

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

# 1885<sup>th</sup>

MEETING: 30 JANUARY 1976 UN LIBRARY

NEW YORK

JUN 29 1984

~~UN/SA COLLECTION~~

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1885) .....	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation in Namibia: Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918) .....	1
Statement of the President concerning a telegram from Mr. Ali Soilihi, head of State of the Comoros .....	15

#### 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.

## 1885th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 30 January 1976, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Salim A. SALIM  
(United Republic of Tanzania).

*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 and United States of America.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1885)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:  
Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.*

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

#### The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 16 December 1975 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/11918)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken previously [1880th-1883rd meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Nigeria, Poland, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber, on the usual understanding that they will be invited to take a place at the Council table whenever they wish to address the Council. I also invite the President and members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take their places at the Council table.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Karim (Bangladesh), Mr. Mikanagu (Burundi), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Camara (Guinea), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Marpaung (Indonesia), Mr. Hall (Jamaica), Mr. Sharaf (Jordan), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Bishara (Kuwait), Mr. Minikon (Liberia), Mr. Kanté (Mali),*

*Mr. El Hassen (Mauritania), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Harriman (Nigeria), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Botha (South Africa), Mr. Driss (Tunisia) and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Kamana (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the members of the delegation took places at the Security Council table.*

2. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda. The first speaker is the representative of Cuba. I therefore invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

3. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have here a Secretariat document prepared for the United Nations Council for Namibia which is 28 pages long and which confines itself to an account of the recent action of the Security Council on Namibia. A similar document reflecting what the Assembly has done on the matter would be much more voluminous, since the Assembly has been dealing with the subject for many years over which it has reached a verdict which is well known and reflects the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the international community. But let us revert to the shorter document. It contains the texts of 14 resolutions adopted by the Council in the period from 25 January 1968 to 17 December 1974, when the Security Council last adopted a resolution on Namibia.

4. This means that about two resolutions on Namibia are adopted a year—one every five months—by this body entrusted with maintaining international peace and security, resolutions whose texts contain various provisions which it would be useful to recall at this stage. Repeatedly these resolutions state that the members of the Council condemn the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia, that they recognize the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and the principle of the national unity and territorial integrity of that people, that they consider also that the continued occupation of Namibia by South African forces could result in situations which might jeopardize peace and security in southern Africa; and that they request those Members of the United Nations which have special relations with the Government of Pretoria, to do their best to persuade it to adopt a line of conduct more compatible with the principles laid down by the Organization.

5. I will not, of course, proceed to read out these resolutions because I know that members of the Council are well aware of them and that they will bear them in mind as they once again consider the subject of Namibia. I do want to recall some of the decisions taken by the Security Council, as, for example, the decision contained in paragraph 9 of resolution 301 (1971) adopted on 20 October 1971, that is, over four years ago. Therein the Council declared that any further refusal on the part of the South African Government to withdraw from Namibia could create conditions detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security in the region.

6. There is another reference in resolution 323 (1972), adopted on 6 December 1972, in paragraph 2 of which the Council pointed out that the overwhelming majority of the opinions of those consulted by the representative of the Secretary-General in Namibia categorically rejected the policy of bantustans, demanded their immediate abolition, demanded the immediate withdrawal of the South African administration from Namibia, and further demanded the accession of that Territory to national independence and the preservation of its territorial integrity. The Council also pointed out that, accordingly, the opinion of the vast majority of the Namibian people was consistent with the repeatedly expressed position of the United Nations on the matter.

7. The last resolution, as the Council well knows, resolution 366 (1974) of 17 December 1974, demanded that South Africa make a solemn declaration that it would comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice... that it recognize the territorial integrity of Namibia as a nation, such declaration to be addressed to the Security Council.

8. The rest is all too well known to members of this body. Members all well know what the reply of the South African régime was. They know further what the unfortunate circumstances were which made it impossible for this United Nations body to discharge its duty, preventing it even from being consistent with its previous decisions. By virtue of the triple veto [see 1829th meeting] the Council was hindered from adopting the appropriate measures and continuing to consider and deal with the question of Namibia in keeping with the Charter and the duties of this United Nations body.

9. We are meeting, then, once again to consider a situation which was described by the Security Council more than once as one that generated threats to peace and security in Africa. And the Council meets once again after long awaiting a South African reply which has not yet come and conciliatory action which some Members of the United Nations are in a position to carry out. At this meeting of the Council there is only one new procedural element. This is nothing other than the surprising reappearance in the chamber

of Mr. Botha, the representative of the racist minority of South Africa. This spokesman of the South African racists and colonialists appears, but not exactly to bring us the reply that the Security Council has been expecting since 17 December 1974, not even belatedly to state that he appeared in the chamber because he recognized, even to some degree, the role of this United Nations body regarding the Territory that South Africa has usurped; nor did he come to announce that his Government was in a position to amend a policy which has met with the most categorical repudiation by the world public.

10. On the contrary, he has come to remind the Security Council that the situation in Namibia is a grave threat to international peace and security. He has come to tell the Council that the South African régime is far from harbouring the least intention of changing its well-known policy. He has come to place on record once again that the racist minority of Pretoria continues to flout international opinion. That it persists in perpetuating its oppression not only of the African masses in South Africa but also of the oppressed people of Namibia and it is doing so as brazenly as the colonialists and racists who organized and promoted the slave trade from the earliest times of the Cape colony, as though the world had not progressed an inch since the colonialists began their massacres of the population of former South-West Africa, since they began their senseless depredation of that Territory, plundering their land and their livestock, indiscriminately murdering the indigenous African population.

11. Very seldom has the Council or the Organization witnessed a more revealing statement than the one it had the opportunity to hear on 27 January [1881st meeting] from the South African representative. He began by saying that the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly and all mankind were wrong and maintained an unrealistic unilateral attitude, which was contrary to the interests of what he called "the peoples" of the Territory. Moreover, he described his Government as if it were absolutely innocent of the history and of the problems of what he still insists on calling South-West Africa and he came again, like the old colonialists, to play a Messianic role, as it were, by presenting his régime as accomplishing a historic and paternalistic mission among the African peoples.

12. Let us just look at a quotation from Mr. Botha's revealing statement:

"As no homogenous people exists in South West Africa, progress towards self-determination must necessarily proceed, if it is not to be imposed, along the lines of agreement between the different peoples concerned. The role of South Africa thus becomes obvious: it is to promote agreement between the peoples of the Territory without imposing a solution on them." [Ibid., para. 96.]

13. Since the first slave-trader came to the shores of the Namibian Territory the European colonialists have attempted to present that Territory as one populated by a series of conflicting tribes, peoples incapable of governing themselves, who have to wait for the white man in his bounty to lead them along the path of peaceful and harmonious development. That was the inspiration of the colonialists since the far-off time when Mr. Heinrich Goering, the father of the notorious Nazi, began the colonization of that Territory. That was the attitude of other racist and colonialist leaders, some of whom bore the same name as the gentleman who spoke before the Council, and this continues to be the attitude and the excuse of the South African régime in denying the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence. The historical experience of all African peoples and of all peoples anywhere in the world who have been victims of colonialism attests precisely to the contrary. The essential pre-condition for the people of Namibia to organize itself into a progressive and democratic society is the immediate withdrawal of the oppressors, of those who are assailing and plundering that Territory, those who have oppressed that population for too long a time for the international community to admit that we shall confine ourselves merely to continuing to adopt resolutions which are not implemented in practice.

