



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2097th MEETING: 10 NOVEMBER 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2097/Rev.1)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(a) Report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) (S/12903);	
(b) Letter dated 24 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12906)	1

191579

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.

2097th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 10 November 1978, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Léon N'DONG (Gabon).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Bolivia, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2097/Rev.1)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
 - (a) Report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) (S/12903);
 - (b) Letter dated 24 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12906)

The meeting was called to order at 5 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) (S/12903);
- (b) Letter dated 24 October 1978 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/12906)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings of the Council, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, Guyana, Mozambique, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bouayad-Agha (Algeria), Mr. Huq (Bangladesh), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Simbananiye (Burundi), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Boaten (Ghana), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) Mr. Hussen (Somalia),

Mr. Komatina (Yugoslavia) and Miss Konie (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2092nd meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of the Council to be seated at the Council table.

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

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2092nd meeting, I invite Mr. Gurirab to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gurirab (Permanent Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization) took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them the following documents: S/12922, containing the text of a draft resolution submitted by Gabon, India, Kuwait and Nigeria, and S/12916, containing the text of a letter dated 7 November from the representative of Mongolia to the Secretary-General.

5. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Permit me first of all to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your assumption of the important and responsible post of President of the Security Council for this month, when the Council is considering the important and timely problem of ensuring the right to self-determination and independence of one more African people fighting for its liberation. I should also like to express my gratitude to your predecessor in the post of President, the representative of France, Mr. Leprette, who so skilfully and with such consistency conducted the proceedings of the Council in October.

6. The question of the situation in Namibia has been discussed a number of times in the Security Council. However, it would be no exaggeration to say that at the present time consideration of this question has now entered a decisive phase.

7. The people of Namibia have experienced some very gruelling ordeals. A mighty wave of the national liberation movement has rolled across the African continent and

swept away the former large colonial empires, and only in southern Africa do we find continuing preservation of the bulwark of racism and colonialism in their most cruel and repugnant forms. So far, the racist régime of Pretoria, disregarding the numerous decisions of the United Nations, has been keeping under its colonialist heel the indigenous population of Namibia, has been attempting to suppress by armed force that country's struggle for national liberation and has been imposing harsh repression upon its patriotic organizations. In the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations much evidence has been repeatedly adduced to show that behind the racist régime of Pretoria, in its effort to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia, stand influential international monopolistic circles that have a vital interest in the continuing unhindered exploitation of the whole of that part of Africa.

8. In recent years the national liberation struggle of the people of Namibia has achieved considerable success. That struggle has been headed by the true patriots of Namibia, who are members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which enjoys considerable authority both inside the country and well beyond its confines, and has earned the well-deserved recognition from the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations as the sole and genuine representative of the people of Namibia. SWAPO consistently defends the interests of the Namibian people in their valorous struggle against the South African occupiers and represents them in the international arena. The success of the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO has compelled the authorities of South Africa and their protectors in the West to look for new ways of preserving colonial domination in Namibia for the purpose of continuing their inhumane exploitation of the indigenous population and of the natural resources of that country.

9. About three years ago the Security Council adopted unanimously resolution 385 (1976), which provides for enabling the people of Namibia freely to determine their own future by means of free elections throughout Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It would appear that the Council enjoys under the Charter the necessary powers to put into effect that decision which it adopted. However, the Western Powers members of the Council, although they supported the decision to hold elections in Namibia under the control of the United Nations, in fact have not evinced any serious intention of using the means at their disposal to oblige the Pretoria authorities to put into practice that decision. On various pretexts they have for a considerable period of time been holding up the implementation of resolution 385 (1976), and have not permitted the Council to take effective measures against the Pretoria régime.

10. Various kinds of plans have appeared designed, we are told, to prevail upon the Pretoria régime to agree to the voluntary transfer of power to the people of Namibia. At the same time, in the Security Council and outside it, we have heard various statements about the beginning of a "new policy" toward African problems, about the intention to take into account the interests and aspirations of the African peoples if they for their part demonstrate a

readiness to take part in talks and renounce continuation of the national liberation struggle against colonial and neo-colonial oppression.

