

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

2098th MEETING: 13 NOVEMBER 1978

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2098)	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

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.

2098th MEETING

Held in New York on **Monday, 13 November 1978, at 10.30 a.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/2098)

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 11.30 a.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 Council's earlier decisions, 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. Hussien (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 take places 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. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Mr. President, first of all, please allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council.

5. The development of the current situation in Namibia has evoked widespread concern. In particular, as a result of the South African racist régime's obdurate persistence in its reactionary stand, the Security Council has met to consider the question of Namibia for the third time in the past three months.

6. The Namibian people's just struggle for national independence and liberation has won the universal support of the African countries and people as well as ever-wider sympathy and support all over the world. The South African colonial authorities have been strongly condemned by world opinion for their illegal occupation of Namibia. Their military repression of the Namibian people has been repeatedly frustrated, and their political tricks have gone bankrupt one after another. Under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Namibian people have carried on armed struggle successfully and persistently. The development of the situation is growing more and more favourable to the Namibian people and the entire African people.

7. However, the South African racist authorities will never be reconciled to the loss of their paradise. With imperialist support, they are still desperately putting up a last-ditch struggle, changing their tactics now and then, in an attempt

to perpetuate their illegal domination of Namibia. Last April, during the ninth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia, the South African racist régime was for a time compelled to commit itself to a gradual withdrawal of its troops from Namibia and a termination of its illegal occupation of the Territory. However, in the twinkling of an eye, it launched massive armed incursions against the neighbouring African States and wantonly slaughtered the Namibian people. Subsequently, using absurd and groundless pretexts, it brazenly reneged on its previous commitment and asserted its readiness to go ahead with unilateral and illegal "elections" in December in pursuance of its long premeditated plan of a so-called internal settlement. Judging from the result of the talks held recently at Pretoria between the five Western Powers and the South African racist authorities, the Botha régime has no intention at all of repenting. The development over the past six months fully shows that no matter how the South African racist authorities may change their tactics, their purpose remains none other than to rig up and foster a puppet régime through the political fraud of an "internal settlement", so as to turn Namibia into another Transkei and thus to attain their criminal aim of perpetuating the occupation of Namibia. All this has further revealed the extreme intransigence and reactionary nature of the South African racists, showing that the revolutionary people can win final victory only by carrying out tit-for-tat struggles, particularly persistent and intensified armed struggle, against the South African racists.

8. The Chinese Government and people have always resolutely supported the Namibian people in their just struggle against colonialism and racism and for national independence and liberation, and we strongly condemn the South African racist régime for its illegal occupation and colonial domination of Namibia. We have consistently held that the Namibian people should attain their genuine national independence free from any outside interference and on the basis of unification and territorial integrity. The South African racist régime must immediately, totally and unconditionally withdraw all its military and police forces, as well as its administration, from Namibia and terminate forthwith its illegal domination there. Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibian territory which should be returned to Namibia immediately.

9. We maintain that the United Nations must follow the historical trend and perform its bounden duty of putting an end to the South African racist régime's illegal occupation and colonial rule of Namibia in accordance with the urgent desire and just demand of the African people. In our view, the Security Council should not only condemn sternly the reactionary deeds of the South African racist authorities, but also take practical and effective measures, including sanctions, against the South African racist régime, in accordance with the just demand of the African countries and the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

10. The Namibian people are a heroic people who cannot be defeated. No matter how many obstacles or even zigzags and reversals they may encounter on their road of advance towards national independence, we are convinced that the Namibian people who have been repeatedly tested and

tempered will certainly heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity, persevere in struggle, ceaselessly frustrate the schemes of the South African racist authorities, resolutely do away with the interference and sabotage of the super-Powers and win final victory in their struggle for national independence.

11. On the basis of the above position, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/12922, sponsored by Gabon, India, Kuwait and Nigeria. At the same time, I should like to make it clear that, in view of the fact that resolution 435 (1978) mainly concerns the dispatch of a United Nations force, the Chinese delegation did not participate in the vote on that resolution when it was adopted by the Council on 29 September last. Consequently, the Chinese delegation wishes to record its reservation on the references to that resolution contained in the draft resolution before us.

12. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It is my understanding that the Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution sponsored by Gabon, India, Kuwait and Nigeria, which is contained in document S/12922.

If I hear no objection I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bolivia, China, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, India, Kuwait, Mauritius, Nigeria, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.¹

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to speak after the vote.

14. Mr. BARTON (Canada): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the high office of President of the Council during the month of November and also to acknowledge the important work of your predecessor, the representative of France.

15. In making this statement, I am speaking not only on behalf of my Government but also in the name of the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

16. Our five delegations understand the bewilderment and share the frustration at the uncertainty of the present situation and also feel the deep sense of disappointment which underlies the resolution which has just been adopted.

¹ See resolution 439 (1978).

17. We have worked for 19 months in an endeavour to devise arrangements which would enable Namibia to attain an independence which is internationally acceptable. The adoption of resolution 435 (1978), approving the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the proposal of our five Governments, was a very significant step in this process. We believed then, and believe now, that the best procedure would be to go forward on the basis of the Secretary-General's report. However, even as we adopted that resolution we were all aware of the difficulties to be overcome.

18. In recognition of that, our five delegations were asked not to consider our work done but to continue our efforts to bring about the attainment of the objective that is common to all members of the Council: the independence of Namibia through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control.

19. And we have continued our efforts. Faced with the South Africans' refusal to accept the Secretary-General's report and their intention to hold unilateral elections that could in no way be reconciled with our proposal or resolution 435 (1978), Ministers of the Five travelled to Pretoria. The Ministers were able, we believe, to gain the acceptance by the South African Government of those aspects of the Secretary-General's report which that Government had questioned. The South Africans agreed to resume discussions concerning United Nations-supervised elections within the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

20. To our Governments' disappointment and regret, the South African Government maintained its intention to proceed with unilateral elections. However, our Ministers made our position plain: that we did not accept the validity of those elections and would consider them null and void. We do not consider them as having any significance. We will not accord any recognition to the outcome. Those elections cannot be considered free and fair and are irrelevant to the progress of Namibia to an internationally acceptable independence. We share the apprehensions expressed in this debate, most notably by our African colleagues, that this unilateral process might be used to frustrate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

21. Nevertheless, South Africa still has no opportunity to demonstrate that it will co-operate with the United Nations, and to allay the concerns which underlie that resolution. In Pretoria the South African Government, in agreeing that discussions should be resumed, accepted that the aim of those discussions would be to carry forward the planning of the proposed United Nations-supervised elections within the framework of resolution 435 (1978) and to fix a date for those elections. Moreover, the South Africans stated their view that it was appropriate to recommend to the Secretary-General that he should begin consultations on the composition of the military component of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. It is those processes to which South Africa has agreed that in our view offer the way forward towards implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Time is short. South Africa should be under no illusions as to our determination.

22. We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution just adopted because we believe that our efforts should be directed to obtaining and supporting the efforts of the Secretary-General to secure South African co-operation rather than to prejudging the possible outcome, as does paragraph 6 of the resolution. However, it would be a mistake to interpret our abstention as a lack of sympathy for the resolution or the direction in which it points the Council in the event of South Africa's failing to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We will make our judgements on the facts at the appropriate time and act accordingly.

23. We reaffirm our commitment to resolution 435 (1978). We will continue our efforts and give all our support to the Secretary-General in his endeavours to obtain the co-operation of South Africa in the little time remaining.

24. Mr. CARPIO CASTILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document S/12922 because we consider that it is a logical consequence of resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council approved the plan presented to it by the five Western countries members of the Council, which plan has been disregarded by South Africa with its usual obstinacy and with a total lack of consideration and respect for the international community.

25. My delegation considers that the time has come to begin to apply sanctions against South Africa regardless of the political and economic interests that oppose such sanctions, but we decided to vote in favour of a less drastic draft resolution in order to act in the spirit of co-operation and compromise that characterizes the international position adopted by Venezuela.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I do not want to be misunderstood. I salute Gabon, India, Kuwait and Nigeria for having done their utmost in submitting the draft resolution which has just been adopted. But, although it received the support of a majority let us see what will be the outcome of such a resolution.