14. Mr. Botha made other comments in his statement on other African problems, to which I will refer briefly later on, since I fully share the opinion you expressed, Mr. President, when you urged the members of the Council to keep to the subject of Namibia, which is sufficiently important and striking in itself to merit our exclusive consideration. Of course, my delegation, at any time if members of the Council so wish it, would be ready to debate here the situation in Angola or any other subject that the Council may want to consider. However, I think it is worth reflecting in the records of the Council what another spokesman for South Africa, whose surname, coincidentally, is the same as that of the representative who spoke here, was saying in Cape Town, South Africa at virtually the same time as Mr. Botha in the Council was expatiating on the virtues of South Africa policy and even venturing to speak of its readiness to work in peace and co-operation with other African States.

15. I have before me a cable from the British news agency Reuters, dated Capetown, 28 January last. I shall read it out:

“The South African Government today introduced legislation empowering the armed forces to cross the country’s borders to counteract any threat to security. The legislation, Defence Amendment Bill, defines South Africa as ‘Africa south of the equator’.”\*

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

The cable goes on to explain that previously, before being able to cross the South African border, the military personnel of that country had to submit papers showing that he did so voluntarily. It goes on to say that this Bill was submitted by the Defence Minister, Mr. Peter Botha, and that it is hoped that it would become law at the end of next month. The defence service of the Republic is defined in the cable as including:

“the suppression of any armed conflict outside the Republic which, in the opinion of the State President, is or may be a threat to the security of the Republic”.\*

I repeat that the geographical definition given in this Bill by the other Mr. Botha in regard to what would from now on be South Africa is “Africa south of the equator”.

16. So as not to be unfair to the representative of South Africa, I was curious enough to look at a document [S/11948 and Add.1] he distributed which features a map of the African continent, on which members of the Council will be able to see the equator line. Out of curiosity, I looked at the trajectory of that line and at how far the powers of the South African army would reach in establishing the law and order of the racists, according to this new legislation. On the basis of the map distributed by the South African delegation, the area in which the troops of the racist régime could intervene freely, by the end of next month, according to Reuters, would include 20 African countries of which 19 are sovereign and independent States—the other one is Namibia—almost all of them States Members of the United Nations, some of which are present in this chamber.

17. It is no accident that today an important African newspaper, the *Daily News* of Dar es Salaam, features on its first page a strong editorial reply to the proposed amendment to the law submitted to the South African Parliament. The *Daily News* editorial rightly stresses the threat that that South African declaration contains for all African States, from Zaire, Kenya and Gabon all the way down to the south, and calls upon the peoples of the continent to redouble their vigilance in view of that threat and to continue and intensify their struggle against the *apartheid* régime.

18. The fact that the existence of the racist régime in South Africa is a constant threat to peace, to international security and to the independence and freedom of Africa cannot be denied by anyone. It has imposed on the masses of South Africa the most cruel exploitation and racial oppression. South Africa has extended that exploitation illegally, despite the repeated demands of the international community, over the Territory of Namibia, which it has utilized and continues to utilize as a base for aggression against

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

other neighbouring territories, and specifically at this time against the People's Republic of Angola. Moreover, according to what I have just mentioned, there are no limits to that South African aggressive action until it reaches the equator.

19. Moreover, that has been the official, publicly acknowledged policy of the racist régime. I draw the attention of the members of the Council to another reference also from British sources, namely *The Guardian* of London of 11 April 1973, quoting the White Paper on Defence published that year by the South African Defense Ministry. At that time this South African document referred to the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau against Portuguese colonialism, and recognized the role that the South African troops were already playing in repressing that liberation struggle of the then Portuguese colonies and of the oppressed people of Rhodesia. These were the words of the Minister of Defence of South Africa, according to *The Guardian*:

"I do not wish to spread alarm, but I must state unambiguously that for a long time already we have been engaged in a war of low intensity and that this situation will probably continue for some considerable time to come."\*

20. It would be an endless task to list the record of aggressive activities by South Africa against the African peoples—it would be endless but it would also be unnecessary, because, as you can see, the leaders of Pretoria have not really been discreet in revealing to the world their plans for enslavement not only of the African peoples whom they now oppress, but even of the African continent as a whole. That is why we believe it is high time for the Security Council to take stock of the action it has taken so far on Namibia and to take note of what has happened since 17 December 1974, or rather, of what has not happened, and consequently adopt vigorous measures to put into practice the repeated decisions of the Council with respect to Namibia. It is high time that this United Nations body expressed clearly and unambiguously its support for the Namibian people who led, by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), is waging a heroic and difficult struggle to win its sacred right to independence. It is high time for the Council to act in accordance with the General Assembly's repeated pronouncements and it is high time for the Council to act in a manner consistent with its own decisions, in particular resolution 366 (1974) of 17 December 1974.

21. There were other comments in the statement made by the representative of South Africa which do not deserve any special reply on our part because it is obvious that the purpose of his statement was to reveal once again the contempt of his Government for

the Council, the United Nations and world opinion and to try to divert your attention from the important task at hand. I shall only say that our support for and our diplomatic, political, moral and material solidarity with the people of Angola are a direct consequence of an international policy based on principles which we have always consistently maintained. Our assistance to that country has been given upon the request of its legitimate Government, the Government presided over by Comrade Agostinho Neto, which has been recognized by most members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and by dozens of States Members of the United Nations.

22. We must, however, thank the representative of Pretoria for his long anti-communist lecture, because it is a good lesson for all. The anti-communist and anti-Soviet hatred felt by Mr. Botha precisely confirms the fact that the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and, in general, the forces of the world defending socialism are the firmest and most loyal allies, the staunchest support and the sincerest friends of national liberation movements. The States of Africa, the peoples of Africa, will not be hoodwinked by the lies of the racists and professional slanderers, who cannot deceive anyone. They know where their friends are, those who have shown themselves to be such throughout the long struggle against colonialism. Among them they have always relied and will continue to rely on our country.

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

24. Mr. HALL (Jamaica): My delegation wishes to express our warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on your performance as President of the Council for the month of January 1976. We hope that under your guidance the Council will deal effectively with the current grave international situation with which we are confronted.

25. The Security Council is now meeting once again to discuss the question of Namibia and my Government is grateful for being given this opportunity to participate in the debate on this matter. A few months ago, on 6 June 1975, three of the permanent members of the Security Council, namely, the United States, the United Kingdom and France, vetoed a draft resolution on this subject. It was the second time in the history of the United Nations that a draft resolution in the Security Council was subjected to a triple veto. The first such phenomenon occurred on 30 October 1974 [see 1808th meeting]. In both instances, the triple veto was exercised by the same countries on matters relating to the activities of that pariah of the international community, the Government of South Africa.

26. Many resolutions on the question of Namibia have been adopted by various United Nations bodies, and indeed the Security Council, by unanimous vote,

\* Quoted in English by the speaker.

adopted its resolution 366 (1974) in December 1974 which, *inter alia*, demands South Africa's withdrawal from the Territory and its recognition of the territorial integrity and national unity of Namibia. In that resolution the Security Council also decided to remain seized of this matter for the purpose of reviewing South Africa's compliance with the terms of the resolution, with a view to considering the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter in the event of non-compliance by South Africa. The result was the reaffirmation by South Africa of its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, and the subsequent display of impotence by the Security Council in mid-1975 to deal with this intransigence.

27. Undaunted by the outcome of the consideration of this matter by the Security Council, the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, adopted resolution 3399 (XXX) on 26 November 1975: a vote of 110 in favour, none against, and 7 abstentions. Those countries abstaining were Belgium, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States. On that resolution, which deals with the effective enslavement of indigenous people by a racist minority, those countries abstained.

