

UNITED NATIONS

0064112



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-FIRST YEAR

UN LIBRARY

JUL 16 1985

1960th

MEETING: 7 OCTOBER 1976

UN/FAO COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1960)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

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.

1960th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 7 October 1976, at 3 p.m.

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

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

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1960)

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions previously taken [1954th and 1956th to 1959th meetings], I shall now invite the President and other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia to participate in the Council's discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamana (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table and Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Keat Chhon (Democratic Kampuchea), Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Wodajo (Ethiopia), Mr. Felli (Ghana), Mr. Cissoko (Guinea), Mr. Maina (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Muwamba (Malawi), Mr. Ramphul (Mauritius), Mr. Bengelloun (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Djermakoye (Niger), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Minah (Sierra Leone), Mr. Hussien (Somalia), Mr. Sallam (Yemen), Mr. Minić (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mwale (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bwakira (Burundi), Mr. Trepczyński (Poland) and Mr. Kanakarathne (Sri Lanka) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Burundi. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I join the speakers who have preceded me in conveying to you my warmest congratulations on the occasion of your accession to the important and difficult post of President of the Council for the month of October. I should also like to thank you and, through you, to thank all the members of the Council for having enabled me to set forth the views of the Government of the Republic of Burundi before on the very important question before it.

6. Availing myself of this opportunity, I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, the President of the Council for the month of September, Ambassador Kikhia of Libya, who fulfilled his responsibilities to our full satisfaction.

7. Once again the Council is meeting to consider the question of Namibia. The General Assembly has devoted innumerable meetings on this question, on which it has adopted several resolutions. The International Court of Justice has also had the question of Namibia before it and has handed down unequivocal advisory opinions on the subject. In other words, this is not a new question, and everything has been said

and even repeated on the subject. None the less, I should like to add my comments, which lay no claim to originality, to those of previous speakers on this question, to say that Burundi condemns the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

8. In August 1966, the Namibian people, led by its *avant garde* movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and conscious of its historic responsibilities, began its struggle against the occupation of its territory by racist South Africa. Two months later on 27 October of the same year, the General Assembly revoked South Africa's mandate over Namibia through its resolution 2145 (XXI). The same resolution laid upon the United Nations the responsibility for administering Namibia and leading it towards self-determination and independence. A year later, in 1967, concerned to discharge its responsibility, the United Nations created the United Nations Council for Namibia and appointed a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. The role of the Council for Namibia was to assist the people of Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination and to obtain its freedom and independence within a united Namibia. The International Court of Justice, seized of the question, handed down four advisory opinions, among them that of 1971¹ declaring the South African presence in Namibia illegal.

9. All these trusting appeals have been regarded by the Government of Pretoria as mere decisions—to be treated with contempt.

10. Recently again, in January 1976, this Council adopted resolution 385 (1976) demanding that South Africa make a solemn declaration undertaking to withdraw its illegal administration from Namibia so as to permit the Namibian people to accede to freedom and national independence. Today we have met to give a concrete expression to paragraph 12 of that resolution, by which the Council decided

“to remain seized of the question and to meet on or before 31 August 1976 for the purpose of reviewing South Africa's compliance with the terms of [this] resolution and, in case of non-compliance by South Africa, for the purpose of considering the appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter.”

11. The demands addressed by the Council to South Africa are well known. None the less I should like to recall their contents: to withdraw its armed forces from Namibia; to accept free elections in Namibia under United Nations auspices; to put an end to as the bantustanization of Namibia; to release political prisoners and to respect Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Namibia.

12. In analysing the behaviour of South Africa after the adoption of resolution 385, (1976) cannot but admit that South Africa has not implemented any of

the provisions of this resolution, just as it has always categorically rejected all the just demands of the Organization of which it claims to be a Member State. But why should we expect that resolution to succeed any better than the many other trusting appeals of our Organization?

13. Instead of complying with the decisions of the Council, South Africa has continued its policy of savage repression of the Namibian people, forcing entire populations into concentration camps, inflicting upon them the indescribable suffering mentioned by Mr. Bill Anderson, a former member of the South African armed forces, in his statement before the United Nations Council for Namibia².