28. I have been familiar with this question for at least 20 to 25 years. We have adopted similar resolutions in the past but with no result. Therefore, why am I speaking? It is just to make my voice heard? I have been speaking here for almost 33 years, but I believe it is my humble duty to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that time is not on the side of peace in southern Africa. There will be trouble. Innocent people will be sacrificed. Emotions will run high. And what will be the result—another Security Council meeting? And, if we meet, what will happen afterwards? Will South Africa become flexible? I believe that as long as South Africa is economically viable and has financial credit almost everywhere—including in some African countries, and black countries for that matter—it can go on and on and we shall still find ourselves in this same impasse. What

shall we do? Shall we just have another Council meeting two or three months, or whatever the period may be, from now, to see how we should handle the problem? Shall we be in a position to tell them that we will apply Chapter VII of the Charter? How many times do I have to tell Members of the United Nations that Chapter VII will not be enforced? Let us be frank as to why it will not be enforced.

29. The sincerity of those countries whose point of view was expressed by my good friend the representative of Canada cannot be questioned. But why are they sincere? They are sincere because they would like to do something and are not in a position to do it. The only thing that they cannot say I will say for them.

30. Let us analyse those countries. They call themselves democratic countries. Every country calls itself a democratic country. The Soviet Union calls itself a democratic country. So does China. They must have elections and that sort of thing, the machinery of democracy. They are under the influence of pressure groups. What are the pressure groups? Are they only business groups? No, sometimes they are trade unions, to be frank and fair. If the application of Chapter VII is accepted by the Governments they may not last very long, because the pressure groups sometimes finance an election in certain countries, and they will lobby against the Government. Members know very well that in Europe and in this country there is a stringent situation in the economic field. We are warned that there may be a depression or, if not a depression, a recession. Does the Council think that those Governments are in a position to apply any article of Chapter VII?

31. Let us see what Chapter VII, Article 42, says:

“Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

There are many articles in Chapter VII, but not one of them will be applied, and even if one of them were applied officially, there are ways and means of circumventing the application.

32. What should we do? Should we be prepared to face the same impasse, as I have said, two or three months from now? No, I do not think we should. We should try to be a little more creative and a little more innovative in the United Nations and not maintain the fossilized attitudes we have taken—not by choice, but sometimes of necessity, if not by compulsion.

33. When I spoke the other day [2094th meeting], I suggested that we should revive the Trusteeship Council. There were objections to that proposal from some of my African friends; others approved of it, and I said that we would see that Mr. Ahtisaari was the High Commissioner for a period of two or three months, until we had made sure that the elections were carried out in an orderly manner. The objection that was raised to that proposal was that we were reverting to a mandated state for the

Territory. That would not necessarily be so, but in order to meet those fears I suggest that the United Nations Council for Namibia should co-operate with Mr. Ahtisaari. Nobody can question the sincerity of the Council for Namibia. Mr. Ahtisaari and the Council for Namibia would see to it that orderly elections took place.

34. But South Africa will not accept that, as I mentioned in my last statement, simply because of the geographical proximity of the mandated Territory to South Africa. The South African Government, in its note to the Secretary-General and the representatives of the five Western States, mentioned clearly that it was afraid that Namibia would become a hotbed of communism, and that its State would be subverted by communism. That may be a legitimate fear, inasmuch as sometimes Western Powers intervene in other territories to see to it that their own ideology is adopted. I am not condoning such action. Unfortunately we are still living in times when, instead of having a new approach, the balance of power, power politics and spheres of influence are still the approaches to international affairs. I have always said that we should have a new approach, but unfortunately we do not have one. That is why, whether under the Trusteeship Council as such or under a combination of the office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ahtisaari, and the Council for Namibia, what I have called an instrument for the neutralization of the Territory, which would have to be accepted by SWAPO, should be worked out.

35. If Namibia were made neutral and did not allow any arms to come in from abroad in order to fight its neighbours—in this instance, South Africa—what would be South Africa's objection? That things would still be smuggled into Namibia? Smuggling takes place everywhere in the world, but we would be aware of it and could take issue then with SWAPO, which I believe would be the party to rule in Namibia because of its popularity there and because it seems to represent the majority of the people. We in the United Nations could take issue with SWAPO, or any Government, if it were to throw in its weight with any of the big Powers.