28. Where is the moral outcry in the international communications media against those countries which abstained? And yet many countries have recently been subjected, and indeed are still being subjected, to an intense campaign of vilification in the international media for having abstained in the voting on other issues which are less clear-cut in their ramifications. Such is the degree of impartiality and objectivity of those who would mould international opinion and seek to impose international standards of morality.

29. The granting of fundamental human rights to the people of Namibia, the eradication of their exploitation by a minority racist régime, the cessation of the reign of terror imposed on those suffering people—all these are sacrificed on the altar of greed resulting from massive investments by transnational corporations, these merchants of death and destruction which wield such influence and power over the policies of the abstainers.

30. Both the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples are to be congratulated on their continued efforts to bring to the attention of the international community the current situation in Namibia. Under the glare of this spotlight the activities of South Africa, aided and abetted by its allies, cannot be concealed from the international community.

31. The Security Council heard a few days ago an incredible statement by the representative of South

Africa on the activities of his Government's illegal occupation of Namibia. That statement shows the contempt of the South African Government for the Council as well as the United Nations and, indeed, for the international community as a whole. It is a statement which reflects the paranoia which permeates the racist régime of Pretoria.

32. The General Assembly has recognized for some time that the situation in Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The validity of that recognition has been forcefully brought home by the invasion of the independent State of Angola by South Africa. And the representative of that racist régime of Pretoria has the temerity to come here to justify the invasion of Angola by South African troops on 9 August 1975 as an exercise by a platoon designed for the holding of discussions—I repeat: to hold discussions—so that workers on the Calueque Dam could return to work. This constitutes a gross insult to us all. My Government strongly condemns this action by the Pretoria régime, which is an attempt to expand its influence over southern Africa, and we denounce all those who support this military manoeuvre. We welcome the recent news that South African troops, under military and political fire, are scurrying out of Angola, and we look forward to the day when we shall hear of their eviction from Namibia under similar circumstances—if necessary.

33. The real intentions of South Africa are to perpetuate its control over Namibia, and we are given a clear illustration of this by the reference to the Namibian town of Walvis Bay as a South African port in a statement by the Foreign Minister of South Africa [see S/11948 and Add.1, annex, footnote a]. What is the purpose of the militarization of Namibia by South Africa? What is the purpose of the military base at Grootfontein in Namibia, if not to launch acts of aggression against neighbouring States? The Declaration of Dakar on Namibia and Human Rights [S/11939, annex], adopted earlier this month, clearly points out the purpose of this militarization as a means of consolidating the illegal occupation of Namibia and of repressing the legitimate resistance of the people of Namibia, as well as using Namibia as a base for intervention in the internal affairs of African countries.

34. Several speakers have called for the holding of free national elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations for the entire Territory as a single political entity, and it is the hope of my delegation that steps will be taken by the Security Council to compel the South African Government to accede to this demand. Draft resolution S/11950, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Guyana constitutes, in the view of my Government, the minimum position that can be expected at this time, and it is our hope that the Security Council will unanimously adopt the draft resolution.

35. The past two decades have witnessed the success of national liberation movements in their relentless fight to secure the freedom of their peoples from foreign, colonial and racist domination. In this regard Africa constitutes a shining example to oppressed peoples throughout the world. Indeed, we recently saw the victory of the indigenous peoples of Africa over a colonial Power that had existed for 500 years. SWAPO is following in the footsteps of those successful liberation movements, and my Government fully supports the activities of that organization in the pursuit of its war of liberation.

36. My Government is convinced that the independence of Namibia is an historical inevitability and that this will be achieved under the leadership of SWAPO, which is the authentic representative of the Namibian people. But the international community has a legal obligation to hasten the establishment of an independent Namibia with the preservation of its national unity and territorial integrity. The current situation in that region of Africa demands action by the Council to set in train those measures which are called for in General Assembly resolution 3399 (XXX).

37. Whatever the outcome of this series of meetings of the Security Council on the question of Namibia, my Government will continue to give moral and material support to the people of Namibia and their representative, SWAPO, and will continue to denounce the Pretoria régime and all those countries which collaborate with that régime by maintaining military, diplomatic, economic, consular and other relations with it.

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

39. Mr. KANTÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to take this opportunity through you to thank the members of the Security Council for having given my delegation a chance to participate in their deliberations on the question of Namibia, a painful problem which distresses so many African States. It is also a pleasant duty for my delegation, Mr. President and dear brother, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are particularly pleased because you are a worthy son of a brotherly country which has excellent relations with mine. The remarkable results obtained by the Security Council on the question of the Middle East are a measure of your ability and your sincere militant commitment to defend the lofty principles of the Charter. We are assured in advance that the debates you preside over will make it possible for us to take an important stride forward in the liberation of Namibia.

40. The question under consideration today is one of the most serious problems with which the Organization has had to deal since it was created. Indeed,

the dispute between the racist régime of South Africa and the United Nations over Namibia goes back to 1947, when the United Nations was informed of South Africa's categorical refusal to place that Non-Self-Governing Territory—then known as South West Africa—under the international Trusteeship System. Since that time, the authorities in Pretoria have heaped nothing but a revolting scorn on the decisions and recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly. We shall not here dwell on the impressive number of decisions adopted on the question by the competent bodies of the United Nations. We would however wish to bring up some important events which have occurred in the evolution of the question in various United Nations bodies.

41. On 27 October 1966, faced with the obstinacy of South Africa, the General Assembly felt compelled to adopt a resolution to terminate South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa and to place that Non-Self-Governing Territory under its direct trusteeship, in accordance with the Charter.<sup>1</sup> By creating in 1967 the United Nations Council for Namibia,<sup>2</sup> charged with the administration of the Territory and with the subsequent appointment of a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, the international community intended to underscore its determination effectively to carry out its mandate over South West Africa.

42. However, in spite of all the recommendations and admonitions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, and notwithstanding the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,<sup>3</sup> which declared the continuing presence of South Africa in Namibia to be illegal, the racist régime of Pretoria none the less continues to occupy that Territory which is under international administration. What is even worse, it is carrying out blind repression there. The odious policy of *apartheid* has systematically been extended to the Territory, while bantustanization of the Territory, which is intended to destroy the unity and national identity of the Namibian people, is being frantically pursued.

43. The delegation of Mali forcefully denounces the so-called constitutional conference convened in Namibia by South Africa as being contrary to the real interests of the Namibian people. By organizing this masquerade by way of a plebiscite the Fascist régime of Pretoria has sought to deceive the world public, its sinister design being, as we are well aware, to set up puppets so as to allow it to continue indefinitely its subjugation of the people of that Territory.

44. It is clear today to everyone that the occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Namibia constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. The apprehensions of independent Africa are therefore justified. Indeed, quite recently there were threats by Pretoria against the territorial integrity of Zambia. Now

there is open aggression by South African troops against the young, independent Republic of Angola, an aggression for which Namibia constitutes the primary staging area. Africa has unanimously condemned this invasion.

45. The effrontery and brazenness of the advocates of *apartheid* are due to the refusal of the Organization to have recourse to the relevant provisions of the Charter to subdue their stubborn determination to perpetuate their domination of Namibia. The allies of paleface power in southern Africa will surely agree with us today that fighter planes, heavy helicopters, tanks and other so-called conventional weapons, which they have supplied under unofficial agreements and in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, serve not to defend the country, as they would have had us believe each time we protested, but to violate the territorial integrity of the independent States of Africa, to slaughter the civilian population in the name of so-called Christian and Western civilization.

46. Those terms, incidentally, are the terms used by the authorities in Pretoria themselves to justify their craven and barbaric aggression against the young People's Republic of Angola. No one in those circles has spoken out to denounce, to blast and to condemn this further act of defiance. Is there this conspiracy of silence because the victims are Africans? We would not like to believe that, but we cannot but recall the audacious Stanleyville airlift carried out in the 1960s, supposedly to save the lives of a few dozen Europeans who were allegedly threatened by fighting—which, nevertheless, was going on far from that town.

