

UNITED NATIONS

0064113



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

**1961**<sup>st</sup> MEETING: 13 OCTOBER 1976

NEW YORK

UN LIBRARY  
APR 1 1986  
UN/DA COLLECTION

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1961) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in Namibia .....	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.

## 1961st MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 13 October 1976, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Iqbal A. AKHUND (Pakistan).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Benin, China, France, Guyana, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1961)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia

*The meeting was called to order at 4.00 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council [1954th and 1956th to 1960th meetings] I shall now invite the President and other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamana (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and other members of the delegation took places at the Council table and Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Bwakira (Burundi), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Keat Chhon (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Wodajo (Ethiopia), Mr. Felli (Ghana), Mr. Cissoko (Guinea), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Muwamba (Malawi), Sir Harold Walter (Mauritius), Mr. Bengelloun (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Djermakoye (Niger), Mr. Garba of (Nigeria), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Minah (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussien (Somalia), Mr. Kanakarathne (Sri Lanka), Mr. Sallam (Yemen), Mr. Minić*

*(Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mwale (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: In addition, I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Botswana, the German Democratic Republic and Liberia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the debate. I therefore propose that the Council agree, in accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

3. I shall invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table when it is their turn to speak.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh), Mr. Mogami (Botswana), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) and Mrs. Brooks-Randolph (Liberia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. I welcome him to the Council and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Sir Harold WALTER (Mauritius): Mr. President, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to address the Council. I promise you that I shall be as brief as possible, because I believe that facts and facts alone should be conveyed to the tired and distracted brains of the distinguished gentlemen constituting the Council.

6. I should like in the first place, following the tradition that exists in all United Nations agencies and in the United Nations proper, to offer you, Mr. President, my sincere congratulations on your elevation to this high office. I can assure you that your path will not be easy. The problems besetting you bristle with difficulties. But you can rest assured that we will give you our entire co-operation to make your task easier.

7. The Council has heard all the statements made so far in regard to Namibia. I therefore do not think

I should go into the details or the paraphernalia surrounding the problem of Namibia. To my mind it is the simplest problem that the United Nations has ever had to deal with. What is involved is the illegal occupation of the country by individuals whose mandate has expired and who have been told to withdraw with elegance and grace but seem to understand only the way of force to get out. These seem to be individuals who revel in the life of a paradise of injustice, in the creation of tribalism and in the destruction of Namibian nationalism.

8. I can do no better than repeat to the Council that the Organization of African Unity will accept nothing less than the conditions laid down by the President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) when he addressed the Council [1956th meeting]. These are the minimum conditions acceptable:

—First, that SWAPO is the sole representative of the people of Namibia. That has been accepted by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

—Secondly, that SWAPO should be the only party, apart from the United Nations, to talk with South Africa directly. If South Africa wants to bring its puppets into the conference, by all means let it do so—but as part of its own delegation, not as a party to the conference.

—Thirdly, that the conference should be convened by the United Nations and held under its auspices.

—Fourthly, that there should be a release of political prisoners prior to the conference. This stands to reason, because the brains are inside, and only the few brains that have been able to escape the repression and oppression of South West Africa by South Africa are outside.

—Fifthly, that there should be a commitment by South Africa to withdraw its forces from Namibia.

As regards the modalities of this conference, they would be discussed during the conference.

9. Those are the conditions which would be conducive to creating the proper atmosphere for the early independence of South West Africa. A date should be fixed for independence. I believe that 31 December 1978 is the date that has been fixed, but it should be much earlier.

10. As regards the difficulties that would surround the advent of independence, that would be a matter for South Africa to deal with. What concerns the whole conference is the creation of an interim government with SWAPO, the working out of a constitutional conference, the release of the political prisoners and the withdrawal of the South African forces. It should

take place under the auspices of the United Nations, which should decide on the modalities for it.

11. I fail to see why those who are willing to help to avert bloodshed and a bloodbath in that part of Africa. I am sure that if the will is there, we can convert this hell of injustice into a paradise of justice. If a sense of justice is accepted by all the gentlemen sitting around this table, there should be no difficulty at all in the realization of this. After all, what right has South Africa to talk? The Territory was given to it under trust, under a Mandate, and the Mandate has been terminated. And is it going to tell all the Powers of this world, "I am your lord and master; I will get out when I want, and I am going to impose the conditions you must fulfil for me to accept the withdrawal of my forces and myself"?

12. I am sure that the super-Powers here present can use their good influence to ensure that the conditions for which we are asking—which are our minimum demand—are enforced and that a declaration is made to that effect by those on missions of good will and peace.

13. May I in this connexion digress for one minute? Why cannot the United States of America, in its wisdom and in its mission of good will for peace around the world, accept Angola as a Member of the United Nations? Cannot it be magnanimous enough to understand that victory is there? Must it take another 21 years to accept Angola as a Member of the United Nations? I am sure the United States will listen to this appeal.

14. That is all I have to say, and I hope the members of the Council will understand that we really mean business. If this fails, Viet Nam will have been a picnic in comparison to what will happen in South West Africa.

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

16. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, may I on behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic congratulate you on your assumption of the important duties of the President of the Council for the month of October and wish you success in your responsible task. I am happy to note that friendly relations exist between the German Democratic Republic and your respected country. I wish to thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for this opportunity to speak here (as representative of the German Democratic Republic) and put forward our view on the question before the Council.

17. During the discussion certain representatives have, in view of the continuing crimes against the

people of Namibia, recalled the brutal repression by German imperialists during the period of the Kaiser's empire. I should like in this connexion to point out that the representatives of the labour movement had at that time already raised their voices in protest and condemned the crimes of the German colonial forces.

