

UNITED NATIONS

ON LIBRARY

DECEMBER



UN/5A COLLECTION

# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

**1464**<sup>th</sup> MEETING: 20 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1464) . . . . .	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring Presidents . . . . .	1
Adoption of the agenda . . . . .	1
The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-2) . . . . .	1

## FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 20 March 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. K. CSATORDAY (Hungary).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1464)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-2).

### Expression of thanks to the retiring Presidents

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before turning to the agenda, I wish to perform the very pleasant duty of paying tribute to my predecessor as President, Ambassador Armand Bérard of France. His term of office gave us further opportunity to appreciate his qualities of wisdom and perspicacity, and the grace and efficiency which are always the hallmarks of his extremely abundant diplomatic activities.

2. I should also like to commend Ambassador Max Jakobson of Finland, who presided over the meetings of the Council in January. His unflinching courtesy and exceptional ability were amply demonstrated during his term as President, reinforcing still further the high esteem in which we all hold him.

3. In discharging my office, I shall endeavour to follow in the footsteps of these eminent colleagues.

4. Mr. BÉRARD (France) (*translated from French*): I simply wish to thank you, Mr. President, for your over-kind words about me. The only credit I can claim for my month as President of the Security Council is, I believe, that I enabled my colleagues to be left in peace by sparing them the need to assemble here. I should like to tell you that we

are convinced--and our experience since the beginning of this month has already shown--that your term as President will be most successful. We know your qualities. To most of us you are not only a colleague, but a friend, and we thank you in advance for the way in which you will direct our discussions. I associate myself fully with what you have said about our colleague from Finland, Ambassador Jakobson, who preceded both of us. We already knew his qualities outside the Council; we appreciate them even more, now that he is our colleague.

5. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for the very generous comments you made in your statement about my Presidency, which was a happy one in the sense that we had only one meeting, at which a unanimous decision was taken--a decision that was instantly implemented after the meeting. I should also like to say that we in this Council are confident that as President you will direct the work of the Council with the distinction and competence which you have always shown in your duties as Permanent Representative of your country in this Organization.

6. May I also associate myself with the words you addressed to last month's President, the Ambassador of France. I hardly need to add my comments to what you have already said about his eminent qualities.

7. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representatives of France and Finland for their friendly and generous words about me, and I assure them that I sincerely reciprocate their cordial feelings.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation in Namibia

Letter dated 14 March 1969 addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia (S/9090 and Add.1-2)

8. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): This meeting of the Security Council has been convened in response

to the urgent request addressed to the President of the Council on 14 March 1969 by the representatives of forty-five Member States, which was circulated as document S/9090 and Add.1 and 2. I have just been informed that the representative of Liberia [S/9090/Add.3] wishes to add his name to this letter as the forty-sixth signatory.

9. I should like to inform the members of the Council that a request to participate in the debate on the question which is on the agenda has been made by the representative of the United Arab Republic, in his capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. If there is no objection, I shall invite the representative of the United Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table in order to participate, without vote, in the Security Council's debate in accordance with the usual practice and with the rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El Kony (United Arab Republic) took a seat at the Council table.*

10. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Council will now take up the item on its agenda. I should like to remind you that the Council considered the item in March of last year under the title "The question of South West Africa", and that General Assembly resolution 2372 (XXII) of 12 June 1968 proclaimed that South West Africa should thenceforth be known by the name "Namibia". The agenda for this meeting has been worded to conform to that decision of the General Assembly.

11. By letter of 23 December 1968 [S/8943],<sup>1</sup> the Secretary-General transmitted to the Security Council the text of General Assembly resolution 2403 (XXIII) on the question of Namibia, drawing particular attention to operative paragraphs 3 and 4, which refer to the Security Council. I should also like to call attention to the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council on 28 February 1969 by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was circulated as document S/9032.<sup>2</sup>

12. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Allow me, first to all, Mr. President, to say to you that the Algerian delegation particularly welcomes your assumption of the important functions of President of the Security Council. It is a happy coincidence that as our Council resumes the consideration of colonial problems it should fall to you, the representative of an anti-colonialist, country, to direct our proceedings.

13. I should also like to commend and thank your predecessor, the representative of France, His Excellency Mr. Bérard, for all his discreet efforts last month.

14. Over the past twenty years, world public opinion has become aware of what the political régimes in southern Africa are based on and of the profound implications that represents for the future of Africa and of world peace.

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-third Year, Supplement for October, November and December, 1968, page 179.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for January, February and March, 1969, p.92-93.*

15. Between 1946 and 1966, the General Assembly and the Security Council took, by an increasingly near-unanimous majority, a number of decisions which the régimes in southern Africa had an obligation to comply with. None of those decisions was implemented.

16. Thus, during these past twenty years there has been a crystallization of world public opinion on the objectives in view, but no agreement has been reached on the practical means of achieving them.

17. A second period opened between 1966 and 1967, when the Security Council authorized the application of measures against the Rhodesian régime under Chapter VII of the Charter and the General Assembly terminated the Mandate exercised by South Africa over Namibia.

18. The hour of decision has struck for southern Africa and for our Organization. For the régimes in southern Africa, the question is whether they will continue to defy the world Organization; for the United Nations, the question is whether effective measures to assert its authority and restore its prestige can be devised. The answers to these questions will have profound implications for the maintenance of world peace and stability.

19. At its previous meetings on the question which is on our agenda, the Security Council had to discuss problems relating to the treatment of Namibian patriots by the South African régime. In March 1968 it did not take up the fundamental question that confronts us, namely, the adoption of practical means for achieving the ends in view, which continue to be the attainment of sovereignty by the Namibian people and the independence of their country.

20. To be sure, the Security Council then recognized the special responsibility towards the people and the Territory of Namibia. Now, however, it is necessary to go beyond recognition of the responsibility and to see that the responsibility is shouldered. We must define our action and decide on the means of imposing the collective will for the sake of the ends in view.

21. Why should we impose the collective will? First, because for more than twenty years South Africa has not complied with the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Secondly, because South Africa continues, against the unanimous will of the States Members of the United Nations and in defiance of all the principles of international law, to occupy a Territory. This is all the more serious, in that Namibia comes under the legal authority of the United Nations, which must assume direct responsibility for its administration until it attains full sovereignty. In so doing, the United Nations is simply performing its cardinal task of decolonization under the terms of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the tenth anniversary of which we shall soon be commemorating.

