

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2270th MEETING: 23 APRIL 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2270)	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.

2270th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 23 April 1981, at 11 a.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/2270)

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 11.45 a.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 to 2269th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Romania, 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. Jorge (Angola), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Morden (Canada), Mr. Malniuerca (Cuba), Mr. Gedle-Giorgis (Ethiopia), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Coumbassa (Guinea), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumamutmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kasina (Kenya), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Baba (Nigeria), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Sen-

egal), Mr. Conteh (Sierra Leone), Mr. Fourie (South Africa), Mr. Hameed (Sri Lanka), Mr. Akapo-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 Brazil, 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 him to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil) 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 taken also at the 2267th meeting, I invite Mr. Peter Muesihange to take a place at the Council table.

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

5. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the Minister of State for External Affairs of Nigeria, Mr. Ali Baba. I welcome him here and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. BABA (Nigeria): I wish first of all to offer you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation, warmest congratulations on your assumption of the most important office of President of the Security Council for this month. You are the representative of a nation with which my

country has always had excellent relations, and I therefore feel encouraged to hope that your presidency will augur well for the cause of justice, self-determination and national independence for Namibians. Faithful to its instincts and history, Ireland has always been a foe of racial oppression and a friend of Africa's emancipation. It is therefore most befitting that this historic series of meetings of the Council is being held under your able chairmanship.

7. I also wish to seize this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General for his important report contained in document S/14333. That report faithfully reflected the circumstances surrounding, and the reasons for, the collapse of the pre-implementation talks, which were held at Geneva last January. Considering the slanderous attacks on his person and high office by the authorities of South Africa, who bear full responsibility for the failure of the Geneva talks, one cannot commend him too highly for the remarkable clarity, objectivity and impartiality of his report.

8. On 27 October 1966, the United Nations General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. In so doing, the General Assembly declared that South Africa had woefully failed to ensure the moral and material well-being of the indigenous people of Namibia and that it had thereby disavowed its sacred trust for the Territory. That historic decision, that *de jure* termination of South Africa's Mandate, led the General Assembly in 1967 to establish the United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole legal administering authority in Namibia [resolution 2248 (S-V)]. That body, currently under the indefatigable leadership of Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia, was to assist Namibia and prepare it for eventual independence.

9. On 21 June 1971, the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, declared the continuing occupation of Namibia by South Africa illegal. The verdict of that Court in paragraph 133 of its advisory opinion was:

"that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory."

10. The General Assembly and indeed the Security Council for their part have also adopted a number of resolutions and decisions reaffirming the special responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and calling upon South Africa to vacate its illegal occupation of the Territory. These resolutions and decisions culminated in Council resolution 385 (1976), on which the plan of the contact group of Western States [S/2636] was based, thus paving the way for the unanimous adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), which has been universally accepted as providing a just and

equitable basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

11. The pre-implementation talks last January at Geneva, convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations after extensive and exhaustive consultations with all concerned, including particularly South Africa, failed solely because the leader of the South African delegation averred that it was "premature" to put into effect a settlement proposal which his own Government and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as well as the contact group and the front-line States had accepted three years earlier. What were the essential elements of that plan? They were: the signing of a cease-fire agreement; the establishment of a demilitarized zone; the deployment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG); the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations; and the rejection of any internal settlement.

12. That South Africa could say after 15 years of openly defying the United Nations, of illegally occupying the Territory, of promoting wanton violence and murder against the innocent civilian population of Namibia, of pressing young Namibians over 14 years of age into conscription in the so-called territorial militia with a view to pitting Namibian brother against Namibian brother, of exporting death and destruction to the neighbouring countries, that the time had not come to end the violence and suffering in Namibia or for it to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council concerning Namibia was not only callous and irresponsible but also a brazen challenge to the authority and credibility of the United Nations as a world body devoted to peace and human rights. Up till then the United Nations had been locked in a vicious circle of unending negotiations with the racist régime of South Africa, which deliberately created one obstacle after another to frustrate the implementation of the independence plan for Namibia. What happened at Geneva was therefore quite consistent with South Africa's international behaviour of deceit and duplicity. Surprising, however, was the way it treated its own Western friends at Geneva with so much levity and inconsideration.

13. Nigeria accepted the Western plan only out of pragmatic necessity. We had thought that the five Western Powers themselves were committed to it. We had hoped that it would bring an end to the unspeakable hardship to which Namibians were being savagely and systematically subjected by their racist oppressors. Since Geneva, the racist régime of South Africa has surpassed itself by indulging in its notorious record of broken promises, breaches of faith and perfidy, by concocting charges that the United Nations was not impartial—as if the United Nations were an abstraction devoid of its membership, which includes South Africa's Western friends that support resolution 435 (1978).

14. South Africa has also been saying that more time would be needed before the implementation of a plan now three years behind schedule could commence. The arrogance displayed by the South African delegation at Geneva and the provocative insults to which SWAPO and the African delegations to the meeting were subjected have been matched only by the frankly unedifying statement of the South African representative before the Council yesterday [2268th meeting]. That the spokesman of a Government which denies the overwhelming majority of its own people political and civil rights could speak so glibly of protecting and guaranteeing "the rights of minority groups", that the spokesman of a country which is about to go to the polls for so-called general elections in which every principle of democracy, including majority rule, civil liberty and universal adult suffrage, is being nakedly violated could so lightly call for respect of "fundamental principles of democracy in Namibia" is not only a cruel irony but also a towering mockery of the very principles of the United Nations and common decency. We totally reject Mr. Fourie's fallacious presumptions and pretensions to speak for the oppressed people of Namibia.

15. After South Africa's most shameless behaviour at Geneva, which could not but seriously embarrass its Western friends, one naturally expected that the contact group of Western States would take a new positive initiative to put back on track the United Nations independence plan, which, in reality, was their own original plan. Unfortunately, we are confronted by insinuations and pronouncements that the United Nations plan requires some modification or revision. That these calls and suggestions for the modification of the plan should be coming from quarters which benefit from the obscene exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia must be suspect and, at best, self-serving. What is wrong with the plan?

16. Let me make one point clear: Nigeria will not accept, under any pretext whatsoever, any attempt or manoeuvre to seek a solution of the Namibian question outside the framework of the United Nations. In our view—and this, I believe, is the view of the overwhelming majority of the international community—Namibia is and must remain a Territory over which the United Nations alone has primary responsibility until independence. Resolution 435 (1978) remains valid in all its aspects. We see no reason to change or modify it. The contact group of Western States owes an obligation to itself and to the international community that has shown that group so much patience and forbearance to ensure that the aforesaid resolution is implemented without further delay. South Africa earlier accepted it. It must abide by its word. SWAPO, which is the only other party to the conflict, in a responsible and statesmanlike gesture has accepted it. I am confident that SWAPO will keep its word to sign a cease-fire agreement and to give an appropriate undertaking to respect political and human rights long

denied to Namibians, leading to the implementation of the plan without any pre-condition.