18. Today, on behalf of my delegation, I wish not only to condemn in the most emphatic terms possible the injustices inflicted upon the Namibian people in the past but also to endorse equally emphatically the accusations levelled at the colonialists of South Africa and their associates regarding their cruel aggression against and repression of another people.

19. The people of the German Democratic Republic has nothing in common with the reactionary forces of German origin operating in Namibia who are still marching in Windhoek along a Kaiserstrasse and around squares named in honour of dyed-in-the-wool Fascists such as Goering and Goebbels, who continue to uphold Goebbels' laws of racial discrimination and to uphold other Nazi ideals and who to this day are enjoying consular facilities in Namibia.

20. The people of the German Democratic Republic stands shoulder to shoulder with the Namibian people in their just and noble struggle under the leadership of SWAPO against the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Republic of South Africa and for the exercise of its right to self-determination.

21. In the course of the present debate attention has frequently been drawn to the fact that the Vorster régime is stubbornly ignoring all Security Council resolutions on the question of Namibia, that even those vague promises that have been made here from time to time have not been kept and that, in flagrant violation of international law, the Vorster régime continues openly to occupy Namibia. The same thing happened to resolution 385 (1976), which calls upon Pretoria to adopt, by 31 August of this year, concrete measures to grant full independence to Namibia.

22. May I recall that during the recent debate on the question of Namibia some members of the Council, here in this forum, recommended on a number of occasions that South Africa be given one more chance. South Africa seized that chance; indeed, nothing else could have been expected. But it did so not for the purpose of complying strictly with the decisions of the United Nations, but in order to engage in diversionary manoeuvres so as to gain time for its invidious attempts, through new and shady tactics, to retain the system of racist and neo-colonialist domination in the last remaining bastions of racism and colonialism in southern Africa, including Namibia.

23. What exactly is the nature of these diversionary manoeuvres? What are the purposes behind them, and who are pursuing them? The answers to all these questions were given with complete clarity by most of

the representatives who have spoken before the Council: for instance, the representative of Mauritius [1959th meeting], who, in very convincing terms, analysed the Turnhalle puppet show. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania presented irrefutable facts. No one could disagree with the following statement of his:

“Thus, the logical question the Council should ask itself is whether this repeated and contemptuous flouting of the Charter does not warrant a reconsideration of South Africa's continued membership in the Organization.” [Ibid., para. 65.]

24. The arrogance of the South African racists stems from a very well-known fact: the profit motive is impelling the official representatives of international monopolies to co-operate with Vorster's *apartheid* régime. They are not disturbed by the fact that in the present instance they are dealing with a Fascist whom the British authorities were obliged to arrest during the Second World War for his speeches in favour of Hitler and of the racist theories of Goebbels.

25. In unlawfully occupied Namibia the black population is undergoing cruel oppression and exploitation; they are but a huge reservoir of cheap labour for the monopolies that are operating there. The black workers receive less than one-tenth of the wage of whites, and their average life expectancy is about 35 years. A system of ghetto-style police zones has been set up, and, as has rightly been pointed out here, the international monopolies are mercilessly despoiling Namibia of its natural resources. Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia<sup>1</sup>, which prohibits the plundering of those natural resources, is completely ignored. It is quite clear that neither the Pretoria authorities nor the imperialist monopolies have any intention of relinquishing Namibia as an object of exploitation; therefore, they wish the people of Namibia to remain under South Africa's colonial yoke.

26. In connexion with the South African armed aggression against the young People's Republic of Angola, the Council, in its resolution 387 (1976), condemned the utilization by South Africa of Namibia to mount aggressive acts against neighbouring African States. The President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, in his statement of 28 September [1956th meeting], explained in detail how the expansion of the military facilities for South African troops was continuing in Namibia. Indeed, as was recently stated in the press, a major air force base was being established there, under the code-name of “Operation Threshold”. That base, like the other South African military bases in the Territory of Namibia, is being established allegedly for the purpose of protecting the sea lanes of the West in the southern Atlantic. In the publication *Jeune Afrique* reference is made to plans to establish a South Atlantic pact which would supplement the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Therefore, the policy of the Western countries towards

the Vorster régime is determined, particularly with respect to Namibia, by the special interests of the imperialist circles, which do not coincide at all with the interests of the African peoples.

27. Namibia could long ago have been a free country and a Member of the United Nations. I can confirm what has just been said by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritius, namely, that the problem of Namibia is really a very simple one. Indeed, if the Council adopted a decision calling for the immediate withdrawal of South African colonial forces from Namibia and the transfer of power direct to SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, on the understanding that otherwise all the members of the Council would forthwith sever all relations—political, economic or military—with Pretoria, I am convinced that the majority of Member States would follow that example, and that the ruling circles in South Africa would then understand the seriousness of their position. So far, however, proposal of this kind has been adopted because of the position of certain Powers. This, in our opinion, is highly revealing.

28. We have heard a lot of fine words during the general debate at the current thirty-first session of the General Assembly. For instance, it has been said that the decisions of the Africans would be respected. In practice, however, we have seen just the opposite so far. If that were not so, the People's Republic of Angola would long ago have been admitted to membership in the United Nations, because that is unquestionably the will of us all, and not only of the African States.

29. The attempts to intimidate national liberation movements must stop also. Those who deplore the fanning of the flames of war and of racial hatred should address their words, not to the national liberation movements and their supporters but to the Vorster régime and its supporters. The Vorster régime has been warring with the Namibian people for several decades. This is the war that must be stopped. So long as it is not, the armed struggle of the Namibian people will not only continue but will unquestionably be intensified. The President of SWAPO and the representatives of African States who have spoken here have said as much in too ambiguous terms, and in doing so, they are merely basing themselves on the lessons of history.

