the Damaras are the second largest ethnic group in Namibia. Like the Ovambos, Damaras had been regarded as compliant by Pretoria, which appointed and maintained tribal "chiefs" to echo Pretoria's "policy". Of course the myth of Ovambo acquiescence was shattered in December 1971 when a strike by 15,000 contract laborers crippled Namibia's economy, paralysing work at mines and factories for three months.

4. As this report was being prepared the major news agencies reported from Namibia of a massive demonstration by Namibians in Windhoek on March 19, 1973, demanding the immediate withdrawal of the military and police forces of South Africa from Namibia. Thus, as Pretoria feverishly attempts to consolidate its illegal occupation of Namibia, it is clear that the Pretoria authorities are increasingly facing a more determined and defiant resistance from the Namibian people.

5. Towards the middle of last July, the U.N. Council for Namibia, which theoretically administers the international territory, issued a statement in which it expressed "serious concern and great alarm at the persistent efforts by the government of South Africa to dismember the territory of Namibia in defiance of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for the territory". Regarding Pretoria's announcements that it has decided to grant self-rule to the Ovambo and Damara people, the statement said: "The Council for Namibia draws the attention of the Secretary General and the president of the Security Council to the grave events which are taking place in Namibia". The U.N. Council for

Namibia strongly called on the Pretoria government "to rescind all measures detrimental to the integrity of Namibia and to refrain in the future from taking any action with regard to the territory which does not belong to it."

6. In pursuance of Security Council resolution 309 (1972), adopted in Addis Ababa, the U. N. Secretary General submitted a progress report to the Security Council on 26th July, 1972. In his report (S/10738), Dr. Waldheim dealt with the discussions he held with the South African "Prime Minister", John Vorster and members of his "government" as well as his visits to Namibia where he held talks with representatives of the Namibian people. Dr. Waldheim also asked the Council that a personal representative be appointed to help him and that he would be based in New York but free to travel to Namibia and South Africa.

7. After considering the Secretary General's report, the Security Council adopted, on August 1, 1972, resolution 319 (1972) which invited the Secretary General to continue his contacts with all parties concerned and approved the Secretary General's proposal for the appointment of a personal representative to assist him in the discharge of his mandate. The Security Council also requested the Secretary General to report to the Council on the implementation of the resolution no later than 15th November, 1972.

8. Towards the end of last September, Dr. Waldheim named Mr. Alfred Martin Escher of Switzerland as his personal representative in pursuance of Security Council resolution 319 (1972). Early in October, Mr. Escher left for Pretoria where he held talks with officials of the Pretoria government and subsequently visited Namibia for 17 days. Mr. Escher's report was submitted to the Security Council on 15th November, 1972. The Escher report conveyed the

South African regime's view that Namibia should advance to independence under a system of separate regional development, Bantustans, evolving possibly to a federal system at an undeterminate future time. In the meantime, Namibia's twelve ethnic groups, Bantustans, should be represented on an advisory committee presided over by Pretoria's Prime Minister. The Escher report drew a great deal of criticism from the African group as well as from the non-western members of the Security Council for its failure in obtaining clarifications from Mr. Vorster on his understanding of the terms of self-determination and independence as regards Namibia. Moreover, Mr. Escher's remarks in his report that it seemed acceptable to him in principle that the Namibian people should obtain experience of self-government on a "regional basis", a euphemism for Bantustans, also drew strong criticisms from most members of the Security Council. In short, Mr. Escher's handling of the negotiations with South Africa and the conclusions reached in his report were not found to be satisfactory. On December 6, 1972, at the conclusion of its debate the Security Council adopted resolution 323 (1972) by 13 for none against, with the Soviet Union abstaining (China not participating in the vote) in which it extended the Secretary General's mandate for contacts with South Africa on the problem until April 30, 1973. The resolution stressed that the Secretary General's contacts must be conducted in the light of the U.N. resolutions on self-determination and independence for Namibia. To that end, the Council has called on South Africa "to bring about a peaceful transfer of power" to the Namibian people. For ease of reference the full text of the resolution is attached to this report. Meanwhile, despite the fact that the Secretary General's mandate has been extended to April 30, 1973, many members of the United Nations as well as of the Security Council have expressed their grave concern at Pretoria's clumsy attempts

to use the Secretary General's mission as a means of delaying facts. With its delaying tactics, Pretoria hopes to gain more time in order to implement its avowed policy of dismembering Namibia into twelve Bantustans and thereby maintain its illegal occupation of the territory through the familiar colonialist policy of divide and rule. To that end, in March, 1973, Vorster went to Namibia and held a closed meeting of the so-called Namibian advisory committee, in which the twelve ethnic groups of the territory were said to be represented. This, of course, is part of Pretoria's manoeuvre to institute Bantustans and divide the Namibian people. In this manoeuvre, Pretoria is fully backed by its western friends and allies who are working hand in gloves with Pretoria in exploiting the rich mineral and other resources of Namibia.

CM/502 (XXI)  
Page 5

9. Foreign economic and business interests in Namibia, especially from

Britain, West Germany, the United States, and France continue to play an important role in bolstering the illegal occupation of the international territory of Namibia by contributing taxes and foreign exchange. Moreover, apart from legitimizing South Africa's political control, the activities of these foreign companies, especially the foreign mining corporations and firms are increasingly depleting non-renewable mineral resources of the territory. Although some U.S. companies were reported to have withdrawn from Namibia in 1971 because of U.S. "official discouragement", many other U.S. companies have begun to invest in the territory. For instance, the Namibian Windhoek Advertiser of June 22 and 27, 1972, and the "Oil and Gas Journal" of July 8, 1972, have revealed that four U.S. companies were awarded offshore oil exploration concessions in Namibia.

The firms were named as New York based Aracco Exploration, Ltd, and a consortium consisting of Continental Overseas Oil Co., Gulf Oil Co., and Phillips Petroleum Co. The initial term of each concession was nine years, with

an option for a three-year renewal. The terms called for an expenditure of a million and half dollars in the first year, that is in 1972, and required drilling after the third year. In addition, government-controlled companies, such as British Petroleum and the French Oil Company SNPA, still continue to operate in Namibia. It should be underlined here that the South African regime is so far totally dependent on outside sources for oil and as such a discovery of oil in Namibia would greatly enhance its drive toward economic self-sufficiency and thereby be able to fight off international pressures against its Apartheid policy. Moreover, any oil found within the boundaries or waters of Namibia would not only strengthen South Africa's Apartheid economy, but would reinforce Pretoria's determination to continue to occupy Namibia in defiance of the United Nations. Meanwhile, as an essential complement to the political and diplomatic campaigns at the international level to ensure the strict application of the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council on Namibia, the armed struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, continues to gather momentum and intensify.