17. This series of meetings of the Council is of special importance for the future of the United Nations. The message which more than 22 Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States Members of the United Nations have brought to this meeting should not be underestimated. For when the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, comprising more than two thirds of the membership of the United Nations, met at Algiers last week, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and their colleagues fully and in a most responsible manner assessed the consequences and implications for world peace and security of the policies of South Africa in Namibia and in the southern region of Africa in general. They noted that South Africa's war-planes were engaged in their fiendish pursuit of genocidal missions, bringing death and desolation to the defenceless civilians in the neighbouring African States of Angola, Botswana and Mozambique. They noted that the racist illegal forces of occupation inside Namibia itself were stepping up their campaigns of murder and repression in search-and-destroy operations. Visitors to the operational area report that there is hardly any family that has not suffered deaths or disappearances. That evidence, if taken literally, would set the number of civilian deaths from killings, mistreatment or detention at probably 20,000 to 50,000. Unless this campaign of genocide is terminated forthwith, the consequences for the future of Namibia and for international peace and security will be very grave.

18. Leaders of SWAPO are being unceremoniously rounded up and incarcerated without any due process. Their supporters have been made targets of indiscriminate harassment, intimidation and brutality; and in recent times Namibian youths have been conscripted into the ethnic armies which South Africa continues to nurture and through which it hopes to subvert the sovereignty of a future Namibian Government.

19. Need we wait until we see South Africa complete its genocidal campaign in Namibia? Need we wait until South Africa, through its indiscriminate bombings, reduces the neighbouring African States to rubble reminiscent of Nazi decimations during the Second World War before we determine that South Africa's acts of aggression abroad and its atrocities within Namibia now constitute a serious threat to international peace and security? Should the Security Council, mankind's last hope for the maintenance and preservation of international peace and security, remain powerless while South Africa continues to flout with unseemly impunity the Council's authority and, by implication, the general will of the international community?

20. Even to get the Council convened to consider the persistent degrading snub to which the entire international community has been subjected has not been

easy. South Africa's Western backers contend, for reasons other than those of accepted norms of morality and justice, that consideration of the Namibian question at this time would not bring the Territory nearer to independence. A racist Government whose main stock-in-trade is the promotion of State terrorism, a Government which, in defiance of the United Nations, continues to occupy Namibia illegally and even uses the Territory as a springboard for launching criminal incursions into contiguous States in flagrant violation of the Charter, is now being paraded as a sacred cow that should not be touched. We were told to exercise restraint, but no such counsel was made available to the racists, whose persistent atrocities were not even mentioned, let alone condemned. The Namibian cause, the latest phase in the long struggle for the total liberation of our continent, transcends any other preoccupation before us.

21. We have said several times before in this forum, and we repeat today, that it is pointless to contemplate any constructive dialogue with a régime that revels in terrorism and naked force and breeds on human suffering and pain. Having persistently violated the principles of international law for decades, the racist régime of South Africa can at best be described as an international outcast, and considering its ignoble record of aggression against States contiguous to it, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that South Africa's behaviour now amounts to a serious breach of international peace and security and that effective measures laid down in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations should be speedily and strictly invoked against South Africa. To plead otherwise is grossly dishonest. To contend that a so-called constructive dialogue with the racists is desirable or even feasible is naïve and unrealistic. As my President, Alhaji Shehu Shagari, President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, said at a recent press conference in London:

"The Western Powers have used their position in the United Nations to block all attempts to introduce economic sanctions, which are the only effective means that would induce the racists to dismantle the system of *apartheid* without bloodshed."

"South Africa and their supporters have unfortunately not yet benefited from the most important lesson of history, which is that the will of a people oppressed will always triumph in the end. It did in Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe. Similarly, the will of the majority African populations in South Africa and Namibia will triumph in the end, no matter the odds, for justice is on their side and the Almighty God is on the side of justice."

22. The prevarication of the South African Government on the key issue of implementing the independence plan for Namibia is comprehensible only to the extent that the Pretoria régime is still very unsure of the outcome of a United Nations-supervised poll

even after years of propping up Namibian quislings in the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA) and in spite of its relentless policies of repression, harassment and intimidation of SWAPO and its supporters. This is all the more significant because the United Nations is slated to play only a supervisory role while South African officials will take charge of the actual conduct of the poll itself. It is distressing that those who block a Namibian settlement have not learned any lessons from what happened in Zimbabwe. Namibians, like other patriotic Africans, will not acquiesce in the foisting of a Government of puppets on them.

23. In this connection, the Security Council must rise to the challenge posed by South Africa's continuing defiance and recalcitrance by brushing aside all diversionary tactics and insisting on justice and freedom for the Namibian people. The Council owes this not only to itself but also to its lingering credibility, which in recent times has been consistently subjected to brazen contempt.

24. If South Africa refuses to recognize the handwriting on the wall, the West must now harness its powers and prestige in support of United Nations efforts for a durable solution of the Namibian question, in accordance with the principles of natural justice and equality. But more important, it must do this not hypocritically, but honestly, sincerely and faithfully. It must put pressure on its racist protégé, which has now grown by reason of its own inaction or overt support into an overbearing monster. It must invoke sanctions or, better still, support Council measures specified in Chapter VII of the Charter, now that South Africa has taken the path of confrontation rather than co-operation.

25. For our part, we reaffirm our support to SWAPO in its relentless struggle to rid its country of all vestiges of colonialism and racism. We do hope that members of the Council will always remember that the United Nations has a special responsibility for the Territory. That responsibility will remain undischarged as long as South Africa persists in its reprehensible policies of occupation. The yearnings and aspirations of oppressed Namibians, both inside Namibia and in exile, will also remain unfulfilled until the inhuman apparatus of racist domination in the Territory is dismantled and all Namibians can live in human dignity and with self-respect.

26. But should action in the Council continue at the end of this debate, to be paralysed by South Africa's backers, I should like to serve a warning that there are always other alternatives open to SWAPO and Africa for solving this problem. Those alternatives could go beyond the intensification of the armed struggle. Let there be no illusion as to the real nature of the unbending determination of Africa and the non-aligned countries and their friends to continue to give all kinds of support to SWAPO and all patriotic Namibians until every inch of their God-given country is liberated from the racist exploitative stranglehold.

27. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic): My delegation has been following with appreciation the manner in which you, Mr. President, have been employing your diplomatic skill and wisdom in the fulfilment of your responsible tasks as President of the Security Council. We wish you further success in the discharge of the responsibilities of this office.

28. At the same time, I should like once again to thank the representatives who have commended the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Florin, for the way in which he discharged the responsibilities of the office of President of the Council during the month of March, for their warm words and the appreciation they have voiced.

29. The current meetings of the Security Council are being followed with great attention throughout the world. The participation in these meetings of many Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned States —to whom I wish to extend a warm welcome on behalf of my delegation—underscores the significance of the deliberations. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has emphatically voiced its support for the concerns of the African States, as they have been outlined in decisions adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and formulated in the letter of the representative of Uganda, Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations, of 10 April [S/14434].

30. Today, 20 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)*], the persistent denial of the right to self-determination of the people of Namibia constitutes a challenge to the United Nations and to the entire international community.

31. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic regards the consideration of the Namibia issue in the Council as urgent and imperative. It is in favour of adopting effective measures in the Council and of taking such decisions as will be helpful in bringing about a speedy solution of the Namibia issue.