30. If today the Pretoria régime and those Western circles close to it feel compelled to begin a political and diplomatic game, this is the result of the change in the relationship of forces in the world and of the successful struggle of the African peoples, particularly the Namibian people. But diplomatic and political game-playing is not likely to solve the problems.

31. The President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, put forward before the members of the Council a detailed

programme, one that is reasonable, realistic and designed to save the people of Namibia further suffering and to give it an opportunity to exercise its right to self-determination. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic most emphatically supports that programme.

32. It is now up to the Council to draw conclusions from the past 10 years and from the prevailing situation, as well as from the emerging shape of things to come, and to adopt the appropriate decisions.

33. Mr. KHARLAMOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union I should like to congratulate you most heartily on your assumption of the important post of President of the Council for the month of October and to wish you every success in your task. I think that the greatest success in your task we could achieve in the course of this month would be to settle the question of Namibia by adopting decisions that would be in accordance with the interests of the Namibian people and of the cause of peace in that part of Africa. As the representative of a friendly neighbouring country with which the Soviet Union has enjoyed fruitful and extensive co-operation on a bilateral basis, as well as in the international arena, you, Mr. President, may rely on the full co-operation of the Soviet Union during the entire period in which you will be carrying out the duties entrusted to you as President of the Council.

34. May I likewise express our profound gratitude to your predecessor in the Chair, the representative of a friendly Arab State, Ambassador Kikhia, who most effectively conducted the work of the Council in the course of the past month.

35. I should like to emphasize the special importance of the participation in the current debate of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of a number of African and non-aligned countries, as well as of the leader of the fighting people of Namibia, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma; we warmly welcome their presence here and their contribution to our work. Their presence here and their participation in the work of the Council are evidence of the great significance that the people of Namibia and the whole of Africa attach to the present debate. Their presence will unquestionably not only help all of us to appreciate more clearly the dangerous character of the situation that has been produced in Namibia but will also help the Council to arrive at just decisions.

36. The United Nations has been discussing the question of Namibia in one way or another and with varying degrees of urgency for more than 30 years, and throughout this whole period progressive mankind has been fighting for the liberation of Namibia. We are now on the verge of taking more decisive and effective measures for the immediate liberation of

Namibia for the immediate settlement of the problem that has become the key element in the strengthening of peace and security in southern Africa and elsewhere. As is well known, in resolution 385 (1976), which was adopted unanimously, the Council formulated a number of minimum demands addressed to the Power now occupying Namibia, and we feel that this was a very mild resolution. What did the Council ask for in that resolution? The Council simply said to those in Pretoria who have taken over Namibia and are holding on to it in spite of decisions of the Council and the General Assembly: "Gentlemen, please quietly leave Namibia; please withdraw your administration and your armed forces and hold elections under the supervision of the United Nations; give the people of Namibia freedom and the right to decide their own fate". How many more demands we could have made. The demands formulated by the Council in that resolution are an absolute minimum.

37. South Africa showed no inclination to take advantage of this opportunity—its last chance to save itself. It did nothing to carry out that decisions of the Council. On the contrary, it tightened its grip on Namibia. So what is left for the Council to do if we do not wish to keep the question any longer on our agenda, if we genuinely wish to bring about the liberation of Namibia and to see the freedom and independence of the people of this much tormented country? We must, in accordance with the decisions of the Council, analyse the situation that has developed there and the steps taken by the South African Government to implement resolution 385 (1976) and the Council's other relevant resolutions and consider what measures it should take to ensure the implementation of these resolutions.

38. Our delegation has listened carefully to the statements made by the representatives of SWAPO, by the representatives of African countries and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in which it was convincingly demonstrated that during the past period not only did South Africa fail to take any positive steps to implement the decisions of the General Assembly and the Council with regard to Namibia, but it constantly strengthened colonial régime in that country, cruelly repressing any attempts at resistance.

39. It is not difficult to understand in these circumstances why SWAPO, which is the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has made every effort to study the question and bring us closer to a decision, and the whole of the international community have indignantly rejected South Africa's so-called proposal on the future of Namibia. Indeed, instead of clearly and unequivocally admitting to the Security Council that South Africa is administering Namibia illegally, that it recognizes the errors of its past ways and is ready to implement the Council's decisions and to withdraw its military and police forces from the country it is occupying and to transfer power to the

Namibian people, the Government of South Africa has resorted to manœuvres and subterfuges which are obvious not only to diplomats but to the reader of any newspaper and the man in the street everywhere in the world. In our opinion, Pretoria's manœuvres do not bring closer but rather remove further the possibility for the Namibian people to reach its lawful goal, namely, its immediate accession to genuine independence.

40. Fully realizing that neither the Security Council nor any other organ of the United Nations could or would recognize the legality of the organization by South Africa of a constitutional conference on Namibia, because it was convened by racists for racist purposes, in order to perpetuate its oppression of the people of the Territory, and because the only organization that genuinely represents the people of Namibia, namely SWAPO, was not admitted to that conference, although it has been recognized by the United Nations as the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, the Pretoria Government, like so many unscrupulous power-holders, is trying to force us to recognize this unlawful gathering as a response to the demands laid down by the Council in resolution 385 (1976). This is hare-faced mockery of the Organization; the Council and the authority of the United Nations are being flouted. This is a flagrant violation by South Africa of the obligations it voluntarily assumed under Article 25 of the Charter to comply with the decisions of the Council.

41. The criminal activities of the South African occupation régime in Namibia during the present year have shown that the racists have no intention of leaving the Territory. We have realized that the Government of South Africa has not shown any intention of complying with the decisions of the United Nations demanding that it cease its unlawful occupation; on the contrary, it has launched a feverish programme of activity to strengthen its military and police presence in the Territory, which go hand in hand with its merciless exploitation and plundering of the country's natural resources and the flagrant exploitation of its human resources. This was discussed in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly yesterday in connexion with the question of transnational monopolies. The story of what is happening in Namibia and in South Africa itself is drenched in blood.