11. The Soviet delegation has repeatedly pointed out the futility and danger of the policy of giving in to the colonialists and racists, stressing the need to apply the sanctions provided for under the Charter of the United Nations in order to compel the Pretoria régime to grant independence to the people of Namibia. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has found it possible not to object to the adoption by the Council of proposals designed to bring about agreement with South Africa regarding the holding of elections in Namibia under the supervision of the United Nations, although in this regard the Soviet delegation did express considerable misgivings about the outcome if this plan was adopted. Events have confirmed the worst forebodings of all those who shared these misgivings.

12. Apparently the Pretoria authorities in their talks with the Western Powers have never considered seriously the question of granting independence to Namibia. Clearly they have been counting on the understanding and sympathy of their partners in the "dialogue". Typically, the Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Botha, in his statement to the Foreign Ministers of the five Western Powers stated:

"The ideals for which the West stands—and I refer especially to those democratic principles of individual and political freedom—are as dear to us in South Africa as they are to you." [S/12900, annex I.]

It would appear, therefore, no accident that the South African racist wanted to stress what the racist system of *apartheid* had in common with the Western world. One and one-half years of talks and manoeuvring around the Western plan for a Namibian settlement have allowed the South African authorities to gain the time necessary for them to prepare and to put into effect their neo-colonialist solution to the Namibian problem—the holding of rigged elections for the purpose of establishing a puppet Government.

13. Now, when the time has come for taking stock of the policy of the new approach to African problems, clearly this policy has led to the most unfavourable consequences for the people of Namibia. In essence, it has served as camouflage for the preparation by the South African authorities of an "internal settlement" in Namibia, the true purpose of which is the preservation of the old system of colonial and racist domination by South Africa under the renewed neo-colonialist label.

14. It is true that the authors of this highly publicized plan of the five Western Powers have asserted that they wanted to avert the holding of these sham elections but were unable to do so. However, who is now hindering or has been hindering them from making use of the existing possibilities of applying sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter to impede this dangerous development of events?

15. No one should be misled by statements to the effect that it would be possible to carry out free elections in Namibia under United Nations control even after the

establishment there of a puppet Government. If the Pretoria régime now refuses to hand over power in Namibia to the true representatives of the Namibian people, the South African racists will simply be in a much better position, after the carrying into effect of the "internal settlement" plan, to disregard the decisions of the United Nations.

16. The prospect of the further development of events in Namibia has been clearly shown in the telegram of 23 October from the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, to the Secretary-General, which states:

"It is clear in the mind of every Namibian patriot that the Pretoria régime intends to create a puppet régime in Namibia through bogus elections in December; such a régime will certainly be manipulated and controlled from Pretoria. There is no doubt that such a puppet régime would ask South Africa to maintain in Namibia its repressive armed forces to continue to suppress the Namibian people's resistance against oppression, foreign domination and exploitation... The United Nations should not allow itself to be used by the Pretoria racist régime to legitimize its evil intentions and illegal acts to impose a neo-colonial solution against the interests of the Namibian people." [S/12913, annex.]

17. We all know what the "internal settlement" in Rhodesia led to. Initially the Western Powers assured us that they would have nothing to do with the illegal régime at Salisbury. But six months went by and the doors of Washington were thrown open to the rebel Ian Smith, and he began to dictate his demands while his troops were carrying out aggressive attacks on neighbouring African States. We should not doubt that the implementation of a settlement in Namibia along the lines planned would considerably complicate the task of ensuring the genuine independence of that country and would cause a serious exacerbation of the situation throughout the region.

18. Many representatives have pointed out quite rightly that the present situation in southern Africa is fraught with the most serious danger to international peace and security. As was stressed, for example, by the representative of Mauritius [2092nd meeting], we have witnessed the beginning of a permanent war in southern Africa which will inevitably spread to other parts of the continent. The other day the Government of Angola drew the attention of Member States [S/12917] to the new aggressive plans of the Pretoria régime which intends to use the Territory of Namibia to attack Angola in order to prevent that country from moving towards social reforms. It is clear that those who oppose the adoption by the Security Council of effective measures to avert this threat are acting in a way detrimental to the interests of African peoples and the strengthening of peace in Africa and throughout the world.

19. We fail to understand how in the circumstances it is possible to favour the holding of any further consultations with the South African authorities and to expect that they will see reason and voluntarily agree to grant Namibia genuine independence after so many years of stubborn refusal to do so. Can we seriously place any hope in the idea that talks between the South African authorities and

the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ahtisaari,—with the greatest respect for his diplomatic skills—would lead to results which proved unattainable for the Foreign Ministers of five Western Powers?