10. Finally, the 27th Session of the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the Question of Namibia, resolution 3031 (XXVII). Among other things, the resolution condemned the South African Government for its continued refusal to terminate its illegal occupation of the Territory and for its continued efforts to destroy the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of Namibia. It also deplored any support given to South Africa by any state, and by any financial, economic or other interests operating in Namibia which enabled the Pretoria regime to pursue its repressive policies in the Territory. Furthermore, the resolution called once again on all states to respect strictly General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia as well as the advisory opinion of

the International Court of Justice; to refrain from all direct or indirect relations, economic or otherwise, with South Africa, which purported to represent Namibia, and to take effective economic and other measures to ensure the immediate withdrawal of Pretoria's administration. In conformity with resolution, 3031 (XXVII) membership of the U.N. Council for Namibia was expanded from 11 to 18 by the addition of China, Burma, Poland, Mexico, Liberia, Rumania and the Soviet Union. Subsequently, the U.N. Council for Namibia, unanimously elected Mr. Paul Lusaka as its president. The Council decided that, henceforth its president should hold office for a year, instead of four months as before. For ease of reference the full text of the resolution on the question of Namibia 3031 (XXVII) as well as the text of the resolution on the U.N. Fund for Namibia 3030 (XXVII) are appended to this report.

RESOLUTION 323 (1972)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 1682nd meeting,  
on 6 December 1972

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 309 (1972) of 4 February 1972 and 319 (1972) of 1 August 1972, and without prejudice to other resolutions adopted on the question of Namibia,

Reaffirming the special responsibility and obligation of the United Nations towards the people and Territory of Namibia,

Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,

Reaffirming the inalienable and imprescriptible right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence,

Affirming that the principle of the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia cannot be subject to any conditions,

Having considered the report submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 319 (1972) (S/10832),

1. Observes with satisfaction that the people of Namibia have again had an opportunity of expressing their aspirations clearly and unequivocally, in their own Territory, to representatives of the United Nations;

2. Notes with interest that the overwhelming majority of the opinions consulted by the Representative of the Secretary-General categorically stated that, inter alia, they were in favour of the immediate abolition of the "homelands" policy, withdrawal of the South African administration from the Territory, Namibia's accession to national independence and the preservation of its territorial integrity, thus further confirming the consistently held position of the United Nations on this question;



3. Deeply regrets that there has been no complete and unequivocal clarification of the policy of the Government of South Africa regarding self-determination and independence for Namibia;

4. Solemnly reaffirms the inalienable and imprescriptible rights 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, and rejects any interpretation, measure or policy to the contrary;

5. Invites the Secretary-General, on the basis of paragraph 4 above, to continue his valuable efforts, in consultation and close co-operation with the Group of the Security Council established in accordance with resolution 309 (1972) and, as appropriate, with the assistance of representatives, to ensure that the people of Namibia, freely and with strict regard to the principles of human equality, exercise their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

6. Again calls on the Government of South Africa to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in the implementation of this resolution in order to bring about a peaceful transfer of power in Namibia;

7. Requests the other parties concerned to continue to extend their valuable co-operation to the Secretary-General with a view to assisting him in the implementation of this resolution;

8. Decides that, immediately following the partial renewal of the membership of the Security Council on 1 January 1973, the Council shall appoint representatives to fill the vacancies that will occur in the Group established in accordance with resolution 309 (1972);

9. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution as soon as possible and no later than 30 April 1973.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
/on the report of the Fourth Committee (A/8957)\_7  
3031 (XXVII). Question of Namibia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Namibia,

Having examined the report of the United Nations Council  
for Namibia,

Having examined the chapters of the report of the Special  
Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of  
the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Coun-  
tries and Peoples relating to the question of Namibia,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General concern-  
ing the enlargement of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Noting with satisfaction the courageous and manifest will  
of the Namibian people to achieve freedom and independence as a  
single unified entity,

Having invited in consultation with the Organization of  
African Unity and through it, representatives of the national  
liberation movement of Namibia, the South West Africa People's  
Organization, to participate in an observer capacity in its con-  
sideration of the Territory, and having heard the statement of the  
representative of the national liberation movement,

Having heard the statements of the petitioners,

Recalling its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and its resolution 2621 (XXV) of 12 October 1970, containing the programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration,

Recalling also its resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 and subsequent resolutions relating to the question of Namibia, as well as the relevant resolutions of the Security Council,

Recalling further the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Security Council in its resolution 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970,

Bearing in mind the direct responsibilities of the United Nations with regard to the Territory of Namibia and its people,

Deeply deploring the continued illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia by South Africa, in defiance of resolution 2145 (XXI) and in flagrant violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations,

Deeply concerned at the efforts of South Africa to consolidate and perpetuate its occupation of the Territory by repressive means, including the extension to Namibia of its policies of apartheid and the further creation of so-called "homelands" against the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants,

Deploring the use of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa as a base for taking actions which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent African States,

Affirming that the basic condition for the fulfilment of the responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia is the removal of South Africa's presence from the Territory,

Mindful of the obligations of all Member States under Article 25 of the Charter,

Expressing its satisfaction at the success of the Namibia International Conference, held under the auspices of the South West Africa People's Organization in May 1972, and commending the declaration and recommendations adopted by that Conference,

Aware of the urgent need for the participation of Namibians in the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia,

Mindful also that the direct responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory of Namibia includes the solemn obligation to protect and safeguard the rights and interests of the people of the Territory pending their exercise of self-determination and attainment of independence,

Noting with appreciation the recognition by a large number of States of identity certificate and travel documents issued to Namibians by the United Nations Council for Namibia,

1. Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, as recognized in General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV), 2621 (XXV) and subsequent resolutions, and the legitimacy of their struggle by all means against the illegal occupation of their Territory by South Africa;

2. Affirms that any solution with regard to the question of Namibia must enable the people of the Territory to achieve self-determination and independence as a single territorial and political entity;

3. Condemns the Government of South Africa for its continued refusal to terminate its illegal occupation and administration of the Territory of Namibia and to comply with the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly;

4. Calls once again upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw forthwith from the international Territory of Namibia;

5. Condemns the Government of South Africa for its continued efforts to destroy the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of separate "homelands"

based on racial and tribal distinctions, including the eviction, displacement and transfer of the Namibian people to other areas, and for its continued extension to Namibia of the policies of apartheid;

6. Deeply deplores any support given to South Africa by any State, and by any financial, economic and other interest operating in Namibia, which enables South Africa to pursue its repressive policies in the Territory, and calls for the termination of such support;

7. Calls once again upon all States;

(a) To respect strictly the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning Namibia, and to take fully into account the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971;

(b) To refrain from all direct or indirect relations, economic or otherwise, with South Africa, when it purports to represent Namibia;

(c) Not to recognize as legally valid any rights or interests in Namibian property or resources purportedly acquired from the Government of South Africa after 27 October 1966;

(d) To take effective economic and other measures designed to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia, thereby making possible the implementation of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V);

8. Commends the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia to all States and the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly and other competent organs of the United Nations, as well as to the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system, for appropriate action in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council;

9. Requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to discharge its functions and responsibilities in accordance with the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and in particular;

(a) To represent Namibia in international organizations, at conferences and on any other occasion as may be required;

(b) To ensure the participation in an appropriate capacity of the representatives of the Namibian people in its activities;

(c) To continue its consultations at the United Nations Headquarters, in Africa or elsewhere with the representatives of the Namibian people and the Organization of African Unity;

(d) To continue to assume responsibility for the urgent establishment of short-term and long-term co-ordinated programmes of technical and financial assistance to Namibia in the light of the relevant provisions of resolution 2248 (S-V) and taking into account resolution 2872 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971;

(e) To continue to expand the existing scheme for issuing identity certificates and travel documents to Namibians by concluding appropriate agreements with Governments of Member States;

(f) To continue to promote publicity with regard to the question of Namibia and to assist the Secretary-General in the discharge of the task entrusted to him under paragraph 14 below;