47. We should prefer not to acknowledge complicity on their part, for we are reluctant to believe that they identify with the brand of Christian, Western civilization preached by Pretoria and reflected only in the odious policy of *apartheid* which, at least in their speeches before us, they condemn. Their silence, however, has not been complete. Some in those circles have spoken out, loudly to be sure, but only to equate the armed aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola with the valuable and effective assistance which the Soviet Union and Cuba have given Angola in its struggle to safeguard its independence under international agreements properly concluded. Their admonitions, if that is what they can be called, were intended solely to create a certain amount of confusion to justify and to foster the colonial reconquest of Angola.

48. But the world will not be duped, and fortunately has recognized with us that the Soviet Union and Cuba have provided, since the outbreak of armed fighting in Angola, that is, since 1961, their constant material, political and moral assistance to the patriots of MPLA [*Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola*], whereas those who today criticize them

armed the Expeditionary Corps of Salazar and Caetano, of grim memories, against the Angolan people. Moreover, we can safely say that since the Second World War the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other socialist countries, including, of course, Cuba, as well as democratic organizations in Western Europe, have not spared their selfless and effective support for the peoples who are fighting against colonial domination throughout the world. In so doing they have made an inestimable contribution to the liberation of the peoples of the world, to the universality of the United Nations and to the maintenance and safeguarding of international peace and security. We call the entire world to witness.

49. One cannot honestly compare that legal and moral assistance, which, what is more, is in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Organization on the emancipation of the peoples of the world, with the deliberate aggression which the racist régime in Pretoria has perpetrated against the Angola people.

50. Has not the Organization, in a number of its resolutions, committed its Member States to giving assistance of all kinds to the national liberation movements? Would the independent Republic of Angola exist today had it not been for MPLA and the support provided by the socialist countries and progressive forces throughout the world? That is a question that one is bound to ask in the face of the allegations and the assertions of certain circles.

51. Let us not fall into believing that there are those who pull the strings behind South Africa, which, however, seems to be saying just that in a number of its speeches, at least in so many words. I believe that these parenthetical comments were certainly necessary so as to bring out once again the dangers to the security of African States and therefore to peace, posed by the continuing occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

52. Today we have seen one way in which the situation has escalated. After decreeing a general mobilization, the authorities at Pretoria on 28 December 1975 enacted a law authorizing them to extend their "military operations" beyond their boundaries. That, we must admit, is a unique example in the annals of history. Even Hitler's fascism did not arrogate such licence unto itself, either under national law or in its proclamations.

53. In the meantime, the other régime, which is an outcast of the international community and an immediate neighbour of South Africa, the rebel clique of Ian Smith, is at its wits' end trying to foster a state of armed tension in Southern Rhodesia in order to lend a helping hand to its cousins at Pretoria in the racial confrontation which they are planning to bring about in southern Africa.

54. Is it not a paradox that the last redoubt of colonialism in Africa is precisely Namibia, a Territory under international administration? Is it not paradoxical that it is the representative of *apartheid* who calls upon the United Nations to take control of the situation in the People's Republic of Angola, whereas his abject régime, which is an outcast of the international community and which has been refusing for the past 30 years to withdraw from a Territory under the administration of the United Nations? Is it not a paradox that, according to the advocates of *apartheid*, the heterogeneity of the population in Namibia is an obstacle to the political emancipation of the Territory? But are the inhabitants of South Africa homogeneous? In what country of the world, can one find such homogeneity, today? The peoples of the entire world, in all countries without any exception, are made up of different races, ethnic groups and tribes. That is true not only of Africa. However, enough of paradoxes.

55. The Security Council must purely and simply reject the dilatory arguments of the Pretoria authorities. We were expecting something other than this from the representative of that country, pleading his case, as he has done, in such poor taste. We had thought that Pretoria would have used its suspension from the Organization to examine its conscience. It would then have come to us to say: we shall abandon our obstinacy regarding the question of Namibia, and we are prepared to withdraw for the benefit of the United Nations.

56. However, as in the past, wisdom has yet again not prevailed in the minds of the advocates of *apartheid*. If it had, we should have been surprised. The allies of Pretoria must resolve to understand that their circumspection has only served to encourage Pretoria to pursue its disastrous policies. We concede and acknowledge that the good faith of some must have been betrayed by their friends in South Africa, but now that the pressures that they have brought to bear bilaterally have proved ineffective in lessening the obstinacy of Pretoria, they must change their minds and take it upon themselves to co-operate actively with the United Nations to liberate Namibia. It is time for them to prove to their African friends, not in proclamations this time, but in concrete deeds, that international security is one and indivisible, that the détente which they advocate for Europe cannot be strengthened while peace continues to be deliberately broken by paleface power in Africa. Interdependence and our common destiny make it compelling. The hour is grave; it is no time for hesitation, for rumblings of war are already heard in southern Africa. This is an appeal which we make to our friends in Western Europe in the name of justice and in the name of that friendship, which they claim.

57. The fight against communism cannot justify any alliance with South Africa nor constitute extenuating circumstances in its breaches of the peace. We are faced with a rebel Member which has turned a deaf

ear for close to 30 years to all appeals to reason, to all recommendations and warnings of the Organization. Today the facts are clear and events overwhelming. Our interminable hesitations and compromise resolutions have only emboldened Pretoria. Indeed not content with maintaining its domination over Namibia, it uses it for the conquest of other African countries. It uses the Angolan problem as a pretext in order to set itself up as a censor or a policeman in southern Africa. Yet it should realize that the African peoples are able to assume responsibility for their own destiny, just like all other peoples. The Angolan problem is exclusively within the competence of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola.

58. Chou En-lai, the prestigious former Premier of Council of State of the People's Republic of China, said in 1968, after a visit to east Africa, that Africa was ripe for revolution. I would say, to confirm the words of that great statesman that Africa has come of age and cannot allow outside forces to choose its options, not even through the intermediary of puppets or Trojan horses. Yesterday the peoples of Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau to mention only them, made their choices under the banners of FRELIMO [*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*] and PAIGC [*Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde*]. Today the Angolan people under that of MPLA, headed by their prestigious leader, Mr. Agostinho Neto, have in turn just made theirs. Tomorrow the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe will make their choices, under the African National Congress (ANC) and SWAPO. This is not a romantic notion; this is the law of history. However, Africa is not therefore either racist or sectarian; it is humanistic and accordingly, open to the entire world. It remains devoted to the moral values which make the strength of mankind and of peoples.

59. The aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola launched from Namibia gives a new dimension to the problem before the Security Council. The Council's decision must take into account the dire consequences of the illegal occupation of that Territory under international trusteeship by the advocates of *apartheid*. You bear weighty responsibilities, because it is up to you to defuse a racial confrontation for which the racists of Pretoria have taken the initiative. The martyred peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania have their eyes on the Council today. You are their final recourse, before they reach the point of no return. Their expectation is that you will reach a firm decision commensurate with the grave menace of paleface power to the lives and security of millions of men, women and children living in that part of the continent. Furthermore, the expansionism of South Africa, if not contained in time, would engulf southern Africa in a virulent racial war with unpredictable implications.

60. We do not doubt that the members of the Security Council fully appreciate the gravity of the current

situation in that part of the world and we are sure that their decision on the question of Namibia will be adopted solely in the light of the interests of peace, excluding all other considerations, even emotional ones, and that it will meet the expectations of the peoples of Africa and in particular of the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and Azania.