20. We are logically compelled to the conclusion that all the talk about new efforts are designed solely to delay matters and to present the United Nations with a fait accompli. Surely there is an already prepared scenario whereby the South African authorities, after holding their sham elections in Namibia and setting up a puppet government there, will then be able to state that henceforth the Security Council will have to deal, not with South Africa, but with a so-called independent Namibia and its so-called sovereign government. And would not the head of that puppet government receive an invitation to visit Washington, just as quite recently Smith was invited there?

21. It is clear to all that the time for persuasion has passed and that the moment has now come for decisive and effective action. The overwhelming majority of speakers in the Security Council have expressed themselves in favour of the immediate application of sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter because of its refusal to comply with the binding decisions of the Council on the granting of independence to Namibia. The Soviet delegation supports that proposal and is in favour of immediately taking a decision on this. Statements to the effect that that proposal should not be put to the vote since it will present difficulties for certain States are, in our view, all just part of the manoeuvring designed to delay the work of the Council and win time for the holding of rigged elections in Namibia.

22. The Soviet delegation has been consistently in favour of the immediate exercise by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination and genuine independence on the basis of respect for the unity and territorial integrity of that country. We are convinced that in order to attain that goal an end must be put to the economic and other kinds of co-operation with South Africa and that there must be established political and diplomatic isolation for the racist régime of Pretoria. Now a decisive moment has come for the adoption in connexion with the situation in Namibia of action under Chapter VII of the Charter, and the Soviet delegation calls upon the Security Council to do its duty towards the people of Namibia and to the whole world community.

23. Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to express its satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, occupying the presidency during this month of November. Venezuela and Gabon maintain the closest co-operation and association, and we have worked together to strengthen an organization like the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries which has played and continues to play an important historical role in the new international co-operation schemes aimed at the achievement of a new international order and a new system of relations based on justice and equity. We pledge you our co-operation and wish you every success in the performance of your functions.

24. At the same time, we wish to express our gratitude to Ambassador Jacques Leprette for the efficiency and firm-

ness, as well as lucidity, with which he conducted our debates last month.

25. The Security Council is meeting yet again to deal with the question of Namibia and the unlawful acts of the racist Government of South Africa in that international Territory. On this occasion those actions are fraught with dire consequences both for peace and security in that region of the world and for the prestige and credibility of the United Nations.

26. In his report the Secretary-General stated:

“The Foreign Ministers of the five Governments concerned, namely Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, held discussions at Pretoria from 16 to 18 October 1978 with the Government of the Republic of South Africa in regard to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Texts of official communications issued after these discussions have been circulated as documents S/12900 and S/12902.” [S/12903, para. 10.]

In other words, South Africa's reply is contained in those documents. It is the same reply that the Secretary-General would have received through his Special Representative had the latter journeyed to Namibia or Pretoria. For that reason my delegation does not consider a further visit by the Special Representative to be advisable, since South Africa's reply, we repeat, is contained in that joint statement. In those circumstances the visit could well be interpreted as an acceptance of the electoral farce fabricated by South Africa.

27. South Africa's decision to organize electoral proceedings in Namibia without United Nations supervision represents a heavy blow to and a defiance of its authority in the international Territory. Consequently, anything done in that Territory without the supervision of the United Nations as the representative of the international community must be regarded as null and void.

28. The fundamental principles which are at the very root of civilized coexistence, and among which is to be found the principle of self-determination of peoples expressed through democratic elections, are being shamefully flouted in Namibia. This unilateral action by South Africa is but the last act in that country's defiance of the United Nations and the culmination of successive violations for which no adequate remedies have yet been found.

29. Now we must not only apply sanctions or effective measures to punish South Africa's insolence; now it is a question of determining whether the United Nations will abandon Namibia to its own fate or, rather, to its own misfortune. It is now a question of determining whether the United Nations is powerless to act in the face of such an affront, or whether this opportunity should be taken to strengthen its prestige and credibility.

30. When my delegation voted in favour of the plan submitted by the five Western countries members of the Security Council it did so for a number of reasons: first of

all, because we regarded it as the product of serious negotiation between the parties and therefore as a compromise between the desirable and the feasible; secondly, because we were assured that it had been very carefully thought out and the sincerity and stature of its proponents offered us, in our view, the most honourable of guarantees; finally, because we believed, and we still believe, that a peaceful, orderly transition with all its failings and limitations, is preferable to solutions of violence and of armed struggle.

