

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2269th MEETING: 22 APRIL 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2269)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)	1

NOTE

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

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

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

2269th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 22 April 1981, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Noel DORR (Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2269)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2267th and 2268th meetings], I invite the representatives of the following countries—Algeria, Angola, Benin, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe—to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Benyahia (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Morden (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Gedle-Giorgis (Ethiopia), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Coumbassa (Guinea), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kasina (Kenya), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Baba (Nigeria), Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Mr. Conteh (Sierra

Leone), Mr. Fourie (South Africa), Mr. Hameed (Sri Lanka), Mr. Akakpo-Ahianyo (Togo), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Vrhovec (Yugoslavia), Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mangwende (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Romania, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Marinescu (Romania) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2267th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision also taken at the 2267th meeting, I invite Mr. Peter Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Peter Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

5. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session considered the situation brought about by the refusal of South Africa to abide by United Nations resolutions on Namibia, by an overwhelming majority and without a single vote against, it declared the urgent need to ensure the early attainment of self-determination, freedom and genuine national independence in a united Namibia [resolution 35/227A].

6. This declaration of the General Assembly, which represented the lofty expression of the will of the international community, was largely based on the New Delhi Declaration,¹ issued in February by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, which in paragraph 45 firmly condemned the racist régime of South Africa for its persistent refusal to withdraw from Namibia and, in particular, for its deliberate sabotage of the Geneva meeting, convened with a view to implementing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

7. The New Delhi Conference—and the Secretary-General of the United Nations agrees with this—considered that the Pretoria régime was fully responsible for the failure of the pre-implementation meeting, the only purpose of which was to set the date for a cease-fire and to put in place the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

8. At the New Delhi Conference, as well as in the discussions which took place in the General Assembly of the United Nations, there was well-deserved recognition of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, for its constructive approach and its impeccable statesmanlike attitude, given the serious situation created by South Africa at the Geneva meeting. Recognition was also given to the front-line States and to Nigeria, for their role as observers.

9. We attach particular importance to the fact that, in paragraph 47 of the New Delhi Declaration, the Ministers paid special attention to the role of the contact group of Western States. They regretted the apparent reluctance of the countries members of the group to use their enormous influence and power over South Africa to obtain its co-operation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. They also urged all countries, in particular France, the United Kingdom and the United States, permanent members of the Security Council, to co-operate fully with the Council in adopting effective enforcement measures against South Africa.

10. As a result of the mandate conferred by the New Delhi Conference, the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries took place at Algiers, from 16 to 18 April, to assess the situation in Namibia and to adopt specific measures with a view to stepping up the assistance given to the struggle, which is being carried on by the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative.

11. The tasks of the ministerial meeting at Algiers were strongly encouraged by the summit meeting held at Luanda by the Presidents of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania and

Zambia, and by the representative of the President of Zimbabwe; the President of SWAPO also attended. The final communiqué released on 15 April [S/14464, annex], the eve of the Algiers ministerial meeting, gave a vote of confidence to the Co-ordinating Bureau, for it to adopt practical measures of assistance to SWAPO and to achieve the mobilization of the international community in support of the struggle for Namibian independence.

12. At the conclusion of its deliberations at the extraordinary ministerial meeting at Algiers, the Bureau decided [S/14458, annex, para. 22 g] that, besides the Ministers for Foreign Affairs already selected by the Organization of African Unity (OAU)—that is, the current President of the Council of Ministers of the OAU; the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the front-line States, namely, those of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe; and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia and Uganda—the following Ministers for Foreign Affairs should also be designated: those of Algeria, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Liberia, Panama, Senegal, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia. They were to participate in this series of meetings of the Security Council, as representatives of the non-aligned movement. It is by virtue of that mandate that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs I have just mentioned have come here to take part in this debate to request the Security Council urgently to impose on South Africa comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to compel the Pretoria régime to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and so that the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia might be promoted within the United Nations system.

13. Given the lawless behaviour of South Africa, consisting of utter contempt for the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, the Government of Panama considers that there is every justification for the Security Council to adopt the measures of coercion which are demanded by the serious situation in Namibia, taking account of the following elements: first, that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations and that its occupation by South Africa is illegal; secondly, that the Organization has a solemn commitment to bring about the self-determination, freedom and national independence of Namibia; thirdly, that there must be respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other off-shore islands, and, that Namibia's territorial integrity cannot be called into question or permitted to suffer the least damage; and, fourthly, that the United Nations Council for Namibia, as Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, should promote and strengthen its co-operation with the governmental and non-governmental organizations which support the liberation

struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative.

14. The international community cannot recognize, and must reject, any assembly, administration or entity established in Windhoek which is not the result of free elections in Namibia held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The international community is committed—and my Government honours that commitment—to recognize the constructive contribution of SWAPO in the search for peaceful formulas to solve the problem. In the view of Panama, such a solution can only be the immediate cancellation of South Africa's illegal administration in Namibia and a guarantee of the prompt independence of a united Namibia through free elections held under the control and supervision of the United Nations.

15. The position which Panama puts before the Council on the question of Namibia, in addition to being within a non-aligned framework, is basically a Latin American position, as was highlighted during yesterday's informal consultations, where the most open harmony and identity were to be seen between the positions taken by the delegations of Mexico and Panama, which this year occupy the Council's two Latin American seats.

16. The voices raised throughout the Latin American continent are voices of support for the aspirations of the Namibian people and of the countries of southern Africa. Only yesterday [2267th meeting], the Minister for External Relations of Cuba, Mr. Isidoro Malmierca, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jamaica, Mr. Hugh Lawson Shearer, who represent two Latin American countries with different political systems, argued with equal emphasis and determination for the prompt independence of Namibia. There is no need to quote them, for the echo of their important statements still lingers in this chamber.

17. The Latin American position was consistently expressed by the Ministers for External Relations of the countries of the region during the general debate at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. I shall cite a few examples. The Republic of Argentina, represented by the then Minister for External Relations and Worship, Mr. Carlos Washington Pastor, maintained that:

"The international community is still awaiting the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia. That Territory must accede to sovereignty with complete territorial integrity. The present situation must be brought to an end, because its persistence calls into question the implementation of the principles and decisions of the United Nations and, at the same time, constitutes a significant danger to the peace and security of Africa and the entire world."²

18. The Minister of State for External Relations of Brazil, Mr. Ramiro Saraiva Guerreiro, argued in the General Assembly³ that:

"We must now concentrate on the questions of Namibia and of the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa, lest we face the continuing frustration of those peoples there and of all of us at the United Nations. Every effort must be made to ensure that prompt and fruitful results are gained from the work accumulated throughout these years at the United Nations towards a solution for the problem of Namibia, whose people are represented by the South West Africa People's Organization. The risk we have been running since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted two years ago is that of having placed too much trust in negotiations that have not developed in accordance with legitimate expectations. The persistence of military aggressions conducted by the Government of South Africa against Angola and Zambia is unacceptable. Political contrivances such as the installation of the so-called Nations Assembly of Windhoek are also unacceptable. The very latest exchange of messages with the Secretary-General betrays the evasive and delaying attitude of South Africa."