61. The PRESIDENT: As there are no further speakers inscribed for the general debate I should like to make a statement as representative of the UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.

62. I should like to begin by expressing the particular satisfaction of my delegation at the participation in our deliberations of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia led by its illustrious President, my good friend, colleague and brother, Mr. Kamana of Zambia. We all know the important role played by the United Nations Council for Namibia in this question, and the participation of Mr. Kamana and his colleagues has certainly enriched our deliberations.

63. I should like also to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania for the devoted and outstanding services to the cause of the Namibians rendered by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, our friend, Mr. MacBride. It is also self-evident that the statement made by our brother, Mr. Garoeb, Administrative Secretary of SWAPO, at the beginning of the meetings on this question has tremendously assisted the Council to gain a proper perspective of the developments in that international Territory.

64. When my Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke before the Council in June last year [*1826th meeting*], he did so against the background of the statement issued by the racist régime of South Africa with regard to Namibia. He made clear the position of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania on the question of Namibia. At that time, he pointed out the arrogance of the racist régime and the cynicism that characterized the reply of that régime to Council resolution 366 (1974). It was the conclusion of the United Republic of Tanzania then that no change had occurred in the defiant position of that régime and that what remained was for the Council to take enforcement measures against that régime with a view to getting it to comply with the decisions of the Council.

65. To that end, the Tanzanian delegation, together with other African delegations, sponsored a draft resolution [*S/11713*] which was reasonable, with a view to enabling the Council to take the necessary enforcement measures. Much to our regret, that reasonable draft resolution was vetoed by three Western permanent members of the Council. At that time, none of those members thought that South Africa had complied with resolution 366 (1974). In their

statements they showed how inadequate was the reply of the racist régime. Yet it was not only the reply which was inadequate, for none of the demands which had been spelled out in resolution 366 (1974) had been implemented. Consequently, political prisoners continued and still continue to languish in the racist prisons. The racially discriminatory and politically repressive laws and practices continued and still continue to run rampant in Namibia. The Namibians exiled for political reasons continue to be threatened and kept out of Namibia. Free expression of political views has long been and continues to be a dream for a distant future. Meanwhile, the abominable policy of the Bantustanization and the so-called homelands is being implemented. South Africa has sought to whitewash its image in a big cover-up by the institution of the so-called constitutional conference between various races of the Territory.

66. In those circumstances, we were surprised that the triple veto was used to block the necessary enforcement measures. At that time we were told that there were signs of change in Namibia. We were told that our differences were on the methods rather than the objectives we sought in Namibia. We were further told, therefore, that the best way would be to encourage a movement for a change through negotiations between the racist régime and the United Nations. Yet, we had heard these arguments before. In 1971 a chance was given to those arguments to take effect. Unjustified hopes were raised in the minds of the people of Namibia that their aspirations were at last going to be realized. Those hopes were dashed. Nothing came out of the contacts because South Africa never accepted the basic position of the United Nations to withdraw.

67. It is now more than six months since we witnessed the sorry sight of the triple veto cast in the Council. Those who cast those vetoes had a moral obligation to apply pressure on the racist régime to accept the position of the United Nations. And we are not unaware of the initiatives they have taken. The most recent welcome initiative in this direction is the one taken 26 January 1976 by two of those members, namely, the United Kingdom and France jointly with their European Economic Community partners [*see S/11945*].

68. But, in spite of such initiatives, during these six months we have seen no movement in Namibia for the better. In fact, oppression is growing worse. South Africa is turning Namibia into a staging area for aggressive purposes against independent neighbouring States contrary even to the terms of the Mandate of 1920, which South Africa itself accepts. Populations are being forcibly evicted from their areas of residency in attempts to thwart the growing tide of freedom struggle. Political trials have continued to be the corner-stone of the racist régime and the purging of the African population of a political view which differs from that of the racist régime continues to be an

important instrument of the South African Government. Everything has demonstrated the emptiness of the so-called constitutional talks. In this exercise detentions have played an important role of frustrating all voices which dissent from the racist views. In this context, it is not only political leaders who have fallen victims to detention, but also church leaders. These leaders have been the subject of such detention too, as has been the case of Pastor Zephania Kameeta, Principal of the Lutheran Paulium Theological College at Otijimbigwe. Would it surprise anyone, therefore, that it is out of concern for their Christian doctrine that some of them write pastoral letters for which they are arrested?

69. In the letter of Mr. Kameeta, the following point, which speaks for itself, appears:

“The struggle on our hands has not only to do with the liberation of Namibia, but goes further and deeper than that. The presence of South Africa is not just a political question, but it is a threat to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Thus I see it as a task of every Christian to work for the bringing down of this Government. In this country, which claims to be Christian, you can be a Christian 10,000 times over, but if you are not white you are treated like a dog.”

Nor should it surprise members of the Council that the effect of this letter was to ensure Mr. Kameeta's detention.

70. Thus *apartheid* continues to reign rampant in Namibia. Should the international community close its eyes to what is happening there? Surely, the Security Council could not be indifferent to the flagrant violation of the rights of the people of Namibia without failing in the lofty tasks that the Charter places on it. For the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia poses a threat to international peace and security. The basic objective of the Council is to get South Africa to leave Namibia. That is why the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa in its resolution 2145 (XXI). It was because of the recognition of the rights of the people of Namibia that the International Court of Justice, on 21 June 1971, ruled that South Africa was under the obligation to withdraw from the Territory. The Security Council is, therefore, duty bound to take the necessary measures to get the *apartheid* régime to comply with the decisions of the Organization. We cannot wish this responsibility away.

71. One of the most important measures that must be taken is completely to isolate South Africa from all international intercourse of every kind. In the political field South Africa must be isolated. There has been important progress to that end. But a more concerted international action is needed. For example, the time is long overdue where there must be a complete severance of all diplomatic and other relations which

enable that régime to continue enjoying some form of political respectability. Of immediate relevance, we call for all disruption of diplomatic and other political relations with the South African régime in so far as Namibia is concerned.

72. Similarly, there must be a severance of all economic relations with South Africa in so far as it relates to Namibia. My delegation is disturbed at the role of foreign firms in Namibia. Those firms continue relentlessly to exploit the economy of that Territory. The South African *Weekly Financial Mail* has characterized the economy of the Territory as being “operated in a colonial style, with South Africa playing the imperial Power and most of its spoils of fishing and mining sucked by foreign firms”. Thus over one third of the new wealth generated is expatriated. All this is done with the sweat of the exploited black masses, who serve under a labour system which denies even their basic elements of human rights. Those who profit from the benefits of the activities of these firms cannot, therefore, be absolved from the evils which the South African system has established in Namibia.

73. Elucidating on the effects of economic collaboration with South Africa, my President, Julius Nyerere, at a recent address at Oxford University on 19 November 1975, had the following to say:

“Yet all those who invest in South Africa, or otherwise treat it as a respectable member of the international community, are giving support to *apartheid* and everything which follows from it. Institutions do not invest in a foreign country out of philanthropy. They invest to make a profit or to get an interest on their money. And by investing for these purposes, they have bought (together with the stocks or shares), an interest in what is called ‘political stability’—which in this case means the maintenance of *apartheid*. Their interest in this will be the greater, the larger the amount they invest and the greater the return on their investment. And the stronger the South African economy, the larger the resources which the South African Government can devote to upholding racial privilege.”

74. Thus it should be equally obvious that to have any economic relations with the South Africans in Namibia is to support South Africa's political presence there. We appeal, therefore, to those who sit and condemn South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia to follow these verbal condemnations with action. One such action is certainly to disrupt all economic relations with Namibia.