42. Parallel with these activities, the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa has considerably increased its military expenditures. It has built a major military base, with the assistance of NATO countries, a base which is in fact the biggest base in Africa, let alone in southern Africa. The South African régime has considerably increased its armed forces. According to press reports, which are probably played down rather than exaggerated, the military budget increased by 36 per cent in the past year alone. Purchases of military equipment from a number of Western countries have greatly increased. Why? Who

is threatening South Africa? Perhaps the people of some island in the Atlantic Ocean or the Indian Ocean? No; there is no such threat. The truth is that this is all being done in somebody's interest. Whose: In the interest of continuing the domination over Namibia, in the interest of maintaining neo-racist régimes.

43. We are also disturbed by the well-known fact that South Africa has definitely decided to develop its nuclear potential. South Africa's policy of escalating military preparations is clearly calculated to retain Namibia as a base for the struggle against the national liberation movements in the neighbouring countries, that is to say, against the young independent States which are its neighbours—and you know what laws have been adopted in South Africa, including the one which gives it the right to continue in hot pursuit all the way to the equator if necessary. This is no accident. All this is tied together. Namibia has been converted now into a bastion, a base and a strong point for hostile activities against neighbouring African countries and for the organizing of diversionary movements, provocation and aggression. The scale of these activities, which are a serious threat to peace and security in that part of the world, is well known to the Council. Over the past year alone the Council has been obliged to warn South Africa of the serious consequences that might ensue if it continued such a dangerous and aggressive course of action.

44. Particular alarm has been caused here in the United Nations and in world public opinion—and first and foremost in the African countries—by the feverish attempts of the racists of South Africa to associate certain Western Powers, particularly the members of NATO, with its nefarious designs to perpetuate its domination over Namibia. Trying to conceal from Africa and from the whole world the real purposes of the increasing mutual contacts at all levels, the racist régimes and the imperialist circles which support them represent themselves as the champions of the peaceful settlement of the problems of southern Africa and profess to support the principle of majority rule in Namibia and in Southern Rhodesia, or Zimbabwe. However, none of us are deluded by statements of that kind. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, stated:

“... in actual fact everything possible is still being done to repress the just struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and of the indigenous people of the Republic of South Africa for their legitimate rights and for an end to the hateful policy of racism. Every possible method is being resorted to, from direct suppression and violence to attempts to divert the national liberation movement from genuine independence and freedom through political gimmickry and financial hand-outs.

“What is being sought from these people before the eyes of the whole world? A renunciation of their

inalienable right to free and independent development, a development along the path of social progress.”<sup>2</sup>

45. The racist régime in South Africa does not intend to leave Namibia. According to a statement by Mr. Malan, in Namibia it is necessary to set up a strong army capable of maintaining whatever situation the Pretoria régime wishes to have maintained there.

46. The delegation of the Soviet Union strongly condemns South Africa's dangerous and aggressive policy. We are opposed to any attempts to postpone the just and speedy settlement of the Namibian problem. We support all the just demands of SWAPO and its supporters. The manipulations and equivocations disguised as talks must stop, and Namibia must be given full independence forthwith in accordance with the decisions of the Council, particularly in resolution 385 (1976). I think that we were very prominently reminded today of our responsibility by the representative of Mauritius. I think that that we cannot do otherwise than endorse his statement unreservedly.

47. The dangerous course being followed by Pretoria authorities requires the Council to act. It must adopt urgent and effective measures. Past experience has shown that the absence of any firm and energetic action by the Council may be interpreted by the racists as a lack of will on its part to implement its decision or to protect international peace and security. But this is precisely what the racist régimes and their protectors want of us. Realizing that the situation in Namibia is a threat to international peace and security—and this is something that no one would wish to deny now—in view of the fact that South Africa has not complied with the Council's minimum requirements for the liberation of Namibia and South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory laid down in resolution 385 (1976), the Soviet Union considers that the Council must immediately adopt the sternest and most effective measures against the racist régime of South Africa, as proposed in Chapter VII of the Charter.

48. Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations; that is why we are obliged to do everything in our power to put a speedy end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

49. At its thirteenth session, the Assembly of the Republic of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, after specifically considering the question of sanctions against South Africa, emphasized the following decision that:

“The strict application of sanctions in all spheres would not only help to speed up the liquidation of *apartheid* in South Africa but would also make an important contribution to the liberation of the people of South Africa.”

That applies also to Namibia.



50. In the view of the Soviet delegation that all members of the Council have an interest in preserving peace and security in Africa and in the liquidation of the remnants of colonial and racist régimes and must therefore make every effort to ensure that the Council at last heeds the appeals of the anti-colonialist majority in the United Nations and adopts effective measures against the racist régime of South Africa, which is illegally occupying Namibia. Such measures might include the proposals advanced by a group of Council members, namely, the speedy imposition of an embargo on the delivery to South Africa of any kind of weapons and military materiel and of any equipment for producing them, together with an embargo on the transmission of military information in any form.

51. The delegation of the Soviet Union firmly supports those proposals. We consider that the immediate cessation of any military co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa, and the adoption of effective measures to prevent the recruitment of mercenaries for service in Namibia of South Africa, are the minimum measures that all Member States and the whole of the international community are bound to take if they are really—and not just in words—willing to respect the Charter and if they are really against the racist, aggressive policy of South Africa in Namibia.

52. Assistance and support of all kinds must be given to the Namibian people, which has elected, under the leadership of its sole lawful representative, SWAPO, to fight for its liberation and for the immediate cessation of the racist occupation.

53. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the Council must also sternly condemn Vorster's constant manœuvring with respect to the so-called constitutional conference. The only purpose of those manœuvres is to evade strict compliance with the demand of the United Nations that free elections be held in Namibia under its supervision and control.

54. It is also necessary to put an end to the co-operation of a number of Western countries and transnational corporations with the racist régime of South Africa, because such co-operation only helps to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime.

55. The implementation of these measures would help not only towards the liberation of the people of Namibia but would also towards the strengthening of peace and security throughout the African continent.

56. What is expected of us now? The representative of SWAPO has stated the requirements; they are the minimum that is required to complement the implementation of the Council resolution. The Council must now come forward, not with strong words, but with strong actions, work, deeds. Namibia must be

liberated—not at some time in the future, but immediately, without delay. The people of Namibia must be masters in their own country, of their fate and of their future—not at some time in the future, but now, today, immediately. We must reject out of hand any manœuvres or equivocations aimed at perpetuating the colonial occupation of Namibia and do everything we can to assist in the speedy and successful solution of the problem of the liberation of the Namibian people.

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

58. Mr. MOGAMI (Botswana): Permit me also to convey to you, Mr. President, and through you to the members of the Council our sincere thanks for affording us this opportunity to participate in the resumed debate on Namibia. I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October.

59. The Council is meeting again to consider the question of Namibia at a time when the world is focusing attention on the situation in southern Africa. It is often the case that this body has to meet time and again on this question because of the continued intransigence of the racist Government of South Africa. The Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of September reminded Council two weeks ago [*1956th meeting, para. 59*] that it has over the years adopted 16 resolutions on the question of Namibia alone; but, predictably, the South African Government has ignored all of them, in defiance of international opinion.

60. In resolution 385 (1976), the Government of South Africa was given until 31 August 1976 to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia. When adopting that resolution the Council decided also to "remain seized of the matter" and to convene later on these very meetings, for the purpose of reviewing South Africa's compliance with the terms of that resolution. In the event of non-compliance by South Africa, the Council would during these meetings consider the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter.

61. South Africa, as we all know, has not complied with that decision. Instead, the international community is watching with increasing concern the deceptive manœuvres through a bogus so-called constitutional conference, which is supposed to lead the international Territory of Namibia to independence in two years. After the exposure by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice<sup>3</sup> of the illegality of South Africa's presence in and occupation of Namibia, we can correctly assert that South Africa's defiance of the decisions of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular, regarding Namibia, is aimed at prolonging its occupation of the Terri-

tory, while consolidating in the mean-time the racist structure of society and government in South Africa itself.

62. South Africa's intention is to end its illegal presence in Namibia only when a puppet administration has been established in the Territory to act as a buffer between South Africa and the forces struggling for freedom, racial equality and liberation in southern Africa. That will not only guarantee continued exploitation of Namibian resources by South Africa but will also help preserve the exploitative presence of Western economic interests in Namibia, which are being used by racist minority régimes in the region to influence Western opinion, and thus assure those régimes sympathy and protection by some major Western countries.

63. That is the crux of the matter. South Africa ignores international opinion in the full knowledge that it can count on the unfailing support of its traditional allies. It is that support, of course, which renders the resolutions of the Council on Namibia ineffective. In this regard I should point out that repeated warnings have been given concerning the inherent danger of, and the serious consequences that could result from, the short-sighted and self-serving schemes, arrangements and other such formulas under which Namibia is supposed to accede to independence. It should be pointed out that any efforts which seek to assist the liberation struggle in southern Africa on the basis of conditional and tacit acceptance of racist structures of society or governments are doomed to inevitable failure.

64. The attempt to destroy the national unity of the Namibian people through schemes which deny the entire population of the Territory the right to choose and shape a social system and government of their own can justifiably be interpreted as a sinister move to extend the immoral bantustan policy to Namibia and to turn the Territory into a confederation of tribal homelands under the control of the puppets of South Africa. Indeed a constitutional conference of hand-picked tribal elements and others who support *apartheid* policies cannot be expected fully to satisfy the demands of a genuine Namibian political leadership. My delegation rejects those South African sponsored proposals as falling far too short of resolution 385 (1976).

65. The international character of Namibia is unquestionable. South Africa should meet with the leadership of the major African liberation movement, SWAPO, which the Organization of African Unity, the non-aligned movement and the United Nations recognize as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, rather than with hand-picked, pliant tribal elements whose allegiance does not even cut across tribal affiliation, to arrange for the transfer of power to a free Namibia. Except for the self-serving interest the aim of which is the survival of racist structures,

there is no justification whatsoever for South Africa's continued repressive occupation of Namibia. In determining efforts intended to avert a racial blood-bath in that inflammatory cauldron in southern Africa, we should all take account of the fact that it is often through short-sighted schemes of the nature that we see today in Namibia that emerging nations are sometimes eventually plunged into conflicts of serious proportions, with harmful consequences for security and stability and serious threats to world peace.

66. In an atmosphere already charged with political tensions as a result of minority rule and racism, the military threat posed by South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia to the territorial integrity of the surrounding African countries makes it even more compelling for the Council to demand nothing short of South Africa's immediate withdrawal from the Territory. After all, what other fears can there be of South Africa's withdrawal, since such a withdrawal will lead to national independence in accordance with the wishes of the population of Namibia, which is what we seek to achieve? Instead, we have witnessed with increasing concern and uneasiness acts of military provocation perpetrated from Namibia against the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia. The so-called Security Act, which gives the armed forces of the *apartheid* State in that subregion unlimited scope for military operation in the whole of Africa south of the equator, cannot be said to contribute to security and stability in the region.