14. Faced with the success of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the fighting arm of SWAPO, South Africa has intensified since the adoption of resolution 385 (1976) its installation of military bases in Namibia as a launching pad for armed aggression against neighbouring countries. The cases of aggression against Angola and Zambia are still fresh in our memory. Not long ago, the Council was called upon to consider the complaint of Zambia against South Africa, and it condemned the latter for its acts of aggression.

15. The militarization of Namibia mentioned by the Chairman of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, continues while the so-called representatives of the Namibian people participate in the Turnhalle tribal talks. Believing it would hoodwink the international community, South Africa gathered puppet elements paid by its régime to participate in a so-called constitutional conference.

16. Burundi endorses the just position of SWAPO, and of the United Nations Council for Namibia—of which it is a member—and rejects the proposals of the constitutional conference in Windhoek. My country supports the just claims of SWAPO, namely, that only SWAPO, an organization recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, should participate with South Africa in any debate concerning the future of the Namibian people; and that any constitutional conference that takes place must be held with SWAPO under United Nations auspices and not with the remote-controlled puppets of the *apartheid* régime. Moreover, South Africa must liberate the political prisoners languishing in South African prisons and enable them to participate in the relevant discussions.

17. My country is convinced that the victory of the Namibian people is inevitable, but in order to avoid shedding the blood of the innocent in Namibia we are pleased at the diplomatic steps taken in the last few days regarding the settlement of the Namibian problem. We hope that the results will be satisfactory. In any case, these steps should be taken within the frame-

work of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and should enhance the prestige of the Organization.

18. The struggle carried on by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO is the same as that of the peoples of southern Africa in general against the *apartheid* régime and against the minority racist régime of Ian Smith. Indeed, some of the Members of the Organization believe that some of the elements of the problem can be tackled whereas others may be left aside for the moment. Any attempt at a partial solution, supposedly to take advantage of the path of least resistance, is doomed to failure. If the entire problem in southern Africa is not taken into account, there will be no solution.

19. My delegation believes that we should not forget that the *apartheid* régime which subsists in South Africa is the root of all the evil.

20. As I stated before the General Assembly, we in Burundi are convinced that

“The failure of the international Organization in its task of administering and bringing this Territory to freedom and independence are due not so much to the refusal of Pretoria to hand over power to SWAPO, which is the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, but also to the active and blind support which certain major Powers give to the South African régime.”³

21. At a time when the Council is to consider the measures to be adopted to force South Africa to implement resolution 385 (1976), my country suggests that the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter be applied in their full severity. We request moreover that Member States should increase their material assistance to SWAPO in its liberation struggle as well as to all those who are struggling against the *apartheid* régime in southern Africa.

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

23. Mr. TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland): Mr. President, the Polish delegation congratulates you warmly on your assumption of the high office of the President of the Council. Your own statesmanship and the long-standing co-operation between Poland and Pakistan add greatly to our satisfaction at seeing you preside over the Council, as it is dealing once again with the question of the situation in Namibia.

24. My delegation is grateful to you and to the members of the Council for having accorded us the opportunity to present once again Poland's position on the problem before the Council. The fact that the present debate is taking place with the participation of a number of ministers for foreign affairs as well as the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, offers

ample testimony of the importance and urgency of the issue at hand.

25. Only a few days ago, speaking in the General Assembly, Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Stefan Olszowski, stressed the following tasks with regard to the situation in the southern part of Africa:

“The time has come, in keeping with United Nations resolutions, finally to put an end to the racist régimes in Namibia, Rhodesia and South Africa. The struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia for independence, the question of the liquidation of all the remnants of colonialism and the elimination of *apartheid* require the resolute support of the entire international community. The rationale of historical justice makes it compelling that the inalienable rights of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe to their sovereign statehood be secured unconditionally and without delay.”⁴

26. This position of ours is not new. Over the last 30 years in the course of which the United Nations has dealt with the problem of Namibia Poland has from the very outset lent its unreserved support to the cause of the liberation of the people of Namibia, in accordance with its inalienable right to freedom and independence. Our stand has always been consistent with the fundamental position of the Polish People's Republic of support for and solidarity with the peoples fighting for their freedom and the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism, and it is inherent in the very principles of our socialist ideology and derives from our own historical experiences. It is in the same spirit that Poland has for long served on the Special Committee on decolonization⁵ and is at present a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

27. Already last January, when the Security Council was considering the same question, the Polish delegation pointed out [1882nd meeting] that the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa was rapidly becoming one of the most serious seedbeds of tension on the African continent. Today, despite resolution 385 (1976), which once again condemned the continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa and called for the holding of free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations for the whole of Namibia as one political entity, the situation remains equally grave. In fact, as far as the main aspects of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa are concerned, it has even deteriorated.

