

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR

2271st MEETING: 23 APRIL 1981

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2271)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)	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.

2271st MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 23 April 1981, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Noel DORR (Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, German Democratic Republic, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Niger, Panama, Philippines, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2271)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 10 April 1981 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/14434)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings [2267th to 2270th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe to participate in the discussion without the right to vote.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Benyahia (Algeria), Mr. Jorge (Angola), Mr. Houngavou (Benin), Mr. Corrêa da Costa (Brazil), Mr. Morden (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Gedle-Giorgis (Ethiopia), Mr. Jelonek (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Coumbassa (Guinea), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kasina (Kenya), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Baba (Nigeria), Mr. Marinescu (Romania),

Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Mr. Conteh (Sierra Leone), Mr. Fourie (South Africa), Mr. Hameed (Sri Lanka), Mr. Akakpo-Ahiany (Togo), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Vrhovec (Yugoslavia), Mr. Kamanda wa Kamanda (Zaire), Mr. Goma (Zambia), and Mr. Mangwende (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh and Democratic Yemen in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaiser (Bangladesh) and Mr. Ashtal (Democratic Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2267th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken also at the 2267th meeting, I invite Mr. Peter Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Paulo Teixeira Jorge. I welcome him here and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. JORGE (Angola) (*interpretation from French*): For 20 years now numerous relevant resolutions have

been adopted by various international bodies, on the one hand, recognizing the right of the Namibian people to independence and, on the other, denouncing and condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist and terrorist Pretoria régime, its shameful and criminal system of *apartheid*, its intolerable arrogance and its scorn of the international community, as well as the scandalous connivance of certain Western Powers in the maintenance of that régime.

7. Since the founding of the United Nations Council for Namibia in May 1967 [*General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V)*] as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence and the decision-making body of the United Nations for that Territory, the Pretoria régime and its accomplices have been bent on undermining fulfilment of that Council's mandate and have been orchestrating a series of manoeuvres aimed at delaying as long as possible the inevitable independence of Namibia and in particular the assumption of power by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

8. In spite of all the patient efforts of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the non-aligned countries to find a just solution to the Namibian question, the racist and terrorist Pretoria régime, enjoying as it does, the support of certain Western Powers—always the same ones—and Israel in the economic, military and nuclear fields, and consequently profiting from their lack of firmness, their selfishness and their hypocrisy, feels free to continue insolently to defy the international community and to consolidate the establishment in Namibia of a so-called council of ministers entirely in the service of its attempts to lead SWAPO out of the process of independence and the intensification of its criminal acts of aggression against the front-line States, and particularly the People's Republic of Angola.

9. In the face of the failure of the Geneva meeting, which was intended to ensure within the framework of the United Nations and on a basis of total impartiality the implementation of the plan produced and negotiated by the Western Powers within what is known as the contact group, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the thirty-sixth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the OAU decided to invite the African Group at the United Nations to call for an urgent meeting of the Security Council in order to adopt binding comprehensive economic sanctions against the Pretoria régime so as to compel it to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia [*S/14390, annex, para. 11*]. It was within the same context that the Council of Ministers of the non-aligned countries took its stand at the meeting held at New Delhi in February 1981. However, it required a great deal of perseverance on the part of our representatives in the United Nations to overcome resistance on the part of certain allies of South Africa to this series of meetings of the Security Council.

10. In the same context, the extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held recently at Algiers issued a pressing appeal to the international community for binding comprehensive economic sanctions to be imposed on the racist and terrorist Pretoria régime pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations [*S/14458, annex, para. 21 f*].

11. The Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* [*General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII)*], as well as numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, make it clear that *apartheid* is a crime in terms of international law. However, there are those in the Council who maintain close relations with a régime of criminals.

12. The brutal repression of the majority in South Africa carried out within the framework of *apartheid* expresses the colonial nature of the South African régime and violates the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination. Accordingly, acts of armed combat and resistance on the part of SWAPO and the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) against the illegal South African authority can in no way be equated in law with the "terrorism" invoked by South Africa and, more recently, by the United States.

13. In its resolution 439 (1978) the Security Council not only reiterated its resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978), 432 (1978) and 435 (1978) but warned South Africa that the Council would be compelled

"to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions".

14. Furthermore, in its resolutions 428 (1978), 447 (1979), 454 (1979) and 475 (1980) concerning the many premeditated, persistent, prolonged acts of armed invasion committed by South Africa in flagrant violation of the airspace, the national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola, the Council *inter alia*, condemned the acts of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that it

"scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola;" [*resolution 428 (1978), para. 4*].

The Council also demanded

"that South Africa cease immediately its provocative armed invasions against the People's Republic of Angola" [*resolution 447 (1979), para. 3*]

and requested

“Member States urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People’s Republic of Angola and other front-line States [resolution 454 (1979), para. 5].