67. The response of South Africa to resolution 385 (1976) has been to proceed with schemes which have completely disregarded the role and significance of SWAPO in Namibia as the authentic representative of the people, in spite of SWAPO's preparedness to meet and discuss with South Africa the question of the transfer of power in Namibia. Those schemes and arrangements have totally disregarded the authority and wish of the United Nations to supervise the conduct of free elections leading to the independence of Namibia, despite the Organization's legal authority over that Territory. Those schemes and arrangements—by whatever name they are called, "Turnhalle talks" or any other name—have made no provision for the release of political prisoners and the return of political exiles to Namibia. As a matter of fact, we are instead witnessing increasing imprisonment and repression by South Africa's administrative apparatus in Windhoek. The participants in the so-called talks do not even voice concern or express condemnation of those acts of repression. My delegation dismisses those schemes and arrangements as purely tribal in nature, and devoid of the essential requirements necessary for a people freely to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and accession to national independence, as laid down by the United Nations Charter. They are lacking in legitimacy. We ask that note be taken of these observations.

68. In his statement two weeks ago [1956th meeting], the President of SWAPO outlined in his conclusion

several conditions that would assist the transfer of power to a genuine Namibian political leadership. We see nothing in those conditions that is inimical to the cause which the Council wishes to defend. As the basic issues are so very clear and since South Africa has been given more than ample time to pull out of Namibia, and thereby respect, not defy, the authority of the Council, the whole world is indeed watching the Council's deliberations with the keenest concern. We hope, therefore, that Council will not relent in its commitment to bring about South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia.

69. My delegation believes that any constitutional advancement over Namibia should be decided upon with the full participation of SWAPO, which is the authentic representative of the people of Namibia. South Africa should withdraw from Namibia forthwith so that free elections can be conducted under the supervision of the United Nations. And in order to achieve this, it is essential that all the political prisoners be released immediately and the Namibian exiles be allowed to return home. South Africa should dismantle its military apparatus, withdraw from the international Territory, and allow free political activity by all Namibians.

70. For other reasons, sometimes obvious, the Council has been unable to assert its authority over Namibia and has instead taken ineffectual measures simply to keep the issues under consideration and maintain a symbolic interest in the Namibian question. Western Powers, and particularly the Western permanent members of this Council, which have in the past repeatedly shielded South Africa by the use of the veto and by their rejection of mandatory action, have an overriding responsibility to ensure that Namibia is led to independence without much delay.

71. The prestige of the Council is at stake. The Council must proceed to take appropriate measures under the Charter to compel South Africa to comply with its resolutions. Failure to do that will inevitably lead to the erosion of its prestige and its ability to deal with situations which are likely to threaten international peace and security. The Council should now demonstrate its concern for the oppressed and exploited people of Namibia so as not to betray the trust which they have placed in it.

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

73. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh): Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you and your country on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council. Permit me with feeling to refer to the personal friendship and good-fellowship which we have enjoyed with you for more than two decades.

74. I should also like to thank you and the other members of the Council for allowing me this oppor-

tunity to express the deep concern of my country over the situation prevailing in Namibia. Recent events in Namibia and other parts of southern Africa have proved that the racial conflict in that region has now reached crisis proportions threatening to engulf the entire area in a fearsome bloodbath.

75. Racial discrimination and domination must yield place to freedom and racial justice. The people of Africa have served notice on the world community that they are no longer prepared to accept as a dole what is their inalienable right. If the international community will not help them, they will help themselves, whatever the cost.

76. The task before the Council is to decide how it can help the people of Namibia to achieve its legitimate rights and aspirations. It should devote itself exclusively to the proposition that its deliberations have the capacity to avert human tragedy.

77. The essential conditions for ending the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and for the transfer of power to the people of Namibia under the aegis of the United Nations have been laid down by Council in its resolution 385 (1976). The Council, after lengthy deliberations and with great care, decided on those conditions as representing the minimum requirements for guaranteeing the full exercise of the right to self-determination of the people of Namibia. Instead of complying with those conditions, as it was asked to do, the racist and colonialist South African Government decided to equivocate about them in its reply to the United Nations and proceeded with actions in Namibia which amounted to a rejection of the conditions. It has imposed on the people of Namibia the intolerable system of *apartheid*. It has continued to plunder the Territory of its natural wealth. It has continued its oppressive régime and militarization of Namibia. Finally, it has embarked on a policy of bantustanization of Namibia with a view to perpetuating its illegal occupation of the Territory. Proposals by South Africa on the future of Namibia have been condemned by the United Nations Council for Namibia as ambiguous, equivocal and lacking in legitimacy. My country, which is a member of the Council for Namibia fully supports these views.

78. The time has come for the Security Council to take appropriate action to fulfil its obligations under the Charter to secure South Africa's compliance with the conditions laid down by the Council to ensure the transfer of power to the people of Namibia. The Vorster régime has continued to defy the Council with impunity. The Council should now consider action against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. When the Council last discussed this proposal, it failed to take any action because some members were not convinced or persuaded that international peace and security were in fact threatened. My delegation wishes to point out to them that developments have shown that their hopes and premises have proved wrong and that, in the interim, enough blood has been shed.

79. The struggle of the peoples of Namibia and of other parts of southern Africa leaves no room for any doubt that racial conflict in the region will inevitably escalate into a brutal war which will affect not only the countries of the area but other nations as well.

80. We also believe that the international community, both collectively and individually, must necessarily fulfil its moral, political and historical obligation to refrain from extending the kind of co-operation to the racist régime in South Africa which enables it to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia. Instead, we should demonstrate our solidarity with the people of Namibia by extending to them moral and material support in their just struggle for freedom and self-determination against a racist, colonialist oppressor. Rather than prolong the agony of southern Africa, we must recognize the tragic consequences of delay, which can only add to the heavy responsibility in terms of the human lives that it would cost.