28. First, internally, Namibia has been turned into a police State, with martial law all over its northern part. As the Council was told last week by Mr. Nujoma, communities have been uprooted and taken to concentration camps, villages have been destroyed, crops have been burned and livestock have been confiscated” [1956th meeting, para. 81]. Indeed, it was more than a statement of facts when the SWAPO

leader declared that since the Council adopted resolution 385 (1976), South Africa has in fact increased its atrocities in Namibia. Such was the reply of the racist régime to the unanimous plea of the Council. Instead of free elections the so-called constitutional conference was organized in order to mislead world public opinion. Its infamous declaration of 18 August 1976 was rightly termed by the United Nations Council for Namibia to be totally lacking in legitimacy, ambiguous and equivocal, since the proposals of the so-called conference do not even approach any of the requirements for genuine self-determination and independence laid down by the United Nations [S/12185, annex, para. 6].

29. Secondly, on the African plane, the occupation of Namibia continues to be a direct threat to the peace and security of the independent African countries, the most evident example of which was the open aggression committed by South African troops against independent Angola. On 31 March, in its resolution 387 (1976), the Council condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa desist from the utilization of the international Territory of Namibia to mount provocative or aggressive acts against the People's Republic of Angola or any other neighbouring African State. But a few months later, the South African régime once more used the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for repeated acts of aggression against yet another independent African State, this time against the Republic of Zambia. Again, in its resolution 393 (1976), the Council strongly condemned the armed attack and declared that the liberation of Namibia and Zimbabwe and the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa are necessary for the attainment of justice and lasting peace in the region. No one should have any doubt that a régime like the one of South Africa, which in the last 16 years has increased its military budget tenfold and tripled it within only the last three years, will never want to cease voluntarily its aggressive actions against the independent States of Africa, especially those bordering it.

30. Thirdly, in the global context, the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa represents an ever-growing threat to international peace and security.

31. The question of Namibia has already been the subject of at least 16 Security Council resolutions and more than 100 the General Assembly resolutions, all of them unimplemented. It is indeed a very sad set of statistics, the best example of how and by whom the effectiveness of the United Nations is being impeded. On the one hand, we have the racist régime in South Africa; on the other, those who support it in various forms, including arms deliveries, often using as a pretext an invented and non-existent "communist threat".

32. My delegation is afraid that one more resolution, unless it provides for stern and effective steps

to enforce the decisions of the Council, will only serve to satisfy the existing statistics. Yet another moral condemnation of South Africa's policies, under the circumstances, can hardly serve the real cause of Namibia. Hence, we fully support the proposals of the Organization of African Unity and of the African Group, made in this Council in the spirit of the recent Colombo decisions to the effect that the Council should avail itself of the sanctions which would directly affect the South African régime and make it withdraw from Namibia. The latest proposals of SWAPO in this regard constitute the most realistic platform for immediate action.

33. The revolutionary and national liberation struggles of the last several decades have proved beyond any doubt that the decisive role in the struggle for a nation's independence is played by the nation itself. We are happy, therefore, that extremely important changes have recently taken place in the southern part of Africa. The struggle conducted by the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe against white supremacy has achieved a fresh impetus and new dimensions. The black population of South Africa has also intensified its fight against the inhuman system of *apartheid*. In the general relationship of forces in southern Africa, in spite of the rapid expansion of its military arsenal and co-operation with some countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the position of the Pretoria régime has been considerably weakened. The support for and solidarity with the Namibian patriots, who, under the leadership of SWAPO, the authentic representative of the people of Namibia, have—despite repression—intensified their legitimate struggle, are gaining momentum. We hail those developments as yet one more illustration of the inevitability of the final eradication of all remnants of colonialism and racism, regardless of the attempts of the forces of the past to reverse the course of history.