I would interject here that this morning we saw another example of this sort of policy, which is disruptive, and contrary to the United Nations system. The Brazilian Minister concluded by saying that:

"In this, as in other problems pending on our agenda, the position of the Organization of African Unity and, in particular, that of the front-line States, is fundamental inasmuch as, on 2 June last, they have reaffirmed at Lusaka the priority they accord to the question of Namibia on the basis of documents already adopted by the United Nations."

19. Colombia, through its Minister for External Relations, Mr. Diego Uribe Vargas, declared⁴ that:

"The process of decolonization, for which the United Nations may justly claim the greatest credit ever since its foundation, has met with the obstinate resistance of the South African Government in its attempt to create the necessary conditions for recognition of Namibia as a free and sovereign nation. This is all the more serious if we realize that South Africa continues to pursue its policy of *apartheid*, a flagrant violation of the most elementary human rights and a vestige of the discriminatory policy of ancient empires."

The Colombian Minister concluded by calling once again on the Assembly

"to condemn *apartheid* and to require South Africa to comply with its international obligation to permit the complete independence of Namibia with all the prerogatives inherent in the sovereignty of States."

20. Chile, through its Minister for External Relations, Mr. René Rojas Galdames, pointed out that the example of Zimbabwe should serve in other out-

standing situations, such as the case of Namibia. The Minister said:

"In this regard we call on the parties to make it possible for the Security Council plan for Namibia to be carried out."⁵

21. Costa Rica, in favouring the independence of Namibia, stated its position clearly when its Minister for External Relations, Mr. Bernd Niehaus Quesada, spoke of the need to carry out the decolonization process and at the same time condemned South Africa as the perpetrator of

"one of the most monstrous political ideologies mankind has known, and one of the political systems most incompatible with humanity that has ever been devised."⁶

22. Guyana, as its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, stated,

"can no longer put up with the unparalleled effrontery of South Africa. We must resolutely implement the plan so carefully and elaborately devised for the early independence of Namibia—for Namibia is decidedly next on the calendar of political freedom. Let us reserve its place in this Organization now."⁷

23. As stated by its Minister for External Relations, Mr. José Zambrano Velasco, Venezuela, faithful to the tradition of the Liberator

"supports all actions designed to eradicate from the face of the earth racism in all its forms, especially the form which claims to set itself up as a system, as is the case in South Africa with *apartheid*."

"Our support for the independence of Namibia, in accordance with United Nations decisions, is clear and unequivocal."⁸

24. The not-too-edifying statement made this morning [2268th meeting] by the Government of South Africa places the Council in the difficult situation of having to decide whether, given the Pretoria régime's attitude of open rebelliousness, it should or should not impose the sanctions authorized under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We therefore insist on the advisability of the five Powers authors of the United Nations plan for Namibia [S/12636 of 10 April 1978] exerting all possible persuasive pressure on South Africa to abide by decisions of the Security Council within the United Nations system.

25. At the same time, as long as the South African Government persists in ignoring those decisions, the Security Council must take the action requested by the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers in February, as well as by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at

New Delhi in February—namely, the immediate imposition against South Africa of the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, including an oil embargo—in order to compel the Pretoria régime to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

26. We are aware that as is stated in the report of the Economic Commission for Africa,⁹ South Africa by various means controls the economies of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland and—to a lesser extent but nevertheless significantly the economies of Mozambique, Namibia and Zimbabwe, with which the South African economy is intimately linked. Therefore, note should be taken of the special geographical position of the countries bordering on South Africa, and suitable measures should be adopted to extend material and financial support to those countries so that they may withstand the effects which any sanctions imposed on South Africa would have on them.

27. The dilemma faced by the Western Powers is that of joining in an international consensus favouring genuine independence for Namibia or, on the contrary, of aligning themselves with the cause of the Pretoria racist régime, a régime which lacks the support of the black majority and of the international community and is based on repression and violence, which naturally result in violent chain reactions.

28. The Namibian independence process cannot be halted. Logically, then, African peoples must weigh the degree of co-operation and friendship of other nations by the extent to which the latter favour or oppose genuine Namibian independence. That explains the special responsibility which States members of the United Nations place on the five Western Powers for compliance with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which they have authored and which is embodied and formalized in Council resolution 435 (1978).

29. Any assurances which those Western Powers could offer in this debate as to their political will to co-operate and to foster implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would considerably clear the political climate in southern Africa.

30. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia envisages, in the first place, the verification of free elections held under United Nations supervision and control. The establishment of a constitutional assembly to determine the structure of the new State should be—because it could not be otherwise—the result of those elections, with the participation of those who would be freely elected through popular direct suffrage.

31. Any scheme, formula or expedient aimed at undermining United Nations authority in that process already envisaged—such as, for example, the launching of a constitutional conference prior to verification of

the election results—not only would be contrary to the United Nations plan, which was the initiative of the Western Powers, but also would be in open contradiction to the aspirations of the people of Namibia and of the international community in general.

32. No one can be unaware that SWAPO has the overwhelming support of the people of Namibia, and those who, in popular elections honestly administered by the United Nations, anticipate defeat in the face of the overwhelming popular strength of SWAPO are, of course, eager to promote other formulas which are not in keeping with the United Nations plan or with the system of representative democracy advocated by the Western Powers. These new schemes, which have no basis in logic, morality, or law, would be disturbing elements and would contribute to a further worsening of the explosive situation in the region. We therefore believe that any other formula for settling the question of the independence of Namibia promoted by the Pretoria régime and its collaborators faced with the obvious prospect of defeat in free elections would be neither logical, just, nor serious; it would be inconsistent; it would have no future, and it would be unacceptable to international public opinion.

33. In the light of all those circumstances, we consider it extremely urgent that the Western States permanent members of the Security Council which have the means to do so—and we again appeal to them—should undertake decisive action with regard to South Africa to induce that Government to accede to formulas that would ensure its co-operation with the efforts of the Secretary-General and of the Council to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

34. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia, Mr. L. K. H. Goma, M.P. I welcome him here and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

35. Mr. GOMA (Zambia): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. I also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Florin of the German Democratic Republic, for the manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

36. The problem of Namibia is one of decolonization and illegal occupation. Justice, freedom and independence have been denied the Namibian people for too long. This series of meetings of the Council would not have been necessary had it not been for the continued intransigence of the South African régime. There was much hope in Africa and elsewhere that, following the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), Namibia was at long last headed for freedom and independence.

37. The situation in Namibia has today reached a very critical stage. The United Nations, as is well known, has made many efforts with a view to finding a just and

peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. Many difficulties were encountered in the process of negotiations before and after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978). Throughout, the name of the game on the part of the South African régime has been procrastination and prevarication. At every stage the international community has been treated to South Africa's all-too-familiar and worn-out deceptive manoeuvres.