36. Namibia should become neutral, like Switzerland, Austria and Sweden; then, I am sure, SWAPO would receive a great deal of aid from the world. If there were peace, I would try to talk my Government into contributing something; I do not know whether I would succeed, but I hope I would. Anybody could give to them, but the major Powers for ulterior political motives. What is wrong with that solution?

37. The resolution that has just been adopted is very commendable, but it reminds me of Alice in Wonderland. She ran and ran, and found herself in the same place. Here is another resolution; but in a few weeks or a few months from now we shall find ourselves in the same position.

38. What is wrong with this plan? I have no patent for it; I am not trying to monopolize it; perhaps it can be improved upon. The fear of South Africa is that Namibia will become a hotbed of an ideology that will ultimately endanger the survival of South Africa, that will bring revolution, simply because the white element there is in the minority and the

black majority in South Africa could be roused, which is only natural, if it is not satisfied with its political, social and economic rights.

39. If South Africa refused to accept the situation after the establishment of Namibia as a neutral State—incidentally, the instrument should be deposited with the Secretary-General, and all the major Powers and the members of the Security Council should be the first to append their signatures to it—then we would call South Africa's bluff. They might then bring up Walvis Bay as a bone of contention. I took it upon myself to make six points, which I submitted a few months ago to the Secretary-General, about Walvis Bay, but I am not going to talk about it until the South Africans do, if we call their bluff. It may not be a bluff; it may be true that they are genuinely afraid. But assuming they do bring up the subject of Walvis Bay as a bone of contention, to put a spoke in the wheel, so to speak, we have a solution. I believe that should the subject of Walvis Bay be brought to our attention again we should deal with it then; at present it is not.

40. I toyed with the idea of submitting a draft resolution on my project, but I thought that if I did it might not get enough votes, or if it did receive a sufficient number of votes that nothing would be done unless the five Western Powers, to use an American expression, tried to sell the idea of neutralization to South Africa. After all, they have a rapport with South Africa, and I must thank them for doing their best; do not get me wrong, I am not saying anything in criticism of the five Western Powers. But representatives should have a new approach. They cannot go on like this. I remember years ago I submitted two draft resolutions much simpler than the one we are dealing with here in the Fourth Committee. And I once submitted a draft resolution to the Security Council, and many of my friends came and begged me to withdraw it. Instead, a resolution of six or seven pages, with eight chapters with Roman numerals, was adopted, with no result.

41. I am not saying this in criticism; I am saying it as a matter of fact; it happened. Therefore, I felt constrained to tell the Council what I thought I should tell it, so that if we find ourselves faced with the same difficulty a month, two months or three months hence, I would, so to speak, have provided the preface by submitting a project that may be feasible. Let us remember that any one of you can perhaps co-operate in adding to or subtracting from any project I may have for the solution of this problem.

42. Why should I arrogate to myself the responsibility of doing this, while we are in Saudi Arabia and Namibia is away on the Atlantic coast? I do so because every one of us should try his best to do something which will bring peace, and to forget our petty national interests. After all, the world's concerns have become global, not regional. We cannot afford anything which falls short of bringing peace to the continent of Africa. If we do not act that way, and the major Powers follow the same approach, then let us say "goodbye" to the United Nations

43. By some miscalculation we may have a widespread conflict in Africa which would perhaps spread to other parts of the world. I remember the difficult days of the Congo; poor Hammarskjöld died during that crisis. We did everything to bring peace; and finally the labour was not lost when our Western friends—in that instance Belgium and others—saw that the age of colonialism had gone. Others tried to revive what they called neo-colonialism. I was not much attracted by such terms. Everyone is colonized by certain groups inside his own country. Let us not lose ourselves by trying to use abstract terms. What we need here is action, not words.

44. I must again thank my colleagues who submitted the draft resolution which we have just adopted and I also hope that my statement will be taken seriously, especially by the Western Powers, and a new approach adopted towards South Africa.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.