22. The continued military occupation of Namibia by South Africa is in itself a serious violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter. It is a typical case of direct armed aggression against a Territory and against a people who are entitled to enjoy the natural and inalienable right to freedom and self-determination.

23. What is even worse is that the Pretoria régime aims not only at the permanent occupation of Namibia but also at the disintegration of the Territory and of the unity of the Namibian people. This, it is true, is not a new policy; it goes back to the European colonialists, who, in order to retain what they had seized in Africa, artificially divided peoples and territories.

24. Today, in the age of national independence and of unity, Pretoria is applying itself to destroy systematically the unity of the Namibian people and the integrity of their territory. That, we must recognize, is the gravest threat to international peace and security.

25. Our action must be aimed at preserving the very existence of the Namibian people. It is a matter of survival for them. Let there be no mistake, however; if our action—peaceful action, we hope—is unacceptable to certain Powers which base their policies on the exploitation of the peoples of Africa, then the Namibian people and the peoples of the Third World, and those who love freedom, will not allow the racist régime to carry out its shameful misdeed. A people cannot be destroyed. Have we not today the example of the rebirth of the Palestinian people, who for twenty years were thought of as a mass of refugees?

26. If the fight which the Namibian people are carrying on appears timid today, we are convinced that tomorrow, thanks to their spirit of sacrifice and self-denial and the effective support they will receive from their brother nations and from the Third World, it will take on another dimension. Is there any other course for the African people of Namibia, when the alternatives are to accept the *status quo* where all power belongs to the whites or to oppose it by methods that are likely to be violent? No compromise is possible for these people. There is no middle course between the retention of power and privileges in the hands of a racist minority and the restoration of sovereignty.

27. The United Nations has terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. It is our duty now to follow up that decision and to consider practical measures for shouldering that responsibility. Our reaction to South Africa's defiance must be to demand the withdrawal of the South African authorities from Namibia.

28. This does not mean, however, that we should merely appeal to South Africa. We already know what would be the reaction to such an appeal. We must convince the Pretoria authorities that withdrawal is inevitable, even if it should have to be brought about by enforcement measures. In this case, the Charter contains the measures to be taken to remove the threat to peace resulting from South Africa's defiance. It cannot be denied that this defiance of our Organization increases the erosion of the authority and influence of the United Nations. It also jeopardizes the attempts of the African States to promote policies of social and economic development which require stability and security for the whole of the African continent.

29. Hence the importance of Security Council action. Any evasiveness, any ambiguity, of the kind to be seen in the policies of the major Western Powers, would only increase suspicions and antagonisms that would not contribute to an

improvement of the conditions for peace and security in Africa, and therefore in the world.

30. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I wish to thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words of congratulation addressed to me.

31. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): I am greatly honoured to be given the opportunity to address the Security Council on the important question of Namibia. Before I proceed, however, I should like to seize this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your elevation to the Presidency of this important Council. I have no doubt that, given your calibre, your experience and your integrity, your Presidency will facilitate our debates on this matter. I humbly pledge the fullest co-operation of my delegation.

32. I also wish to extend my admiration, rather retroactively, to Ambassador Bérard of France, who was last month's President of our Council. I regret that protracted negotiations deprived us of the opportunity to hold this meeting under his able leadership.

33. In regard to the business before us, it is my privilege to present the following draft resolution, for the consideration of the Council, on behalf of the delegations of Colombia, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal and Zambia. The draft resolution reads as follows:

*"The Security Council,*

*"Taking note of General Assembly resolutions 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967; 2324 (XXII) and 2325 (XXII) of 16 December 1967; 2372 (XXII) of 12 June 1968 and 2403 (XXIII) of 16 December 1968,*

*"Taking into account General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1968 by which the General Assembly of the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South West Africa and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence,*

*.. "Recalling its resolution 245 (1968) of 25 January 1968 and 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968,*

*"Reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to freedom and independence in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,*

*"Mindful of the grave consequences of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia,*

*"Reaffirming its special responsibility toward the people and the territory of Namibia,*

*"1. Recognizes that the United Nations General Assembly terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the territory until its independence;*

*"2. Considers that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and the previous decisions of the United*

Nations and is detrimental to the interests of the population of the territory and those of the international community;

"3. *Calls upon* the Government of South Africa to immediately withdraw its administration from the territory;

"4. *Declares* that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter;

"5. *Declares* that the Government of South Africa has no right to enact the 'South West Africa Affairs Bill', as such an enactment would be a violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly;

"6. *Condemns* the refusal of South Africa to comply with General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI); 2248 (S-V); 2324 (XXII); 2325 (XXII); 2372 (XXII); and 2403 (XXIII) and Security Council resolutions 245 and 246 of 1968;

"7. *Invites* all States to exert their influence in order to obtain compliance by the Government of South Africa with the provisions of the present resolution;

"8. *Decides* that in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations;

"9. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible;

"10. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter."

34. We have called for this meeting because we feel that it is incumbent upon this Council to examine this important question seriously and be actively seized of it, in view of the two recommendations that have been made by the General Assembly and also in fulfilment of the decisions of the Organization of African Unity. The draft resolution I have just submitted falls far short of our demands, but it contains some positive elements which advance the question a little further than has been done before. We have had to draw a sharp and painful distinction between what we want and what is possible to achieve, given the delicate balance of power in this Council. This draft resolution is what we have been able to achieve. I wish to thank all the delegations who have rendered their advice and support in the preparation and submission of the draft resolution.

35. Members of the Council will agree that the very fact that it has been possible to convene this meeting is indicative of the seriousness with which the rape of Namibia by South Africa is viewed by the Council.

36. Let me now turn briefly to some of the main elements of the draft resolution. It is not my intention to dwell on

the parts of the preamble as their import has been spelt out in the formulation of previous resolutions and decisions. I am, however, convinced that this Council would have failed in its duty if it did not impress upon South Africa that we shall not tolerate any longer its extremely regrettable attitude that the Council is a mere talking chamber. It is necessary for us to indicate in no uncertain terms that we intend to honour the Council's previous resolutions on Namibia, towards which the Council has a special responsibility; for unless South Africa understands that, I fail to see how it could be expected to treat any future decisions of this Council with the seriousness that they deserve.

37. Paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution is important and necessary if the Council is to enjoy the confidence of the General Assembly and the world community as a whole. Such a recognition, in our view, would also serve to emphasize to South Africa that it has no right to administer Namibia. Besides, it would be complementary to previous resolutions of this Council on Namibia.

38. Paragraph 2 is a logical sequel. We should have liked to have stated categorically the truth that South Africa's continued stay in Namibia is an act of aggression and, therefore, a threat to international peace and security. While we have had to accommodate the feelings of certain members who are averse to the idea of an inevitable confrontation with South Africa, we found it necessary to try to advance on such little progress as we have been able to achieve previously.

39. Paragraph 3 introduces no new elements to the question, the call having already been made by the General Assembly. We are aware that South Africa has already embarked on a divisive programme of creating Bantustans in Namibia. We feel that such a programme, apart from being illegal, is fraught with danger. It is designed to weaken the national unity and the determination of Namibians who have ranged themselves against the forces of occupation.

40. We attach great importance to paragraph 5. In defiance of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the South African Government, on 5 February 1969, tabled a bill in Parliament the purpose of which is the formal annexation of Namibia. The bill, when enacted, will divest the present illegal Legislative Assembly in Windhoek of its authority to legislate in African affairs, including African education, justice and prisons, companies, mining, agriculture and forestry, labour, and several other fields. The levying of taxes has also been affected. Thus, a foreign country, South Africa, through its own Parliament is deciding to wrest even the vestiges of authority which the representative Legislative Assembly of what was formerly known as South West Africa has hitherto enjoyed. It must sound ironical that we should make this call while we are asking South Africa to get out, but it will be a measure of our concern that we should ensure that South Africa does not introduce any further legislation designed to aggravate the economic and political situation in that international Territory. This piratical action on the part of South Africa is tantamount to a sack of Namibia and should be condemned vigorously.

41. The invitation in paragraph 7 should raise no difficulties and should be seen as consistent with this Council's attitude on previous resolutions on Namibia.

42. The remaining paragraphs are designed to ensure that the Council, having regard to South Africa's defiance so far, and in view of the seriousness of the situation, has a course of action to take in the event of further refusal by South Africa to comply with Security Council decisions.

43. I wish to emphasize that, in our view, paragraph 8 does not entirely exclude the application of Chapter VII. The demands of compromise have militated against the definition of such action, but it is readily accepted that this was a question of having the art of the possible.

44. It will be recalled that by its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly of the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South Africa and assumed direct responsibility until that country attained its independence. That momentous decision was not reached out of spite towards the Government of South Africa, nor was it taken out of a mere desire by the United Nations to exercise its rights over Namibia for the sake of it; rather, the international community as represented in the United Nations arrived at that decision upon the sad realization that South Africa had violated all the provisions of the Mandate in its administration—or, to be more precise, its maladministration—of what is now Namibia. I do not have to remind the Council of the innumerable and exhaustive efforts, going back to 1946, made by the United Nations and designed to remind South Africa of its obligations. Year in and year out South Africa has not only defied world opinion, but has also steadily increased and tightened its repressive régime of laws on the Territory. It has denied the indigenous people of the known freedoms, including the right to self-determination, by applying its obnoxious policy of *apartheid*. It has turned them into second-rate citizens, a class outside the pale of political and social justice. It was under these circumstances that the General Assembly acted on 27 October 1966 [resolution 2145 (XXI)]. The following year, the Council for Namibia was established to discharge the responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia. That Council took up the challenge immediately, but, as its reports of the last two years show, the Council has been prevented from discharging its functions in the Territory by the refusal of the Government of South Africa to comply with the terms of resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) of the General Assembly. The recalcitrant posture of the Pretoria régime over this question has been reflected by South Africa's performance in and reactions to the decisions of the General Assembly, its refusal to co-operate with the Council for Namibia and its rejection of the decisions of the Security Council. The racists of South Africa have turned the decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council into the most gigantic and hilarious bluff of our time. We here have a responsibility to take appropriate, corrective and meaningful measures to arrest this disgraceful trend.

45. If we believe in democracy, if we cherish social justice and equality, if we indeed lend our support to the principle of self-determination, if we believe in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights, then we have a duty to take these measures and take them now.

46. It is a matter of grave concern that while the United Nations is trying to lay the foundation for the ultimate independence of Namibia, South Africa not only continues to occupy the Territory illegally but also embarks on a wild legislative programme whose obvious end would be the annexation of Namibia. Reports reaching us have already indicated that the illegal act of annexation is contemplated for April 1969. Members of this Council will readily agree that such an action would be illegal even in the context of the former Mandate.

47. To my mind there are very few situations which demand more immediate attention than that of Namibia today. For while we drift from one resolution to another, the racist minority oppressors in Pretoria have balkanized Namibia into tribal confederations on the Bantustan pattern. Whole populations have been moved from their ancestral homes into semi-desert parts of the Territory, exclusively in the interests of the alien white minority. As one would expect, brute force has been used to achieve these inhuman objectives. The result is that already within a few weeks there are 2,000 refugees in Zambia who have fled Namibia following this external aggression by South Africa. The last wave of refugees—men, women and children—is, of course, in addition to the many thousands who have been fleeing over the years. A turbulent population movement has therefore taken place, the social and political consequences of which will immensely exacerbate the difficulties in the way of the Council for Namibia, the United Nations and the Security Council itself.

48. There is another grave aspect of this matter to which I should like to refer, which further strengthens the case for immediate action by the Security Council. It will be recalled that even before 1966 the oppressed peoples of Namibia, like their counterparts in South Africa itself decided to embark on a struggle of liberation for their motherland. That struggle has become intense and will continue to grow until the goal of independence is achieved. The South African régime, in the face of this dangerous situation of its own creation, has consistently refused to recognize the absurdity and futility of its policy; instead, it has embarked on a huge programme of military preparedness.