38. We are all familiar with the results of the pre-implementation meeting convened at Geneva last January under the auspices of the Secretary-General for the purpose of implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia. The Geneva meeting failed solely because of the unreasonable stance of the South African régime. And let it be remembered that the Geneva meeting was but one in a series of concessions to South Africa by the United Nations. By convening the Geneva meeting, the United Nations was bending over backwards to try to accommodate South Africa.

39. Since the failure of the Geneva meeting, we have not seen any other proposals for the peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia. As far as we are concerned, therefore, the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia remains the only valid basis for a negotiated settlement.

40. With the failure of the Geneva meeting, the existing situation in and around Namibia has become dangerously explosive. We have therefore come to the Security Council because we continue to believe in the need to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. This we do in spite of the obvious South African attempt to make us despair and abandon the negotiation process.

41. Contrary to the spirit of the negotiations and in direct contravention of numerous United Nations resolutions, South Africa has continued its efforts to impose a so-called internal settlement on the people of Namibia. It has encouraged the growth of and financed so-called political parties in Namibia whose primary interest is opposing SWAPO rather than liberating Namibia. A so-called constituent assembly of South Africa's puppet groups in Namibia has been established. The militarization of Namibia has continued and today over 100,000 South African troops are reported to be stationed in Namibia. Together with other South African instruments of oppression, they continue to commit atrocities against the Namibian people. Namibia today is besieged by a calculated South African reign of terror. Members of SWAPO are daily victims of unwarranted detention, imprisonment and torture.

42. Throughout the process of negotiations, and indeed to this day, South African acts of aggression against independent African States, with the utilization of Namibia as the launching pad, have continued unabated. The People's Republic of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and my own country, Zambia,

have been constant targets and victims of South African aggression. Many innocent lives have been lost and incalculable damage to precious property has been done in our respective countries.

43. Indeed, there has been a massive beefing up of South African military forces in Namibia and on the borders of neighbouring countries. There are thus huge and well-equipped South African military bases on our borders with Namibia. In addition, South Africa continues to train dissidents from neighbouring countries and to recruit mercenaries to work against these countries. The aim of South Africa in all these actions is the destabilization of sovereign and independent African States in southern Africa.

44. Clearly, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. It is against that background that we urgently seek the adoption of effective enforcement measures which will compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and thus defuse the explosive situation that currently exists in and around Namibia. That is the challenge before the Security Council. In the circumstances, it is incumbent upon all the permanent members of the Security Council to seek an immediate solution of the Namibian problem. That would demonstrate the necessary political will on their part, which is essential to enable the Council to discharge its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security throughout the world. In this context, the Western permanent members of the Council, which we know possess enormous influence and leverage over South Africa, should not shirk their responsibility to maintain international peace and security, now seriously threatened in southern Africa, because of South Africa's perceived economic and strategic importance to them.

45. Namibia must be liberated and *apartheid* in South Africa must be eradicated. We wish to emphasize the role of the United Nations, and in particular that of the Security Council, which must be the vehicle for bringing about peace in southern Africa on the basis of these objectives. We are for meaningful solutions to the problems of southern Africa through the United Nations. We would therefore object to any attempt under whatever pretext to remove the question of Namibia from the United Nations and seek a solution outside it. We would find no justification for any such attempt. Indeed, we would question the motives of those seeking to exclude the United Nations at a time when there is a viable plan for the liberation of Namibia on the basis of Council resolution 435 (1978). Namibia is and must remain a Territory for which the United Nations has direct responsibility until independence.

46. We do not need another plan for the independence of Namibia; there is nothing wrong with the present plan, which was the product of protracted negotiations.

What is urgently needed is the implementation of the present plan as it exists. Those who initiated this plan have not applied sufficient pressure on South Africa to ensure its co-operation.

47. The five Western Powers therefore have a particular responsibility to support the adoption of important enforcement measures against South Africa in order to achieve this objective.

48. I cannot conclude my statement without paying tribute to the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, for their steadfastness in the struggle for the liberation of their country. The people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, have tried to solve the problem of Namibia by peaceful means. South Africa, as evidenced by its actions, has repeatedly rejected this approach. As a result of this rejection there has been an escalation of hostilities in the region.

49. SWAPO has proved itself as the champion of the struggle for the liberation of Namibia. It is the custodian of the genuine interests and aspirations of the Namibian people. As such it deserves increased and concrete international solidarity and material support to enable it to wage even a more effective struggle for the liberation of Namibia.

50. Let it be clear that there can be no settlement of the Namibian problem without the participation of SWAPO.

51. The Council should now accept its full responsibilities. The entire international community is impatient for a solution to the problem of Namibia, as can be seen from the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the declarations of the OAU and the non-aligned movement. The Namibian people have been denied their inalienable rights for too long. Let freedom and national independence come to Namibia without any further delay.

52. The genuine liberation of Namibia for which the United Nations is striving should indeed be a source of pride and satisfaction to all of us who believe in the United Nations. The credibility of the Organization would indeed be greatly enhanced if we were able to find and effect a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations has accepted direct responsibility until independence.

53. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Togo, Mr. Anani Kuma Akakpo-Ahianyo. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

54. Mr. AKAKPO-AHIANYO (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in this month of April the presidency of the Security Council has fallen to you. I should like to congratulate you and to express to you my conviction that under your leadership the work of the Council is sure to be successful.

55. I should like also to congratulate your predecessor, the representative of the German Democratic Republic, on the competence with which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

56. When one thinks of the Namibian problem and the tragedy of *apartheid*, one can only be aghast at the prospect: most of the human values of this world are being shaken to their very foundations.

57. South Africa has constantly hurled defiance at the whole of humanity and arrogantly flouted all the decisions of the United Nations. It has been trampling underfoot the most elementary freedoms and daily commits acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. There are even Members of this very Organization which can find excuses for South Africa, if they do not actually support it. Some morality!

58. In this last quarter of the twentieth century we have the distinct impression that the world is no longer governed by any morality. Economic chaos has become so generalized that everyone is clinging to his privileges and does not even have time to notice that, by his side, he is trampling his neighbour underfoot. We have the impression that every nation is bent, single-mindedly, on the exclusive preservation of its own interests, even if this means trampling on others in the way. Even man's labour no longer finds its ideal. Thus in certain parts of the world the fruits of human labour, because the laws of the market are so inexorable, cannot be sold and at best are fed to pigs.

59. Transnational corporations are bent on profit, on maximizing profit. They are ready to take anyone as an ally, even someone who in the second half of the twentieth century refuses to recognize the value of man. The kingdom of *apartheid* offers the best conditions for profit in this time of economic chaos, and people will support it even if every day it sets dogs on the blacks. What does it matter? Some morality!