32. In view of the position held by South Africa and as a result of the ensuing failure of the Geneva talks at the beginning of this year, the non-aligned States at the Conference of their Ministers for Foreign Affairs at New Delhi called upon the Security Council of the United Nations to convene an urgent meeting in order to adopt comprehensive mandatory measures against South Africa in the economic field, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, and thus to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.²

33. Those demands were reaffirmed with vigour at the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers. At the same time, reference was made at the

Algiers session to the share of responsibility borne by imperialist Powers for the policy of occupation which South Africa continues to pursue in Namibia [see S/14458, annex].

34. Profound concern about the critical situation in and around Namibia was expressed by the Group of African States also in its statement of 24 March in which those States came out against the overt support rendered by the United States to the racist régime in South Africa.

35. With full justification the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe stated the following during this debate:

"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." [2269th meeting, para. 144.]

36. The position of the German Democratic Republic is clear and unequivocal. Only a few days ago it was outlined once again, in the message which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Oskar Fischer, addressed to the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers. That message reads, *inter alia*:

"The German Democratic Republic advocates an early and just solution to the Namibia issue on the basis of the United Nations Security Council resolutions.

"A solution to the Namibia issue can be attained only if the Republic of South Africa is forced to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia and if its allies cease their aid to the racist régime. Therefore the German Democratic Republic demands that comprehensive mandatory measures be imposed against the Republic of South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, including an oil embargo as well as a stricter arms embargo."

37. In the recent past there has been no lack of attempts by certain imperialist circles to prevent or at least to put off a debate on the question of Namibia in the Security Council. They include the submission of so-called new proposals. Such tactics are not a new thing at all, and are rather transparent at that. They are meant to undercut resolution 435 (1978)—that is, the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia—to delay further a comprehensive settlement of the question of Namibia and to prevent the adoption of effective measures in order to call a halt to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. At the same time there is, as could be learned from several reports

in the mass media, a scheme to impose a constitution upon the Namibian people and thus to safeguard imperialist interests. This policy is conducted through puppets that are patronized by South Africa and on no account represent the people of Namibia.

38. All this is happening against the backdrop of the illegal racist rule which South Africa maintains in that country through tens of thousands of its mercenaries who are greedy for terror and bent on aggression. The so-called proposals represent yet another defiance of the will of the majority of States Members of the United Nations as already expressed in resolutions and decisions adopted by the Organization. As a consequence, all the endeavours the United Nations has undertaken so far with a view to achieving Namibia's independence would be frustrated. These manoeuvres cause deep concern on the part of all those who are interested in the speedy granting of independence to Namibia.

39. It is precisely those who defame the struggle for national and social liberation as terrorism, who support racist, pro-Fascist and other brutal régimes and allow racial oppression and discrimination to subsist in their territory, who today are arrogating to themselves the right of prescribing to the people of Namibia and the international community how this problem should be solved.

40. The Namibian people, which under the leadership of SWAPO is struggling to win its independence and freedom, has, like other peoples, the right freely to choose the form of the country's future political, economic and social order, thus exercising true self-determination. The so-called proposal that a constitution be drawn for Namibia even before that country achieves independence is tantamount to curtailing that right.

41. As far back as 1966, the United Nations stripped the South African occupation régime of its Mandate as Administering Authority for Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for that Territory until genuine self-determination and national independence were achieved there [General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI)]. In pertinent resolutions and decisions the United Nations has repeatedly expressed its support for the people of Namibia and SWAPO, which is internationally recognized as the only legitimate representative of that people, and has demanded rigorous measures to enable Namibia to achieve independence as soon as possible.

42. The Tenth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, held in mid-April, launched an appeal reaffirming our country's fraternal and firm solidarity with all revolutionaries and patriots in their struggle for national and social liberation. The appeal closes as follows:

"The Socialist Unity Party and the people of the German Democratic Republic will continue to

consistently fulfil their internationalist commitments and exercise fraternal solidarity with all fighters for peace, democracy, national independence and social progress."

Thus the socialist German State consistently carries on the great anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist traditions of the revolutionary German working class.

43. As in the past, the German Democratic Republic will in the future render active solidarity to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, just as we will keep on providing assistance to the front-line States.

44. My delegation is prepared to continue its constructive endeavours towards the implementation of the Namibian people's right to self-determination, thereby living up to its responsibility as a non-permanent member of the Security Council.

45. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, upon whom I now call.

46. Mr. LUSAKA (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia): May I first of all express the gratitude of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the opportunity accorded it to address the Security Council on the question of Namibia at a very critical moment in the history of this issue in the United Nations.

47. I should like also to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your distinguished career as well as your extensive knowledge of United Nations affairs will ensure that the proceedings will be guided with wisdom and a profound understanding of the complexity of the question of Namibia in the United Nations. We extend our deep appreciation to Ambassador Florin of the German Democratic Republic for the very able manner in which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

48. The adoption of resolution 385 (1976) by the Council led to several initiatives which increased the expectation of a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia by the United Nations. Subsequent resolutions of the Council, including resolutions 431 (1978), 432 (1978), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), elaborated the political stand of the Security Council in order to ensure a speedy transition to independence in Namibia.

49. The Secretary-General of the United Nations gave much of his time and skill to assist the Council in advancing the negotiations for the presence of the United Nations in Namibia during the period of transition to independence. As a result of his efforts the United Nations was ready to play its role at short notice during the final stages of negotiations, which were deliberately sabotaged by South Africa's actions at the Geneva pre-implementation talks in January this year.

50. In his efforts the Secretary-General counted on the full support of the OAU, the front-line States, Nigeria, SWAPO and countries which were also concerned with the continuous threat to international peace and security resulting from South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its continuous aggressive attacks from Namibian territory against the independent African States.

-1. While a group of Western Powers also contributed to the efforts of the international community to obtain the compliance of South Africa with the resolutions of the Security Council, it has been widely felt that theirs were half-hearted attempts to exert pressure on South Africa and that they were an important factor in promoting South African intransigence.

52. Throughout the negotiations the representatives of SWAPO have revealed to the world exceptional qualities of statesmanship and political moderation. In spite of the efforts of many of the parties concerned, no fruitful results have been achieved, because of the continued refusal by South Africa to comply with United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

53. South Africa has created one obstacle after another to the implementation of the United Nations plan. It has continued to manoeuvre inside Namibia in order to give power to those elements which are well known for their subservience to South African interests in that Territory. In that respect, South Africa undertook the so-called elections of December 1978. The so-called electoral process was strongly condemned and declared null and void by the Council in its resolution 439 (1978). Despite that decision by the Council, South Africa subsequently proceeded with its schemes of creating a so-called council of ministers to strengthen further the position of tribal elements and racist supporters of *apartheid* in the Territory. Those initiatives were followed by other measures such as the creation of a "territorial army" and the decree imposing universal military service on the population. Those measures, in violation of United Nations resolutions, were clear attempts by South Africa to increase its control over Namibia by frustrating as much as possible the aspirations of the Namibian people and of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, to self-determination and independence.

54. By its actions South Africa has shown that it does not wish to respond constructively to the initiatives of the international community. The Pretoria régime is continuing its efforts to perpetuate its exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia. The Pretoria régime is continuing to harass and kill in cold blood SWAPO leaders and cadres inside and outside Namibia. These barbarous acts by the racist régime in Pretoria must end immediately.