49. During the period 1966-1968, South Africa's military expenditure of \$406 million was as large as my country's total budget. That figure was almost seven times that of its military expenditure during the year 1960-1961. In addition, South Africa continues to spend colossal sums of money on its police force. These preparations have been made with a view to continuing its occupation and soon to defending its illegal annexation of Namibia. South Africa's military ventures have already split beyond the borders of Namibia, for within this decade we saw that country shamelessly recruiting and helping finance mercenaries who went to attack the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Of late, it has committed aggression against the State and people of Zimbabwe without provocation whatsoever. South African soldiers have crossed into Zambia from Namibia, terrorizing unarmed civilians while South African air force planes have deliberately violated our air space.

50. Thus, in this unfolding situation, Namibia has already been used as a launching pad for South Africa's acts of aggression against Zambia. The Pretoria régime has made serious threats of aggression against my country, and saboteurs financed from Pretoria are desperately trying to harm our national economy.

51. It is unrealistic to talk of peace and stability in the African continent unless the major problem of race is resolved. Race and its twin sister colour threaten the peace and stability of the African continent. Confrontation based on colour will be the major factor in international unsettlement in the rest of the twentieth century as ideology and the cold war have been in its first half. The spectre of a racial conflict on a global scale and the consequences for the world, cannot be but frightening for all peace-loving nations. Yet this is what South Africa and the white totalitarian régimes present in Namibia, South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique, where millions of peace-loving human beings are still the subject of rule by force against their will, exercised by racist minorities for their own ends, but to the detriment of the majority. The process of decolonization and democratization which has brought about the independence of hundreds of millions of Africans has now run into a full gale of racialism and economic self-interest in Africa, south of the Zambesi river.

52. What is the nature of the conflict in southern Africa, one may ask? In our view, first of all, it is one of colour. A few thousand white immigrants found themselves in the midst of a black inhabited country; different in culture and feeling different from the indigenous race, they could not look elsewhere for the defence of their interests but within their social cultural group for strength—their would-be protective umbrella, the country of origin not being practically within reach. Secondly, religious fanaticism based on certain misconceptions about the nature of man became a unifying force within the white community, a community of the chosen with a destiny which only the white people are privileged to have. An appeal to race superiority, to the concepts of master and slave, of the Christian and the heathen, to Western civilization and its undefined opposite—all these form rallying points in the maintenance of the *status quo* in that area; it is a source of unity which feeds the undercurrent of fear of competition from the majority for economic and political control if principles of democracy and the fundamental human rights are to be respected. This is the third aspect of the conflict, it is the factor which has made the struggle brutish, severe, prolonged and complex. What began as a very severe form of discrimination, segregation and separation is now official *apartheid* which through a variety of devices has enabled the three million bloodthirsty whites of South Africa to bar by every possible means including brutal force the economic, social and political advancement of the people of Namibia.

53. Fear of competition from the majority, the fate of the poor white—was partly the main reason for the discrimination and *apartheid*; but since then, it has also turned into a ruthless struggle for the survival of the white race. The result is a chain reaction of fear breeding fear, suspicion, prejudice, hatred, and then as the screw of *apartheid* is tightened, the inevitable racial explosion must occur which

will make Viet-Nam look like a child's picnic. Through a blind obsession, the South African authorities have defied and prevented all moral, legal and scientific arguments to sanction white superiority.

54. *Apartheid* is thus a dangerous rationalization of an instrument protectionist in purpose, but defeatist in fact and destructive in the final analysis. This is the nature of the counter force met by decolonization to which we as members of the Security Council have a special and direct responsibility; this is the counter force over which the United Nations must prevail if only to reduce the area of tension. I should like to state categorically that the accelerating fanaticism of *apartheid* would not have been as successful as it has been, were it not for the overt and open support and the confidence which the white totalitarian régime has received mainly from the Western Powers which have poured in investment capital in thousands of millions of pounds, as well as expanded their trade with the racist régime.

55. How many resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Trusteeship Council in our effort to correct the present course in South Africa's political, social and economic development? How many draft resolutions have failed to go through as a result of opposition, open or covert, by Western major Powers? The attribute of the Western major Powers can best be described as one of prohibitive procrastination in the interests of white majority régimes.

56. The situation in Namibia is so terrible, so inhuman, that ordinary Europeans and Americans would recoil in horror if they learned the truth of what is being perpetrated against African men and women—against ordinary people like themselves—who have the same hopes, fears, tensions and needs.

57. It is not enough for those with cosmopolitan interests simply to declare their commitment to the principles of democracy; it is not enough for those possessing the power and the means to resolve situations and reduce world tensions simply—and I quote the Preamble to the United Nations Charter—"to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." The major Powers must be committed to principles, both by verbal declarations and by deeds. There is need to demonstrate such commitment in practice.

58. Those in positions of leadership of this generation must have the courage to exercise not only paramount but responsible authority over the affairs of their fellow men. Leadership, to be worth exercising and asserting, must be genuine, responsible, and in the interest of those over whom it is being exercised. Leadership without wider morality is brutal leadership, and is not worthy of the human society. Those who lead our world must be told, in no uncertain terms, that successful leadership does not call only for political ingenuity and clever manipulation of awkward situations, nor the scoring of diplomatic victories and the inflicting of defeats; it calls, above all, for the mustering of all moral stamina, courage, honesty, and a dedication to face the truth and to shape and steer the ship

of humanity perpetually on its proper course to safety, stability and peace for the progress and happiness of all. Never before in history have these qualities of leadership been more in demand than today when the world is so delicately balanced between survival and destruction.

59. I am sorry to have spoken at such length on this matter, but the gravity of this whole question demands that while we debate the aggravating situation in Namibia I should warn the Council of this obvious threat to international peace and security. We, like several other Members, have time and again pointed out that the Security Council should energetically address itself to the whole question by summoning all the resources and power at its command. So far, we have moved at a snail's pace. The draft before us carries us only a little further; and after what I have said, and given South Africa's almost traditional defiance, we should have liked the provisions of Chapter VII to come into immediate play. But we are realistic enough to recognize the social, political and economic structure of the international community. Desirous to maintain a wider measure of agreement, and in the hope that this Council will move with unanimity, as was the case during its last meeting early this year, we have decided to give full support to the present draft resolution, despite its inadequacies. The just struggle of the people of Namibia must and will go on to the bitter end. My country is irrevocably committed to this cause, and will continue to render moral and material support to the people of Namibia in their just struggle for independence.

