

August 6, 1973

#1

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. WILLENS

RE: The Namibia situation and its relation to the Mariannas.

Jay Lapin asked me to write you a short memo summarizing the-research I-have done on Namibia.

Namibia, formerly the territory of Southwest Africa, has been under the control of South Africa for 58 years, despite a U.N. resolution in 1966 terminating its mandate. G.A. Resolution 2145 (XXI). In 1964 South Africa, pursuant to the Odendaal Plan, commenced a policy of separating the people of Namibia into homelands, or Bantustans as they are otherwise known. Further legislative acts in 1968 and 1969 effectuated a reorganization in the internal political structure of Namibia, eliminating all substantive features of self-government and essentially turning it into a province of South Africa. Within that provincial system the homelands ostensibly operate as independent regimes, but it is clear that while they are separate from one another, they are completely dominated by South Africa. The populations of the homelands appear to be made up of distinct ethnic groups, thus deriving names such as Ovamboland and Kavangoland, and have been brought together by forced (according to the South Africans "voluntary") demographic shifts.

South Africa's homeland policy in Namibia has spawned resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council; too numerous to list, to the effect that South Africa is violating the territorial integrity of Namibia by fragmenting its people.

However, the Namibia situation differs from that of the Mariannas for several reasons:

1. Although tribal chiefs in the respective homelands purport to speak for the majority of their people, they are clearly puppets of the South African regime, used to give the homeland policy a cloak of legitimacy. The U.N. recognizes the South West Africa Peoples Organization (SWAPO), the exiled national liberation movement, as the true spokesman for the Namibian people. SWAPO emphatically rejects the homeland policy and resists South African domination altogether.

The Mariannas, on the other hand, appear to be completely independent politically. While

01-04901

there may be a majority and minority view as to the virtues of a compact with the U.S., there are not two separate groups in the Mariannas with competing claims to be speaking for the majority of people. If anything, the Mariannas are trying to liberate themselves from the tyranny of the rest of Micronesia and not from the control of the U.S.

2. South Africa has maintained open defiance of the U.N., refusing to relinquish control over Namibia in accordance with the termination of the mandate. The U.S., however, presumably will abide by a majority ruling of the U.N. concerning the handling of the trust territory. There is thus a substantial difference in good faith between the two trustees.
3. On simple humanitarian terms South Africa's policies are reprehensible. Most of the men in the homelands are in what amount to forced labor camps, and the natural resources of the homeland regions are being exploited for the benefit of South African companies. On the other hand, close association with the U.S. will, if anything, raise the standard of living of the Mariannas people.

The information in this memorandum was compiled from General Assembly Resolutions 1514 (XV), 2145 (XXI), 3031 (XXVII); Statement Issued by the United Nations Council for Namibia on July 12, 1972 Concerning Developments Relating to Ovamboland, G.A. Doc. A/AC. 131/27; Report of the Fourth Committee on the Question of Namibia, G.A. Doc. A/8957; Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia Vol. II (1972), Supp. 24 (A/8724); 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 (1972), G.A. Doc. A/8723/Add. 2.

Gus Oliver

cc: Jay Lapin  
Gil Kujovich