60. In this country, where we are in this magnificent glass palace, it would appear that 12 per cent of the population is black—and they have the right to vote, we are told. But in South Africa there are 16 million blacks, and 3 million whites who have subjected the blacks to their pitiless yoke. Africa is simply asking for the end of *apartheid* so that the 16 million blacks can have their voice heard, like the 12 per cent blacks here. But that is in vain. It would appear there are people here who are preparing to cast a veto against this demand. Some morality!

61. In Namibia the South African régime is persisting in refusing to face the facts.

62. At the end of the First World War, the League of Nations and, after the Second World War, the United Nations entrusted the administration of Territories formerly under the control of Germany to other Powers. The administering Powers were given the

mandate of conducting those Territories to self-determination. Since then most of the administering Powers have honourably discharged their mandates and the Territories formerly administered by them have become independent and occupy places in the Organization. During that time South Africa, which received the Mandate over Namibia, has persisted in refusing to comply with the commitments it undertook and is constantly showing its scorn for the international community. This defiance of the whole of mankind is a challenge that must be met unanimously, by all mankind. But no; it would appear that some hesitate to condemn the casualness with which South Africa persists in flouting the international community. Some morality!

63. All credit must be given to the administering Powers which have gradually, one after another, led to international sovereignty the countries which had been placed under their trusteeship by the Organization. My country, Togo, won its right to sit in the United Nations thanks to the struggle of the Togolese people, assisted by other peoples, but, it must be recognized, thanks also to the fact that the administering Powers respected the commitments that they had undertaken. Burundi, Cameroon, Rwanda and Tanganyika became independent in similar circumstances. That is entirely to the credit of the administering Powers of those countries. Logically, those Powers should have been in the front lines in today's struggle to prevail upon South Africa to respect, as they themselves did for their part, the commitments undertaken. But it would appear that they are hesitant and that some are even preparing to take refuge behind the convenient screen of abstention; others are preparing to cast a veto against the unanimous will of the whole of Africa and the peace-loving peoples of the world, indeed against the policy which they themselves applied to countries which were formerly under their administration. It appears that they are preparing to do this in support of *apartheid*. Some morality!

64. In the industrialized world strikes, and acts of terrorism are matters of great concern; and there is also concern for each gulag born every day. But now people are getting worried about the fact that Africans—blacks for the most part, moreover—are disturbing the clear conscience of people with problems concerning the emancipation of the blacks of Namibia and South Africa. Some morality!

65. The anti-left reflex is no longer an alibi, since the birth of Zimbabwe. Formerly the refusal to lend assistance to the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa was justified by alleging that leaders were remotely controlled by Eastern Powers—or Powers from somewhere or other—and that the accession of the black majority to power would be followed by a massacre of whites. For a year now independent Zimbabwe has been a resounding proof to the contrary. A multiracial viable society is possible in southern Africa—in Zimbabwe, in Namibia, in South Africa. Africa needs

all its children: it needs its black children and it needs its white children. Black Africa and white North Africa have always fraternized in the same spirit of solidarity throughout the centuries. Now why do we have these prejudices whereby black Africa cannot possibly apply the same fraternization with white Africa in southern Africa? Prejudices of this kind are inspired entirely by racism on the part of those people who harbour those prejudices. Some morality!

66. Today our social and moral sensitivities are becoming dangerously blunted. Those of us who still remain believers are really beginning to wonder what can be the point of reciting 1981 times a day Mary, Jesus, Holy Spirit or Allah Akbar. Formerly when one knelt in church or in a mosque it was with the pious idea of asking for divine benediction on earth and begging forgiveness. Today, when it turns out that there are Powers in the world—and by no means the smallest ones—which it would appear are preparing to cast a veto against the claim of the Namibian people who are seeking nothing more than to live in peace with all their sons and fairly and equitably to enjoy the fruit of their children, we wonder desperately what is the point of our genuflections on Sunday or Friday. Some morality!

67. In Namibia the colonizing Power of pre-1914 left a strong colony of its own nationals. Its role is particularly important, because it proclaimed its intention not only to root out for ever from its history any traces of nazism but also to contribute to scrupulous respect for the rights of man wherever those rights were being flouted.

68. In Namibia the elementary rights of the black majority are being flouted. It is to be hoped that the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic will unhesitatingly lend their support to the peoples which want to see the advent of majority rule in Namibia.

69. What is at stake in the debate which is going on is obvious to everyone because freedom is a universal value. Namibia wants to be free, independent in the integrity of its territory and to govern itself, thanks to its sons of all races and all colours—because no one chooses the colour of his skin at birth.

70. Togo, my country, a former German colony and former Mandated Territory of France and the United Kingdom, is today an independent country and is well placed to talk of the Namibian tragedy. We have the best possible relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada.

71. But the anti-left reflex is far too convenient. How can one take refuge behind a reflex whereby the unsupported must be sustained? The contrary may very well be true: when the industrialized countries invariably choose the narrow path of refusing their support to the majority which is struggling, it has no further

choice and may even have to turn to the devil himself. Is that the end which people have in view?

72. But history is there to teach us. Do the industrialized countries really want the sincere friendship of Africa—the whole of Africa, the Africa of today and the Africa of tomorrow? Or do they really prefer to ally themselves with retrogressive forces that have no future?

73. For its vast wealth, Africa needs the technology of the industrialized countries. But if the industrialized countries today prefer to a whole future certain gold ingots sullied by *apartheid*, they will have chosen the easy way out, the line of least resistance. They will have ensured the material interests of certain transnational corporations that know they are condemned by history, and they will have missed the train of mutually advantageous international co-operation, which Africa is offering the industrialized countries. But the industrialized countries should know that they will have trampled underfoot their own morality by wishing to consume everything today without thinking of what will be left tomorrow.

74. Yesterday, for Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe was represented as a bogey man who would throw out all the whites once he came to power. People sat on the fence and shilly-shallied; they supported the Ian Smiths, the Muzorewas, the Sitholé-Muzorewas and many other puppets. But when the forces of democracy were allowed free rein, the nationalist tidal wave was overwhelming, and there was a striking manifestation above all of this capacity of Africa to show others that the racism to which they had resorted was not one of the fundamental values of Africa.

75. Today, when Zimbabwe should serve as an example to those very people who try to sow fear and terror, allegations are once again being unearthed that the white minorities should feel panic about SWAPO—as if Africa has not sufficiently demonstrated that, if it is fighting racism and *apartheid*, it is not doing so in order to install those scourges within an independent Namibia tomorrow.

76. SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, is struggling for majority rule and for the equality of all the sons of Namibia, whether they be black, white, mixed or other. It is struggling for peace in the region. It sufficiently demonstrated that by accepting the Western plan [S/12636] even when the whole world knows that the plan was an inadequate one. At the time Africa showed its maturity by exerting pressure on SWAPO to accept that plan and resolution 435 (1978), which flowed from it. At the time, Africa and peace-loving peoples thought that the Western countries in their turn would be in a position to exert similar pressure on their own nursling, South Africa. Alas, how wrong they were. It would appear that in those countries account must be taken of public opinion! In reality, however, everyone is enslaved to

something there. Who has actually seen this so-called public opinion? The power of the mass media is such that the press manufactures what it wants and imposes it on the consumer, thus depriving everyone, including those who rule, of any room for manoeuvre. That is the so-called free world. Some world and some morality!

77. The countries members of the contact group are today facing a choice. They must choose either the sincere, lasting friendship of Africa today and tomorrow or sitting on the fence and in actual practice allowing the *apartheid* régime to find other opportunities for its diabolical manoeuvres.

78. On the one hand, there is the friendship of Africa; on the other, there is Pretoria and *apartheid*. That is the choice that Africa is awaiting very calmly, just as it is awaiting the advent—and it will come, without a doubt—of an independent, sovereign Namibia.

79. In any case, the Security Council must guarantee all the responsibilities that properly belong to it and take the decisions that are necessary to meet the constant challenge to mankind posed by the racist system of *apartheid*. It will thus be demonstrating that humanity should not despair of living in union, peace and solidarity, to use an expression so dear to the President of the Togolese Republic, General Gnassingbé Eyadéma.

80. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for External Affairs of India, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao. I welcome him here, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

81. Mr. RAO (India): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and your colleagues for giving me the opportunity to address the Security Council on the critical situation in Namibia. It gives me great pleasure to see you presiding over these important meetings of the Security Council. India has cordial relations with Ireland, and I recall that we have co-operated constructively both in the United Nations and otherwise. I have no doubt that under your wise guidance the Council will be able to take positive action.

82. I have come to New York directly from Algiers, where the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries met in an extraordinary session at the level of Ministers for Foreign Affairs to undertake an evaluation of the situation in Namibia. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs, after having considered the different aspects of the problem, came to the unanimous conclusion that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa since 1966 in violation of numerous resolutions of the United Nations, combined with South Africa's brutal oppression of the people of Namibia and its acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent African countries, constitutes a threat to international peace and security. We decided that charged, as it is, with the responsibility of maintaining peace and security in the world, the Security

Council should be made aware of the gravity of the situation and that we should ask the Council to take appropriate measures to remove the threat to peace [S/14458, annex, para. 22 (f)].

83. The Secretary-General's report of 19 January 1981 [S/14333] is before the Council. It gives an accurate account of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva which marked the unhappy culmination of a sincere effort by the international community to bring about a negotiated settlement to the question of Namibia. The negotiations that followed the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978) clearly demonstrated that South Africa was all along engaged in an exercise of persistent procrastination aimed primarily at perpetuating its illegal occupation of a Territory for which the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility. The talks held at Geneva in January were designed to set a date for the commencement of the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, but South Africa virtually rejected the plan by informing the meeting that implementation of the plan was premature. The responsibility for the failure of the plan must fall squarely on South Africa, because the only other party to the conflict, namely SWAPO, has expressed its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement without any conditions. The deplorable drama that South Africa staged at Geneva, parading puppet groups and hurling charges of partiality at the United Nations, was obviously aimed at perpetuating the colonial structure either by maintaining the *status quo* or by imposing an internal settlement in flagrant violation of Council resolution 439 (1978).

84. Thus, after two years of patient negotiations conducted by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative and several years of restraint on the part of the international community, we have the sad spectacle of the United Nations plan lying virtually abandoned or, worse, deliberately sabotaged. The destiny of an entire people is in danger because of cynical defiance by a régime which stands universally condemned for its brutality towards its own people. The process of decolonization to which the United Nations is committed has been halted just when it was to be completed.

85. We had no illusions about the chances of success of the United Nations plan. History has taught us that colonialist forces do not abandon their empires of their own accord. Freedom is not handed over on a platter. It was the intensity of the freedom struggle waged by the Namibian people, under their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, that forces South Africa to accept the United Nations plan, albeit only for tactical reasons, as has become very evident now. It is only the constant prospect of the intensification of the struggle and the increased pressure of the international community that can lead to the implementation of the plan. The struggle has continued unabated, but South Africa is counting on its powerful patrons to stop the avalanche of world opinion from forcing the United

Nations to use the weapons available to it under the Charter to enforce its will. By a sad irony, South Africa is expecting that some Members of the United Nations will themselves co-operate in frustrating the efforts of the United Nations. Had it been made clear from the beginning that failure to implement the plan would invite the wrath of the Security Council, South Africa might not have treated the United Nations with such disdain and contempt.

86. The time has now come for a new response to the challenge the attitude of South Africa poses to the Security Council itself. The Council that approved a plan of action barely two years ago and patiently negotiated for its implementation cannot abandon it now as unworthy and impractical. The very fact that the plan gained universal acceptance over a period of time is sufficient testimony to its continuing validity. The signing of a cease-fire agreement, the establishment of a demilitarized zone, the deployment of UNTAG, the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations and the rejection of any internal settlement are the cardinal elements of the plan. Those elements should not be modified or diluted. The first step the Security Council should take, following the failure of the Geneva talks, is a reaffirmation of the plan accompanied by a determined effort to force South Africa to implement it.

87. The Council needs no advice on the concrete measures it can take to force South Africa to comply with its resolutions. Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations contains provisions which are to be applied by the Security Council in situations where a Member nation refuses to give effect to Council decisions and thereby causes a threat to the peace and a breach of the peace. Since there is no doubt that the acts of genocide perpetrated by South Africa in Namibia and the acts of aggression committed by it against the neighbouring African States do attract the provisions of Chapter VII, the non-aligned countries have unanimously called upon the Security Council to impose urgently comprehensive mandatory sanctions, including an oil embargo, against South Africa. Such calls have indeed been made earlier by the non-aligned movement, but so far the Council, particularly some of its permanent members, has preferred to stay its hand so as to give the negotiations a chance of success. Now that those efforts have failed, it is incumbent upon the Council to consider the invocation of the provisions of Chapter VII, which I have just mentioned. It is the credibility of the United Nations itself which is at stake here. If the Security Council fails to act now with determination, the strength of the United Nations to play a crucial role in other crises will be considerably weakened. Let not the future generations judge us wrong for having failed to give sustenance to the peace-keeping ability of the United Nations. Let us not be accused of having succumbed to the pressures of selfish economic and strategic considerations. Let it not be said that a racist minority régime held the entire international community to

ransom. Let us rise to the challenge and do justice to the people of Namibia, who look up to the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, for support.

88. We are aware that the imposition of sanctions against South Africa is likely to create serious difficulties for the geographically disadvantaged nations in Africa, whose economies are inextricably entangled with the South African economy. But their temporary difficulties, for the alleviation of which methods have to be found by the international community, cannot be used as a pretext to encourage a racist régime to persist in its defiance of the United Nations. Independent African countries in southern Africa have expressed their willingness to make sacrifices, however great, for their brethren in Namibia. There is no price too great to pay for the emancipation of the majority community in Namibia and the liberation of the African continent.