(g) To undertake a study on the compliance of Member States with the relevant United Nations resolutions, taking into account the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice relating to Namibia;

(h) To examine the question of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia, and to seek effective means to regulate such activities as appropriate;

(i) To continue to examine the question of bilateral and multilateral treaties which explicitly or implicitly include Namibia, and to seek to replace South Africa as the party representing Namibia in all relevant bilateral and multilateral treaties;

10. Requests all States, United Nations organs and specialized agencies and other organisations within the United Nations system, as well as the non-governmental organizations concerned, to co-operate fully with the United Nations Council for Namibia in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly, and in particular:

(a) To refrain from any action which may confer a semblance of legitimacy upon South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia;

(b) To render to the Namibian people, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, all moral and material assistance necessary to continue their struggle for the restoration of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and to work out, in active co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Organization of African Unity, concrete programmes of assistance to Namibia;

(c) To take effective steps to assist the Secretary-General in disseminating relevant information on this question under paragraph 14 below;

11. Invites the Security Council to take effective measures, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter, to secure the withdrawal by South Africa of its illegal administration from Namibia, and the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council designed to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination;

12. Decides to enlarge the membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia and requests the President of the General Assembly, in the light of the relevant report of the Secretary-General, to nominate additional members during the current session of the Assembly;

13. Urges the Secretary-General, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 2871 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971 and in view of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to undertake the necessary consultations to nominate as soon as possible a full-time United Nations Commissioner for Namibia;

14. Requests the Secretary-General, having regard to the suggestions of the United Nations Council for Namibia concerning the widespread and continuous publicity on this question, to take effective steps, including the publication of a regular bulletin on Namibia and the issue of a series of United Nations commemorative postage stamps, to publicize as widely as possible, in particular:

(a) The work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of other organs on the question of Namibia;

(b) The grave situation in the Territory created by the further repressive measures taken by the South African régime against the people of Namibia in violation of the relevant decisions of the United Nations;

(c) The legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence;

(d) The need for increased moral, political and material assistance to the people of Namibia and their liberation movement;

15. Invites the various organs of the United Nations concerned to effect the greatest possible co-ordination of their respective activities relating to Namibia;

16. Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary assistance and facilities to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the discharge of their respective duties and functions;

17. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

At its 2114th plenary meeting, on 18 December 1972, the General Assembly, pursuant to paragraph 12 of the above resolution, confirmed the nomination by its President of Burundi, China, Liberia, Mexico,



Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as members of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

As a result, the Council is composed of the following Member States: Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Egypt, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
[on the report of the Fourth Committee(A/8957)]  
3030 (XXVII). United Nations Fund for Namibia

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which the United Nations decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assume direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence,

Reaffirming its resolve to discharge that responsibility in regard to the Territory,

Mindful that, by assuming direct responsibility for Namibia, the United Nations incurred a solemn obligation to assist and prepare the people of the Territory for self-determination and independence,

Recalling further its resolutions 2679 (XXV) of 9 December 1970 and 2872 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971 concerning the establishment of a United Nations Fund for Namibia for the purpose of putting into effect a comprehensive programme of assistance to Namibians, as outlined in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session,

Recognizing that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia at present prevents the United Nations from furnishing needed, large-scale assistance within the Territory,

Having examined the report of the Secretary-General on the operation of the Fund during 1972,

Bearing in mind that the scope of the programme, as well as its financing and administrative machinery, will be subject to review by the General Assembly when South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is terminated,

Noting that the Secretary-General, owing to lack of funds, has not been able to carry out the programme in all its parts as envisaged in his report submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session in accordance with its resolution 2679 (XXV),

Noting further that the Secretary-General has, for the above-mentioned reasons, found it necessary, inter alia, to defer implementation of the preparation and investigation of the long-term measures described in paragraph 108 of his report to the Assembly at its twenty-sixth session,

Recognizing the importance of undertaking a detailed investigation of the human and natural resources of Namibia, with a view to preparing proposals for a co-ordinated plan of international economic and technical assistance, including manpower training, to be implemented in Namibia after the withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory,

1. Expresses its appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General on the operation of the United Nations Fund for Namibia during 1972 and endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained therein;

2. Decides, as a transitional measure, to allocate to the Fund the sum of \$100,000 from the regular budget of the United Nations for 1973;

3. Authorizes the Secretary-General to continue to appeal to Governments for voluntary contributions to the Fund;

4. Invites Governments to appeal once more to their national organizations and institutions for voluntary financial contributions to the Fund;

5. Urges the Secretary-General to implement the long-term measures and studies outlined in his report to the Assembly at its twenty-sixth session as soon as the necessary funds become available;

6. Authorizes the Secretary-General to implement the arrangements for the administration and supervision of the Fund, with the advice of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of the Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia;

7. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to render all necessary assistance to the Secretary-General in carrying out the tasks assigned to him under the present resolution;

8. Decides, pending the entry into full operation of the comprehensive programme, that Namibians shall continue to be eligible for assistance through the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa;

9. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General-Assembly at its twenty-eighth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

CM/502(XXD)

PART V

APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

~~APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA~~

1. During the period under review, the Apartheid system in South Africa has not changed one iota. On the contrary, the Pretoria regime has continued to intensify its repressive acts to consolidate its Apartheid policy in South Africa and to accelerate its imposition on the people Namibia and Zimbabwe. During 1972, the so-called Parliament of Pretoria was reported to have enacted over 100 new laws or amendments of early laws, all of them directed at tightening up the machinery of Apartheid in one way or another. Perhaps the most sinister of the new measures adopted by the Pretoria "Parliament" were the Security Amendment Bill and the Post Office Amendments Bill, which extended the powers of the secret police (BOSS) and legalised telephone tapping respectively. Moreover, Pretoria's secret service obtained a record budget for its activities during 1972. The total amount allotted for the secret service for 1972 was US\$9.97 million, whereas it had \$6.01 million for 1971. The largest part of the 1972 Secret Service budget that is \$7.70 million out of the 9.97 million dollars was allotted to the notorious Bureau of State Security (BOSS). The Figure for Boss for 1971 was \$4.90 million out of the \$6.01 million secret service budget. In 1972, the budgetary allocations for other secret service branches was also greatly increased. For instance, in 1972, the amount for military intelligence was \$460,000 as compared with the \$360,000 for 1971. Pretoria's Police also obtained \$1.47 million for secret service as compared to \$1.41 million for 1971. It is interesting to note that according to the Johannesburg Star of April 8, 1972, the secret service of <sup>the</sup> Department of Foreign Affairs of Pretoria obtained \$350,000. But in 1971, that is Pretoria's intensive campaign year

for "Dialogue", the Foreign Affairs Secret Service spent double the amount it was reported to have spent during 1972.

2. Another notable development in 1972 was the sharp increase of terrorist attacks by the supporters of Apartheid, especially the right-wing activists, against people and organizations in South Africa known for their opposition of Apartheid. Thus Petrol bombs were thrown at residences, cars, and churches; anonymous death threats by telephone were received by several people and pamphlets were issued attacking the anti-apartheid personalities and organizations. The Pretoria regime, as expected, has kept quiet without taking any action against the white terrorist gangs.