34. In its usual consistent and principled manner, Poland stands ready to contribute its utmost to the cause of independent Namibia.

35. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the head of the delegation of Sri Lanka to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, Ambassador Kanakaratne. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

36. Mr. KANAKARATNE (Sri Lanka): Mr. President, let me first convey to you our warm congratulations on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for this month. With a person of your wide experience and diplomatic skill presiding over these important meetings, we can all be confident that the deliberations of the Council on the situation in Namibia will be under expert guidance. My delegation is particularly happy to see such a distinguished representative of a friendly neighbour State of ours entrusted with such a responsibility. May I also

congratulate and convey our thanks to your predecessor, the representative of Libya, who presided over the Council during his term of office last month with great acceptability. The delegation of Sri Lanka thanks the other members of the Council for having given it an opportunity to participate in this meeting in the hope that our modest contribution to its discussions will help in finding a just and timely solution of a problem which has proved itself to be an intractable one.

37. Council has taken cognizance of document S/12188, containing the text of the resolution concerning Namibia adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Colombo a few weeks ago. It is to carry out the mandate entrusted to it as the current Chairman of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, in paragraph 5 of that resolution that Sri Lanka has sought to participate in these discussions and to bring the content of the resolution to the attention of the Council.

38. The international community would do well to remember that the situation in Namibia is one of the longest-standing issues which have engaged the attention of the United Nations. The speakers who have preceded me have drawn the attention of the Council to the long history of the crisis we are now met to resolve. Nevertheless, I think it would be useful for the Council to refresh its memory on the history of the Namibian question in so far as the United Nations is concerned. The International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971¹, has summarized the attempts, both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, to seek a pacific settlement of this problem. We are still, in October 1976, once more grappling with an issue which first was brought to the attention of the world body 30 years ago, for it was as far back as 9 February 1946 that the General Assembly, by its resolution 9 (I), invited all States administering territories held under Mandate to submit trusteeship agreements. All of them, with the single exception of South Africa, responded positively to this request. From that resolution to the most recent of over 100 General Assembly resolutions, the Government of the Union of South Africa has shown an indifference and an intransigence which are totally inconsistent with its obligations as a signatory of the Charter.

39. After 20 years of patient and restrained appeals by the world body to that Government and in the face of its obduracy, the General Assembly eventually adopted, in 1966, its resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating the Mandate exercised by South Africa. Four years later the Council adopted resolution 276 (1970), declaring the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be illegal, and called upon all Member States to act accordingly. It was, because, in the words of the International Court of Justice, the Assembly in paragraph 106 of its advisory opinion of 1971, lacking the necessary powers to ensure the withdrawal

of South Africa from the Territory, enlisted the co-operation of the Security Council. Thus acting in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter". It is important to note in this context that in paragraph 2 of resolution 276 (1970), the Council declared that "the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal" and that consequently all acts taken by the Government of South Africa "on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid". In paragraph 5 of that resolution the Council further called upon "all States, particularly those which have economic and other interests in Namibia, to refrain from any dealings with the Government of South Africa which are inconsistent with paragraph 2 of [this] resolution".

40. The delegation of Sri Lanka speaks today before the Council not in anger but in sadness. We cannot find in the 30-year history of the United Nations any other single issue on which a Member State has persistently and deliberately ignored so many and such authoritative resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. In 1971 the International Court of Justice, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, handed down its now famous advisory opinion. The Government of South Africa fully participated in the proceedings of the Court and, under the norms of civilized international behaviour, should have accepted the advisory opinion and at least begun to act in keeping with its much vaunted claim that it is acting in southern Africa to preserve civilization and law and order. My Government is deeply disappointed that a founding Member of the United Nations should behave in a manner which can only be described as subversive of the very foundations of international conduct. We cannot recall any issue which has come up before the United Nations over the last 30 years on which the views of the three principal organs of the United Nations—the General Assembly, its legislative body, the Security Council, its principal executive organ, and the International Court of Justice, its main judicial arm—have been stated with such clarity and unanimity.