The Council also decided to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations

“to obtain available information from the People’s Republic of Angola on the human casualties and material and other damage resulting from repeated acts of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa” [resolution 447 (1979), para. 6],

and called for

“the payment by South Africa of full and adequate compensation to the People’s Republic of Angola for the damage to life and property resulting from these acts of aggression” [resolution 475 (1980), para. 6].

The Council decided also

“to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People’s Republic of Angola by the South African racist régime, in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof” [ibid., para. 7].

15. In spite of all that, the people of Angola have had to make enormous sacrifices over the last three years and are continuing, almost alone, to pay an extremely high price for doing its internationalist duty as well as complying with the relevant resolutions of international bodies on Namibia so that the Namibian people also can become independent.

16. During this period, South African armed forces have carried out 1,400 reconnaissance flights, 290 air raids, 56 debarkations of helicopter-borne troops, 72 land attacks, causing the death of more than 1,800 persons and the wounding of about a thousand persons and material damage estimated at \$7 billion. With extremely few exceptions, all the international solidarity we have enjoyed has been indifference or passivity.

17. However, the position and the approach of the People’s Republic of Angola have been and will always remain the same on the Namibian question. They are clear and well known, and we therefore do not intend to repeat them.

18. As will have been noted, the Security Council has repeatedly decided “to consider the adoption of more effective measures” against the racist and terrorist régime of South Africa, “in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof”.

19. Accordingly, in the face of the intransigence of the Pretoria régime and its refusal to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, in the face of the criminal acts of aggression committed against the front-line countries, which constitute a serious threat to international peace and security, we should like to know how many new acts of violation of the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of our country we must bear before the Security Council finally shoulders its responsibilities, by imposing comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions, because, unless that is done, the very credibility of the Council will be called into question, along with its own resolutions.

20. If all our efforts must be directed towards the search for a negotiated solution of the Namibian question, that is something that can be contemplated only within the exclusive framework of the United Nations, and that in turn entails the implementation of the United Nations plan, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), as was clearly reaffirmed by the heads of State of the front-line countries at their meeting at Luanda on 15 April last [S/14464, annex, para. 8].

21. Under your presidency, Mr. President, as the representative of Ireland, the Security Council will have at this crucial moment to take decisions which may become historic. Your recognized diplomatic qualities give us grounds for hoping that such will indeed be the outcome.

22. The fight continues! Victory is sure!

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

24. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you, as well as the other members of the Council, for allowing the delegation of the People’s Republic of Benin to participate in this historic debate on the question of Namibia.

25. The delegation of the People’s Republic of Benin welcomes the presence in the Council chamber of Ministers from many African and other non-aligned countries. I should like to convey to them the fraternal greetings of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Benin, Comrade Simon Ifèdé Ogouma, who, for reasons beyond his control, was not able to be here today to speak in the Council personally.

26. My delegation would like to congratulate Ambassador Florin of the German Democratic Republic, who presided over the work of the Council last month. My delegation is pleased to see that this important debate, which is to lead to the liberation and independence of Namibia, is being conducted under the presidency of a son of Ireland, whose people set a striking example of courage and of struggle against British colonialism.

27. Your country, Mr. President, waged a long struggle; it gave itself a language, shaped a culture for itself, and built and strengthened an independent nation. Those are the same noble objectives being pursued with staunch determination by the heroic people of Namibia. Thus, Sir, we are particularly heartened by your presence in the presidential chair at this historic time.

28. That is why my delegation ventures to believe that under your leadership the Council will at last understand that the time has come to put an end to the deceit, the hypocrisy, the lies and the arrogance of the Pretoria racists and their patrons, who are accomplices in the humiliation, the crimes and massacres committed against the oppressed people of Namibia, in the acts of aggression perpetrated against Angola, Mozambique and Zambia, and in the repeated defiance of the international community, which supports the struggle of the Namibian people.

29. The history of the long struggle of the Namibian people forcefully shows that the question of Namibia is in no way a complex one. The question is quite simply one of the right of colonial peoples to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. That right was unanimously proclaimed in 1960 in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). But the irrational, desperate schemes of the racist régime of Pretoria, and the unspeakable treachery of its Western patrons, are a partial explanation for the delaying tactics which are aimed, on the one hand, at complicating this very simple problem and, on the other, at seeking neo-colonial solutions to it. That is why the efforts undertaken thus far by the international community, revolving around the initiative of the five Western Powers [S/12636] have yielded no results. That can come as no surprise, for those Powers and the racist régime of Pretoria are joined together to perpetuate the *status quo* in Namibia, so that they may continue to indulge in the shameless plunder of that Territory's immense resources.

30. This is a serious challenge, which must be met without delay, to save Africa from being dragged into an imminent catastrophe, a catastrophe which would spare no State in the international community. Yes, the conditions for an armed conflict of unforeseeable dimensions are present in southern Africa. It is clear that no African State feels secure. It is enough to listen to radio broadcasts from Pretoria and to certain war-mongering statements by its racist leaders to understand that the situation has become extremely serious. All of Africa—fighting Africa—is counting on its many friends, who are ready to intervene by its side in case of need.