55. Since the collapse of the pre-implementation talks—a collapse caused by South Africa—the non-aligned countries and the OAU have taken up the ques-

tion of Namibia and recommended that the strongest possible measures should be taken by the United Nations. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in February last, reaffirmed the total support of the movement of non-aligned countries for the Namibian people's inalienable right to self-determination, freedom, independence and territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay. It further reiterated its support for and solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative. The Ministers of the non-aligned countries furthermore called on the Security Council urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to compel the Pretoria régime to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia.¹

56. Almost without exception, all members of the Security Council, including the three permanent members of the West around this table, have stated, without any equivocation, that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal. Since that is so, why then cannot the Western members, especially, withdraw their support for South Africa's presence in the Territory and carry out the mandate which was entrusted to the United Nations 15 years ago, in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which was supported by the United States delegation through its affirmative vote?

57. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting at Freetown, Sierra Leone, from 1 to 4 July 1980, had already demanded that the Security Council should adopt mandatory sanctions against South Africa to force its compliance with Security Council resolutions on Namibia. At its resumed thirty-fifth session in March last, the General Assembly solemnly called upon

"the Security Council to convene urgently to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to ensure South Africa's immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations relating to Namibia". [General Assembly resolution 35/227 A, para. 29.]

58. The heads of State of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, met at Luanda on 15 April, with the participation of the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and reviewed the developments in southern Africa. In their communiqué they underlined particularly their grave concern about the increased number of acts of aggression which have been perpetrated by South Africa against the front-line States, as well as attempts and threats aimed at destabilizing and undermining their Governments. They also viewed with deep concern the continued refusal by the South African régime to

implement Council resolution 435 (1978). Their communiqué also drew the attention of the international community to the intensification of the repressive measures taken by the illegal régime inside Namibia and to the creation of new *faits accomplis* with the aim of giving a semblance of legitimacy to its puppets. In line with the positions of the OAU and the movement of non-aligned countries, the Luanda summit reaffirmed the support of the heads of State for the United Nations plan as provided for in resolution 435 (1978), and stressed the urgent need to implement that plan without any further delay, prevarication, qualification or modification. They stressed the responsibility of the five Western Powers to ensure the implementation of the United Nations plan, of which they are the authors [S/14464].

59. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, who met at Algiers from 16 to 18 April, also supported the demand for United Nations sanctions against the South African régime [S/14458, annex].

60. The international community cannot stand by in silence while the Namibian people are humiliated, brutalized and killed, and their resources plundered, by a régime which has been condemned by the international community for its brutal, racist and repressive policies, and which continues to defy the well-considered views and decisions of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, for well over a decade—that is, since 1966—the United Nations has been trying to reach some accommodation with South Africa, alternately employing criticism, cajolery and mediation, but in vain. Thus, it is evident that a peaceful solution for Namibia remains elusive and that United Nations enforcement measures are becoming imperative.

61. It is therefore time for the Security Council, whose resolutions have been ignored by South Africa, to consider measures that would effectively impose compliance with its decisions with respect to Namibia.

62. The United Nations Council for Namibia, established by the General Assembly in 1967 as the sole legal Administering Authority for the Territory until Namibia's independence [resolution 2145 (XXI)], has given careful consideration to the formulation of draft resolutions on sanctions to be imposed on South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In consultation with other parties concerned, the Council for Namibia strongly believes that the ideas which were exchanged will greatly contribute to the draft resolutions to be considered during the current debate.

63. The Charter clearly specifies the responsibility of the Security Council to act with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression, of which the South African position is typical.

64. It is not necessary for me to review in detail the acts of the Pretoria régime which constitute a clear

violation of Article 39 of the Charter. It is sufficient to recall that South Africa has repeatedly used the Territory of Namibia, which is under United Nations responsibility, to carry out acts of aggression against independent African States. This situation is very well documented by Governments and by the United Nations information media. I should like, however, to cite one example: On 6 May 1978, by its resolution 428 (1978), the Security Council condemned the South African attack on Angola. The Council additionally decided that, in the event of further violation of Angolan territory, it would meet again to consider the adoption of "more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof." Since then, Angola and other front-line States, particularly Mozambique, Botswana and Zambia, have been raided by racist troops. Those raids continue, and therefore the threat to peace also continues. Is it not the responsibility of the Security Council to arrest this threat to peace in the area?

65. South Africa's policy of developing a nuclear capability, and its racist policies, defined as a crime against humanity by the international community's International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, adopted by the General Assembly on 30 November 1973 [resolution 3068 (XXVIII)], constitute an unchallengeable basis for Security Council action. It is undeniable that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and its repression of Namibian patriots, in violation of United Nations resolutions, constitute a breach of the peace in the area.

66. Other detention laws, including the notorious section 6 of South Africa's Terrorism Act of 1967, remain in force in Namibia, and Namibians can be and are seized without compliance with the next-of-kin notification provisions of the proclamation. It is against that background that the Council should consider the draft resolutions, which contain recommendations for appropriate action in conformity with the Charter in order to force South Africa to comply with United Nations resolutions regarding its illegal occupation of Namibia.

67. The time for decisive action is now. Those who wish to prevent the necessary initiatives to force South Africa's compliance with United Nations decisions should ponder the gravity of their stand. Namibia is under the responsibility of the United Nations, which has a solemn commitment to assist the Namibian people to achieve self-determination, freedom and nationhood: independence in a united Namibia.

68. Member States must not fail to meet this commitment.

69. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Peter Muesihange, Secretary for Foreign Relations of the South West Africa People's Organization, to whom

the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to make his statement.

70. Mr. MUESHIHANGE: At the outset of the intervention, which you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council have so graciously allowed me to make in this crucial debate on the question of Namibia, may I say how extremely delighted and inspired SWAPO and the fighting patriots of Namibia are to see that the Security Council is at last actively seized of the grave situation in Namibia.

71. This is the first debate of the Council on the thorny problem of Namibia since 1978, when the Council unanimously adopted resolution 439 (1978), relating to the illegal and bogus election held in December of that year, and dealing also with the unilateral measures and impositions in Namibia by the criminal racist South African usurpers.

72. To us, the very fact that the Council is meeting is a political victory for SWAPO and the other progressive forces which together have been waging a multifarious struggle in various combat zones and at different levels against imperialist domination, colonial oppression and racist reaction. These very same forces of death, destruction and darkness have, over the past four years, used all kinds of manoeuvres and disinformation to pre-empt and deflect all efforts aimed at bringing the crimes and injustice being perpetrated against the peoples and countries of southern Africa by the racists and their collaborators before the Security Council.

73. Consequently, the Council has been immobilized and an impasse has deliberately been created, which has only encouraged the Pretoria régime to carry on with its State terrorism, political repression and all other illegal acts of intimidation and neo-colonialism in occupied Namibia.

74. That has been the strategy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Powers, those that are the major trading partners and collaborators of *apartheid* South Africa. In this connection, it has not escaped our notice that a counter-meeting of the key NATO Powers, the five Western Powers, had been scheduled to take place on 22 April in London, supposedly "to consider future courses of action" on Namibia. This has been very characteristic of the Western approach. Each time that a Security Council meeting has been called, either a new Western move has been announced or it has been said that African States and their friends should refrain from—allegedly—calling for confrontation and instead co-operate towards finding a peaceful solution—so-called—regarding Namibia.