31. The premeditated deception reveals yet again the true face of the South African régime, whose arrogance has been stimulated by the courteous treatment that régime has received up to now, which almost turns leniency into compromising complicity.

32. While on earlier occasions, as in the case of resolution 418 (1977), we have adopted measures condemning South Africa's attitude, on this occasion we believe with greater conviction than ever that we must take the exceptional measures contemplated in the Charter, because of that country's defiant attitude of the will of the people of Namibia which endangers international peace and security.

33. The Council adopted resolution 216 (1965) condemning the unilateral declaration of independence proclaimed by a racist minority in Southern Rhodesia and imposed sanctions against that régime under resolution 253 (1968) in view of the prevailing situation in that colonial Territory, brought about by a group of rebels against the colonial Power. Namibia is an international Territory, but in the case of Southern Rhodesia it was the United Kingdom which was exercising its power over the Territory. We recall these facts because if those sanctions were applied against the Smith régime for rebelling against a single country, we fail to understand what arguments could be used not to apply sanctions against South Africa, which has challenged and defied the whole of the international community, legally represented by the United Nations and in particular by the Security Council.

34. Finally, my delegation is ready to vote in favour of any draft resolution which embodies the elements included in our statement.

35. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I have no other speakers on the list and I should like now in my capacity as representative of GABON to make a general statement.

36. If there is one problem which has truly aroused the concern of the international community since 1946 and given rise to the greatest number of resolutions and decisions in the United Nations, it is the question of Namibia. Yet today, while the world has awaited and continues to await a happy outcome of this thorny problem following the adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978), the only ideal framework combining all the elements of a peaceful settlement, the Council is compelled yet again to deal with this distressing question of Namibia. It must do so because the dynamics of peace triggered by the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) have been brutally brought to a halt and the effective and strict implementa-

tion of that resolution has, *ipso facto*, been put off indefinitely, and also because of South Africa's contemptuous rejection of the Secretary-General's plan.

37. In the light of this new negative and provocative attitude by Pretoria which destroys any prospects of an internationally acceptable peaceful settlement of the Namibia problem, and which once again constitutes a challenge we cannot ignore and a threat to international peace and security not only for the region but for the entire world, the five Western countries members of the Council have found nothing better to do than to change the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978) in the sense desired by Pretoria in order to help it to save face.

38. In fact, the elements to be found in the joint statement of 19 October by the Government of South Africa and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the five Western countries [S/12900, annex II] create a situation so new as to turn the statement into a flagrant contradiction of the plan and explanatory statement of the Secretary-General adopted by the Council and thus binding on it. It is difficult for my delegation, therefore, to accept such proposals arrived at outside the framework laid down by resolution 435 (1978), which is the basic document for the true and effective decolonization of Namibia.

39. My delegation believes that the five Western countries should have brought all their weight to bear in negotiating with South Africa on the ways and means of implementing the Secretary-General's plan immediately, all the more so since they explicitly recognized in this very chamber that the plan adopted by the Council was in keeping with their proposals. My delegation, to its great regret, is bound to note that this has been neither their approach nor their concern.

40. On the contrary, the five Western countries hastened to meet all South Africa's demands, forgetting that they had denied SWAPO the possibility of amending the report of the Secretary-General when it was before the Council for discussion, by arguing that any amendment to that plan would undoubtedly create a new situation likely to call everything into question. We note that this logic to which we bowed in the long run, has not been carried to its natural conclusion since what was denied SWAPO appears to have been granted to South Africa with respect to a document that was in fact final and official.

41. With regard to the unilateral elections of 4 December, the avowed purpose of which is to designate local leaders, my delegation is of the opinion that the holding of such elections will undoubtedly endorse the appointment of leaders of an independent Namibia within the framework of an internal settlement which was diabolically forged long ago by the pitiful Pretoria régime and which excludes one of the most important components in the Namibian equation, namely SWAPO. True, authorized voices have spoken out to condemn and declare null and void the elections of 4 December. These are empty condemnations to which we have become accustomed and which no longer deceive us, since it is those same voices which oppose an effective condemnation of the South African Government by United Nations bodies.