31. Africa's patience has worn thin. The Namibian people can wait no longer. The presence in this chamber of many Ministers for Foreign Affairs who have come directly from Algiers, where an extraordinary ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the

Non-Aligned Countries concerning Namibia was held, is clear evidence of the seriousness of the situation and the urgent need to achieve the rapid decolonization of the Territory.

32. The Security Council is the guardian of international peace and security. What, then, has the Council done since 1968, when the question of Namibia was brought before it? Before answering that question, we should like to recall that, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. In 1971, the International Court of Justice confirmed, in a unanimous advisory opinion,¹ the illegality of the situation in Namibia and the obligation to put an end to it. The Council, since that time, has certainly adopted many resolutions, but experience has now shown that all those resolutions are without teeth and thus have no effect on the seriousness of the situation in Namibia.

33. Namibia is today a highly militarized Territory, owing to the presence of many South African troops and of mercenaries, those hired killers who come from the West to commit abominable crimes against the civilian population of Namibia. Throughout Europe and the United States, South Africa has set up recruitment centres to engage mercenaries to serve in its armed forces and to protect the facilities of multinational corporations, which are the instruments of oppression and exploitation, and of the plundering of Namibian resources. This is an extremely serious circumstance. It clearly amounts to indirect military assistance given to Pretoria by the West in flagrant violation of Council resolution 418 (1977). Racist South Africa, relying on its troops and its mercenaries, engages in all sorts of inhuman acts: the massacres in Cassinga in Angola and the many acts of aggression against neighbouring countries bear the most eloquent witness to the brutality of the racist régime and to the seriousness of the situation in Namibia.

34. The time has come for the Council to act. Action must be commensurate with the seriousness of the situation in Namibia, a situation which threatens international peace and security. Comprehensive sanctions must be adopted against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Those sanctions are aimed at helping the oppressed people of Namibia to recover its fundamental freedoms, especially its self-determination, independence and national sovereignty.

35. We know that the repeated and abusive use of the veto hangs over the outcome of this debate like a sword of Damocles. We should like to say to those in question that this immoral behaviour is nothing but a demonstration of racism towards the black indigenous population of Namibia, which is struggling to recover its human dignity. Using a categorical veto to block our legitimate demand for binding sanctions against racist South Africa would again unveil the duplicity of the Western Powers, which stop at nothing to satisfy

the needs of their short-term interests. The use of a categorical veto to block our demand for binding sanctions constitutes a genuine declaration of hostility towards the whole of Africa in these particularly difficult circumstances. The use of a categorical veto to block our demand for sanctions is a denial to the Namibians of their basic human rights, rights proclaimed with great hue and cry by a certain democracy: "Western democracy".

36. It is time for action, concrete action, effective action. We want no more useless chatter, pious wishes or crocodile tears. We want no more manoeuvring or soporific talk. We want—now, immediately—a free, independent Namibia, sovereign in the integrity of its territory.

37. In supporting SWAPO we want a free, truly independent Namibia—a Namibia for Namibians, and for Namibians alone. In rejecting the puppets of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA) and the tribal parties we are saying no to neo-colonialism and to the other sham arrangements that make it possible to perpetuate the exploitation and plundering of Namibia. When certain members of the Council defend DTA and even go so far as to support its illegal appearance before the Council—indeed, against the letter and spirit of resolution 439 (1978)—we can clearly see their neo-colonial ulterior motives, their short-sighted calculations and their machiavellian strategy. But they can fool only those who let themselves be fooled. We are not taken in by it.

38. Why does not racist South Africa accept free elections guaranteed by the United Nations pursuant to Council resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978)? Why do South Africa's sponsors use all manner of stratagems to challenge resolution 435 (1978), which they themselves imposed on the Council? Why all these manoeuvres?

39. There is but one answer to all those questions. The failure of the Pretoria racists and their Western allies is inevitable. The liberation of Namibia is inevitable. The dismantling of the bastion of imperialism and of the ramparts of the South African racist régime is certain. No veto, no conventional or nuclear military force, no monied power, no imperialism can halt the normal course of history.

40. The Namibian people is perfectly aware of its interests and knows that SWAPO is its sole authentic representative. The elements of DTA and those of the tribal parties are like the Muzorewas and Sitholes of Rhodesia, who are today forgotten because they have been thrown into the wastebin of history. The tribal parties and DTA are tools of the neo-colonialist policy of Pretoria and its protectors. No African State recognizes or supports them. To do so would be to betray the sacred interests of the Namibians.

41. As for the People's Republic of Benin, it will continue to support SWAPO by all the means at its

disposal until the oppressed Namibian people recovers all its rights guaranteed by the Charter.