41. A moment ago I said that my delegation was speaking with sadness. What is at stake now is not so much the attitude of the Government of a Member State towards the Organization, but rather the effectiveness of the world body in finding a just and peaceful solution to this problem. Much has been said in recent times about the impotence of the United Nations. In fact, accusations were being levelled at the United Nations until very recently to the effect that the Organization was being imperilled because of the irresponsibility, so-called, of its new majority. We have seen self-appointed defenders of the prestige and the authority of the world body proclaiming to the world, in sometimes picturesque and sometimes piquant language, the dangers that now face the Organization. My delegation makes so bold as to say that if the effectiveness and efficacy of

the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security is in danger, that danger does not come from the so-called irresponsibility of the new majority but rather from the inactivity and impotence of the more influential and major Members, which have stood by with folded arms, permitting a single Member State to flout the decisions of the Council, to ignore the resolutions of the General Assembly and even to question the opinions of the International Court of Justice.

42. As has been pointed out by all the speakers who have preceded me, time does not stand still for any of us. It is our belief that before time finally runs out we—and particularly those Governments without whose moral and material support South Africa cannot continue on its present course—have one more opportunity for a final effort to resolve this crisis and prevent the loss of life and the bitterness of a major segment of the human race. Although we welcome any and all initiatives that could be taken, or now are being taken, for a peaceful resolution of this situation, we must clearly state that the prime responsibility for such action lies with the United Nations, since it is the United Nations that is now legally responsible for the affairs of Namibia.

43. We listened with considerable attention to the restrained and constructive statement made by Mr. Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, [1956th meeting], which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia. We were heartened by the offer he made on behalf of his people in that statement. It is the view of my delegation that in that statement lies perhaps the only and final answer if we are seeking to avert a major disaster in that part of the continent of Africa. My delegation would, therefore, urge the Council to lay down as basic principles for a settlement the following: recognition of SWAPO as the only legitimate representative of the people of Namibia; arrangements for talks between SWAPO and the Government of South Africa without any further delay, under the auspices of the United Nations, regarding the transfer of power; withdrawal of the Government of South Africa from Namibia without further delay in accordance with the terms of resolution 385 (1976); preservation of the territorial integrity of Namibia against the attempts of the Government of South Africa to fragment the Territory; commitment by the Government of South Africa to withdraw its armed forces from Namibia; release of all political prisoners in Namibia before the talks I have just referred to take place.

44. That the President of SWAPO has offered to meet the South African authorities is a welcome sign of his sincerity in working for a non-violent and bloodless resolution of this problem. It is our hope and prayer that the Council will respond to that offer by ensuring its acceptance by the Government of South Africa.

45. It is in this spirit that we of the non-aligned group of nations approached this problem in Colombo when the resolution on Namibia was adopted by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. My Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, in her message marking Namibia Day, 26 August, this year, stated, and I quote:

“The observances today mark the determination of the international community to continue this struggle to a successful conclusion, and to end the injustice of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, its racist policies and its schemes for the fragmentation of the Territory by the creation of bantustans. On behalf of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, as its Chairman, and in the name of humanity, I urge all nations to redouble their efforts for the ending of this injustice and for the restoration of the rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination and freedom in a united Namibia.”

Subsequently, in her statement to the General Assembly on 30 September, the Prime Minister, speaking as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group, stated in reference to Namibia and other problems of southern Africa as follows, and I quote:

“The Message from Colombo, as far as it concerns southern Africa, is also directed to the nations which are continuing to collaborate with those régimes, thereby giving them a false sense of security and a semblance of respectability to which they are not entitled.

“... ”

“All initiatives towards a just solution of these problems are naturally welcome as long as they are genuinely designed to expedite the transition from obduracy to reason. At the same time, I should make it clear from this forum that if reason were to fail and the peoples of Africa were forced to resort to the ultimate solution through armed struggle, every non-aligned nation would stand solidly behind them.”⁶

46. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Mr. President, having listened attentively to the statements made by the Foreign Ministers and representatives of many African countries, the Chinese delegation would like now to make a few observations on the question of Namibia.