3. As in the past, a series of deportation and banning orders were issued by the Pretoria regime against persons who opposed Apartheid. Political prosecutions under the so-called "Terrorism Act, the Suppression of Communism Act; the unlawful organizations act and the sabotage act, were numerous. As usual, in political trials the accused are brought before a court, where they confess under duress, and the whole farce ends in a severe penalty against the accused. Professor Anthony Mathews, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Natal, who has spent several years documenting the manner in which South African courts have interpreted Security legislation, published last year a book on South Africa's Judiciary. Professor Mathews said in his book that South African courts, unlike their counterparts elsewhere, have been involved in the Security programme in an enforcing rather than restraining capacity. According to him in South Africa a stage has been reached in which the Security Police have such a free hand to manipulate witnesses and accused persons in the privacy of indefinite solitary confinement, that political trials

have in effect become little more than appeals from decisions of Security police interrogators. Persons have been held incommunicado in terms of Section 6 of the so-called Terrorism Act of 1967 for up to two years by the police before being brought to court. Witnesses who allege that statements have been extracted from them by torture do so in the knowledge that the persons who interrogate them are sitting in the court room with the power to return them to the very conditions against which they complain. Thus, according to Professor Mathews, a vigilant judiciary could have done much at least to reduce the danger of distortion of judicial process. Instead, South Africa's compliant judiciary has connived at its own impotence. According to the Sunday Times of 11th June, 1972, Professor Van Niekerk of Natal University went even further from Professor Mathews view point. At a meeting called to protest against the death of Ahmed Timol, a teacher who fell from the seventh floor of Security Headquarters in Johannesburg, <sup>he</sup> made two points. First he said that judges should speak against the law when it sank below the minimum standard of justice as did Section 6 of the so-called Terrorism Act. Secondly, he suggested that the judiciary should go still further and kill the usefulness of Section 6 "by denying, on account of the built-in-intimidatory effect of unsupervised solitary confinement, practically all credit worthiness" to evidence obtained under it. As a result of his statement Professor Van Nickerk was charged in the Natal Supreme Court with contempt of court and attempting to obstruct the course of justice. Through such measures of intimidation and blackmail, even innocuous and minor challenges to the Apartheid laws and their administration are muzzled.

4. In November, 1972, the United Nations special committee on Apartheid published a report on the maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa. The report throws a new light on the injustice and agony to which the Africans in



South Africa are being subjected. It will be recalled that the 26th Session of the General Assembly had called on the South African regime "immediately to put an end to all forms of physical and mental torture and other acts of terror against opponenets of Apartheid under detention or imprisonment and to punish the perpetrators of such criminal acts." The report on the maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa, prepared in pursuance of a U.N. General Assembly resolution adopted in November 1971, was based on evidence obtained from many sources, including South African courts and former detainees, or prisoners. The report underlined that "maltreatment and torture of opponenets of Apartheid ... has become an essential feature in the implementation of the Policy of Apartheid in South Africa." Moreover, the report stressed that the Pretoria's regime has "encouraged and shielded the Security Branch in the adoption of Nazi Gestapo methods."

5. The latest publication of the South African Study project on Christianity in Apartheid society (SPROCAS) pointed out<sup>that</sup> "today under the pass laws, an average of more than one black person is prosecuted every minute of the day and night through the year."

6. SPROCAS is joint project by the South African Council of Churches and the Christian Institute to examine South African Society more closely in the light of Christian principles and to make re-comendations for the achievement of a more just society. Under its director, Mr. Peter Randall, Spro-cas established several commissions to examine different aspects of the Apartheid way of life in South Africa. Thus, the report of the Economic Commission of Spro-cas arrived at conclusions which contrast sharply with the standard views of foreign interests and corporations that South Africa's economic boom will shatter Apartheid.

7. In part one, the Spro-Cas report sets out long term goals, which it calls "positive features of a Responsible Society." These include an emphasis on social goals as well as economic growth, development policies shaped to human needs, elimination of poverty, sharing of power and economic risks, and equality of opportunity for all. On the basis of these six principles, the Commission finds South Africa to be an irresponsible society. Section two is devoted to an analysis of "the facts of inequality". Then the Commission takes an in-depth analysis of the familiar argument of the vested interests in the west and of South Africa's "liberals", that "industrialization will bring change". On the basis of its findings, the Commission dismisses the view that economic growth will inevitably force significant change, on the grounds that "the ability of black labour to utilize opportunities for a redistribution of power obviously depends also on factors outside the industrial system". The Spro-Cas report also concludes that mere replacement of whites by blacks will not alter the basic patterns of inequality and discrimination in South Africa unless black workers brought in to help relieve the shortage of skilled whites: (1) receive the same wages as whites receive for the same job; (2) enjoy the same security and social benefits as white and (3) have recognized means of bargaining power. According to the Johannesburg Star of 17th June, 1972, the report concludes that, "to provide black labour and yet to deny the right to permanency in 'white' areas to the actual labourers, the 'Government' has reverted increasingly to prison and migratory labour". In short, the report of the economic commission of Spro-Cas concludes that the shortage of skilled labour and the inflow of Africans into positions hitherto reserved for whites have not really led nor are they likely to lead to cracks in the Apartheid system. As such the report disagrees with the often repeated argument that industrialization and economic growth are necessarily and inevitably leading to the breakdown of Apartheid or racial discrimination

Thus, internal economic forces alone will not eliminate the policies of Apartheid in South Africa.

8. Despite the intensification of repressive acts against the opponents of Apartheid, the Pretoria regime was seriously challenged by the oppressed people of South Africa on several fronts. Last June there was a wide spread student unrest in South Africa. Many youth student demonstrations were held especially at the University of Witwatersrand and the university of Capetown opposing the Apartheid system and its effects on education and civil liberties of the African people in South Africa. After the demonstrations were quelled by force, the Pretoria regime warned that demonstrations against its policies, whether peaceful or not, will no longer be tolerated and will be stopped. To that effect, Pretoria's police chief, General Gideon S. S. van der Walt, was quoted by the Star Johannesburg of October 28, 1972 to have declared: "I cannot say we will confine ourselves to batons. We may even be compelled to use fire arms." Thus, the world may soon be witnessing a series of massacres of the African people of South Africa similar to or even worse than those perpetrated at Sharpsville in 1960.

9. Another important challenge to Pretoria's Apartheid policy was the unleashing of massive strikes at the beginning of this year. On January 9, 1972, a wave of strikes involving over 60,000 African workers, paralyzed over 100 firms and halted municipal services of Durban, which is South Africa's third industrial city and principal port. The strikes spread to Johannesburg, Cape Town and other industrial centres of South Africa. The massive nature of the strikes involving hundreds of thousands of workers and their effectiveness shook the Pretoria regime to its foundations. Its immediate reaction was to attack the strikers with tear gas, dogs and batons

and to arrest thousands of workers. But Pretoria's brutal and repressive acts and threats of more brutal measures never succeeded to intimidate the oppressed African people of South Africa from intensifying their legitimate struggle against the Apartheid policies of the Pretoria regime.