42. The Security Council must cease to be a tool in the hands of Africa's oppressors and those who deny to other individuals the basic freedoms enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Council must not protect the Pretoria racists and back illegality in Namibia. The Council must be a tool of struggle for human freedom—for the freedom of all individuals, regardless of the colour of their skin. The Council must now shoulder all its responsibilities by courageously decreeing sanctions against racist South Africa. To act this way means removing oneself from the senseless acts of Pretoria; it means obliging Pretoria to accept the international verdict; it means working for international peace and security, the very *raison d'être* of the Council. To act in that fashion means working in favour of respect for human rights, saying no to war, massacre and genocide in Africa.

43. Ready for revolution; the struggle continues!

44. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The resumption in the Security Council of discussion of the question of Namibia, this most urgent issue of the final elimination of the shameful system of colonialism from the African continent, is long overdue.

45. The extreme importance attached to this question by African and by non-aligned countries as a whole is reflected by the participation in the work of the Security Council of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of many African, Asian and Latin American countries.

46. The Soviet delegation has listened most attentively and sympathetically to the statement of the representative of SWAPO [2270th meeting] and to those of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs who have come here, all of whom with a great deal of emotional force have called for the freeing of Namibia from racist occupation. The time has come to take a decision that would promote the ultimate removal of this item, the question of Namibia, from the agendas of both the General Assembly and the Security Council. But of course, this is possible only if the people of Namibia achieves genuine independence. In the view of the Soviet delegation, that is precisely the standpoint from which we should view this series of meetings of the Council. We must finally take effective measures against the racist régime of Pretoria so as to compel it to comply with the relevant decisions of the General Assembly and the Council.

47. In so far as concerns the racist régime of South Africa and its stubborn ambition to prevent the genuine independence of Namibia, everything in this is crystal-clear to us. Far too much time has gone by for us to be able to harbour any illusions whatsoever in this regard.

48. The system of *apartheid* denies the natural, inalienable human right to freedom and equality

without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. By elevating *apartheid* to the status of its State policy, the Pretoria racists have extended it also to the Territory of Namibia, which they illegally occupy.

49. Furthermore, the rulers in Pretoria are making wide use of the territory of Namibia as a military spring-board for carrying out systematic acts of aggression and provocation against neighbouring independent States. They are trying in this way to intimidate the peoples of those countries and to compel them to refrain from helping the national liberation movements in southern Africa.

50. The reasons for such provocative conduct on the part of the rulers of South Africa and for their refusal to comply with the numerous decisions of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations are not difficult to discern. Those reasons are that the racists feel powerful support behind them; the preservation of that hot-bed of colonialism and racism in southern Africa serves the political, strategic and economic interests of a number of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—primarily the United States. All this, as it were, is a matter of elementary political ABCs, and if we mention it again today it is simply because the time has come once and for all to draw the necessary conclusions from all this.

51. The position of the United Nations on the question of Namibia has always been and remains clear and unambiguous; it has been enshrined in numerous authoritative decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly: Namibia is a Territory illegally occupied by South Africa; the presence of South African troops and the South African administration in Namibia is illegal; it is contradictory to the elementary norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The inalienable right of the people of Namibia to achieve freedom, independence and self-determination by all means available to it, including armed struggle, has been repeatedly recognized.

52. At its resumed thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly reaffirmed that the national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO, is the sole lawful representative of the Namibian people [*resolution 35/227 A*]. These decisions should be recalled by those who are attempting to fasten the label of "international terrorism" on the national liberation movement and in particular, in this case, SWAPO.

53. On that score, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, in his report to the Twenty-Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made the following comment:

"In demonstrating their utter disdain for the rights and aspirations of peoples, they are attempting to represent the liberation struggle of the popular masses as a manifestation of 'terrorism'. In actual fact, they have set themselves the task of attaining

the unattainable: to bar the way to progressive changes in the world and to reassume the role of masters of the destinies of nations."

54. The situation with regard to the Namibian question has now become really critical. For many years the African countries and the United Nations have been ready to show patience and sensible restraint in so far as concerns the Namibian problem and to agree to negotiations—something upon which certain Western Powers have laid considerable stress. Initially, representatives of those countries opposed the adoption of effective measures with regard to South West Africa, asserting that they could persuade South Africa to agree to a settlement in Namibia.

55. In this regard, I should like to remind the Council of the following. Nine years ago—as long ago as that—in February 1972, in the course of a series of Security Council meetings held in Africa [*1627th to 1639th meetings*], those countries gave us the assurance that all they would need would be six months to resolve the Namibian problem by means of negotiations and they stated that, should South Africa not agree to that, then the necessary serious conclusions would be drawn. The Soviet delegation in the Security Council even at that time—nine years ago—had serious doubts about the sincerity of those assertions and expressed them. Indeed, months went by, years went by but no important changes in the conduct of those Powers with regard to the Namibian question and South Africa were actually forthcoming.

56. At the next stage—when the earlier promises of those countries had already been forgotten, it would appear—they proposed another version of a Namibian settlement, which was adopted with certain qualifications in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) almost three years ago. At the same time the Council in its next relevant resolution—resolution 439 (1978)—warned South Africa that, if it were to refuse to comply with the Security Council resolution on Namibia the Council would meet to adopt appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The Western Powers at that time did not object to outlawing all actions of South Africa with regard to the establishing of puppet authorities on Namibian territory.