75. Cunningly, it is the national liberation movements and their supporters that must be urged to "deser" or "moderate" their demands for Security Council action. These incidents have been too numer-

ous over the years to be accidental. The meeting in London to which I have just referred is, in terms of both its timing and its import, no exception. Rather, it is a well-calculated strategy to win yet another stay of execution for the Fascist South African régime and to continue to safeguard the vested interests of the capitalist Powers and their giant transnational corporations in southern Africa.

76. Looking around this chamber, I cannot help but feel—despite the sinister plots and diatribe that are being hatched up—invigorated by the participation of so many Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other high-ranking political personalities from friendly countries in the current debate. This is indeed a source of great satisfaction to us and a manifest sign of support for and solidarity with our national cause for Namibia's speedy liberation and total emancipation.

77. The past four years, perhaps more than any other period during our long association with the United Nations, have severely tested our patience as both leaders and activists in the struggle. These have turned out to be years of serious trials and tribulations requiring of us at all times to know that the price of liberty always involves suffering and sacrifices. We have had to maintain even higher standards of political leadership and statesmanship in the face of constant provocations, including frequent loss of human lives and destruction of valuable property.

78. Ironically, it was during this period, starting with the launching of the widely publicized and much talked about "Western initiative" [S/1263]—which was supposed to have led to the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations leading to Namibia's independence and national sovereignty—that not only has the trust been betrayed and the promise broken once again, but the unique responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and its people has also been seriously eroded and distorted. South Africa was rescued by its friends with a triple veto.

79. In the first instance, the question of Namibia is a concrete and straightforward question of decolonization and of illegal occupation. The Namibian patriots and all other anti-colonial sectors of our population are demanding nothing more or less than speedy and unfettered freedom and the national and social liberation of all of our Namibia, including our Walvis Bay and the Penguin and all other offshore islands. That, in essence, is the demand which a long time ago became a sacred cause of the United Nations. For the principles and purposes of the Charter, the resolutions and decisions of the Organization, the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice and the emerging body of principles of international law relating to decolonization and the exercise by all oppressed countries and peoples of their inalienable right to self-determination enjoin the Member States of this great institution to support SWAPO and the Namibian patriots who are

resisting in their country foreign, colonial domination and illegal occupation by the Afrikaner junta.

80. In a solemn undertaking entered into about 15 years ago, after terminating all administrative powers exercised before by South Africa over Namibia, the United Nations pledged to stand behind the oppressed people of Namibia until genuine independence was achieved in the Territory [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. Thus it seems axiomatic to us that that solemn undertaking remains valid and calls for implementation.

81. This is no longer a bone of contention and should never give rise to any further debate as to whose authority and responsibility are being sabotaged and challenged; it is that of the United Nations. It is equally clear and well known who the culprit is; it is *apartheid* South Africa, which continues defiantly to obstruct Namibia's decolonization, perpetuates the illegal occupation and State terrorism in occupied Namibia and perpetrates repeated acts of aggression and unprovoked military attacks against independent African States in the region.

82. Already in 1976 the international community, encouraged by SWAPO and the friendly countries in the forefront of those supporting us, called for a worldwide campaign to punish the Boer régime for its ruthless suppression of the political aspirations of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, its violations of their human and national rights and its maintenance of illegal rule in Namibia, as well as for the victimization of the majority of the South African people under the brutal policies and practices of the *apartheid* system.

83. At that time—in 1976—the valiant people of Namibia had already lived through 56 years of the cruellest and most dehumanizing and degrading racist colonial system, which was further aggravated by the seizure of power by the neo-Hitlerite, all-white National Party, spearheaded by the clandestine Broederbond.

84. The campaign to which I have referred was aimed at isolating and punishing racist South Africa; it was aimed at imposing against it total economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

85. The victories scored in Indo-China, and those scored in Africa by the revolutionary forces in the former colonies of Fascist Portugal, and the advancement of the struggles of the peoples in southern Africa had at that time created a positive political climate for concerted international action to bring freedom and liberation to the rest of Africa and arrest the plunder of natural resources by foreign business interests to the detriment of the African masses.

86. Frankly and strictly speaking, today it would be an understatement to say that the racist usurpers, around whose necks a noose was about to be tightened

four years ago through the collective will of international public opinion, have been allowed to slip out of that noose; they are cynically boasting about how indispensable they are for the viability of existing international and regional economic relations.

87. We can now say, with the hindsight of the past four years, that what was put forward originally as a well-intentioned diplomatic initiative by the five Western Powers has in fact turned out to be—it seems more by calculation than by default—a contrived public relations exercise in the service of South Africa. South Africa, which, without any exaggeration, is obviously the front-line manager and police of the combined interests of the major capitalist Powers and their military-industrial and nuclear centres, has so far managed to escape the wrath of progressive mankind.

88. Earlier on I mentioned the unprecedented participation of so many Ministers in this debate. I wish to add at this juncture that the current debate, which is obviously an epoch-making event under the circumstances, is taking place in the aftermath of some major developments that have taken place recently in Africa.

89. On 15 March, the leaders of the front-line States and the President of SWAPO held a summit meeting at Luanda. The leaders reviewed the current situation in southern Africa in general and in Namibia in particular. The latest attempts to destroy Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia and those aimed at the destabilization and subversion of the lawful Government of the People's Republic of Angola were strongly denounced and rejected. The reported intentions of Washington to provide assistance to Angolan puppet and traitor groups in the service of the Pretoria régime were characterized as a hostile act not only against Angola but also against the whole of Africa and peace-loving mankind. SWAPO associated itself fully with those grave concerns expressed by the African leaders.

90. Only a few days ago in Algiers the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries concluded its deliberations on Namibia in the context of the critical situation imposed upon the peoples of southern Africa by the fascist and aggressive operations of South Africa throughout the region.

91. That meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau was attended by more than 30 Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other senior officials of member countries. It was a historic meeting which made crucial decisions for both the present and the future needs of the struggle in southern Africa. For us in SWAPO it was a unique demonstration of friendship and solidarity with the struggling people of Namibia by the largest segment of the world community.

92. We salute the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries for having decided at the New

Delhi Conference to hold the extraordinary meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau, which, as SWAPO President, Comrade Sam Nujoma, intimated at the conclusion of his major address at Algiers, ended with "a resounding success heard loud and clear by friend and foe alike in all corners of the world".

93. I would be failing in my duty if I did not renew here our thanks and appreciation to Mr. Bendjedid Chadli, President of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, and to the Government and, indeed, the fraternal people of Algeria for all that they have done in terms of the elaborate preparations made, the facilities and assistance provided and the customary warm hospitality which ensured that success.

94. I believe the Algiers final communiqué is now available as an official document of the Security Council [S/14458, annex]. That communiqué together with the joint communiqué of the front-line States issued on 15 April at Luanda—which, I believe, should also be an official document of the Council [S/14464, annex]—expresses the serious sense of indignation at and condemnation of the policies and recalcitrance of racist South Africa and certain key NATO Powers that are responsible for the grave situation in southern Africa.