10. The immediate cause for the series of strikes was demand for higher wages. According to the Johannesburg Financial Times of June 16, 1972, "The long term trend suggests that the wage gap is widening gradually, with non-whites feeling the pinch in even their basic household budgets. Hardest heat, of course, is the African with an average national wage of 58 rand a month. This is considerably less than the poverty datum line in most South African towns..." The Star of Johannesburg of 17th June, 1972 also quoted the latest Spro-cas economic commission's report as having stated that "the average per capita income of whites is over thirteen times higher than the average income of Africans." Moreover, the same report underlines the fact that the earnings gap between whites and Africans is twice as wide in the mining industry as it is in other sectors of the economy. The ratio of white to African earnings in mining was reported to be 19.4 to 1 compared to 6.0 to 1 in manufacturing and 6.6 to 1 in construction. As a result, the Spro-Cas report concluded that with respect to African wages in mining, "black gold miners in 1969 were earning no more than - and possibly slightly less - in real terms than their grandfathers in 1911." The situation has worsened since 1969 because the cost of living for urban Africans has risen to an unprecedented rate. According to the Rand Daily Mail of 31st August, 1972, the cost of living in the Soweto township of Johannesburg rose to 9.3 percent during the first six months of 1972 alone.

11. The white South African is better off not only as compared with the

Africans in South Africa but even as compared to other whites in other parts of the world. The University of Witswatersrand has prepared a comparison between the living standards of whites in South Africa and those in Australia, Italy, Britain and the United States working in construction, manufacturing, mining and railways. According to the Rand Daily Mail of 18th August, 1972, the study has established that "the average real earnings of South African whites are nearly three times those in Italy, nearly twice those in Britain, up by about 15% on those in Australia, and only the United States gives higher real earnings, between 10% and 50% higher."

12. As recently as 15th March, 1973, the London Guardian revealed the contents of a confidential study on wages paid to African workers by foreign companies in South Africa. According to the findings of the report 97 of 100 British firms in South Africa were paying their African employees starvation-level wages. Moreover, 80% of African workers were receiving wages below-subsistence level. The study was undertaken by the South African productivity and wage Association, an employers body, for the United Kingdom - South African Trade Association (UKSATA).

13. Because of the seriousness of the challenge of the series of strikes to the Apartheid regime, on 19th February, 1973, Vorsters Finance Minister Nicolaas Diederichs announced that "wages of state employees of all races will be increased by 15% as from 1st April, 1973." Subsequently, Pretoria's labour minister, Marais Viljoen, announced that wages of postal workers would also be increased. A wage agreement in the iron, steel and metal manufacturing industry, providing for a 12% increase in basic wages, was also reported. But although many more companies and firms have since announced wage increases for African workers the gap between African and white employees, both in the public and

private sectors, is likely to continue. What is even more significant is that despite these minor and in the long run ineffective, concessions in the economic sphere the Pretoria regime has categorically rejected political demands such as the demand of the strikers that basic trade union rights should be extended to African workers. Nevertheless, Vorster himself was reported to have confessed in Pretoria's "Parliament", <sup>that</sup> the massive strikes by Africans was "a valuable lesson for everyone in South Africa" and as such "it would be foolish not to take to heart". Whatever are the feelings of the racists of South Africa the liberation struggle will continue to intensify until final victory.

#### The Apartheid Economy

14. In his new year message Mr. Vorster declared "We have reason to be optimistic about the economic future of our country. We have gained plenty of lost ground and the salary increases granted, and the adjustments still to be made, ought to lead to increased productive investments. The mining industry has entered into rewarding long-term contracts, the value of agricultural exports has risen sharply, new mines have been opened, or will be opened shortly; and the completion of a number of dams has assured the water supplies of urban and industrial growth. Our standard of living, as well as our cost of living, can without a doubt stand comparison."

15. Although Vorster's declaration should be taken with some reservations since they were meant to sooth the nervous white South Africans and the equally nervous Western vested industries, the overall economic growth in South Africa shows an up-ward trend. As usual foreign capital continue to play an important role in South Africa's economic growth and development. As Ralph Horwitz pointed out in his book; The political economy of South Africa, foreign capital in South Africa was crucial to the development of mining and strategic to the development of manufacturing. South Africa is still highly dependent

on foreign capital to achieve a relatively high rate of growth. The South African Reserve Bank quarterly bulletin of September, 1971, indicated that following the Sharpeville massacre and South Africa's departure from the Commonwealth, large sums of foreign capital left the country and it was not until 1965 that the balance of payments registered a net inflow of capital. The role of foreign capital in the economic expansion of the 1960s was evident from the fact that net capital inflow from abroad contributed an average of 11% to gross domestic investment in 1965-70. The Star of Johannesburg of 4th April, 1972, indicated that whereas in 1970 the net inflow of foreign capital was 725 million rand, the figure for 1971 was 763 million rand. If we turn from the question of capital flows to that of foreign assets, the quarterly bulletin of the South African Reserve Bank of December, 1971, indicated that at the end of 1970 total foreign investments in South Africa was 5818 million rand. Of this total 58% represented investment by the sterling area, mainly from Britain; 17% by the dollar area, mainly from the United States, 24% by Western Europe, mainly from France and West Germany; and 1% by other countries. Figures on the investment of particular countries are no longer published by the South African Reserve Bank. But from several sources there are indications that while British investments are generally holding their earlier level, the United States share appears to be increasing. American capital is concentrated in the key sectors of Pretoria's economy. More than half of United States investments are used to strengthen, modernize and stimulate the industrial, including the military-industrial, potential of Apartheid South Africa. In particular, American capital holds the dominant position in the automobile industry where General Motors, Fords and Crysler are very much involved. Similarly, major American mining companies such as, Union Carbide and U.S. Steel are very active in the mining industry. So also are Fire Stone and Goodyear in the rubber industry and Standard Oil of California and Esso in the oil industry.

Western European investments also appear to be rising rapidly. In 1966 the investment of France, Switzerland, West Germany, Belgium and Luxemburg constituted less than 14% of the total, whereas, in 1970 the holdings of Western European nations was 24%. According to the latest U.N. report on foreign investments in South Africa (No.21/72), released in October, 1972, unlike the earlier period, "today western economic interests, private South African capital and South African state capital are working together in co-operation. The state corporations provide the infrastructure and basic raw materials, and the subsidiaries of overseas corporations work together with state concerns like ISCOR, SASOL and SOEKOR". Further, the report stressed that "it is overseas investments that have provided essential capital at all crucial growth stages of the economy. And it is overseas capital that is today giving South Africa access to advanced technology."

16. From South Africa's Economic Development Programme for 1970-75 it is clear that foreign capital is expected to continue playing an important role. The economic development programme envisages a growth rate of 5.5% per annum in real Gross Domestic Product, which will necessitate a rate of growth of domestic investment of 6.9% per annum, with gross domestic investment rising to a share of 24.37% of GDP in 1975. Obviously, this target will require large inflows of foreign capital.

17. Assuming that the Pretoria regime will attract the required amount of foreign capital, two important roles of foreign investment should be stressed. In the first place, in South Africa, more than elsewhere, foreign capital does not play only the narrow economic role. Since the last few years the Pretoria regime has been working hard to have foreign interests in South Africa adopt vested interests in the maintenance of the status quo. As a result several foreign economic



interests operating in South Africa, and getting fabulous profits, are reported to have set up lobbies in their countries to influence government policy towards Apartheid South Africa. Thus, for instance, the Pro South African lobbyists in Britain and United States are known to be extremely active and thus influence the Nixon and Heath policies towards Apartheid South Africa.