57. It would appear that no further loop-holes were left for South Africa. But after the failure of the Geneva negotiations, which were the culmination of all the manoeuvring and the procrastination on the part of South Africa, the representatives of the Western countries once again showed how extremely resourceful they were—a resourcefulness worthy of a better cause. They openly adopted a course of virtually backing down from resolution 435 (1978). Now it is proposed to the United Nations that the Organization should virtually recognize the existing régime in South Africa and also legitimize the puppet participation in Namibia.

58. So two months ago—in February this year—members of the Council discussed the question of a statement on the part of their President in connection with the death sentences imposed upon three fighters against the *apartheid* system. The new element here was that, the same Western Powers were now overtly attempting to extract a price for such a statement—that is, making other members of the Council recognize the Fascist juridical system of *apartheid*.

59. A month ago in the United States at the very highest level a statement was made to the effect that South Africa was for it “a friendly country”. But there was not a word of condemnation said by the United States about new acts of aggression by South Africa, including those from the Territory of Namibia against independent African States.

60. Finally, just two days ago [2267th meeting] an overt attempt was made to provide the puppets of South Africa with an opportunity to speak here in the Security Council. Surely that is just one more link in this revealing chain. Surely those actions on the part of the Western countries demonstrate that time and again—how many times now?—they have been prepared to favour South Africa at the expense of the Namibian people and the interests of Africa. The fact that those attempts have not succeeded here in the Council in no way means that we should forget the direction in which those delegations want to push the Security Council.

61. The position of the Soviet Union on the Namibian question is a position of principle and is consistent. The Soviet Union does not seek for itself any particular rights or privileges in Africa or in any other continent. It has unfailingly been of the view that in Africa peace and tranquillity should reign, that every African country should enjoy the fruits of freedom and become master of its own resources and that the roots of racism and *apartheid* should be eradicated from every corner of African soil.

62. In this regard, Comrade Brezhnev stated:

“The Soviet Union believes that in the field of promoting the national liberation of peoples the United Nations at the present time has no more urgent task than ensuring genuine independence for the Namibian people, the sole lawful representative of which is SWAPO, and eliminating the *apartheid* régime in South Africa”.

63. The Soviet Union has always been in favour of ensuring for the people of Namibia their inalienable right to self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of that country, including Walvis Bay. We are in favour of the immediate total withdrawal of the troops and administration of South Africa from Namibia, including Walvis Bay, without any conditions whatsoever. We are in favour of the transfer of all

power to the people of Namibia as embodied in SWAPO, which is recognized by the OAU and the United Nations as the sole lawful and authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

64. The Soviet delegation entirely shares the view of previous African and other non-aligned speakers that it is high time to put an end to all procrastination and delay in the matter of a Namibian settlement. We believe that the Council must support proposals contained in the documents of the OAU and the non-aligned movement and adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

65. The Soviet delegation is ready to vote in favour of the adoption of such measures. We are also convinced that all friends of Africa will vote in this way, because there is no alternative to vigorous pressure on these out-and-out racists and a resolute boycott of them.

66. But there is one question to which the world community should now find an answer. It is the following: Are the Western Powers, together with the other members of the Council, ready to agree to the adoption of genuine and effective sanctions against South Africa or are they going to continue to try to procrastinate, invent subterfuges and even directly undermine this process?

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

68. Mr. COUMBASSA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, before discussing the item before us, we should like to say how grateful the delegation of the Party-State of Guinea is to you and to the members of the Security Council for giving us this opportunity to participate in this debate. May we also congratulate you most warmly on the fact that you are presiding over the Council at the very time when it is considering the highly important question of the situation in Namibia. Your personal qualities as a seasoned diplomat and your thorough experience in international issues give us reason to hope that the present deliberations will be successful.

69. Please allow us also very warmly to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Florin, representative of the German Democratic Republic, for the competence and serenity with which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

70. The latest events in connection with the question of Namibia confer clear urgency on this debate. They indicate to the international community that the time has come for it to re-examine its means of action in order to direct them towards more concrete and effective measures to hasten the accession of the Namibian people to independence and national sovereignty.

71. For 35 years the problem of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations, and it is still there in spite of the adoption 20 years ago of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)]. In the course of that long period, the Security Council, as well as the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice, has spoken out on many occasions on this question. Their statements acquired particular importance with the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the Assembly put an end to the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and transferred the administration of the Territory to the United Nations. Pretoria's rejection of that decision and its defiance of all subsequent resolutions adopted by the Organization have placed South Africa in a position of constant rebellion and defiance *vis-à-vis* the international community.

72. The persistence of this anachronistic situation and the close links between the Namibian problem and the *apartheid* policy of the South African régime have meant that throughout these years a grave situation has been created in that region which endangers the international peace and security which this lofty Council is entrusted with safeguarding.