47. In recent years, with the powerful support of the numerous third world countries and their people, the African countries and people in particular, the armed struggle waged by the people of southern Africa against racist domination and for national liberation has reached a new high, vehemently pounding away at the reactionary rule of the racist régimes in southern Africa. The armed struggle of

the people of Zimbabwe is expanding ceaselessly and is shaking the rule of the Smith racist régime. The Namibian people have persevered in armed struggle, and their armed forces are growing steadily, dealing heavy blows to the racist régime. Defying brute force and facing the most difficult conditions, the Azanian people have, since last June, broken through the brutal repression by the police and armed forces of the South African fascist régime and waged powerful mass struggles against the racist régime. These struggles were unprecedented in the number of participants, the areas affected and their duration. All this fully demonstrates the new awakening of the Azanian people and their strong will to carry the national liberation struggle through to the end. This shows that the great African peoples are now launching an offensive against barbarous racism and that the handful of colonialists have been cornered in southern Africa.

48. The armed struggle of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe has opened up a new situation and developed in depth after having repeatedly frustrated the various manoeuvres employed by the racists. After the Portuguese colonial system was shattered by the armed struggle of the people in southern Africa, the racist régimes of Vorster and his like, with the support and abetment of the super-Powers, have intensified their counter-revolutionary dual tactics with a combination of threats and blandishments. However, the African people have realized from their own experience that these are pernicious schemes aimed at disintegrating the national liberation movement, disrupting the militant unity of the African countries and sabotaging the armed struggle of the people in southern Africa. Hence their determined tit-for-tat struggles against them. Since then, the Vorster and Smith racist régimes have stepped up their sanguinary repression of the national liberation movements of Namibia and Zimbabwe. Apart from creating the shocking Soweto carnage, the South African racist régime has ceaselessly launched military aggression against Zambia and other neighbouring independent African States and seriously encroached upon their sovereignty and territorial integrity in an attempt to threaten and bluff the African countries, prevent them from giving support to the national liberation movement and extinguish the flames of the armed struggle of the people of southern Africa for national independence. All this has evoked the courageous resistance of the African countries concerned, and due punishment has been meted out to the racist régimes.

49. The numerous African countries and their people have realized from historical experience that one should not harbour any illusions about the reactionaries and that national independence and liberation can never be easily obtained from the enemies' "favours" or from negotiations, but can be won only through unremitting struggles, particularly armed struggle. Chairman Mao Tse-tung pointed out long ago: "Everything reactionary is the same; if you don't hit it, it

won't fall. This is also like sweeping the floor; as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself." As rightly pointed out in a resolution adopted at the thirteenth summit conference of the Organization of African Unity, "the only effective guarantee for the African people of South Africa against the repetition of massacres is the launching of armed struggle for the seizure of power by the people".

50. The plan for establishing a so-called multiracial government in Namibia recently produced by the racist régime of South Africa is a clumsy scheme designed to enable it to shirk its responsibility for the non-implementation of resolution 385 (1976), to deceive world opinion and to prolong its illegal rule in Namibia. It is a refurbished version of the bantustans plan. SWAPO and many African countries have categorically rejected this plot of South Africa's. They point out unequivocally that this plan concocted by the South African authorities is aimed at maintaining in a disguised form their illegal rule in Namibia and is, therefore, totally unacceptable. Under these circumstances, the Namibian people have expressed their readiness to continue and strengthen their armed struggle until Namibia attains genuine independence. This is the reliable means to ensure victory.

51. The people of southern Africa are winning continual victories in their struggle. But the situation there is complicated owing to the super-Powers' meddling. Motivated by their strategic need to seek global hegemony, they have intensified their rivalry over southern Africa. Their activities of intervention, expansion, aggression and division constitute a serious threat to the people of southern Africa. One super-Power does its utmost to support the racist régimes, offers them advice and propagates "peaceful evolution" in a desperate attempt to preserve its vested interests in southern Africa. The other super-Power, which pretends to "support the national liberation movement", resorts to various means of sowing discord and steps up its infiltration, intervention and expansion in southern Africa. However, the much-tried African people are clear-headed. They do not believe the nice words of the super-Powers, nor are they intimidated by their bluster. They will surely win their national liberation by relying on their own armed struggle, strengthening their unity, preventing the tiger from entering the back door while repulsing the wolf from the front gate, and persistently carrying on the struggle to the end.