75. South Africa has defied the international community for too long. It is high time that South Africa was made to accept the authority of the United Nations over Namibia. For our part, in the United Republic of Tanzania, we shall continue to support the struggle of the people of Namibia till victory is won.

Our objective remains the achievement of independence for Namibia as a whole. We reject any attempts by South Africa to hoodwink the world by cosmetics and rhetorics. We oppose any attempt to divide the Territory, and we reject any so-called constitutional talks calculated simply to maintain South Africa's occupation and promote bantustanization of the Territory. Our intention still remains the achievement of a solution by peaceful means, or, to be more precise, to achieve a solution of a less violent nature. We have proclaimed this intention in world forums, as well as within OAU. As the Dar es Salaam Declaration on Southern Africa clearly asserted, Africa continues to believe that if South Africa wanted a peaceful solution it should have implemented resolution 366 (1974), thus accepting the authority of the United Nations and respecting the right of Namibians to self-determination and independence, as well as refraining from undermining the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia as a nation.

76. But since South Africa refuses to abide by the demands of the Council, we have no alternative but to call for the necessary measures to be taken against it. On our part, we shall continue to support the gallant freedom fighters of Namibia under the dynamic leadership of SWAPO. For this we make no apologies, for it is the right of every people everywhere to fight for freedom. A person ceases to be human if he does not fight for his freedom. And in that fight he must demand support from other human beings for the sake of greater freedom for all. For, however much we may regret the need for war, we can no more refuse that support than the Allies could have refused support for the resistance movements of Europe during the 1940s. In this matter we have no alternative. The ball is certainly in South Africa's court. The bitterness that is caused against the people there as a result of bloodshed is the responsibility—the sole responsibility—of the racist régime. It is for South Africa to choose between peace and war.

77. Yet, there may still be some who still harbour illusions about South African intentions with regard to Namibia. As I have indicated, we in the United Republic of Tanzania do not have such illusions. During the current debate, we were once again subjected to the rhetoric of arrogance by the representative of the racist régime.

78. In the exercise of my right of reply on 27 January [see 1881st meeting], I remarked on the hollowness of South Africa's statement before the Council, and I need not abuse the patience of members to make a further exposure of that statement. It is sufficient to assert that the statement clearly demonstrates South Africa's continued defiance of the authority of the Council and the international community. It is also sufficient to assert that, from South Africa's point of view, truth becomes truth only when it is recognized as such by the South Africans. Mr. Botha's statement clearly confirmed that South Africa has still to accept contemporary realities.

79. Nevertheless, we are now throwing out another challenge to that régime to accept a free expression of the views of the people of Namibia through an election supervised and controlled by the United Nations. And for those who still harbour doubts about the intention of South Africa, we can only say that this is a splendid opportunity. Let South Africa accept this challenge if it is to give any semblance of respectability to the arguments of its international apologists.

80. It is, however, important to understand that we do not intend to associate ourselves and the United Nations with a farcical exercise of elections. It is our intention that such elections be the result of a real free expression of views. We see it therefore as an important part of such exercise that all exiled political leaders of the people of Namibia be allowed to return without any restriction, and that they be allowed to exercise their right to political expression freely, as well as to propagate their opinions without let or hindrance. We see it as a necessary condition that the South African régime adhere strictly to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as the repeal of all restrictive laws. In short, it is necessary that South Africa adhere to the demands of the Security Council as expressed in resolution 366 (1974), in all its aspects.

81. We in Africa want peace. Yet we cannot deny the right of Namibians to self-determination and independence. We cannot, therefore, remain indifferent to their plight. Namibia must be free. Whether that freedom comes through the ballot or the barrel of a gun is not our choice. That choice belongs to South Africa. And, on both those choices, the role and responsibility of the allies of South Africa are grave indeed.

82. Speaking now as PRESIDENT, I would say that the Council has concluded its discussion, and I take it that the time has come to take up the draft resolution submitted yesterday in document S/11950. Does any member of the Council wish to speak now in connexion with the draft resolution?

83. Mr. VINCI (Italy): My delegation fully supports and will vote in favour of draft resolution S/11950, which has been submitted by eight members of the Council. I wish to pay a high tribute to you, Mr. President, and to the original drafters of the working paper who have acted with an outstandingly constructive spirit—which is the main quality of statesmanship—in order to accommodate the other delegations represented on the Council.

84. My delegation is particularly grateful to the sponsors for having produced a final text which fully reflects our views and recommends a course of action for Namibia which we feel is the most appropriate at this stage. We cannot better show our appreciation than by stating that we have no reservations to express on the provisions contained in the draft resolution. I will simply recall for the record that Italy abstained

on General Assembly resolutions 3295 (XXIX) and 3399 (XXX), referred to in the third paragraph of the preamble.

85. As I stressed in my statement yesterday [1884th meeting], a unanimous decision by the Council on the subject of Namibia is of paramount importance, and I hope that will be the result of our vote today. It is only by acting with one voice that the Council may produce an impact on the Government and people of South Africa, thus bringing closer the elimination of an illegal situation we have been facing for so long. I therefore warmly welcome today's draft resolution and commend it to the positive vote of our colleagues in the Council.

86. Before concluding, Mr. President, I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the firm, courteous and enlightened way in which you have conducted our deliberations. You have managed to focus the attention of the Council on the subject which we were meant to deal with, without dispersing our efforts in the consideration of matters not strictly pertinent to the Namibian question. This achievement has certainly facilitated our work and its final positive outcome.

87. The PRESIDENT: Since no other member wishes to speak at this stage, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution sponsored by Benin, Guyana, the Libyan Arab Republic, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania, which is before the Security Council in document S/11950.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.<sup>4</sup>*

88. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

89. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): In voting in favour of the resolution on Namibia which was just adopted unanimously by the Council, my delegation wanted to furnish proof that the French Government unreservedly supports actions taken whenever they are aimed at enabling the population of Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. It congratulates the sponsors of the resolution for the constructive proposals they have made in having the essence of this text bear on the organization of general free elections in Namibia.

90. The French delegation would, however, like to make a few brief comments. The text on which the Council has just taken a decision refers to certain resolutions on which we abstained. The reservations we put forward on them still stand, as well as those of a strictly legal nature which relate to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. These few comments, however, I should like to stress, in no way detract from the political position of France on the problem of Namibia.

91. Members of the Council are aware that one of the main difficulties in this matter is to define the role of the United Nations in the process of self-determination and, above all, to have it accepted by South Africa. My delegation deems it necessary to give its interpretation of the role the Organization should play in the possible general elections.

92. During the consultations you have undertaken, Mr. President, we have listened with the utmost attention to the arguments advanced to justify as wide a role for the United Nations as the sponsors of the resolution would wish. We believe for our part that the role of the United Nations should be effective and precise. It seems to us, however, that supervision should not result in the creation of a machinery incompatible with the presence of an administration which will obviously not have left the Territory before the elections are held. As we said in our statement [see 1883rd meeting], when the time comes the Council should determine how to ensure that these elections are held in conformity with the normal requirements of genuinely democratic balloting.

93. One last comment seems necessary to us on paragraph 3 of the resolution. We are here discussing the problem of Namibia, not the situation prevailing in another country. We condemn any foreign interference in the affairs of an independent country, on any basis or under any pretext. In this context we do not believe it is fair unilaterally to condemn certain military actions carried out in a country which is a neighbour of Namibia.

94. Mr. President, at the time of the conclusion of this debate on Namibia, I should like to congratulate you on the way in which in a particularly heavy month, you have conducted the work of the Council. We have appreciated both your authority and your sense of realism. Our congratulations go also to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Sean MacBride. We are aware of his untiring efforts to find a solution to the problem of Namibia in keeping with justice and with the dignity of the population of that Territory.