73. We should like here briefly to recall a few of the principles on the basis of which attempts have been made—in vain—to find a peaceful solution to this important question.

74. First, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence has been recognized and enshrined. None the less, South Africa has opposed the exercise of that inalienable right in Namibia.

75. Secondly, since the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI), which we have already mentioned, Namibia and its inhabitants have been the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Since then the administration of the Territory has been conferred, until it attains independence, upon the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is presided over with competence and devotion by the Ambassador of Zambia, our brother Paul Lusaka. South Africa has rejected that decision and has continued with impunity to occupy the Territory of Namibia.

76. Thirdly, Security Council resolution 385 (1976) provides in its paragraph 7 that in order that the people of Namibia may be enabled freely to determine their own future "it is imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity." It is those same racist authorities in Pretoria which have prevented the normal development of that constitutional process.

77. Fourthly, the Western countries, especially the countries of the contact group, have always upheld the need to establish and maintain dialogue with the Pretoria régime for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. In that connection, did not the settlement plan contained in resolution 435 (1978) offer broad possibilities for a peaceful solution?

78. The answer to that question is widely known. The continued defiance of Pretoria, characterized by bad faith, arrogance and obduracy, have systematically blocked all negotiations on the question of Namibia up to the failure of the recent Geneva meeting.

79. What range of measures now remains to be proposed to persuade an increasingly intransigent and unreasonable South Africa, which has gone so far as to reject the settlement plans submitted by its allies?

80. We can no longer bide our time and issue verbal condemnations. We must act and with even greater resolve, since the international community has no choice but to decree the imposition of mandatory comprehensive sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter against the racist régime of South Africa. Those sanctions must include the strengthening of the arms embargo, an oil embargo and an economic embargo.

81. Members of the Council will recall that already in 1977 resolution 418 (1977) had decreed a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. But what have we observed since the adoption of that decision? Not only has South Africa been able to meet its military needs by importing equipment, but we have even witnessed a dizzying development of the military industry in that country, to the point that it has become today an exporter of weapons. It is a secret to no one that the increase of the military resources of the South African régime have been favoured and supported by the wide-scale assistance of certain Western Powers. Hence, the arms embargo imposed on South Africa has been deliberately violated.

82. This is compounded by the South African racist régime's zealous endeavours to acquire the nuclear weapon. An exchange of scientific experts and other forms of assistance from the Western countries has made it possible for the *apartheid* régime to obtain the technology to develop nuclear devices, thus encouraging the Pretoria régime in its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries, *inter alia*, Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia, and has thus seriously threatened the peace and security of Africa and the rest of the world.

83. The same failures, the same weaknesses registered in the application of the arms embargo against South Africa have been observed in connection with the oil embargo decreed by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries against Pretoria's racist régime, because that country has also managed to meet its oil needs, thanks to the co-operation of certain Western oil-producing countries.

84. South Africa is the only country in the world where racism is institutionalized, the only country where skin colour determines what place a category of nationals occupies within the social hierarchy. That régime is based on repression and on violence and is founded on the systematic denial of human rights and of the rights of peoples. The abject régime of South Africa has been repeatedly condemned by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the international community as a crime against all mankind.

85. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is a challenge which must be met by the international community. The Security Council must assume its responsibilities during the present series of meetings. That is why we venture to hope that all the countries which sincerely support the liberation struggle of African peoples will unfailingly demonstrate this by supporting the adoption and strict implementation of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. We urgently appeal to the Western countries which operate directly or indirectly through transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia to join the international community in adopting and firmly and concretely supporting these sanctions.

86. In any event, our delegation remains convinced that the valorous people of Namibia, under the courageous leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, which enjoys the unconditional support of all peoples which cherish freedom, peace and justice, will triumph in its just national liberation struggle.

87. Mr. WHYTE (United Kingdom): My delegation has listened with great care to the statements which have so far been made by such a distinguished company of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and others in this debate. We have heard—indeed we could not possibly have failed to hear—the disappointment, the anger, above all the frustration which echoes and re-echoes in nearly all those statements.

88. We understand these sentiments. We went to the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in good faith. We did not succeed.

89. Since then, in our attempts to pursue negotiations towards an internationally acceptable settlement for Namibia, we have been given pause, principally by the processes involved in installing a new Administration in Washington. But the contact group is still in business. We have just held a meeting over the past two days in London with our partners in the contact group, and I shall, with the Council's permission, on behalf of the five Western Powers, read out the following communiqué which was issued in London today at the conclusion of that meeting:

“Senior officials of the five Western Governments (Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States) met in

London on 22 and 23 April 1981, to review the situation concerning Namibia. They received a complete report from Mr. Chester Crocker, United States Assistant Secretary-Designate for African Affairs, on his visit to 12 African States, including the African front-line capitals, South Africa, Nigeria, Zaire, Kenya, Swaziland and the Congo.