89. The struggle of the Namibian people for their birthright and the efforts of the United Nations to complete the process of decolonization must reinforce each other. I do not see how the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa can be avoided unless the Security Council succeeds in securing South Africa's compliance with the United Nations plan within a time-frame accepted by all parties and guaranteed by the permanent members of the Security Council. If South Africa seeks to subvert either the United Nations plan or the approved time-frame, the Council should be willing to impose mandatory sanctions without waiting for a fresh call from the rest of the world. We remain convinced that the time has come for the Council to act decisively in support of the people of Namibia and to strengthen the United Nations, in whose continued existence lie the hopes for the very survival of mankind.

90. In conclusion, it is imperative at this juncture for the Council to take resolute action, as follows: first, to declare that South Africa, by its continuing violation of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries has committed a breach of the peace and threatened international peace and security; secondly, to call for an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the withdrawal of its forces from the territory of Namibia; thirdly, to demand the cessation by South Africa of all acts of genocide against the people of Namibia and of aggression against the front-line States; fourthly, to reaffirm the continuing validity of the United Nations plan contained in Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) for achieving the independence of Namibia and to set up a time-frame for implementation of the plan; and fifthly, to decide to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa with a view to securing the implementation of the plan.

91. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zaire. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

92. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you for this opportunity to participate in the present debate of the Security Council on Namibia.

93. I should like also to convey to you my warm congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the month of April. Your well-known abilities as a negotiator, coupled with the commitment of the country you represent to the principles of law and democracy, to the right of peoples to self-determination and the preservation of their own identity, as well as your special responsiveness to questions of decolonization, are for us a guarantee of success for these important Council deliberations on Namibia.

94. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Florin, representative of the German Democratic Republic, for the quality of the work he did as President of the Council.

95. More than 60 years ago, Hitler and the Nazis, inspired by the ideas of Gobineau on the superiority of the Germanic race, ideas found in his *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, by those of Chamberlain in his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, by the notion of the super-man as developed by Nietzsche, and by an old tradition of anti-semitism reinforced by *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, by the apology for war, violence and the cult of force of Arndt—in short, by all the ideas of Fichte and Hegel on the authoritarian, not to say totalitarian, State; and inspired also by the passionate nature of the man in question—a result of his temperament—were putting the finishing touches on German national socialism, which was aimed at preserving and defending the superior race: that of the tall blond Aryans of the North, we were told.

96. National socialism was to be typified by an obsession with racism and the cult of force and violence. That absurd Nazi doctrine engulfed all of Europe—for Hitler tried to impose his law from the Atlantic to the Urals—as well as other parts of the world.

97. Then we witnessed a formidable coalition, an extraordinary alliance of Powers aimed at halting the Nazi adventure and at preserving the world from such pernicious notions of man, the State, relations among peoples, and the races and their rights.

98. African soldiers joined the forces of the Allied Powers to oppose the excesses of the Nazi racists and, during the Second World War, as they had done during the First, they died side by side with their European brothers in arms, in defence of peace and international security, human rights and the rights of peoples, in defence of their cultural identity, and of the territorial integrity of States, to say “no” to the dream of domination, to the Nazi desire for power and domination based on racism and exploitation—in short, so that all

the rights of the peoples of Europe might be restored to them.

99. What other system of government today comes closer than South Africa's *apartheid* system to nazism which, in its time, mobilized the whole of the international community in a wave of universal condemnation?

100. But the impression tends to prevail today that all of us who participated in the destruction of Hitler's dream of domination, based in particular on race, seem no longer to agree when it is a matter of restoring to the African people of Namibia its rights to self-determination, freedom, equality and independence; that our co-operation stops at the threshold of Namibian independence, although as late as 1966 we were unanimous in affirming that South Africa had failed in its obligations with regard to the administration of the Territory and had not ensured the moral and material well-being of the people of Namibia [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI)*].

101. I should like the members of the Council—especially the permanent members—in the name of co-operation among nations and of international peace and security to wipe away that impression by the most appropriate means, means commensurate with the political stakes, for the African continent is very sensitive on the matter of southern Africa and the independence of Namibia.

102. Everyone knows that, when defeated, Germany was subjected to the law of the victors, and was stripped of the colonial possessions which it had held since the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, including Namibia, the then Territory of South West Africa.

103. To punish the supporters of nazism and German national socialism, and aware, I think, of the dangers and wrongs which could be brought about by the transfer of those ideologies to the colonies, the victors decided in the name of peace, international security and civilization that Namibia would be taken from Nazi Germany and placed under the authority of the League of Nations.

104. There was undoubtedly an indication, if not an awareness, that fanatics of racism, violence and the cult of force were incapable of carrying out a mission of civilization in the colonies and in Africa.

105. On 17 December 1920, the League of Nations entrusted to His Britannic Majesty the Mandate over Namibia, to be carried out on his behalf by the Government of South Africa.

106. In terms of the basic documents of the League of Nations, especially of Article 22 of the Covenant, the essence of the Mandates System flowed from the idea of a sacred mission, dedicated and exclusively devoted to a specific end: the well-being of peoples which had

not yet reached the level of autonomous government or acceded to independence.

107. In the case of Namibia, that mission implied that all political power was in the final analysis to be exercised for the benefit of the people of Namibia. And this is where South Africa's failure is to be noted, for just after the First World War, it indulged in a savage exploitation of Namibia and a systematic despoilation of its resources to the detriment of the indigenous population. As early as 1923, that situation gave rise to the outbreak of a spontaneous revolt by the Nama and the Herero tribes, but it was suppressed in a blood-bath by South African troops.

108. Worse still, South Africa went about annexing the Mandated Territory, making Namibia into its fifth province and exploiting the Territory for its exclusive profit after the demise of the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations in 1946, to which it reported on the administration of the Territory. Everyone knows that, in its resolution 65 (I) of 14 December 1946, the General Assembly, by 37 votes to none, with nine abstentions, refused to permit the annexation of Namibia by South Africa as a fifth province, and called for the Territory to be placed under the International Trusteeship System, inviting South Africa to propose a trusteeship agreement for Namibia.

109. South Africa, as could be expected, refused, and maintained the *status quo*. On 11 July 1949, South Africa informed the United Nations that it was no longer in a position to submit reports on the administration of the Territory in the interest of effective administration and that, thenceforth, the Territory of Namibia would be represented in the South African Parliament.¹⁰

110. By its South West Africa Affairs Amendment Act of 1949, South Africa, in defiance of the international community and in contempt of the United Nations, unilaterally altered the international status of Namibia to incorporate it purely and simply as a fifth province.