60. I formally present the draft resolution I have just read out on behalf of the Afro-Asian and Latin American delegations of Paraguay, Colombia, Senegal, Pakistan, Nepal and Zambia.

61. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Zambia for his good wishes to me. I have also noted that a draft resolution has been submitted to the Security Council for its consideration and that it will shortly be circulated as a document.<sup>3</sup>

62. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, just as you were nearing the end of your term as President of the Security Council during what was apparently a fairly uneventful month, we are now obliged to impose on you public meetings, and perhaps numerous private consultations. However, being well acquainted with your courtesy, kindness and sense of responsibility, we know in advance that, even if there is disagreement with you on some points, you will direct our debates impartially and with fairness. We are gratified to see you presiding over this Council.

63. Last month, our distinguished colleague Ambassador Armand Bérard presided over the Council with his legendary discretion and vigour. Although there were no public meetings, we all know how active Ambassador Bérard was in a matter which is commanding the full attention of all the leading figures in our Organization. Is it not better, after all, in many circumstances, to engage in private consultations, exchanges of views and a dialogue in order to arrive at practical results than to stage a display in a public

forum with blustering, and unfortunately hollow, statements?

64. Of course, Mr. Ambassador, our two delegations do maintain close and cordial relations by reason of the special ties which have linked our two countries for centuries past. Adding a personal note, however, I would say that since I came to the United Nations, you have always shown me the greatest consideration, which has touched me deeply, and it is a pleasure for me today to pay a personal tribute to your candour, courtesy and kindness. I trust that the efforts you are still pursuing within the framework of the Council will soon result in a peaceful settlement of the problem which is of concern to us all.

65. Yet, however urgent and explosive this problem may be, we must not on that account forget another problem which will, in due course, become explosive unless we shoulder our responsibilities now. You see, certain dramatic international developments are now teaching us how important it is to shoulder one's responsibilities—and all one's responsibilities—as soon as a serious situation affecting the freedom and the inalienable rights of man arises.

66. The question which we are considering today brings into prominence a series of violations of human rights and a denial of human dignity.

67. Let us remember that the prime cause of nearly all wars, and particularly of the Second World War, has been violations of human rights and, subsequently, of the right of peoples to self-determination.

68. What is involved in the case of Namibia?

69. Quite simply the outright annexation of the Territory of Namibia, by South Africa, despite the relevant decisions of the United Nations. The component elements of this act of annexation are to be found in a whole series of laws and regulations adopted by South Africa. What are we to do now? For our part, we should have liked the great Powers to bring pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa, with a view to inducing it to respect the most elementary rules of international ethics. It seems, however, first, that South Africa will not listen to reason, and, secondly, knowing that it is economically powerful, particularly in monetary matters, that it ignores the wealth of advice offered to it. We are therefore forced to come before the Security Council to denounce the illegal acts of the Pretoria authorities and their scornful defiance of the entire international community.

70. Who are these authorities and what are they doing?

71. We know that during the Second World War the present Prime Minister of South Africa was a member of a branch of the Nazi Party in the Union of South Africa. He was placed under house arrest at that time because of his Nazi ideas. It is, therefore, no surprise that the people of Namibia are daily subjected to the most humiliating and degrading treatment.

72. These are not gratuitous accusations; for I like to have a factual basis before making any final judgements. The sad

<sup>3</sup> Later circulated as document S/9100.

realities of South Africa and Namibia have been brought home to me in other United Nations bodies. I have been to the areas bordering on those countries; I have listened to men, freedom fighters, who succeeded, at the risks of their lives, in escaping from those concentration camps. Therefore I feel bound to say that it is time for the entire international community—and particularly the permanent members of the Security Council—to shoulder its responsibilities, because the situation in Namibia, as in South Africa, is daily becoming more serious. The system of *apartheid* is being progressively introduced there and some South African laws, such as the Terrorism Act and the Suppression of Communism Act, are being applied there.

73. Yesterday a press report from Capetown informed us that the South African Senate had approved a new law transferring to the Government of South Africa most of the administrative and financial responsibilities hitherto vested in the Legislative Assembly of South West Africa.

74. The most serious endemic diseases are allowed to spread among the indigenous population. Immoral practices are forced on them in the prisons. The family unit is disrupted, heads of families being separated from their wives and children. Those who, in Namibia as in South Africa, have taken up arms in a desperate attempt at self-defence in order to save their race from total annihilation are imprisoned, usually without trial, and executed *en masse* in the central prison at Pretoria. We learnt recently from the official statistics of the South African Department of the Interior that 119 persons had been executed at Pretoria in 1968 and about 100 in 1967. These figures, huge as they are, are actually far below the total number of persons executed in the central prison at Pretoria. As you know, even in the countries with the highest crime rates, so many people have never been executed in a single year. The truth of the matter is that South Africa, whose wealth, we should remember, is built on the sweat of the indigenous inhabitants, is trying, if not to exterminate, at least to eliminate a good part of an entire race, after having debased it and reduced it to the level of beasts of burden. In South Africa, the indigenous inhabitants, who occupy only 13 per cent of the total area of that State—and the poorest part—are the ones who work in the gold-mines. We felt compelled to mention these the most striking facts, so that world public opinion might know of the tragedy of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa and Namibia.

75. All this is an affront to our conscience and our beliefs; for we would have liked to have seen a multiracial society, based on respect for human dignity, existing in perfect harmony in that part of the world. To us, the human person is still the supreme moral value, in the hierarchy of values. Human dignity is indivisible. It cannot be recognized in one place and denied in another, because all men, regardless of the colour of their skins, share one and the same nature—human nature. It is clear that the Pretoria authorities, disciples of that theoretician racist, Gobineau, have made race the supreme value and that, to them, biological qualities are worth more than any other values.

76. My country, which is headed by one of the greatest humanists of our times, who has portrayed man in noble terms, cannot accept the existence, in this age of enlighten-

ment, of a society on a biologically motivated ethic. Such an approach is contrary to our universal outlook. For that reason, we find it natural that conscious of their human attributes, should rise Namibia, as in South Africa, against the Afrikaner theoreticians of racist doctrine.