“The Five agreed that it was of the utmost importance to bring Namibia to independence at the earliest possible date and reiterated their commitment to an internationally acceptable settlement. In that context, they also agreed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) continues to provide a solid basis for a transition to independence in Namibia. They considered possibilities for strengthening the existing plan and agreed that expeditious progress towards a settlement would be enhanced by measures aimed at giving greater confidence to all of the parties on the future of an independent Namibia.

“The representatives agreed that it was necessary to develop more specific proposals for discussion with the concerned parties. It was decided that intensive consultations among the contact group representatives would continue, and it is intended that the five Foreign Ministers will consider the issue further when they meet at Rome.” [S/14457, annex.]

The meeting at Rome, I might add, is due to take place on 4 and 5 May—in 10 days' time.

90. We understand why the patience of so many who have addressed the Council is sorely tried. Most of those who have spoken in this debate are now advocating, without further delay, that we proceed to mandatory measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

91. We appeal to all those concerned to resist the temptation now to abandon the possibility of negotiation. We do this because we are totally convinced that going down the road of sanctions will not bring closer the independence of Namibia on an internationally acceptable basis.

92. Comparisons have been drawn between the search for independence by Namibia and the achievement of independence by Zimbabwe. The differences between the two are perhaps as significant as the similarities. But there is, it seems to us, one fundamental similarity. Throughout the months and indeed the years of negotiation, often infuriating and frustrating, which preceded the successful Lancaster House Conference on Zimbabwe, it was always clear that it was in the long-term interest of all the parties that Zimbabwe should proceed to independence by negotiated settlement rather than by ultimate resolution through armed struggle.

93. It is surely likewise in the interests of all the parties that have been involved in the protracted nego-

tiations over Namibia that the Territory too should proceed to independence by a negotiated settlement, internationally acceptable.

94. I therefore repeat, that, despite the frustration, let us resist the temptation to pull up the drawbridge and settle down for the long siege; let us instead affirm our determination to make negotiation succeed.

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

96. Mr. KASINA (Kenya): First, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for inviting Kenya to participate in this important debate. I should also like to express to you my delegation's pleasure and satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the Council's deliberations. Your personal experience and skill in international matters will, no doubt, be of great value in the current debate. Kenya, although not a member of the Council, will endeavour to co-operate in the debate to see that the Council comes up with a concrete and immediate solution to the long and vexing problem of Namibia.

97. Once again the Council is considering the question of Namibia. It is indeed regrettable that the racist régime has constantly chosen not to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council on the question of Namibia.

98. As is well known to all of us, the United Nations has been dealing with the question of Namibia from its inauguration. The problem of Namibia is as old as the United Nations itself, and the facts of the problem have been well recorded. It is therefore not necessary for my delegation to recall in detail all the relevant facts, even if we had the time to do so in the course of this debate. In 1946, by a resolution of the General Assembly [resolution 65 (I)], South Africa was requested to bring Namibia within the United Nations Trusteeship System. South Africa refused to comply with that request; instead it has continued colonizing the Territory and extending its *apartheid* policies to it.

99. In the years that have passed South Africa has consistently refused to recognize United Nations authority over Namibia. It has extended the criminal policies of *apartheid* and is busy planning the policies of bantustans and the so-called homeland in Namibia. These policies are clearly aimed at violating the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

100. In 1966, as I have just said, the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia [resolution 2145 (XXI)] and placed the country under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The responsibility of administering Namibia until it became independent was entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia [resolution 2248 (S-V)]. Despite those pronouncements by the United Nations,

South Africa has continued to reject and even challenges the authority of the United Nations over the Territory.

101. From all that it is quite clear that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and that everybody except South Africa accepts the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory.

102. Despite South Africa's defiance of the United Nations and all the frustrations in which it has, as a result, culminated over the last 33 years, hope was entertained that a political solution that could lead Namibia to self-determination and independence was feasible. We recall that in April 1978 the five Western countries then serving on the Security Council worked out what we were told was a settlement proposal which could lead Namibia to independence. The proposal [S/12636] was a product of lengthy discussions that produced resolution 435 (1978) of the Council. Although we had reservations and misgivings about the settlement proposals and the consequent resolution 435 (1978), we accepted in good faith the proposals of the five Western countries. It was our understanding at that time that the Group of Five had applied the necessary pressure on South Africa to accept the United Nations plan.

103. The result of the Geneva meeting early this year confirmed our fears and doubts and the misgivings we had had all along. South Africa has never been sincere in negotiations for a peaceful political solution regarding the independence of Namibia. Clearly South Africa's duplicity and arrogance resulted in the failure of the Geneva meeting. During those talks SWAPO declared its willingness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to reach an agreement on the date for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. South Africa, on the other hand, characteristically exhibited its usual intransigence by rejecting the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It was clear from the beginning that South Africa went to Geneva just to wreck the United Nations plan.

104. Since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and placed the Territory under its responsibility, numerous resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council urging South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia. All those resolutions have simply been ignored by the Pretoria régime.