95. Mr. SAITO (Japan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution S/11950, which the Council has just adopted. It is a source of satisfaction to my delegation that the Council has taken a unanimous decision on the question of Namibia. It is a most significant fact of which we are proud.

96. In my statement before the Council two days ago [see 1882nd meeting], I expressed my conviction that we have to put an end to the present stalemate and address ourselves to the most pressing action—the need to hold free and democratic elections under United Nations supervision—and at the same time enable the Council to take a unanimous decision, thus strengthening the Council's position on the question of Namibia. The present resolution meets

this requirement, and it is the main reason why my delegation voted for it.

97. I hope that the Government of South Africa will not fail to respond to the resolution, which reflects the unanimous and strong will of the Council, and thereby enable the Council to take further steps to implement it. For our part, we are fully aware of our unavoidable responsibility for the implementation of the resolution we adopted unanimously.

98. Before concluding, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the sponsors of the resolution for their untiring and arduous efforts in formulating the text in a spirit of accommodation, taking into account the divergent views, including those of my delegation.

99. In particular, I wish to take this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude, as well as my own, to you, Mr. President, for the way you have conducted both the informal and the formal proceedings of the Council which led to this constructive decision. I am happy also to see that the Special Committee re-elected you its Chairman this morning for the fifth consecutive time, thus demonstrating its confidence in those high qualities of leadership and personal integrity from which the Council has benefited during its consideration of the question of Namibia, in full co-operation with Mr. Kamana, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, who also greatly contributed to the settlement of the knotty question of Namibia.

100. Mr. LAI Ya-li (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution S/11950. However, we wish to state that we have reservations on the relevant contents about free elections in the draft resolution. We hold that when the Namibian people are still under the domination and repression of the South African troops, police and administration, the holding of the so-called free elections is completely out of the question. There is a danger that such a practice may be utilized by the South African racist régime to continue its occupation and domination of Namibia in a disguised form. We also hold that it is imperative to maintain vigilance and guard against the South African authorities' attempt to capitalize on the so-called "dialogue" to deceive the world public and delay their withdrawal from Namibia.

101. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom): This has been a useful, and I believe, important debate which has revealed a considerable degree of agreement around this table as to how we should best proceed. The intensive consultations which you, Sir, have held with all Council members and the pains which you have been at to take account of the points of view of all members have contributed greatly to this successful conclusion.

102. My delegation believes that the positive votes which all 15 members of the Council have just cast will give added authority to the resolution before us. We whole-heartedly endorse the call for United Nations supervision of free elections throughout the whole Territory of Namibia, which is the main feature of this resolution. We do so the more willingly because of our own commitment to the democratic process.

103. At the same time, my delegation would like to express its reservations on a number of aspects of the resolution for which we have just voted. The resolution recalls, in its preamble, a number of earlier resolutions both of the Security Council and of the General Assembly for which my delegation did not vote. More specifically, I must reserve our position on the fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble concerning the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and the legal responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia. Our views on these matters are well-known. In brief, it remains our position that General Assembly resolutions have the status of recommendations and are not mandatory in effect.

104. As for what the resolution has to say about the constitutional processes, we believe it to be both right and proper for the Security Council to call for elections in Namibia, and to see that they are carefully supervised. But for the reasons set out in my delegation's statement in the general debate, we continue to have reservations about the use of the word "control" in relation to the future task of the United Nations in Namibia. I need only say that we have been encouraged in the past few days to find that there seems in fact to be a broad identity of views among Council members about the way in which the United Nations could best carry out the supervisory role contemplated for it. We also take note of the intention in paragraph 8 of the text before us to have the Security Council revert to this question in a more detailed way at the appropriate time. There are, as we indicated earlier, a number of important matters relating to the conduct of the electoral process which deserve closer consideration.

105. With reference to paragraph 3, which condemns the South African military build-up in Namibia and any utilization of the Territory as a base for attack on neighbouring countries, I wish to make it clear that my delegation deplores any utilization not only of the Territory of Namibia as a base for attacks on neighbouring countries. We deplore the utilization of any territory, in or outside Africa, as a base for attacks on African countries. We are, of course, discussing Namibia and not Angola, but my delegation wishes to emphasize that it is not prepared to accept any one-sided condemnation of the use of force. My Government's position is well known and was reaffirmed by my Foreign Secretary only two days ago. We are opposed to any external intervention in Angola. We continue to call for a cease-fire and for a political settlement which would enable the people of

Angola to determine its own future freely. In this context we do not think that the reference to South Africa's aggressive military build-up in the area, in the eighth preambular paragraph, reflects the facts of the situation fully and fairly.

106. Finally, in supporting the demands in paragraphs 11 (b) and 11 (d) for the release of all Namibian political prisoners and for the return of all Namibians currently in exile for political reasons, we have in mind those Namibians who have not been convicted of or charged with criminal offences.

107. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): Mr. President, in response to your appeal and to the superb example of leadership and constructive development which you have shown throughout this debate, my delegation limited our statement yesterday to a discussion of developments in Namibia and South African policies there. I want to make clear that it is in the context of Namibia, and in that context alone, that the United States has decided to vote affirmatively on the resolution which the Council has just adopted.

108. In precisely the spirit of the statement just made by my colleague, the representative of the United Kingdom, let me say that it goes without saying that had we been discussing Angola, as some of our colleagues have sought to do in spite of your discouragement, Mr. President, it would have been incumbent upon the Council to examine all foreign intervention, including the non-African forces which are currently fighting there.

109. The resolution we have adopted reflects the view long held by my Government regarding South African presence in Namibia and the view that the Namibian people, under United Nations supervision, must promptly be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination. The United States believes that the correct interpretation of paragraphs 7, 8 and 9, concerning the means of "United Nations supervision and control" of the free elections in Namibia, must be based on a reading of those three paragraphs together, as would be proper.

110. It is clear that the Council is leaving open the exact form of United Nations supervision of these elections, leaving it to be worked out subsequently by the United Nations. We believe that in this way the Council wisely avoids prejudging the exact nature of the United Nations role until this matter can be specifically considered.

111. In conclusion, as I am evidently to be the last speaker, I should like to join all my predecessors and what I cannot but assume to be all my colleagues on the Council in congratulating you, Mr. President, for having brought us to a unanimous conclusion—a rare event in many of the proceedings of the Council, rarer yet with respect to this subject—a unanimous conclusion concerning what the responsibilities of the

world community are to the people of Namibia. I would like to congratulate you, Sir, for the rare patience with which you have endured our drafting and our other antics over the last month. It has been an example which I shall hope to emulate to the extent of my abilities, as any of us would wish to do.

112. Finally, I wish to express once again the admiration of my Government for the superb moral leadership and executive direction which we have had, which the United Nations has had, from the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Sean MacBride.

113. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

114. Mr. KAMANA (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia): I do not wish to impose on members of the Security Council any longer than is necessary. I merely asked to speak to say, on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, how much we appreciate the very skilful and enlightened manner in which you, Mr. President, have conducted these deliberations. We wish to pay a tribute to you, Sir.

115. We also wish to thank the sponsors of the resolution which has just been adopted unanimously for the work they put into its preparation as well as into the necessary consultations that have culminated in the significant result we have just witnessed this afternoon.

116. We also wish to commend all members of the Security Council for the realistic manner in which they have discussed this all-important question of Namibia. We are grateful to them for allowing us, as representatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to participate in the debate.

117. It is our hope that South Africa will heed its isolation and take immediate steps to relinquish its illegal occupation of Namibia. We trust, too, that the resolution just adopted will not be just another resolution, but that, as is our hope, it will be implemented.