18. Secondly, despite their farcical argument that economic forces will crack Apartheid, the role of foreign owned companies in South Africa is mainly status-quo-oriented. It would be naive to expect that foreign interests would promote major changes in political and economic relationship between the Africans and whites in South Africa. Since their lucrative profits based on the ruthless exploitation of African labour in the various sectors of economic activities, the most that foreign companies could do is to put pressure on Pretoria so that certain superficial rigidities in the process of the imposition of Apartheid are relaxed or removed. To participate in the elimination of the root-causes of exploitation and Apartheid is against the very objectives of foreign economic and financial interests.

19. With regard to foreign trade, the Pretoria Government Gazette of July 7, 1972, indicating that during the first half of 1972, South Africa's exports were much greater than in the same period for 1971. Record exports of fruit raised the value of vegetable products to 132.9 million rand, compared with 65.6 million rand in the first half of 1971. Big increases were also recorded in wines, tobacco, and textiles. The comparative figures for imports and exports are as follows:

Territory	" in millions of rand			
	Imports		Exports	
	1972	1971	1972	1971
Africa	78.5	58.7	151.3	135.8
Europe	753.2	810.8	506.9	376.0
America	251.1	264.3	92.9	79.5
Oceania	31.9	31.2	8.3..	7.1
Ships Stores	-----	-----	35.3	36.8
Unclassified	10.4	11.2	1.4	1.1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1.394.3</b>	<b>1441.6</b>	<b>944.2</b>	<b>722.4</b>

Source: Government Gazette, Pretoria, No. 3621, 1972

20. On January 16, 1972, Pretoria released its preliminary trade statistics for 1972. The statistics shows that South Africa's trade balance improved by more than 505 million rand in 1972. Imports fell by about 58 million rand while exports increased from 1,555 million rand

in 1971 to 2,003 million rand last year. Although, the Pretoria regime has stopped revealing statistical data of its trade with individual countries, her traditional|most important trading partners continue to play their former role.

#### Pretoria's Increasing Military Build - up

21. According to the latest issue of The Military Balance, published by the London Institute of Strategic Studies, the total of South Africa's armed forces personnel has more than doubled from 44,250 in 1970-71 to 109,300 in 1972-73. Moreover, the number of AML-60 and

AML - 90 armoured cars increased from 300 to 800. The Number of Saracen armoured personnel carriers was estimated at 250. Other armour includes 100 centurian tanks, 20 comet tanks and 50 Ferret Scot cars.

22. The publication also indicated a big increase in Naval Manpower, from 9,000 to 11,300. Pretoria's navy now has nine frigates and three submarines, as against one last year, ten coastal minesweepers one escort minesweeper, two destroyers, five seaward defence boats and one fleet replenishment tanker.

23. Although the number of Airforce personnel has reportedly remained constant at 8,000, the total number of combat aircraft has increased to 166. Although the number of Buccanneer, Camberra and Mirage aircraft was said to remain fairly constant, the number of Impala aircraft, now being manufactured in South Africa, rose from 50 to 75. 16 Puma helicopters were also purchased with four more to be delivered in 1973. It is interesting to note that there is an unaccountable drop in the number of Alouette II/II helicopters from 106 to 60, which is likely must have been given to the Portuguese colonialist forces in Angola, and Mozambique and to rebel Rhodesian for anti-guerrilla operations.

24. For the 1972-73 financial year, Pretoria will spend 344.04 million rand on "defence". This record budget is an increase of seven percent over the previous year. Of the 27.1 million rand to be spent on armaments, the expenditure on guided missiles has nearly doubled, to 11 million rand. The budgetary allocation for aircraft was 41.6 million rand; ammunition 19.5 million rand and military vehicles 19 million rand. During discussion on the budget in Pretoria's so called parliament, Mr. P.W. Botha, the "minister of Defence" said that South Africa was doing its utmost to collaborate with "friendly" countries by making facilities available "for the defence of our friends as well

as ourselves." On what he termed as the growing threat of "Communism" and "revolution" in Southern Africa, Mr. Botha declared:

"This threat against South Africa and the broader threat against Southern Africa is part of the threat against the "whole free world"; It is part of a greater strategy directed against the forces of civilization. To the north of us we have to deal with the growing effort of forces determined to increase the menace of revolutionary warfare and gradually to undermine our will power to oppose it."

25. Regarding the growing Western involvement in the maintenance of the status-quo in Southern Africa, Mr. Botha declared: "There are signs, encouraging signs, in the free world that the position of South Africa is better understood today than before. Secondly, it is being realized more and more that the cape sea route and a stable Southern Africa are of the utmost value to those countries which depend on half a million tons oil carried around the Cape of Good Hope everyday. But I do not think it is in the interest of South Africa at this stage to say too much about these encouraging signs. I think we should rather approach these matters in a different way, by individual discussions and discussions at government level."

Source: "Parliamentary" debates, Pretoria, 26/4/72

26. On October 12, 1972, Mr. Botha stated that South Africa was well on the way towards total independence of foreign munitions supplies. Opening the fifth munitions testing range at Rochefstrom, he said that the testing range formed an important link in South Africa's chain of defence and further declared "together with our munitions factories, it symbolizes our self-sufficiency in this vital sphere."

27. Thanks to the direct and indirect Western Assistance and collaboration, the Pretoria regime has, by the end of 1972, manufactured

has started full production, making weapons of 20 mm to 260 mm calibre. It is also producing armoured cars and electronic equipment, including a portable radar detection system for use on South Africa's borders, as was revealed by Mr Botha himself. Apart from these, South Africa has developed the Cactus ground to air missile through French assistance and collaboration. She has also started to manufacture Mirage aircraft, under French licence. According to Pretoria's chairman of the Armament Board, professor J. Samuels, the advanced mirage sub-sonic fighter will be in service by the end of this year.. Under licence from Italy's Aer Macchi, South Africa is in the process of building up a light transport aircraft designed to operate from short, rough strips. It is also reported that West Germany firms are helping in the design and production of a new South African missile, the Harp - 3. It has been known for several years that the United States was selling light reconnaissance and trainer aircraft. But on March 20, 1973, U.S. Senate sources revealed that the United States was selling 747 troop transport planes, helicopters as well as herbicides and defoliants to South Africa. With regard to the sale of herbicides, the United States Government has sold to South Africa chemical weapons containing 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T which have been used in Vietnam and are classed as munitions.

U.S. Sales Figures of Herbicides for South Africa are as follows:

		<u>weight</u>	<u>Value</u>
1969	Herbicides, 2,4,-D and 2,4,5-T	446,087 lbs.	\$115,707
	Herb. NEC	347,237 "	832,847
	Herb. preparations (with some 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T)	1,738,740 "	994,944
1970	Herb. 2,4,-D and 2,4,5-T	426,680	83,815
	Herb. NEC	407,223	\$1,007,863
	Herb. preparations (with some 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T)	2,812,205	1,499,454

		<u>Weight</u>	<u>Value</u>
1971	Herb. 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T	843,499 lbs	\$354,419
	Herb. NEC	472,480	\$1,277,001
	Herb Preparations	3,977,266	1,992,467
1972	Herb. 2,4,D and 2,4,5-T	657,010	137,302
(Jan.-July)	Herb. NEC	26,826	7,528
	Herb. Preparations	572,594	23,220

Source: Washington Notes on Africa, November 22, 1972.