42. The holding shortly of unilateral elections in Namibia, despite the relevant resolutions of the United Nations--in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is a further repetition of Pretoria's persistent and arrogant defiance of the Security Council and of world public opinion. It radically undermines the entire content of the plan of the Secretary-General. Thus, my delegation will categorically oppose the organization and holding of such elections, regardless of their purposes and motives. True, we have been told that these sham elections are regarded as an internal process of designation of leaders. But what would those leaders do? They would be leaders in the pay of Pretoria who would govern Namibia in the interests of and to safeguard South Africa's selfish interests.

43. What is most galling is that we were not told that after 4 December those with whom the United Nations must deal would be those who are elected and that any change in the legal position of Namibia would depend on their goodwill. This assertion is to be found in paragraph 4 of the joint statement of 19 October, and I quote:

"The South African Government will thereafter use its best efforts to persuade them seriously to consider ways and means of achieving international recognition" [*ibid.*].

In a statement to the press, Mr. Botha, the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, did not fail to say that he was not certain that he could convince those leaders who may be elected on 4 December. This statement is quite clear. It tends to prove that Pretoria opted in favour of an internal settlement, as happened in Zimbabwe, where the African group in power is the one most radically opposed to the organization of an expanded conference as requested by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. Such a situation is symptomatic and indicative of what would happen were the Security Council to agree to the holding of the unilateral elections on 4 December.

44. South Africa at present offers no guarantee as proof of its good faith. Everything will depend on the goodwill of those who are elected. All these dilatory and fraudulent tactics can therefore be seen to have but one aim and that is to present us with a fait accompli, thus bypassing the Council plan in order to enable Pretoria to elude international pressures and extricate itself from the Namibian hornet's nest by placing its lackeys in positions of authority while preserving its interest and privileges. South Africa would thus rebuild around its borders the security belt which had crumbled following the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire in southern Africa.

45. All these manoeuvres should destroy the last illusions of those who still believe in the good faith of Pretoria. My delegation categorically rejects these alleged internal elections and hopes that all members of the Council will share this position and demand that South Africa should abandon those elections.

46. In the face of all these conditions so dangerous for international peace and security, the Security Council must face its heavy responsibilities and take another step on the sanctions ladder. It must show itself to be firm and consistent with its own resolutions, in particular resolutions

385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). By adopting resolution 435 (1978), the Council gave an undertaking, vis-à-vis the Namibian people and the international community, to implement it. Now it must live up to its commitments. What is at stake is the credibility of the United Nations and the Security Council in respect of decolonization. The Council must not compromise on the basic purposes of the Organization, otherwise the whole work of the United Nations will suffer the consequences.

47. While renewing its support of the sacred struggle of the Namibian people for true independence, my delegation hopes that the five Western members of the Council, going beyond the selfish interests which have always guided them in their choice, will join their voices to those of peace-loving and justice-loving peoples in order at long last to compel the insipid authorities in Pretoria, who refuse even a simple dialogue, to abide by the decision of the Organization. Unless this is done, one would be tempted to believe that many of the champions of law are concerned with breaches of law only when these are committed by their adversaries.

48. Mr. JAIPAL (India): On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to introduce briefly the draft resolution in document S/12922, which was circulated this afternoon. The draft is largely self-explanatory, and I hope that clarifications are not called for. If I may say so, it is action-oriented and the result of exhaustive informal discussions.

49. The main thrust of the draft resolution is, first, the call for the cancellation of the unilateral elections scheduled for 4 December in Namibia and, secondly, the call to South Africa to co-operate with the Council and with the

Secretary-General in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Furthermore, the draft contains a solemn note of warning to South Africa that its non-compliance with resolution 435 (1978) would oblige the Council to begin a process which could lead to action under the Charter, including action under Chapter VII.

50. It will be seen that the ultimate objective of the draft resolution is to ensure South Africa's compliance with resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). In our view, there is no reason why South Africa should not comply with these resolutions. As members know, the Council had been led to expect South Africa's compliance, since it had accepted the principle of United Nations-supervised elections. Furthermore, South Africa had also agreed to withdraw its presence from Namibia and to facilitate the independence of the Territory. In view of these solemn pledges, the Council has every right to expect South Africa's compliance with its resolutions.

51. We hope that, in view of these facts, it will be possible, even at this late stage, for South Africa to reverse its steps and return to the path of legitimate action in conformity with the Charter, in order to lead the people of Namibia to genuine independence.

52. We trust that the Western members of the Council who have been dealing with South Africa will impress upon that country the seriousness with which the Council will regard any situation that may derive from South Africa's refusal to comply with the Council's resolutions mentioned in the present draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.