111. Convinced that the administration of the Mandated Territory by South Africa had been carried out in a manner contrary to the Mandate, to the Charter of the United Nations and to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and prompted by successive advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), affirmed its right to revert to itself the administration of the Mandated Territory, and reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of South West Africa to freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter, with resolution 1514 (XV) and with other relevant resolutions of the Assembly on South West Africa. That important resolution of 27 October 1966 established in no uncertain terms the responsibilities of the United Nations towards Namibia.

112. In its resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, the General Assembly created the United Nations Council for South West Africa/Namibia, which, as everyone knows, was charged with the task of administering Namibia until its independence, with the widest possible participation of the people of the Territory, and of transferring all powers to the Namibian people after the proclamation of independence. That resolution stated that South Africa no longer had any right to administer the Territory and set June 1968 as the deadline for Namibia's accession to independence.

113. Despite these positions which have been repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed by the United Nations and the international community, South Africa, as we have seen, has proceeded to extend and apply to Namibia its policy of *apartheid* and bantustanization, as well as its racist laws and racist judicial procedures. It has been carrying out arbitrary arrests and convictions, as well as summary executions of Namibians, and continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia, contemptuous of Security Council resolution 264 (1969), which enjoined it to withdraw its administration from the Territory immediately. It has also been systematically defying Council decisions in an obvious bid to undermine United Nations authority.

114. Thus 1968 ended without the wish of the General Assembly being fulfilled, and without independence for Namibia. And here we are again today, in April 1981, discussing this item in the Security Council.

115. Understandably exasperated, the United Nations, through the Security Council, by its resolution 283 (1970), embarked upon the course of sanctions—selective, of course—in the face of the serious concern over the flagrant and persistent refusal of South Africa to abide by the decisions of the Security Council.

116. South Africa replied by stepping up its repression of the Namibian people and by persistently violating human rights; by efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and by the aggressive strengthening of its military machine in the Territory, which it has since used as a base for attacks against neighbouring independent African countries.

117. Thus, as everyone knows, by resolution 385 (1976), the Council took a series of measures to condemn the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa—condemning South Africa's illegal and arbitrary application of racially discriminatory and repressive laws and practices in Namibia, condemning the South African military buildup in Namibia and any use of the Territory as a base for attacks against neighbouring countries. That resolution called upon South Africa to put an immediate end to its policy of bantustans and so-called homelands, the purpose of which is to violate Namibia's national unity and territorial integrity. It also

condemned South Africa's attempts to evade the clear demand of the United Nations for the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision and control in Namibia. It further declared that, in determining the date, time-table and modalities for the elections in accordance with paragraph 7 of that resolution, there should be adequate time, to be decided upon by the Security Council, for the purpose of enabling the United Nations to establish the necessary machinery within Namibia to supervise and control such elections, as well as to enable the people of Namibia to organize politically for the purpose of such elections. Furthermore, that resolution fixed the deadline of 31 August 1976 for the purpose of considering the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter of the United Nations in the event of non-compliance by South Africa.

118. It was only on 27 July 1978 that the Council, by its resolution 431 (1978), took note of the proposed settlement of the situation in Namibia, contained in document S/12636, and requested the Secretary-General to submit at the earliest date possible a report containing his recommendations for the implementation of the proposed settlement.

119. Yet South Africa, despite the terms of resolution 435 (1978), would once again take unilateral measures in connexion with the electoral process—particularly the unilateral drawing-up of electoral rolls—in order to ensure the illegal transfer of powers, in violation of relevant resolutions of the Council, thus safeguarding its interests in Namibia, in defiance of the legitimate aspirations of the people concerned.

120. Thus, by its resolution 439 (1978), the Council declared that the elections organized by South Africa, and their results, were null and void and that there would be no recognition by the United Nations, or any Member State, of any representative or organ established by that process, and called upon South Africa immediately to cancel the elections it had proposed to hold in Namibia in December 1978.

121. All that is very well known. I should like to stress here the particular responsibility of the United Nations—especially that of the Security Council—to lead Namibia to independence and to seek all possible means to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978)—and to perform that task in spite of South Africa's persistent defiance.

122. We are convinced that even within the United Nations framework it is possible—indeed desirable—to find original formulas that would allow all parties concerned to try once again to come to agreement on universally recognized principles likely, once accepted by all, to guarantee the independence of Namibia—if, indeed, we are all really committed to the emergence of a democratic society in Namibia, to the principle of multiracialism, to the rights of the African majority and to protection of the rights and interests of the minority, and of all minorities, in Namibia.

123. The crucial question to which the Council has to find an appropriate response is: what must be done and how should it be done to induce South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of its resolutions and those of the General Assembly on Namibia? And here the question arises as to what effective pressure is to be exerted on the Pretoria régime to prevail upon it to co-operate in the implementation of the plan for the settlement of the Namibian question adopted by the United Nations.

124. We believe that we should neglect no initiative that can exert pressure. The international community, through the United Nations system, governmental and non-governmental organizations, young people, journalists, athletes, trade unions, the world of science and the arts, must all be constantly mobilized in order increasingly to isolate the Pretoria régime as long as it continues to pursue its criminal policy of *apartheid* in defiance of relevant United Nations resolutions.

125. I might well stress here the exceptional role of permanent members of the Security Council—particularly the members of the contact group—in exerting pressure on South Africa to induce it to abide by United Nations decisions.

126. It would undoubtedly disturb the future of relations of co-operation based on confidence and mutual respect, if the permanent members of the Security Council, in particular our friends the members of the contact group, were to fall short of the actions we are entitled to expect of them in order to bring about Namibia's speedy accession to independence and the restoration of a climate of peace and stability in southern Africa.

127. In order to depart from the beaten path the Security Council must find the most appropriate form of pressure or effective sanctions against South Africa. In this context, and mindful of the effects of the selective sanctions adopted in the past against South Africa, it becomes clear that consideration of recourse to the comprehensive economic sanctions and other measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter is in keeping with the scope of South Africa's systematic opposition to any suggestion of co-operation with the United Nations and to any notion of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem, and with the resultant profound concern in the world at large and in Africa in particular.

128. Today we must all realize that the persistent illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa in violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter, the denial of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence within a united Namibia and the maintenance of the southern part of the African continent in a state of insecurity and constant instability constitute a grave threat to peace and international security in that part of the world. In our view, South Africa alone must

assume the entire burden of responsibility for this climate of constant turbulence and instability, which could give rise to an explosion at any moment.

129. The failure of the Geneva meeting on the pre-implementation of the United Nations plan contained in Council resolution 435 (1978) is further proof of the determination of the racist Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, thus defying the international community, and at the same time adds a new dimension to the possible aggravation of the situation in southern Africa.

130. This series of meetings of the Council, which is being held at a particularly critical time in the history of international relations based on trust and within a context marked by uncertainty and the stepping up of mistrust in international relations and the deliberate maintenance of a climate of confrontation, is absolutely crucial for the prestige of the United Nations and the Council in particular.