28. From FRELIMO and other sources it is now known that South African air squadrons have been spraying chemicals over the vast areas of liberated Mozambique. Similar south African criminal activities are also strongly suspected in Angola's liberated regions.

Thus, the major NATO powers especially Britain, France, the United States and West Germany, are not only selling arms to Apartheid South Africa, but are also helping her develop a mighty war industry. In playing an active role in building up the military potential of South Africa, the Western Powers are strengthening Pretoria's capacity to menace the security and sovereignty of independent African States, especially those bordering territories under colonial and racist domination. In other words, through the direct and indirect collaboration of the Western Powers, Pretoria is now armed to the teeth. And her military might will be used not only in suppressing the national liberation movements in Southern Africa, but also in threatening the security and independence of African States, members of the OAU. In this respect, Pretoria's constant efforts to involve the NATO powers in the economic, industrial and military development of South Africa and subsequently to foster identity of interests between her and the Western Powers so

that they could be involved directly in the maintenance of the status quo should be seriously counter-acted by independent Africa.

### APRTHEID AND THE UNITED NATIONS

29. In its annual report last September, the 16 nation U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid urged the Security Council to consider imposing mandatory sanctions against South Africa for its total disregard of all United Nations resolutions on the elimination of Apartheid in South Africa. The report said that in past resolutions the General Assembly had repeatedly expressed the conviction that appropriate action under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter is essential to compel the Pretoria regime to change its policies. Accordingly, the report stated: "The Committee therefore recommends that the Security Council should give high priority to a meeting to consider seriously the possibility of instituting mandatory sanctions similar to those established against the Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia."

30. The voluminous report of the Committee detailing the activities of the Apartheid Committee over the last year said: "With increasing indifference the South African regime continues to draw advantages from its membership of the United Nations, while refusing to respect its decision and while ignoring the opposition of the overwhelming majority of member states to its Apartheid policies". The report also stressed the fact that "The deterioration of South Africa's relationship with the United Nations has not yet been fully reflected in the actions of the Security Council". Accordingly, the Committee's conclusion was that "although decisions have been accepted by the Security Council..... in which the Government of South Africa was condemned for its glaring violations of the Charter, the methods of resolving the present situation should unequivocally point towards

sanctions and measures of enforcement."

31. On the basis of the report of the Apartheid Committee and on the recommendation of the Special <sup>Political</sup> Committee, the 27th Session of the General Assembly adopted five resolutions on Apartheid. The five resolutions deal with the maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees; the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa- the Programme of Work of the Special Committee on Apartheid; the dissemination of information on Apartheid and the Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of Apartheid.

32. The last resolution (2932 E(XXVII)), which is the most important, reaffirms the conviction of the General Assembly that "economic and other sanctions, instituted, under Chapter VII of the charter of the United Nations and universally applied, constitutes one of the essential means of achieving a peaceful solution of the grave situation in South Africa." Accordingly, the resolution requests the security Council "to consider urgently the situation in South Africa, with a view to adopting such effective measures under chapter VII of the charter." The Assembly also requested members of international organization, particularly the European Common Market the General Agreement on Trades and Tarriffs, and the International Monetary Fund to deny all assistance and facilities to the Pretoria regime as long as it maintains its Apartheid Policy. This important resolution was adopted by 100 votes to 4 against, (South Africa, Portugal, Britain and the United States) and 21 abstentions. The full text of this resolution as well as the other four resolutions on Apartheid are annexed to this report.

33. Finally, by resolution 2948(XXVII), the General Assembly approved, by 65 votes to 40 against with 21 abstentions, "the report of the credentials committee, except with regard to the credentials of the representatives of South Africa." This is the third year since the



General Assembly rejected the credentials of South African delegation to the U.N.

34. Thus, as a result of Pretoria's persistence in its policies of Apartheid, South Africa is increasingly becoming more isolated. Even Pretoria's former friends such as Australia and New Zealand have made a dramatic reversal of their policies towards Apartheid regime. The new governments of Australia and New Zealand have pledged to support U.N. measures designed to eliminate Apartheid. On December 13, 1972, the Australian Government even contributed 10,000 US dollars to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for South Africa and 5,000 dollars each to the U.N. Fund for South Africa and the U.N. Fund for Namibia. This is the first time that Australia has contributed to the U.N. Funds. Moreover, the Australian Government has also decided that in future racially selected South African teams will neither enter Australia nor be allowed transit through Australia.

34. Meanwhile, the Pretoria regime has been desperately fighting against international isolation. Apart from continuing its bankrupt "Dialogue" policy, which has now been rejected even by its "few friends" in Africa, the Pretoria regime staged the so-called 1973 multi-national games in Pretoria from 24th March to 7th April, 1973. Of the more than 500 participants who were originally scheduled to participate, less than 100 "overseas competitors" including officials and coaches were reported to have taken part. Thus, as it turned out, the Pretoria games funfare was a total failure. The whole show was stage managed by the Pretoria regime to sooth the growing nervousness of the white population of South Africa at their isolation by the international community. Even then, many countries including Australia, Brazil, Sweden refused to participate. Very many professional as well as amateur athletics and sports associations also refused to send their teams to the Pretoria games. For as long as the Pretoria regime continues its criminal

Apartheid Policy, it will continue to be even more isolated. And until it abandons Apartheid, the anti-apartheid forces, especially, the liberation forces of South Africa, will continue to intensify their armed struggle against the minority racist regime of Pretoria, until final victory.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[On the report of the Special Political Committee (A/8879)]

2923 (XXVII). The Policies of apartheid of the  
Government of South Africa

A

Maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 2764 (XXVI) of 9 November 1971 concerning the maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in South Africa and the persecution of religious leaders to that policy,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid entitled "Maltreatment and torture of prisoners in South Africa", submitted in pursuance of that resolution,

Expressing grave concern over any and every act of maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid in South Africa, and over the deaths while in detention of a number of detainees,

1. Calls upon the Government of South Africa immediately to put an end to all forms of physical and mental torture and other acts of terror against opponents of apartheid under detention or imprisonment and to punish the perpetrators of such criminal acts;

2. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to follow the situation and take appropriate steps to promote an international campaign for an end to repression, maltreatment and torture of opponents of apartheid under detention or imprisonment in South Africa;

3. Requests the Secretary-General;

(a) To publicize the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid on maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees and all other available information on this matter;

(b) To transmit the report of the Special Committee to the Commission on Human Rights and to appropriate international non-governmental organizations.

B

United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa

The General Assembly,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, to which is annexed the report of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa,

Recalling that, in paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 311 (1972) of 4 February 1972, the Council urged Governments and individuals to contribute generously and regularly to the Trust Fund,

Conscious of the continuing and increasing needs for humanitarian assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, as well as in Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, and to their families,

Noting with appreciation the efforts of the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees to promote contributions to the Trust Fund,

1. Expresses its appreciation to the Governments, Organizations and individuals that have contributed to the United Nations Trust Fund, for South Africa;

2. Again appeals to all States, organizations and individuals for generous annual contributions to the Trust Fund and for direct contributions to voluntary agencies concerned, in order to enable them to provide relief and assistance to persons persecuted under repressive and discriminatory legislation in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia;

3. Requests the Secretary-General and the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa to continue their efforts to obtain increased contributions from governmental and non-governmental sources to the Trust Fund.