118. The PRESIDENT: The last speaker is Mr. Moses Garoeb, Administrative Secretary for the South West Africa People's Organization of Namibia. I invite him, accordingly, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

119. Mr. GAROEB: The only reason my delegation takes the floor at this time is to express our profound thanks to the members of the Security Council for the unanimous vote they have just cast which ensured the adoption of draft resolution S/11950. For us this is an indication that, in spite of the differences of opinion, in spite of the reservations on the resolution, the Council is at least unanimous on one thing, and that is that South Africa is illegally present in Namibia and must withdraw and that the people of Namibia must exercise their right to independence. And for this we are indeed very thankful to the members of the Council.

120. Secondly, we should like to take this opportunity to express similar thanks to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, our good brother, Mr. Kamana, and to Mr. MacBride, the Commissioner for Namibia, for they are, as it were, the ones immediately associated with us in the day-to-day and direct prosecution of the liberation struggle of our country.

121. We believe that the vote that has been cast here today puts the Security Council firmly on the road to asserting its authority to ensure that South Africa withdraws from Namibia. We believe also that it is an endorsement of our right to self-determination and independence but, most importantly, for us it is an indication that the Council is our partner in the exercise of the liberation of our country. We should like also to thank all those Members of the United Nations that are not members of the Council but that have taken up their precious time to participate in this debate.

122. Last but not least, Mr. President, I should like to thank you personally and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania for the work you have done to ensure the unanimous passage of the resolution. I have seen the efforts you have put in, the time you have spent and the energy you have dispensed in seeing to it that the Security Council should come to a unanimous agreement on this resolution. If I may say so, on behalf of my delegation, I have always had confidence in you personally. I have seen you preside over very important conferences and I have never doubted that you have always worked for consensus and a constructive approach. In your work, young as you are, you have gained the respect of persons of all ages.

123. Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Security Council on behalf of SWAPO, and indeed on behalf of the people of Namibia, for the vote it has just cast. It is our sincere hope that the Council will ensure that the resolution will be implemented.

124. The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded the present stage of the discussion of the item on our agenda.

**Statement by the President concerning a telegram from Mr. Ali Soihili, head of State of the Comoros**

125. The PRESIDENT: Before we adjourn, I wish to inform members that I have received the following telegram from Mr. Ali Soihili, head of State of the Comoros:

"I have the honour to inform you of a new development in the French aggression against the territory of the Comoros. Flouting international law and morality, the French Government intends to organize a referendum in Mayotte on 8 February

1976. Mayotte is an integral part of Comorian territory under the French laws which have recognized the *de facto* and *de jure* unity of the archipelago ever since 1912. On 12 November 1975, the United Nations admitted the Comorian State consisting of the four islands of Anjouan, Mayotte, Mohéli and Grande-Comore. In view of this flagrant aggression, I have the honour to request you to convene the Security Council urgently in order to maintain peace in the archipelago and to take all necessary action to safeguard the integrity of our country. Ali Soihili, head of the Comorian State." [S/11953.]

126. In accordance with the usual practice, the President of the Security Council—which means both myself and my successor—will approach members of the Council in order to enable the President to decide what appropriate further steps should be taken.

127. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): The problem of the Comoros is not new. In fact, since the Comoros acceded to independence on 6 July 1975 it has had a problem with the former colonial Power. The former colonial Power, France, tried and is still trying to maintain under its authority Mayotte, an integral part of the Comoros. It undertook retaliatory measures which had the effect of paralysing the functioning of the technical services of the administration in the new Republic. These measures, whose consequences are very serious for the Comorian people, are all the more condemnable and unjustifiable since the difficulties of every nature faced by the Comorian Republic are the consequences of a long colonial administration.

128. Mayotte is an integral part of Comorian territory, under French law itself—as the telegram tells us—which has recognized the *de facto* and *de jure* unity of the archipelago ever since 1912. On 12 November 1975 the United Nations admitted the Comorian State consisting of the four islands of Anjouan, Mayotte, Mohéli and Grande-Comore. The General Assembly in its resolution—

129. The PRESIDENT: I apologize to the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, but I should like to make an appeal to him. Since the item is not yet on the agenda of the Council, perhaps it would not be appropriate for him to go into the details of the question.

130. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I am not going into the details of the problem. I have a demand, but I have to explain why. I want to ask for action from the Council, I have to say why it is urgent to take action. I am not going into the details of the problem. I know that we have not yet decided to put it on the agenda of the Council, but, since this telegram has been distributed to all the members and since also a press communiqué has been distributed by the French delegation, I think I have to explain why I am asking that the Council take urgent action.

131. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

132. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): I'm raising a point of order. It is not the practice of the Council to discuss a text or a question before deciding to put the text or the question on its agenda. Mr. President, you stated a moment ago that you had received a telegram. You indicated that the President of the Council, yourself or your successor, would organize consultations to determine what should be done about the telegram. I request that the usual procedure be followed. I should like to raise a formal objection to the statement by the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic on this subject. He may request a meeting of the Council, but before the question is put on the Council's agenda he cannot start discussing it. When it is put on the agenda of the Council, I am prepared to speak on the question, even if it is put on the agenda today. My purpose is not to delay the debate, but I cannot accept the discussion of a subject which is not on the agenda.

133. The PRESIDENT: I must say that the representative of France is right in this connexion. If the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic wishes only to make a proposal, then he can make that proposal. But to go into the discussion of the merits of the proposal would not be fair to the Council, particularly since the item is not on the Council's agenda.

134. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I should like to ask the Council to take urgent action and to convene a meeting to discuss this matter, and I think it is appropriate to explain why it is urgent. General Assembly resolution 3385 (XXX)...

135. The PRESIDENT: I should like to appeal to my colleague from the Libyan Arab Republic, because I can see that we may have a proliferation of points of order. I think he has made his point that he wants a meeting of the Council to be convened urgently. Certainly I, as President of the Council, will take into account the fact that at least one member of the Council desires that this matter should be considered urgently. In the conduct of the consultations, either by me or by my successor, that particular request will be taken into account. I therefore appeal to him not to continue with a substantive discussion.

136. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): Sir, I am not saying anything substantive. I am saying that the problem is urgent, because there is to be a referendum on 8 February...

137. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

138. Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the question which is on the Council's agenda is worded as follows: "The situation in Namibia". There is no other item on the agenda.

139. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): The Libyan delegation requests that this problem be placed on the agenda of the Council...

140. The PRESIDENT: With all due respect to my Libyan colleague, I should like to state that his request will be taken into account. But I do not think that, as the representative of France has correctly said, we can discuss the item now. The representative of the Libyan Arab Republic has already made his request and that request will be taken into account. The President of the Council will certainly take into account the specific proposal made by our colleague from the Libyan Arab Republic that in view of the urgency of the matter this question should be considered as soon as possible. I would therefore appeal to him and to all the members of the Council to agree that there is no point in holding a procedural discussion now on whether or not a delegation can speak on this item.

141. Mr. KIKHIA (Libyan Arab Republic): I am not speaking on the item. I wanted to say that the question was urgent and to propose that a meeting be held. I do want to finish my statement. I wanted to suggest that we hold a meeting tomorrow or Monday. That is all. That is my precise suggestion.

142. The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic. Again, as I said at the beginning of this discussion, in the normal consultations that will be undertaken by the President of the Council the specific suggestion made by our colleague from the Libyan Arab Republic will be taken into account.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> See General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI).

<sup>2</sup> See General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967.

<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> See resolution 385 (1976).



---

### كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها  
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

#### 如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

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

#### COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

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

#### КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

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

#### COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

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

---