131. For us the Namibian question is and must remain essentially a question of decolonization. All parties should therefore refrain from approaching it in such a way as to distort its true meaning and thus contribute to delaying the independence of the Territory.

132. I think that we are all in favour of the emergence of a democratic society under the leadership of the majority, a society mindful of human rights and founded on respect for law and the protection of the rights and interests of all its citizens without distinction as to race, religion, philosophy or political opinion. We are convinced that, by leaving it to the people of Namibia themselves to decide freely on their future by means of free elections under the control of the United Nations, that people would prove to the world, as others have proved in the recent past in that region, their full degree of political maturity and ability to manage their affairs—in a word, everything of which a people is capable when it works in freedom.

133. On that basis the Security Council should be able to bring together all the conditions likely to reopen negotiations on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), while maintaining an attitude of firmness and not acquiescence with regard to South Africa. In our view, the Council has no other choice if it wants to see peace in the southern part of the black continent.

134. In solidarity with all the just causes of liberation, the Republic of Zaire wishes to reaffirm its total support for SWAPO, the authentic and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, and for the legitimacy of the struggle being waged by the valiant people of Namibia for their independence and respect for their territorial integrity.

135. While the Republic of Zaire condemns the persistent refusal of South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the imple-

mentation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and South Africa's constant defiance of the international community, it also cannot tolerate the repeated acts of aggression of South Africa against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States in the region at a time which is so critical and delicate in international relations. Such behaviour, which is irresponsible in more than one aspect, would seem to indicate the casualness with which that régime can lend itself to a chain of events which may lead the world to war.

136. I cannot end my statement without paying a particular tribute to the Secretary-General for his remarkable contribution to the efforts of the international community and the United Nations to bring the people of Namibia to independence. I am convinced that the international community will properly appreciate this invaluable contribution.

137. I should like, on behalf of peace and the indispensable co-operation of nations, to express the hope that the Security Council will give the most appropriate response to the expectations of millions of Africans whose eyes are turned towards it for the restoration of a climate of calm, security and stability in southern Africa, for an acceleration of the process of bringing Namibia to independence and, above all, for maintaining intact the prestige of this important organ of the United Nations entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security.

138. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker for this meeting is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, Mr. Witness Mangwende, M.P. I welcome him here and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

139. Mr. MANGWENDE (Zimbabwe): Mr. President, on behalf of the OAU, which I currently have the honour to serve as Chairman of its Council of Ministers, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the high office of the presidency of the Council. I have no doubt that your sagacity, experience and diplomatic skill, which have already been amply demonstrated, will give positive and constructive guidance to our deliberations on the question of Namibia.

140. The United Nations has now been preoccupied with the question of Namibia for 35 years. The question is a simple one of genuine self-determination and independence for the Territory, which has the misfortune of being under the illegal military occupation of South Africa in defiance of the international community. It is against that background that what was regarded as the dawn of a new era for the people of Namibia was proclaimed to us by the contact group of Western States, which, also with a great deal of fanfare, informed the international community that it had negotiated a settlement of the Namibian situation with South Africa to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their

right to genuine self-determination and independence in a free and fair election under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

141. On the basis of the Western proposal [S/12636], the international community, through the Security Council, proceeded to adopt resolution 435 (1978), which established the United Nations plan to bring Namibia to genuine self-determination and independence within a period of 12 months. Thereafter the OAU as well as SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, endorsed the United Nations plan and requested the Secretary-General to proceed expeditiously to implement that plan.

142. Soon after the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), it became apparent, through exchanges of correspondence with the Secretary-General, that South Africa was, to say the least, not prepared to proceed to the implementation of the United Nations plan. Accordingly, the Council adopted resolution 439 (1978), by paragraphs 5 and 6 of which it demanded that South Africa co-operate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978) and warned South Africa that its failure to do so would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions.

143. In the course of these developments, the OAU was made to believe that the five Western Powers were in a position to use their political and economic leverage with South Africa to ensure the full co-operation of South Africa in the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978).

144. What can we now say of this confidence reposed in the Western group? We at the OAU are greatly disappointed at the apparent unwillingness and half-hearted effort of the contact group of Western States to exert concerted pressure on the Pretoria régime to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

145. Following the adoption of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), South Africa began to stall and prevaricate, but continued to give the impression that it was ever ready to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). However, it soon became obvious that South Africa had its own plans for Namibia, which were completely contrary to the spirit and letter of that resolution. It demonstrated its bad faith by using the intervening period after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) to consolidate its occupation of the Territory and establish a puppet régime in the Territory, to which it devolved administrative and legislative authority

and committed itself to granting a fake independence by way of an internal settlement à la Muzorewa. Despite these ominous developments, the five Western Powers continued to assure us of the good faith of South Africa and urged the need for continued negotiation on a settlement.

146. To cut a long story short, since the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), the international community has been engaged in three years of futile negotiations with South Africa regarding the question of Namibia. The limit of African endurance and the patience of the Namibian people was reached at the Geneva meeting held in January to consider the modalities for the implementation of the United Nations plan. At that meeting, South Africa refused to agree to a cease-fire date and to a date for the emplacement of UNTAG in Namibia to ensure independence for the Territory in 1981, as had already been decided upon by the Security Council.

147. The OAU holds South Africa fully responsible for the failure of the Geneva meeting to reach agreement on the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978). By its refusal at the Geneva meeting to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa, of its own accord, placed itself within the ambit of paragraph 6 of Council resolution 439 (1978). Accordingly, the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the OAU Council of Ministers, meeting at Addis Ababa from 23 February to 1 March, among other things endorsed the call of the New Delhi Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries for the convening of the Security Council to meet to consider the situation in Namibia with a view to adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, including an oil embargo, against racist South Africa in order to ensure the implementation of the United Nations decisions and resolutions on Namibia [S/14390, annex, para. 10]. On behalf of the OAU, I should like to urge you, Mr. President, as well as all member States of the Security Council, to give serious consideration to the request of the Council of Ministers to which I have just referred, with a view to reaching a speedy solution to the Namibian question.

148. We are most concerned that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa in defiance of United Nations resolutions is posing a very serious threat to international peace and security. Nobody but the most complacent observer can fail to see that the use of Namibia by *apartheid* South Africa to destabilize the southern African region seriously threatens world peace and security. This Council cannot afford to be indifferent to such a situation. Also, the Council cannot afford to prevaricate on an issue of principle and, indeed, on the subject of enforcing its own resolutions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/36/116 and Corr.1, annex.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, 9th meeting, para. 71.*

³ *Ibid.*, 4th meeting, paras. 25-27.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 33rd meeting, paras. 175 and 176.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 17th meeting, para. 182.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 27th meeting, para. 177.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 9th meeting, para. 176.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 4th meeting, paras. 245 and 246.

⁹ A/CONF.107/1

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the Fourth Session of the General Assembly, Annex to the Fourth Committee, document A/929.*