52. As Chairman Mao Tse-tung pointed out, "the evil system of colonialism and imperialism arose and thrived with the enslavement of Negroes and the trade in Negroes, and it will surely come to its end with the complete emancipation of the black people". A just cause enjoys abundant support while an unjust cause finds little support. The struggle of the people of Namibia and the rest of southern Africa is just and therefore enjoys the broad support of the people of Africa and the whole world.

53. The last summit conference of the Organization of African Unity took up the eradication of colonialism in all its forms and the achievement of the complete liberation of the African continent as its main theme. The conference stressed the need for support for the armed struggle of the South African people and adopted resolutions extending maximum political, economic and military assistance to the national liberation movements of southern Africa. The political declaration adopted by the summit conference of the non-aligned countries last August also reaffirmed its support for the national liberation struggle carried on by the Namibian people and called for assistance to them in all forms.

54. The Chinese Government and people have always firmly supported the just struggle of the Namibian people against forcible occupation by the South African authorities and for national independence. We hold that the Council should adopt a resolution sternly condemning the South African authorities for refusing to implement resolution 385 (1976), unequivocally calling on the South African authorities to terminate immediately their illegal occupation of Namibia and withdraw their administration and all their military and police forces therefrom, to guarantee the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia and to release immediately all the detained political prisoners. Furthermore, we support the legitimate demand of many African countries that the Council should consider the adoption of all necessary measures, including sanctions, against the South African authorities in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.

55. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, first I should like to extend my warmest congratulations to you on your accession to the presidency and to wish you every success in your task. I also wish to express appreciation to your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Kikhia of Libya, for his outstanding performance during the month of September. I also wish to be allowed, since I was absent from Headquarters during most of August, to extend very warm congratulations to Ambassador Abe of Japan, who discharged his duties during August most competently.

56. With regard to the question of Namibia, it is obvious that so far South Africa has not complied with the provisions of resolution 385 (1976), adopted unanimously on 30 January 1976. As a co-sponsor of that resolution, my delegation is very interested in having the situation in Namibia examined in the most decisive and thorough manner, so that the prestige of the Council may be enhanced as it deserves.

57. Given this attitude of obvious recalcitrance, and in the light of the provisions of resolution 385 (1976), the Council has been holding meetings since 31 August to study what measures it would be appropriate to take under the Charter. In the course of the debate

we have heard the statements made to the Council by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia [*ibid.*] by the representatives of the Group of African States and the Organization of African Unity [*1954th and 1956th meetings*] and by the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma [*1956th meeting*].

58. Without giving an elaborate account of the background, I think it is obvious that the Council is faced with a situation with undeniably serious implications, which have been referred to by numerous heads of delegation during the debate, for this is a question which has been awaiting a solution for more than 30 years, a solution commensurate with the dignity of the United Nations, and corresponding to the ideals, purposes and principles which are the *raison d'être* of this Organization.

59. We also know, as has been mentioned here repeatedly, that an advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971¹ declared that South Africa was under the obligation to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia. Another indisputable element is the responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia. All these circumstances indicate that, from the very day the United Nations was established, the mandate of what was then the Union of South Africa should have been terminated. Since then, therefore, Namibia has been illegally occupied. Moreover, South Africa has displayed an attitude of rebellion and open defiance of the will of the international community, manifest disregard of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as of the advisory opinion of the Court which I have just mentioned.

60. In addition to flouting both law and morality—an attitude wholly deserving of censure—South Africa constitutes an element of unrest of disturbance of the peace, of invitation to conflict, of violation of human rights and of the most basic principles of the dignity of the peoples of southern Africa, and is how seeking to destroy the national unity of those peoples, and the territorial integrity of Namibia and therefore intensifying its repression. In other words, instead of repenting or showing any desire to make amends, South Africa has chosen open defiance of the international Organization. This is a situation that creates serious problems for the Organization, a situation that cannot be allowed to continue.