81. If the international community has to wait for more Sowetos and even more bloodshed before it is moved to act, we might as well go into recess and leave the world to those who would rather preside over the peace of the graveyard.

82. The PRESIDENT: The next name on the list of speakers is that of the representative of Liberia, Mrs. Brooks-Randolph, former President of the General Assembly. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

83. Mrs. BROOKS-RANDOLPH (Liberia): Mr. President, permit me to begin by extending hearty congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I am confident that with your varied experience you will diligently guide this Council to a successful outcome on this important matter which, in one way or another, affects all men of conscience. Concomitantly, I should like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Kikhia of the Libyan Arab Republic, for the manner in which he so skilfully and efficiently presided over this Council for the month of September.

84. As members of the Council are aware, Liberia has always championed and promoted the cause of the indigenous people of Namibia by actively fostering their political emancipation, and it continues to feel great concern regarding their socio-economic problems.

85. In 1954, after reviewing the legal aspects of the question of South West Africa in connexion with South Africa's failure to place the Territory under the Trusteeship System of the United Nations, the Liberian representative in the Fourth Committee<sup>4</sup> stated that, since South Africa elected not to do that, it could not deny its obligations and responsibilities as derived from the Mandate, which embodied certain international contractual obligations barring South

Africa's annexation of South West Africa. She stated, further, that if the South African Government felt that the Mandate over South West Africa had lapsed with the demise of the League of Nations, it must agree that its authority to administer the Territory had lapsed also—unless, of course, it was merely exercising the rule of force.

86. In 1956 the Liberian delegation sought to bring the Territory under the Trusteeship System and therefore submitted a draft resolution<sup>5</sup>. Because of the powerful lobbying and control over the United Nations by the colonial Powers and their allies, the draft resolution was revised, and in its final form it requested the Secretary-General to explore ways and means for a satisfactory solution of the question of South West Africa and to take whatever steps he deemed necessary with a view to finding such a solution<sup>6</sup>.

87. When the South West Africa Committee proposed that the violation of the Mandate over South West Africa should be taken to the International Court of Justice under the provisions relating to compulsory jurisdiction, the legal interpretation of that proposal placed the responsibility for so doing on those States that were former members of the League of Nations. The Liberian representative took the initiative and drafted a resolution for the purpose, in which she, with other sponsors, called upon Member States of the United Nations that were former members of the League of Nations to take the case of South West Africa to the International Court of Justice because of South Africa's violation, at the expense of the indigenous population of South West Africa, of the sacred trust of the Mandate. Again, responding to that grave challenge, the Liberian Government, although Liberia is a poor country, initiated the suit against South Africa before the International Court of Justice. It was joined by the Government of Ethiopia. Both Liberia and Ethiopia were original members of the League of Nations. The majority opinion of the Court evaded replying to the issues raised by Liberia and Ethiopia with regard to the violation of the sacred trust of the Mandate; that judgement of the Court, delivered on 18 July 1966<sup>7</sup>, in the case which Liberia and Ethiopia had brought against South Africa in respect of the administration of its Mandate over South West Africa, evoked considerable harsh comment on and criticism of the Court throughout the world.

88. In his statement at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of Liberia, Mr. J. Rudolph Grimes, proposed the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee for South West Africa. He said:

“As a first step, therefore, the Liberian delegation proposes that the Assembly should establish an *ad hoc* committee whose members will immediately be appointed by the President of the Assembly

which should report to the present session of the General Assembly on or before 30 November 1966 on the objectives, terms of reference and composition of a United Nations commission for South West Africa, to be established prior to the adjournment of this session. The said commission would have among other functions at least the following:

“(a) A speedy termination of the Mandate, of which South Africa has proved itself unworthy, and which it continues to violate in the most essential respects, so that the inhabitants of South West Africa may be led towards self-government and independence;

“(b) A speedy abolition of *apartheid* in the Territory; and

“(c) Ensuring all technical and other assistance to the inhabitants of the Territory necessary for their material wellbeing and social progress.

“The *ad hoc* committee should recommend the ways and means by which the United Nations can effectively assert its supervisory powers and establish the United Nations presence in South West Africa, and should study the administrative, financial and personnel programmes which would be involved. The Secretary-General should be requested to assist the committee in its work.”<sup>8</sup>

89. The proposal of the Foreign Minister of Liberia was accepted and was incorporated in paragraph 6 of resolution 2145 (XXI). That paragraph reads as follows:

“Establishes an *Ad Hoc* Committee for South West Africa—composed of fourteen Member States to be designated by the President of the General Assembly—to recommend practical means by which South West Africa should be administered, so as to enable the people of the Territory to exercise the right of self-determination and to achieve independence, and to report to the General Assembly at a special session as soon as possible and in any event not later than April 1967.”

That was the paragraph which led to the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Liberia is a member.

90. Equally important was a statement made by the Liberian representative in the Fourth Committee that the people of the Territory themselves, Namibia's indigenous people, would have to take some action, even resort to force, if the South African Government continued to ignore world public opinion and the resolutions of the General Assembly and other world forums.

91. We believe, therefore, that the people of Namibia are awakening to the harsh reality that independence

and social and economic development do not come to a people on a silver platter but that sometimes there must be even the sacrifice of human life, and that this has caused the weakening of the iron grip that the South African Government has had on Namibia in the past.

92. And now my delegation would like to state that it has no doubt whatsoever that the situation in Namibia today poses a very serious threat to international peace and security as a result of the intransigence shown by the South African régime in its failure to relinquish its illegal control over Namibia.

93. South Africa, as a signatory of the Charter, has pledged under Article 56 “to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55”. Article 55 requires the promotion of “universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion”.