95. In the communiqué of the Algiers meeting, the friendly countries of the non-aligned movement, of which SWAPO is a proud member, expressed a clear, categorical, systematic and principled position concerning the question of Namibia, and who our domestic and foreign enemies were, and adopted a Programme of Action for ending colonial oppression and illegal occupation in Namibia. Increased support for and assistance to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the oppressed people of Namibia, were further stressed. In this connection, the Ministers undertook to bolster material, military, political and diplomatic support for SWAPO in order to enable it to intensify the armed struggle in the face of South Africa's persistent rejection of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem.

96. Similarly, the Ministers concluded that the aggressive policies and unprovoked military attacks by the terrorist and racist Pretoria régime against the front-line States and its intransigence and prevarication in the face of the universal condemnation of its continued illegal occupation of Namibia stem from the Fascist nature of that colonial-settler State based on *apartheid* and the denial to the African people of South Africa of the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and to the establishment of a democratic State. Accordingly, the Bureau issued an urgent appeal to the wider world community, including certain permanent members of the Security Council, to reinforce the struggle of the South African people against *apartheid* and to continue giving, or to start now to give, their full support to the liberation movement, which in SWAPO's view means the African National Congress of South Africa, for the eradication of the system whose

existence constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security [S/14458, para. 19].

97. I should also like to recall here a strong view expressed in Algiers. In view of the deteriorating situation in southern Africa arising out of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and in view of the numerous obstacles created by South Africa to thwart the search for a negotiated solution of the question of Namibia, the Ministers further undertook to strive actively to oppose all the attempts aimed at distorting the substance of the question of Namibia, which is specifically a problem of decolonization and of illegal occupation [*ibid.*, para. 18]. The front-line leaders and the President of SWAPO issued a strong warning in this regard when they reaffirmed in the aforementioned Luanda communiqué of 15 April their continued support for the United Nations plan as provided for under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and stressed the urgent need to implement that plan without any further delay, prevarication, qualification or modification [S/14464, para. 8].

98. In the same vein, the Co-ordinating Bureau condemned and rejected the current attempts to present the Namibian issue as a regional conflict with the aim of depriving it of its universal dimensions and underplaying the defiance by the illegal occupation régime of the legitimate demands of the oppressed people of Namibia, the will of the United Nations, the OAU, the non-aligned movement and the international community at large [S/14458, annex, para. 18].

99. Like the front-line summit, the Bureau rejected the idea of tampering with Council resolution 435 (1978) through either modification, qualification or dilution of its provisions [*ibid.*, para. 9].

100. Accordingly, it is our patriotic duty strongly to condemn and reject the latest hostile moves against SWAPO and the lawful Government of the People's Republic of Angola, whose only crime is that of having decided to resist naked imperialist and racist aggression and the covert operations against Angola and the colonial oppression and illegal occupation in Namibia. We know that both Angola and SWAPO enjoy the unflinching and overwhelming support of progressive, peace-loving and justice-upholding mankind. We shall go forth. The struggle will continue, no matter what the sacrifices may be, for we know that in the end the oppressed masses will prevail. No amount of State terrorism, police brutality, attempts at destabilization or vetoes will for ever impede Namibia's total liberation and national independence. It is also our conviction that the will and determination of our patriots cannot be killed by vetoes. No people has been kept for ever in a permanent state of bondage. Victory shall be ours because that is the only logical and inevitable outcome of the heroic struggle we are waging in Namibia to free the land, to re-establish ownership and control over the natural resources under the soil and sea-bed all over Namibian territory.

101. Now I wish to come back to the tragic situation which the racist Boer régime has created in Namibia as the Western Powers concerned, instead of exerting pressure on South Africa, have encouraged it to carry out a long chain of illegal and unilateral acts in the Territory.

102. Namibia has been put high on the agenda of the imperialist forces, not as a sign of retribution or repentance by racist South Africa's supporters and allies. The intentions are clear: they are, on the one hand, to sabotage and undermine the armed liberation struggle being waged by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), SWAPO's military wing, and, on the other hand, to cut the United Nations out of the question of Namibia or to turn it into a mere rubber stamp. That should not be accepted.

103. For nearly four years now, the United Nations and various other sectors of the international community have been caught in a serious dilemma in the question of Namibia. The five Western Powers, contrary to their solemn undertaking in the spring of 1977, have not yet delivered South Africa and may never have the political will to do so.

104. Security Council resolution 435 (1978), like all the other previous relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, has been aborted by the Pretoria Fascists and reneged on by the Western Powers themselves, in spite of the fact that it was they who launched the initiative with fanfare and great promises.

105. What it all amounts to is that still more years of suffering and victimization of the Namibian people have been added to the already sordid maladministration over Namibia by the successive Boer racist régimes, making it 61 years of uninterrupted colonial oppression, political repression and ruthless exploitation. It is a matter of record that the Pretoria racists have repeatedly flouted the decisions of the United Nations and the world Court and have refused to co-operate with the Organization in carrying out its responsibility towards Namibia and its people.

106. The so-called contact group of Western States, rather than persuading racist South Africa to relinquish its illegal occupation of Namibia, ended up encouraging South Africa in setting up unilaterally, in December 1978, a bogus political and constitutional entity, namely, a constituent assembly, preceded by an illegal election financed, organized and manipulated by the racist, colonial agents in Namibia.

107. Today the situation in Namibia has developed from bad to worse. Indeed, the situation is grave. Violence and coercion are the order of the day. According to *The Sunday Telegraph* of 22 March 1981, "the number of South African troops and paramilitary police in Namibia is now thought to have reached 100,000, apart from locally recruited forces". On 1 April 1981, a "Namibianization" process was

launched. A separate so-called territorial army, buttressed by a local police force and administrative agencies, has been installed in Windhoek. Additional powers have been devolved on the bogus national assembly and on an ethnically based council of ministers to exercise legislative and executive functions respectively. This creeping but well-calculated sinister scheme has thus assumed an appearance of some legitimacy. But we remain convinced that the masses will not be fooled. They can clearly see through this farce, which will surely vanish when the day of reckoning arrives.

108. In addition, the familiar, infamous colonial policy of divide and rule has been reactivated, involving the conscription of the Namibian youth at gunpoint to shoot and kill their brothers and sisters fighting under the banner of the patriotic PLAN, SWAPO's military wing.

109. The objective is to transform the essentially colonial conflict into a civil one between good and evil, as perceived by the wicked minds of the racists and their mentors. What is more, the entire country has become a theatre of war. A state of emergency has been in existence throughout the country for nearly a decade. This state of affairs was reinforced by a martial law which empowers the army and the police to shoot and kill those Namibians believed or suspected to be SWAPO followers. Furthermore, the racist colonial governor appointed by the Pretoria junta has been given extraordinary powers to rule by decree and has been promulgating a chain of illegal and repressive acts.

110. In a vain attempt to silence the revolutionary voice of the people, SWAPO of Namibia, a fascistic campaign of terror and intimidation has been unleashed against SWAPO leaders and activists, thousands of whom are languishing in hellish detention centres, concentration camps and other cruel torture chambers in various parts of South Africa and Namibia.