61. At this time South Africa is carrying on a veritable colonial war against the people of Namibia. It is using armed force against the civilian population, the most abominable methods of torture, and intimidation. It has instituted a reign of terror—the only way in which repudiated régimes can maintain themselves against the will of the people. But that is not all South Africa also attacks its neighbours harasses them and subjects them to violence, particularly Zambia and Angola, and it disturbs the peace in the entire region.

62. Some statesmen who are used to seeing peoples suffering patiently insist that this debate should be conducted very calmly, without arousing heated situations, without stirring up passions, but it is very difficult for any responsible statesman to remain indifferent to a situation of this nature.

63. The problem of Namibia is not an isolated problem, as the spokesman for the African States and the President of SWAPO have rightly said here. We agree, the problems of Namibia, of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa have a common basis: there is no way for the African majority to come into power. We are faced with a well-planned transnational conspiracy to prevent the indigenous people from benefiting from the exploitation of their resources.

64. It is said that peace is indivisible; but we know that the concept of peace of the great Powers is not the same concept of peace as that of the non-aligned countries, and since there can be no peace without justice, there has to be peace with justice.

65. In considering this problem of southern Africa, we must see to it that the principles and the basic declarations—which the Secretary-General has described as part of the spirit of the contemporary world—can be summarized in two major pronouncements of the United Nations: the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the resolution on the right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources [*General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII)*]. And, since Latin America is aware of the scope of these declarations in the case of southern Africa, we believe that, like peace, these pronouncements on decolonization should be universally applicable—in Africa, in Asia, and also in Latin America.

66. Yesterday, for example, reference was made in a debate between two presidential candidates of one of the super-Powers to the right of self-determination of the Namibian people, the right of self-determination of the people of Zimbabwe and, I would say also, the right of self-determination in South Africa. President Ford stated that the United States favours self-determination in South Africa with due respect to minorities. We therefore wonder whether self-determination is to be exercised by majorities or minorities. We have, for example, the case of the Panama Canal Zone. Because some 3,000 United States families there wish to retain their privileges, they seek to impose a colonial type of régime that poisons the political, economic and social climate in Latin America. That is why we say that if decolonization is applicable to Africa it should also be equally applicable to Latin America; and that is why we think that the peoples of the world expect from the representatives of the super-Powers—such as President Ford and Governor Carter—more noble things, loftier ideas than wishing to maintain the colonialist principles of a bygone age. We need doctrines which

enlighten the spirit of mankind, not expressions of what used to be called manifest destiny, according to which the United States had a civilizing mission and could dominate the continent. No, we expect a loftier type of action in a world no longer beset by the cold war. The cold war ended in Latin America approximately a year ago, I would say. So that now we, too, must put an end to those vestiges of the stranglehold of manifest destiny and of that civilizing mission. The same is true of Africa because these concepts are indivisible.

67. The generosity of the United States cannot be denied when problems of aid have to be solved throughout the world. Now that country promises that if \$2 billion would solve the problem of Zimbabwe, the United States is willing to give \$1 billion to resettle the minority that is now exploiting the people of Zimbabwe. A similar solution to the problem of the Canal Zone would cost much less, for there are only 3,000 to be resettled.

68. I would like to conclude by saying that, like some of its colleagues in the Council, Panama hopes that the situation in southern Africa will soon come to an end. But to achieve this there must be vigorous and decisive action on the part of the Council.

69. Latin America also has a distinguished history. A moment ago the representative of China appropriately quoted Chairman Mao's words condemning the slave trade. It was also censured by the Amphictyonic Congress of Panama in 1826, where the abhorrent traffic of the slavers was likened to the crime of piracy. We would like to emphasize the fact that, in 1826, 40 years before the Civil War in the United States to put an end to slavery, statements had been made in my country that represent historic milestones in the struggle which the non-aligned countries are now carrying on.

70. I wish to conclude by saying that the delegation of Panama is in favour of the Council's reaching a timely decision, a decision which must be strictly in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, for mankind cannot be indifferent to these acts. We must put an end to that inhuman, oppressive and unworthy situation of colonialism that is a blotch on man's escutcheon.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

Notes

¹ *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.*

² See A/AC.131/SR.237.

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 14th meeting, para. 212.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 5th meeting, para. 59.

⁵ Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

⁶ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 11th meeting, paras. 23 and 25.*