C

Programme of work of the Special Committee on Apartheid  
The General Assembly,

Commending the work of the Special Committee on Apartheid in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2775 (XXVI) of 29 November 1971,

Endorsing the programme of work of the Special Committee on Apartheid contained in its report,

Requests and authorizes the special Committee on Apartheid, within the budgetary appropriation to be made for this purpose:

(a) To hold consultations with experts and representatives of the oppressed people of South Africa and African liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity, as well as anti-apartheid movements and other non-governmental organizations concerned with the campaign against apartheid, in order to consider ways and means of intensifying international action against apartheid;

(b) To send representatives or delegations, as appropriate, to national and international conferences dealing with the problem of apartheid and to the headquarters of specialized agencies and the Organization of African Unity;

(c) To take appropriate steps, in co-operation with the Organization of African Unity, to ensure greater moral and material assistance to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa;

(d) To continue co-operation with other United Nations bodies concerned with apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism in Southern Africa;

(e) To submit a special report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eight session on the implementation by States of United Nations resolutions on apartheid.

---

D

Dissemination of information on apartheid

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 2775 B and G (XXVI) of 29 November 1971,

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolutions 2775 D, F and G (XXVI),

Noting with appreciation the efforts of the Unit on Apartheid and the Office of Public Information in this respect,

Having considered the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid,

Considering that the dissemination of information on the evils and dangers of apartheid and on the international efforts for the eradication of apartheid should be intensified in co-operation with Governments, specialized agencies and appropriate regional and non-governmental organizations,

Desirous of increased co-operation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity in disseminating information on apartheid,

1. Requests the Secretary-General, taking into account paragraphs 220 to 228 of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid and in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, to take steps to intensify the dissemination of information on apartheid and, in particular, to arrange for an increase in the circulation of publications and films and for additional translations into various languages;

2. Requests the Secretary-General to make appropriate arrangements for wider and more effective publicity by the Office of Public Information through all media, including films and broadcasts, on the evils of apartheid and the efforts of United Nations organs towards the eradication of apartheid;

3. Requests the specialized agencies concerned, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Labour Organization, to co-operate closely with the Office of Public Information and the Unit on Apartheid in disseminating information on apartheid;

4. Requests the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to expedite the preparation and publication of an educational kit on racial discrimination and apartheid in Southern Africa;
5. Invites Governments and organizations to encourage information media to contribute to the campaign against apartheid by the widest dissemination of information on the evils of apartheid and on the international efforts towards the eradication of apartheid;
6. Requests States and public organizations to take appropriate steps to promote the establishment in countries where they do not exist of non-governmental organizations actively concerned with the campaign against apartheid;
7. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty eighth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

E

Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of  
apartheid

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions on the question of apartheid, in particular resolution 2775 (XXVI) of 29 November 1971,

Strongly convinced that the United Nations has a vital interest in securing the speedy elimination of apartheid,

Having considered the reports of the Special Committee on Apartheid and the relevant sanctions of the report of the Economic and Social Council,

Gravely concerned about the explosive situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole resulting from the inhuman and aggressive policies of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa, a situation which constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Noting that the Security Council decided, in its resolution 311 (1972) of 4 February 1972, adopted at Addis Ababa, to examine, as a matter of urgency, methods of resolving the present situation arising out of the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa.

Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of South Africa to self-determination and freedom,

Alarmed at the forcible removal of the African people from their rightful homes to the so-called Bantustans,

Further reaffirming that the practice of apartheid constitutes a crime against humanity,

1. Condemns the racist Government of South Africa for continuing and intensifying the implementation of its inhuman policy of apartheid, and subjecting the opponents of apartheid to ruthless repression, in violation of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, thereby creating a grave threat to the peace;

2. Condemns the establishment by the racist Government of South Africa of the so-called Bantustans and the forcible removal of the African people of South Africa to those areas as a violation of their inalienable rights, contrary to their inherent right to self-determination and prejudicial to the territorial integrity of the country and the unity of its people;

3. Demands that the Government of South Africa repeal all repressive laws, regulations and proclamations used to persecute persons opposed to the policies of apartheid and immediately release all those imprisoned, detained or restricted for their opposition to apartheid;

4. Further condemns the South African régime for its progressive exportation of the policy of apartheid into neighbouring African Territories, especially Namibia which it continues to occupy illegally in defiance of the United Nations;

5. Condemns the continued and increasing co-operation of certain States and foreign economic interests with South Africa in the military, economic, political and other fields, as such co-operation encourages the South African régime in the pursuit of apartheid in defiance of the United Nations;

6. Again calls upon all Governments to implement fully the arms embargo against South Africa, without any exceptions or reservations;

7. Reaffirms its conviction that economic and other sanctions, instituted under Chapter VII of the Charter and universally applied, constitute one of the essential means of achieving a peaceful solution of the grave situation in South Africa;



8. Requests the Security Council to consider urgently the situation in South Africa with a view to adopting such effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter;

9. Firmly supports the efforts of all those engaged in the struggle inside South Africa against apartheid and its evil consequences;

10. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa to eradicate apartheid and racial discrimination by all available means to attain in the country as a whole majority rule based on universal suffrage;

11. Appeals to Governments, specialized agencies, national and international organizations and individuals to provide greater assistance, directly or through the Organization of African Unity, to the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa;

12. Requests the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to discontinue all collaboration with the Government of South Africa until it renounces its policies of apartheid and accords with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

13. Requests all members of international agencies and organizations particularly the members of the European Economic Community, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the International Monetary Fund, to take the necessary steps to deny all assistance and commercial or other facilities to the Government of South Africa so long as it pursues its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination and continues to defy the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council;

14. Requests all States to take appropriate steps, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2775 D (XXVI), to uphold the Olympic principle of non-discrimination in sports and withhold any support from sporting events organized in violation of this principle, particularly with the participation of racially selected teams from South Africa;

15. Commends the activities of anti-apartheid movements, trade unions, student organizations, churches and other groups which have taken national and international action against apartheid;

16. Invites all organizations, institutions and information media to take appropriate steps, in accordance with the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations, intensified and co-ordinated campaigns with the following goals:

(a) Discontinuance of all military, economic and political collaboration with South Africa;

(b) Cessation of all activities by foreign economic interests which encourage the South African régime in its imposition of apartheid;

(c) Condemnation of torture and ill-treatment of prisoners and detainees in South Africa;

(d) Discouragement of emigration to South Africa, especially of skilled workers;

(e) Boycott of South Africa in sports and in cultural and other activities;

(f) World-wide collection of contributions for assistance to the victims of apartheid and support to the movement of the oppressed people of South Africa for freedom;

17. Requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to arrange, in consultation with the Secretary-General, for the preparation and widest dissemination of expert studies to counteract the propaganda by foreign economic and financial interests against resolutions of the United Nations and in favour of economic collaboration with the South African régime and racist institutions in South Africa;

18. Further requests the Special Committee on Apartheid to take steps to publicize all available information on collaboration by States and foreign economic and financial interests with the South African régime and South African companies;

19. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session on the implementation of the present resolution.

**AFRICAN UNION UNION AFRICAINE**

**African Union Common Repository**

**<http://archives.au.int>**

---

Organs

Council of Ministers & Executive Council Collection

---

1973-05

# 1) Zimbabwe

## Organization of African Unity

Organization of African Unity

---

<https://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/7790>

*Downloaded from African Union Common Repository*