111. To show the limitless propensity of the racist Boers to promote criminality, it is necessary to point out that puppets and other colonial agents are used to carry out dirty tricks and terrorism against the local population by destroying their livestock, property and harvest. When the local population resists such acts of intimidation, they are forcibly removed to different localities in an attempt to cow them into submission. For the defiant ones all opportunities for employment are foreclosed.

112. Of course, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the leaders of the clandestine Broederbond creates uniquely favourable opportunities for the ruthless depletion of the mineral wealth under the soil and the sea-bed of our country, not for present use but for stockpiling. The transnational corporations appropriate all the super-profits which go to South Africa and abroad, leaving the Namibian peasants and workers with nothing but their chains, sweat and toil.

in violation of United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.⁴

113. It is an oft-repeated charge that occupied Namibia is being used time and again as a springboard for military attacks and other acts of aggression against the front-line States, especially the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia. In carrying out those hostile acts of provocation and destruction the Boer Fascists enlist the active participation of mercenaries from Australia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States.

114. The renegade and counter-revolutionary bandits of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, who are housed on military bases inside Namibia along with the so-called South African Defence Force, are also used for subversion and destabilization in the region. Consequently, a grave situation seriously threatening international peace and security has been brought about not only in Namibia but in the entire southern Africa region.

115. Against that background loaded with a time bomb, it must be clear to all of us that racist South Africa, encouraged and supported by the major Powers of NATO, has nearly completed the creation of a neo-colonial administration in Namibia. But this puppet entity consisting of the bogus council of ministers, led by an ex-colonial official and a wealthy Afrikaner farmer who has enriched himself thanks to his privileged position as a white man in a land governed on the basis of the discriminatory and repressive laws and policies of the *apartheid* system, will vanish just the same way that the Smith-Muzorewa group vanished in Zimbabwe in spite of the enormous financial and logistical backing by the racists and other foreign supporters.

116. At the outset of this debate we witnessed a strange spectacle: the Council was presented with a dilemma in the form of a request to allow the DTA puppet group sponsored by South Africa and the Western permanent members to participate in this debate. We were dismayed. It was a political act presented as a procedural matter. Any distinction between DTA, the bogus National Assembly and the ethnically based council of ministers in Namibia is merely hypothetical. They are all one and the same thing—that is, illegal, neo-colonial creations serving the interests of the exponents of *apartheid*, colonialism and the foreign business interests. SWAPO fully concurs in the convincing and irrefutable arguments made so far in the debate, namely, that allowing the puppet traitors to address the Security Council would indeed violate the provisions of resolutions 439 (1978), according to which those entities are illegal, null and void. It is most regrettable that discussions about that non-representative group were introduced in the Council through the back door. The fact that those elements

were sponsored by a particular group of countries is reminiscent of the Muzorewa scandal and clear testimony as to who they are and whose interests they serve.

117. SWAPO is astounded that responsible Governments should have sought to re-enact the Geneva fiasco where puppets were unleashed to insult, vilify and reproach the United Nations, including the illustrious Secretary-General, the OAU and SWAPO. In this context, we took note of the following glib comment by the representative of the United States on the elections called for under resolution 435 (1978): "if . . . they can ever be arranged" [2267th meeting, para. 34]. We shall leave it at that.

118. SWAPO is grateful that the puppets were rebuffed and the request on their behalf rejected. We are reinforced by that.

119. Before concluding may I inform the Council and the world at large that at this very time our people are being subjected to killing, abduction and intimidation by the racist army and police in the northern part of Namibia. The reports reaching us tell of a very grave situation in the general area of Oshakati, Ombalantu, Kaokoveld and Okavango. This is the nature of the strategy of military onslaught and coercive diplomacy. South Africa's friends are having a meeting in London, seeking to counter this debate. At the same time the Fascist forces of the occupation régime are killing and maiming the oppressed people of Namibia.

120. The Namibian patriots and all progressive and peace-loving mankind are watching the deliberations of the Security Council and waiting to see whether the decisions to be taken here this time will be commensurate with the present grave situation in and around Namibia.

121. In conclusion, we have come back before the Council bringing with us these charges and a long catalogue of crimes and violations to urge the members around this table to find a redress of grievances. It is in the final analysis the historic and special responsibility of the United Nations that is flouted and rejected in Namibia. The Council must take the lead to rectify the situation in Namibia.

122. We join in the chorus of the majority of mankind in calling for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, including an oil embargo, against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We are aware of the threats expressed or implied in this regard, but we are convinced that the wishes of the majority in the Council cannot always be obstructed by the arrogance of power exercised more often than not by a minority which supports the *status quo* in southern Africa. Therefore we see good sense in the call for an emergency special session of the General Assembly should the Security Council fail to adopt the measures being proposed.

123. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Security Council for allowing me to speak on behalf of SWAPO and in the name of the struggling patriots of Namibia.

124. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

125. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia, Mr. Josip Vrhovec. I welcome him here, and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

126. Mr. VRHOVEC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I should like to join the preceding speakers who have expressed confidence that your wisdom, diplomatic skill and experience will contribute to the successful consideration of this very important and complex question on the agenda of the Security Council. Needless to say, you represent a country with which my country maintains very good and friendly relations.

127. We attach particular importance to these meetings of the Council. The theme of our discussion involves a question of threat to international peace and security. As is known, in such cases all the organs of the world Organization must act effectively in accordance with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. The international community is rightly expecting that.

128. The non-aligned movement was guided by those considerations in entrusting the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau at Algiers to deal with the question of Namibia and to adopt appropriate decisions.

129. I have come to these meetings, together with other Ministers, directly from the meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau held last week at Algiers. The non-aligned countries, which have always given full support to the decisions of the United Nations on Namibia, have once again given proof of their responsible and constructive approach to the solving of international problems. The meeting at Algiers adopted a final communiqué based on full respect for the decisions of the United Nations and recommended measures for accelerating their implementation [S/14458, annex].

130. With the Council's permission I would now refer to some essential elements of this problem which are in our view relevant to its consideration by the Council. I should also like to state the views of my country concerning the role and obligations of the Council in this regard.

131. In the case of Namibia we are undoubtedly faced with a problem of decolonization. Its final solution constitutes a debt of the international community to the principles of the Charter. The attempt to portray this problem as part of East-West confrontation constitutes a manoeuvre by South Africa aimed at making

use of current international tensions in order to prolong its occupation of Namibia and its domination in southern Africa.

132. It is our profound belief that such an attempt must be resolutely rejected because its acceptance could divert us to an erroneous and dangerous path. In our view the Council took the right decision in not admitting DTA's representatives to sit at this table. Otherwise there would have been a kind of game-playing: democracy against democracy.

133. I believe that none of us entertains any doubt that there is an international consensus on the need for genuine independence for Namibia. However, verbal support is not sufficient. What is needed now is concrete steps and measures ensuring the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

134. We are deeply concerned over certain intentions to prevent realization of the internationally agreed obligations towards Namibia.

135. As is known, in 1966, by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), the United Nations had already terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The following year the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for Namibia by establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia, giving it the mandate to administer the Territory [General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V)].

136. That decision was adopted in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Many years have passed since then. In the mean time, the United Nations has adopted a number of decisions and recommendations with a view to creating conditions for the achievement of independence by the people of Namibia.