77. The situation now existing in that southern Africa is, we affirm, a serious threat to international and security.

78. The Security Council must unequivocally demand unconditional and immediate withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia, if we are to avoid a race warfare that could be disastrous to the whole mankind. We call on the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council and its permanent members, to shoulder the responsibilities conferred on them by the Charter, and to call on South Africa to discharge its obligations as a State Member of our Organization.

79. If the United Nations is to continue to be the guardian of the peoples, if it is to guarantee world peace and security, the Charter of the United Nations is to remain the guiding principle in their relations, then it is high time for the international community to apply to this distressing situation the solution which the peace-loving and freedom-loving peoples are awaiting.

80. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Senegal for his over-generous contribution to the President.

81. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): Mr. President, may I be permitted to express the appreciation of my delegation to the distinguished predecessors in the Chair, Ambassador Kinnunen of Finland and Ambassador Bérard of France, as well as our full confidence in your leadership as the President of the Security Council for this month.

82. It is indeed gratifying that, for the first time in the request of African-Asian Member States of the Security Council, the Security Council is taking up for discussion a substantive political question of Namibia. It was high time that the Council did so.

83. So far as my delegation is concerned, it has remained our contention that the possibilities of the Security Council as the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security should be utilized with a view to giving effect to the General Assembly's historic resolution 2145 (XXI) and subsequent resolutions on the question of Namibia. It may be recalled that by resolution 2145 (XXI) the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over South West Africa, declared that South Africa had no other right to the Territory and decided that thenceforth South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

84. Nearly as important as this fundamental resolution 2248 (S-V) by which the General Assembly constituted the United Nations Council for Namibia was the view to discharging the Organization's obligations to the Territory. This was clearly a most logical follow-up to the decision to terminate the Mandate.

85. However, the Government of South Africa, with its usual arrogance, has refused to withdraw from the Territory. It has indicated no sign of desire to abide by the resolutions of the General Assembly. As a member of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*, my delegation is particularly and painfully familiar with the abject contempt and ridicule in which the Government of South Africa holds our Organization and all its decisions.

86. The Government of South Africa has not only not withdrawn from Namibia, but it has introduced the much-hated policies of *apartheid* in the Territory. It is seeking, by means of oppressive legislation, to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans, and subjecting the indigenous population to inhuman atrocities, terror and imprisonment.

87. One may wonder how the Government of South Africa, isolated and condemned as it is by world public opinion, can defy the decisions of the United Nations and violate the international status of Namibia with impunity. It is an ironic situation that while South Africa has proved to be a chronic delinquent in the international community, it has been receiving the treatment of a foster child from major industrial, military and developed Powers, Member States of the Organization. Champions and pioneers of the cause of justice, liberty and freedom in their own respective countries, those Powers appear to have failed signally to lend their active support to the cause of freedom and independence in southern Africa. This becomes apparent when one examines the causes of failure of United Nations endeavours in those parts of the world. The total lack of interest shown by those Powers in serving in and co-operating with two important United Nations bodies actively related to the problems in southern Africa, namely the Committee on *Apartheid* and the Council for Namibia, is also very significant.

88. However well-meaning the motives of those Powers may be, it is plain for all to see that their action—or lack of action—is helping compound a situation which is already tense and dangerous. Portuguese colonialism, the illegal racist régime of Southern Rhodesia, the inhuman policies based on racial discrimination in South Africa and continued violation of the international status of the Territory of Namibia—these factors combine to turn southern Africa into a hot-bed of tension. Conflicts in other areas of the world may induce one to minimize the dangers of this situation, but the Security Council, as the guardian of international peace and security, cannot afford to close its eyes on the strong possibility of the situation deteriorating into a violent, long and bitter racial conflict which, once started, may engulf a wider world.

89. The situation calls for strong and resolute action on the part of the Security Council, in particular its four permanent members. The views of my delegation on the role of the Security Council with regard to Namibia have been made known at every session of the General Assembly since 1966. Our position is based on our unqualified support for the original resolution 2145 (XXI). Since under that resolution South Africa's Mandate over Namibia has been terminated and the Territory has come under direct

United Nations responsibility, it is our considered view that because of its refusal to vacate the Territory, the Government of South Africa is guilty of committing acts of aggression. This would bring the question of Namibia strictly within the purview of the Council, and for that matter, under Chapter VII of the Charter. If occupation of a territory under direct United Nations responsibility does not constitute a threat to international peace and security, it would indeed be difficult to conceive of any situation that would.

90. It is with this understanding of this question that the delegation of Nepal has joined other Asian-African member States in requesting an urgent meeting of the Security Council. After drawing the attention of the Council to the grave threat to international peace and security resulting from South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the letter from the African-Asian countries requests it to take appropriate measures and actions to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

91. It is up to the Security Council now to face the problem squarely.

92. The representative of Zambia has submitted a six-Power draft resolution, of which my delegation has the honour to be a co-sponsor. My delegation has given a great deal of thought to this draft resolution. May I say at the outset that my delegation is not entirely satisfied with its provisions, in so far as the draft resolution fails to determine the reality of the situation, namely, the continued illegal occupation of the Territory, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and wards off any hint or suggestion of enforcement actions under Chapter VII in the event of failure on the part of South Africa to comply with the resolution? Secondly, the operative part of the draft resolution evades resolution 2248 (S-V)—an important resolution, under which the General Assembly decided to give effect to the Organization's obligations by taking practical steps to transfer power to the people of the Territory.

93. In spite of these shortcomings, however, the resolution does provide a cause for some satisfaction. It marks a vast improvement on Security Council resolutions 245 (1968) and 246 (1968), which formed the subject-matter of the illegal trial of Namibian freedom fighters in Pretoria, and which touched upon the substantive political aspect of the question in their preambular parts only. Under the present draft resolution, the Security Council would significantly, for the first time in its history, reinforce the historic General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) by recognizing the termination of the Mandate and the assumption by the Organization of direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence. Under this draft resolution, the Security Council would, again for the first time, call upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw from the Territory.