94. In violation of that sacred legal commitment, the racist minority Government of South Africa not only continues to practise *apartheid* in South Africa but also cultivates the heinous and barbaric policy of racial discrimination in Namibia, a Mandated Territory which is now a United Nations responsibility as a result of the revocation of the Mandate.

95. The Council, by its resolution 385 (1976), once again demanded South Africa's unconditional withdrawal and laid down conditions for the peaceful transfer of power to the authentic representatives of the people of Namibia. In its reply to the Council, the racist minority régime once again has resorted to misleading tactics to disguise its intention of continuing its colonial and racist control over that Territory.

96. We cannot accept the so-called constitutional conference at which supporters of *apartheid* and hand-picked tribal elements claiming to be representatives of the Namibian people prepare formulas which, under a pseudo-independence, would ensure the further consolidation of racist policy and the continued plunder and illegal exploitation of Namibian resources by South Africa and its allies. Also, the hand-picking of people by the Administering Authority when a Territory is moving towards independence has the evil effect of entrenching the strife between indigenous peoples which sometimes erupts after independence. And those who are responsible are the very ones who preach that black men or the African people cannot rule themselves.

97. In a statement issued on 18 August [S/12185], the United Nations Council for Namibia condemned the latest stratagem of the South African administration in Windhoek as completely unacceptable, lacking in legitimacy and ambiguous.

98. My Government insists on its demand that the future of Namibia and the form of independence Namibia as a unitary State will adopt can be determined only by the Namibian people itself, and by no one else. We in Liberia never can and never will accept the divisive concept that the Namibian people is composed of several nations. We regard this as an all-out and flagrant attempt by the South African Government to undermine the indivisibility of that nation, to perpetrate the ignominious bantustan policy in that Territory and to promote the balkanization of the country as well as the continuation of its present status.

99. Let us not belabour the issue. The facts are well known, and South Africa's intentions and designs are an open secret in the world community. We regard South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia as an affront to all of us, and I am driven to say that we consider its continued presence in Namibia to be most offensive to this Organization. South Africa should be forced to respect the territorial integrity of Namibia and its indivisibility, and the Namibian people should be given its legitimate right to determine its own destiny.

100. During the eleventh session of the General Assembly, in 1956, when I served as Vice-Chairman of the Fourth Committee, I stated<sup>9</sup> that I considered that the question of South West Africa was no less important than the other problems facing the United Nations and saw no reason why it should be relegated to the background, especially as all the members of the Committee had stressed its urgency.

101. The Government of Liberia continues to view the question of Namibia as a serious special case for the United Nations. The General Assembly, through its resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), by which it terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and provided for the establishment of a Council to administer the affairs of Namibia, and the Security Council, by affirming in its resolution 301 (1971) the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice<sup>3</sup> that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal, together established a firm legal base enabling the United Nations to use the best channels available to it to bring about a peaceful transfer of power from South Africa to the people of Namibia.

102. Liberia now, as over the decade, maintains and steadfastly continues to stand resolute in its contention that the people of the international Territory known as Namibia must without compromise obtain their inalienable rights to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity.

103. As has been my Government's policy, we insist that there must be democratic elections in Namibia now under the auspices of the United Nations and that the world community must now more than ever before, with greater zeal and effectiveness exert concrete efforts to ensure that the Government of South Africa

withdraws from Namibia, thus granting to the people of the Territory their legitimate right to determine their own future and paving the way for them to do so.

104. We believe and insist that the South African Government should unconditionally and immediately open constitutional talks with the parties directly concerned with the Namibian issue, with a view to granting full independence to the Namibian people. To that end we demand that the principal parties to any such constitutional conference must be, first, SWAPO which is the authentic representative of the people of Namibia—and other African political associations could associate with SWAPO; secondly, South Africa, which is the *de facto* though not the *de jure* authority in Namibia; and, thirdly, the United Nations, which is the *de jure* authority in Namibia. In addition, we insist that the said constitutional conference be held outside the Territory of Namibia and outside South Africa, and that the United Nations be represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

105. It might be useful to observe that in early 1975 Prime Minister John Vorster of South Africa stated "We do not want an inch of South West Africa's territory, and I would be only too pleased to get South West Africa off our backs." Here and now we challenge Mr. Vorster to live up to his words—now and not in 1978. Chapter VII of the Charter, which is not limited to diplomatic, political or economic pressure, should be invoked and brought to bear on the South African régime with a view to its relinquishing its control over Namibia.

106. Finally, let me share with the Council some thoughts of my President, Mr. William R. Tolbert, on the right of a people to self-determination:

"By both the circumstances of her birth over 129 years ago and the hostile environment in which she existed during her early years, condition which have contributed to the shaping of her unalterable convictions, Liberia has been impelled always to give uncompromising and constructive support to oppressed peoples struggling for their freedom and their inalienable rights. We solemnly reaffirm this support and renew here our commitment to buttress the legitimate efforts of all peoples striving to attain self-determination and independence."

107. We say South Africa must get out of Namibia not in 1978 but immediately.

108. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to make a statement in exercise of his right of reply.

109. Mr. SCRANTON (United States of America) I just wish to state that the United States delegation deeply appreciates the comments of the Foreign Minister of Mauritius, who represents both Mauritius

and the Organization of African Unity, and promises the Minister that the United States Government will give full consideration to his remarks, as he has every right to expect.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A, para. 84.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 7th meeting, paras. 250 and 251.*

<sup>3</sup> *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.*

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Fourth Committee, 407th meeting.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid., Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 37, document A/C.4/L.445.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid., document A/3541, para. 27.*

<sup>7</sup> *South West Africa, Second Phase, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1966, p. 6.*

<sup>8</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1414th meeting, paras. 78 and 79.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid., Eleventh Session, Fourth Committee, 581st meeting, para. 6.*