137. By its resolutions the United Nations has subsequently confirmed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence; recognized the legitimacy of the struggle waged by the people of Namibia, with all the means at its disposal, against the illegal occupation of the country; recognized SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people and granted it observer status in the United Nations; demanded respect for the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and the preservation of its natural resources; proclaimed null and void the sham elections aimed at implementing so-called internal solutions; and adopted a number of decisions and recommendations calling upon Member States to contribute to the isolation of South Africa by imposing an embargo and sanctions against it.

138. In that connection, I should like to recall the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice

of 1971,¹ which proclaimed South Africa's presence in Namibia to be illegal and advised that all the States Members of the United Nations should refrain from any act likely to result in *de facto* recognition of the occupation.

139. The General Assembly and the Security Council have thus far adopted dozens of resolutions on the question of Namibia. Finally the Security Council defined, in its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It is important to emphasize here that that plan was initiated by the so-called contact group of five Western States [S/1263]. The plan called for the holding of elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, entrusting the elected representatives of the Namibian people with forming a constitutional assembly which would adopt the constitution of the new nation.

140. The outcome of all those efforts of the United Nations, which enjoyed the full support of its Members, is known. Three years later, instead of fair and free elections, we witnessed total failure at the pre-implementation conference held at Geneva in January.

141. Now we are confronted to an even greater extent with the arrogant defiance of the United Nations and the world community by the racist régime of South Africa, which continues its blatant and ruthless illegal occupation of Namibia. Moreover, we are faced with various attempts to avoid and dilute the United Nations plan for Namibia, such as suggestions that a constitutional conference should be held before elections. That is, in our view, in contradiction of the obligations assumed by the United Nations as well as of the sovereign right of peoples to decide freely their own destiny.

142. The question arises, therefore, why is the principle of fair and free elections to be sacrificed in the case of Namibia, when this principle is otherwise exalted as one of the highest values of genuine democracy? All this is fraught with the danger of the United Nations plan for Namibia becoming a mere scrap of paper.

143. We cannot avoid the question of why the United Nations has not been able to act in a case so clearly involving its own responsibility. Having legal authority over Namibia, the United Nations is called on to ensure its independence. The United Nations Council for Namibia has become, *de jure*, a body entrusted with the task of administering Namibia. This clearly shows that the question of the independence of Namibia must be solved within the framework of the United Nations. Consequently, any attempt at solving this question outside the United Nations is contrary to the principles of the Charter and relevant decisions of the Organization. Such attempts are therefore unacceptable.

144. However, instead of complying with the decisions of the United Nations, South Africa continues to

perpetrate acts that cannot be described otherwise than as serious threats to international peace and security.

145. South Africa continues the illegal occupation of Namibia, committing acts of repression and atrocities against the Namibian people. By means of so-called internal solutions it is trying to install a puppet regime and to give it a semblance of legality, soliciting the support of Western countries.

146. South Africa continues to exploit the natural resources of Namibia, in collusion with transnational monopolies. It is exploiting the uranium of Namibia for the development of nuclear technology for military purposes, thus posing a new threat to international peace and security. The racist régime is trying to disrupt the national unity of Namibia through bantustanization and its territorial integrity through detaching Walvis Bay and the Namibian islands. It continues to pursue its brutal policy of racism and *apartheid* against the majority of the people in South Africa, depriving them of their fundamental national and human rights.

147. South Africa continues to use the Territory of Namibia as a stronghold for launching acts of aggression against the neighbouring front-line States, pursuing a policy of State terrorism and sowing fear in an attempt to undermine the stability of those countries and their firm resolve to resist the aggressive policies and domination of the racist régime. In so doing, the South African racist régime continues persistently and arrogantly to ignore the United Nations and the whole international community. There is no doubt that such a policy is fraught with dangerous and far-reaching consequences, not only for the stability and security of Africa but also more widely in the world. That can only open the door to a further exacerbation of tensions in international relations and push us nearer to the brink of a new cold war.

148. We are deeply concerned over these developments. We must not allow ourselves to be blackmailed by the racist régime of South Africa.

149. Africa wants to be sure that the old colonialism, together with racism and *apartheid*, will not be replaced by new forms of domination and exploitation. In that respect, Africa and the OAU can count on the full and resolute support of the movement of non-aligned countries. The liquidation of colonialism was already assigned a high priority in the political programme of the movement at its first conference, held at Belgrade 20 years ago—a priority that it still retains.

150. The demands for comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter must therefore be viewed as clear proof of the determination of the Council and indeed of the United Nations as a whole to fulfil its obligation with respect to the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, as well as its obligation to safeguard international peace and security.

151. The international community cannot tolerate any longer the existing state of crisis in Namibia, which is prolonging the suffering of the Namibian people and has the effect of destabilizing the whole African continent. Any further postponement of indispensable measures would only give South Africa more time to consolidate its internal solutions.

152. As against this, SWAPO has given ample proof of statesmanship and political wisdom by endorsing the United Nations plan and by its readiness to accept a political process conducive to the genuine independence of Namibia. The support of the United Nations for SWAPO is part of the efforts to implement the principles on which the United Nations is founded.

153. World history—and the history of the struggle for decolonization in particular—has proved that all attempts at solving problems without taking into account the true aspirations of peoples have been doomed to failure. Such attempts unavoidably lead to an aggravation of the situation in the region and beyond. They give rise to interference by non-African Powers. The independence of Namibia, in harmony with the genuine aspirations of its people, is therefore historically inexorable. It is the legitimate right of the Namibian people to achieve its freedom through armed struggle.

154. That truth is fully borne out by the example of Zimbabwe. The victorious liberation struggle of its people created all the necessary conditions for ensuring the genuine independence of Zimbabwe and its independent development. At the same time, the accession of Zimbabwe to independence has contributed to strengthening security and stability in that region and in Africa as a whole.

155. The United Nations is also under an obligation to the front-line States, which are subjected to constant acts of aggression committed by the South African racist régime. The final solution of the problem of

Namibia would represent the best contribution to the security of the front-line States. Until that aim is achieved, it is indispensable to lend full support and assistance to those countries.

156. Before concluding my statement, I should like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to promote the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

157. The international community expects that at the present series of meetings the Council will adopt measures leading to a resolute and consistent implementation of its resolution 435 (1978). All the measures that the Council decides to adopt on this occasion should be such as to contribute to the speedy independence of Namibia under the auspices of the United Nations.

158. As far as Yugoslavia is concerned, we have come here in good will, and we are ready to participate fully in the implementation of United Nations resolutions. My country will continue to give full support and assistance to SWAPO in its just struggle for the self-determination of the people of Namibia, and will also actively support all the measures that the Council may adopt towards that end.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970). Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

² A/36/116 and Corr.1, para. 46.

³ *Ibid.*, paras. 44-46.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة
يمكن الحصول على مسودات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور النزوح في جميع أنحاء العالم. احصل عليها من المكتبة التي تSusan بها أو اكتب إلى الأمم المتحدة، رقم البريد في سريلانكا، أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经销商均有发售。请向书店询问或到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售处。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ ОБ'ЄДИНЕННИХ НАЦІЙ

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

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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