94. For these reasons, believing as we do in politics as being an art of the possible, my delegation has co-sponsored the present draft resolution, in the hope that its adoption as a starting-point will make it possible for the Security

Council to take further effective and logical measures, if necessary under Chapter VII of the Charter, to give effect to its own independent decision.

95. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I think the representative of Nepal for his kind words to the President.

96. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, before I turn to the subject before us, may I very simply but very sincerely thank the speakers who preceded me for the over-generous remarks they addressed to me, particularly Ambassador Boye, whose words were inspired by sentiments of friendship which moved me deeply.

97. The request for this meeting of the Council, submitted by forty-five countries, came as no surprise to the French delegation.

98. When voting in favour of resolution 246 (1968), on 14 March 1968, my delegation indicated [*1397th meeting*] that our country could not remain unmoved by an appeal made in the name of humanity. Somewhat later, in its statement of 27 May 1968 in the General Assembly, my delegation stated<sup>4</sup> that, if such were the will of the majority, "we would be in favour of the Security Council being seized of the problem of South West Africa".

99. It is natural that the Council should be concerning itself with the situation in this Territory, especially as the past year has unfortunately brought forth more discriminatory and repressive schemes of the kind to which France has always objected. The actions of the Pretoria Government with regard to the establishment of six so-called separate homelands, the setting-up of an Executive Council and a Legislative Council in Ovamboland, the removal of indigenous people against their will, the continuation of annexationist designs, particularly the introduction of a "South West Africa Affairs Bill", which the press describes as a major and perhaps decisive step in the process of integrating the Territory into the South African governmental machinery—all these measures indicate the acceleration of an anachronistic policy which my delegation has repeatedly and unequivocally condemned as contrary to the obligations arising out of the spirit of the Mandate.

100. The obstinacy with which the Pretoria Government, far from promoting the legitimate evolution of the Territory towards self-determination and independence, is attempting to secure its domination over the people entrusted to its charge by the League of Nations can only provoke in them reactions of despair that cannot be stifled either by the sentences of South African courts or by the police repression which our colleague of Senegal, with great nobility of mind and heart, has just described so movingly.

101. We must unfortunately admit that the United Nations, confronted almost from the day of its foundation with a situation so contrary to the spirit of the Charter, has not fulfilled the hopes which the international community, and in particular the new African States, placed in it.

<sup>4</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1663rd meeting, para. 58.

102. It is true that the almost universal condemnation expressed in numerous resolutions has resounded in Pretoria; that unrewearying efforts have been lavished on the search for ways of putting an end to this intolerable oppression; that both the Secretariat and the successive bodies charged with translating the will of the majority into deeds have shown praiseworthy zeal and sincerity; and that so many debates, so many votes, so many objurgations, while raising in the hearts of black Africans hopes that were sometimes perhaps too high, at the same time cannot have left unmoved those segments of a white majority whose growing awareness must finally, we believe, triumph over selfish prejudice. Nevertheless, all these efforts have produced only meagre results. The Organization's actions have thus far proved to be a poor response to a harsh and, I might add, a complex reality. The debates at our last General Assembly showed that the great majority of States were becoming increasingly aware of these shortcomings and wished to leave to our Council the task of seeking an end to a problem the solution of which seemed as remote as ever.

103. It is not, I believe, a secret to anyone that many delegations have for months been considering calling for a Council meeting. The reason why they did not carry out this plan until this week is no doubt that they were understandably apprehensive about the kind of remedy we might be asked to opt for. Their misgivings are justified by the disappointments of the past. The lengthy debates which resulted in the unanimous adoption of resolution 246 (1968) of 14 March 1968; the difficult negotiations which preceded its adoption; the explanations of vote given at that time, including those of the delegations that are still participating in our work—all these clearly show the bounds within which the Council can set its course of action if it means to achieve unanimity among its members, or at least obtain the significant majority that is essential in order to bring pressure to bear on Pretoria.

104. I for one have no doubt that unanimity can be achieved if our Council, learning from experience, displays a sense of realism and does not allow itself to be carried away by propagandist considerations.

105. Are we not all even now at one in desiring an end to the humiliation unjustly inflicted on so many Africans and in wanting to restore our Organization's prestige, which is at stake in this matter? Are we not all even now convinced at heart that the adoption of impractical resolutions and the utterance of empty threats can only carry us further from these goals?

106. More specifically, do we not feel that, confronted with Pretoria's machinations, we should reaffirm the international status of the Territory? We all know that that status did not terminate with the demise of the League of Nations, that it cannot be modified unilaterally by the administering Power, and that only the exercise by the inhabitants of their right to self-determination can bring it to an end. We also know that its continuance imposes on South Africa obligations both towards the inhabitants, whose material and moral well-being and social progress it is bound to promote, and towards the United Nations to which it is bound to render annual reports and to transmit petitions from the Territory.

107. It is clear that the Government of South Africa has deviated from those obligations and that the new measures it is imposing or planning to impose at Windhoek are a violation of the commitments resulting from Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and from the Agreement signed at Geneva on 17 December 1920. The Security Council must most earnestly draw the attention of the Pretoria authorities to those defaults and call on them to desist from such malpractices.

108. If, however, we went much further than that, might we not shatter the unanimity that seems highly desirable, and might we not ourselves be deviating from the legal propriety of which we should be the guardians?

109. The United Nations, as heir to the League of Nations, cannot exercise powers in respect of the Mandate handed down from the League, greater than those vested in the Geneva organization, and it is doubtful whether the latter could unilaterally have deprived South Africa of its Mandate over South West Africa.

110. Moreover, one cannot but note the melancholic fact that the action taken by the General Assembly in this matter, far from having the effects expected by those who advocated it, has done nothing but to precipitate what is no doubt the very turn of events which they hoped to avert, and that the efforts made to translate resolution 2145 (XXI) into deeds have been unsuccessful.

111. It will be recalled that the French delegation did not vote for that resolution and has on several occasions expressed its reservations concerning it. My delegation would not be able to go along with the Council if it decided to embark on a course that would obviously lead nowhere.

112. The lesson of past failures, and also, of course, the inclusion in the Council of new delegations, especially those which for reasons of geography, shared hopes and courage in the face of other injustices have a feeling of kinship with the victims of *apartheid*, give us occasion for reflection, which we trust will be fruitful. My delegation hopes that the points it has just made may provide the basis for such reflection.

113. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, I should first of all like to congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Council. My delegation finds it appropriate that the question of Namibia should be considered by the Security Council under your leadership. Having had the pleasure of working with you since the beginning of last year, I cannot but express my admiration for the courage and eloquence with which you have consistently upheld the cause of justice for Asian and African peoples. Your great ability and skill and your formidable linguistic accomplishments have impressed all your colleagues. We are confident that, under your guidance, our present deliberations will be both harmonious and fruitful.

114. I should also like to take this opportunity to place on record our deep appreciation of the wisdom and dignity with which Mr. Bérard discharged his duties as President of the Council during February. Although the Council did not meet last month, important consultations took place on the

momentous issues involved in the situation in the Middle East. The satisfactory outcome of those consultations to all concerned was in no small measure influenced by the judgement and skill which were brought to bear on the situation by Mr. Bérard, both as President of the Security Council and as Ambassador of France.

115. The Council is meeting today to deal with the substantive aspects of the question of Namibia. The groundwork for our deliberations was laid down by resolution 246 (1968) adopted by the Council on 14 March 1968, and also by General Assembly resolution 2403 (XXIII) of 16 December 1968. Action by the Council on this question has been rendered imperative by the developments which have since taken place.

116. What is South Africa's response to General Assembly resolution 2403 (XXIII)? Although the applicable descriptive terms have been exhausted, the truth remains that this response is one of total defiance. Not only has the Pretoria régime refused to relax its policies towards South West Africa, but it has gone even further on its reckless course.

117. Once again ignoring the authority of the United Nations, South Africa has embarked on illegal actions which are clearly designed to divide the people of Namibia into Bantustans and destroy the integrity of their Territory. South Africa has forcibly removed Africans from their homes in Windhoek to the segregated area of Katutura. The sense of outrage felt by the entire membership of the United Nations at this flouting not only of the authority of the United Nations, but also of all norms of international conduct, was manifest in the consideration of this question by the General Assembly at its last session.

118. Not possessing the necessary authority to enforce the decisions of the United Nations, the General Assembly could not but turn, as it did in resolution 2403 (XXIII), to the Security Council to take urgently all effective measures, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, to effect the immediate withdrawal of South African authorities from Namibia in order to enable Namibia to attain independence. This was the voice of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations. It is to this voice that the Council has now to hearken.

119. What can the Council do in this situation which holds the latent danger of racial war, which is a challenge to the authority of the United Nations and which clearly subverts the fundamental principles on which alone rest our hopes of easing tensions in Southern Africa? If we look for an answer in the Charter of the United Nations, we shall find it unmistakably in the provisions of Chapter VII.

120. But it is a basic limitation of the United Nations that decisions can be meaningful only when they are taken in agreement and harmony. Too often the imperatives of consensus eclipse the demands of the situation. As all members of the Council are aware, there have been intensive consultations on the question for the last few weeks. As a result, the draft resolution so ably introduced by my friend and colleague, Ambassador Mwaanga of Zambia, on behalf of his delegation and five other co-sponsoring delegations, including Pakistan, is now before the Security Council.

121. In commending the six-Power draft resolution, I should, however, like to draw attention equally to its merits and its shortcomings. It is clear that the draft text is a considerable advance on the Council's resolution 246 (1968) inasmuch as it addresses itself not to any particular actions of South African authorities in Namibia, but to the basic issue of the unlawful presence of South Africa in the Territory. It considers that this presence is detrimental to the interests of the population of the Territory and of those of the world community. It calls upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw its administration from the Territory. It declares that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia are contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

122. The crux of the draft resolution lies, however, in operative paragraph 8. We are disappointed that in that paragraph the Council merely repeats the language of operative paragraph 5 of resolution 246 (1968) instead of going further. In this respect the present draft resolution clearly falls short of the requirements of this situation.

123. A warning was given last year. The warning was not heeded. Surely it must now be followed by effective action and not by yet another warning. But as I said before, in such situations we can only move in unison if we are to move at all. It is well known that three permanent members are not willing to proceed to take the necessary measures to compel South Africa to withdraw its unlawful authority from the Territory. The only redeeming feature of the provisions of operative paragraph 8 is that action under Chapter VII of the Charter is not foreclosed by the text. Whether or not the Council commits itself to such action now, we have no doubt that only sanctions can convince South Africa that the United Nations has the will and the capability to meet the challenge to its competence to decolonize the Territory.

124. At the time we adopted resolution 246 (1968), I said that in order to induce the South African Government to respect the decisions of the United Nations, the role of those permanent members that are in a position to bring to bear decisive influence on South Africa would be crucial.

Those words are even truer today. It is not that we refuse to understand the hesitations of the three permanent members of the Security Council in this respect. But we cannot see how this situation in the entire southern region of the continent of Africa can be improved unless they show themselves willing to do what is required and expected of them by the international community.

125. We appeal to the three members to act in accordance with the human, moral and political imperatives of the situation. This appeal is not based on any racial viewpoint. Could anything be more demeaning to western civilization itself than that a racist minority régime which boasts of representing that civilization should continue its illegal occupation of a territory whose international status is unquestioned? Could anything be more anachronistic than that this occupation should continue in a day and age when respect for the right of peoples to self-determination is a basic norm of international conduct for all civilized States?

126. I wish I could cite here reliable economic figures in regard to Namibia. As we know, these are not being released by the Pretoria régime. But two facts are beyond dispute. First, that régime disposes of enormous economic resources in South Africa. Second, the Territory of Namibia remains among those which are the least developed. And yet South Africa's acquisitive instincts are so insatiable that it must forcibly appropriate the small portion of an impoverished people to further enrich itself. It is not only unjust and deserving of the world's condemnation that South Africa should rule and divide Namibia, that it should fasten the yoke of the odious *apartheid* system on its people: it is indecent, and indecencies have no place in the order of the United Nations.

127. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I thank the representative of Pakistan for his friendly congratulations and his offer of co-operation with the Chair.

128. In view of the lateness of the hour, and after informal consultations with the members of the Council, I suggest that we should adjourn this meeting and reconvene this afternoon at 3 p.m.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*