105. The continued illegal occupation by South Africa no doubt frustrates the efforts of the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination. The racist régime has organized an elaborate machinery of repression and suppression, thus advancing the dreadful *apartheid* policies into the Territory. The people of Namibia cannot, therefore, become free until the complete and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the country. The people of Namibia

like other peoples that have emerged from colonial rule to freedom, have every right to the same freedom.

106. The occupation of Namibia by South Africa is even more disturbing when the régime establishes military and air bases in the Territory. We are all aware of the military attacks which have been launched from Namibia against the neighbouring countries. The United Nations is fully aware of the acts of aggression that have been committed by the Pretoria régime against Angola, Botswana and Zambia.

107. The United Nations has reached the stage for decisive action to eliminate the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The programmes laid down by resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) still remain to be executed. Why is it that for the last 15 years the United Nations has not seen fit to take punitive measures against a State that has defied its authority for 35 years? For how long are we going to allow this one racist nation to challenge our collective authority? Where do we go after 15 years of peaceful negotiations and fruitless efforts?

108. The United Nations has assumed a moral and political duty towards the people of Namibia. We have a duty to see that the people of Namibia exercises its inalienable right to independence.

109. After 35 years of peaceful negotiations, only to be confronted with duplicity and naked aggression by South Africa so that it may continue to hold the people of Namibia in perpetual slavery, my delegation calls upon the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. This should also include an oil embargo, which if fully implemented will bring about South Africa's immediate compliance with the resolutions and decisions of this body.

110. On many occasions we have said that without the support and encouragement of various kinds coming from some Members of the Organization that have a strong exploitative interest in Namibia and South Africa, the Pretoria régime would have long ago complied with the decisions of the Organization, quit Namibia and dismantled *apartheid* structures in South Africa. We want again to repeat that it is those States having strong military and economic ties with the régime that encourage it to behave in the way that it does. Indeed, in the same manner, the way in which some members of the Security Council vote on the several draft resolutions to be proposed here may cause South Africa to continue to feel encouraged in its defiance of the resolutions of the Council.

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

112. Mr. CORRÊA da COSTA (Brazil): I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members

of the Security Council for allowing me to participate in this debate. Permit me also to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month and to wish you success in the discharge of your difficult and important task.

113. I also wish to pay a tribute to Ambassador Florin of the German Democratic Republic for having skilfully conducted the Council's business last month.

114. These meetings are indeed of historical significance: for the circumstances in which they are being held, for the expectations they have created throughout the world and for the widespread recognition that they usher in a new phase in the struggle for the carrying out of the independence process for Namibia. That being so, Brazil could not fail to lend its modest, though unambiguous, contribution to this debate.

115. The history of Brazilian foreign policy unequivocally shows that Brazil has always been an unconditional supporter of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and that the often painful and frustrating process of bringing closer together diverging views, even on the most difficult and critical issues, is always a better option than resorting to extreme measures which do not allow for an adequate face-saving way out of the resulting impasse.

116. On the other hand, Brazil also believes with the same degree of conviction that if international peace and security are to be maintained, the provisions of the Charter must not only be abided by but also applied whenever appropriate. Of course, we recognize that the appropriateness of applying a specific provision of the Charter may well be a matter of judgement.

117. In the case of Namibia, however, as the result of the Council's present debate will clearly evince, the international community, with perhaps one or two exceptions, concurs in its judgement on the need for further action to expedite Namibia's freedom and independence.

118. I shall refrain from delving into the past history of South Africa's disrespect for United Nations resolutions on Namibia. I did so at length at the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly earlier this year² and many speakers who have preceded me in this debate have set the record straight on where we stand at the present moment. I shall confine my brief remarks to just a few aspects of the situation.

119. The Brazilian Government entertained the hope that the negotiations for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would eventually yield positive results and lead to the long-awaited independence of Namibia. We did not delude ourselves; we knew that many difficult obstacles would need to be overcome and that predictable setbacks would require redoubled efforts to keep the negotiating process alive.

But we sincerely hoped that, with South Africa's having accepted in principle the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and bearing in mind the efforts at persuasion by the contact group of Western States, South Africa's stubbornness and anachronistic policies might well follow the stream of modern history.

120. Nevertheless, as events turned out, we proved to have been unrealistic and perhaps naïve. As soon as an agreement seemed to be at hand, South Africa stalled the negotiations by claiming that the illegal authorities installed in Windhoek should be given a say in the way the independence process was to be conducted. At the Geneva pre-implementation meeting, after SWAPO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, had expressed its willingness immediately to conclude a cease-fire agreement, South Africa flatly shattered whatever illusions might have existed that it was committed to an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question.

121. The second aspect of the situation on which I should like to comment has to do with the distorted way in which Pretoria has been attempting to present the situation in Namibia to world public opinion. By accusing the United Nations of partiality in favour of SWAPO and of neglecting the views of an illegal government, South Africa is pretending that the Organization all of a sudden picked SWAPO as the Namibian people's authentic representative, as though the question of Namibia had no antecedents and as though more than 30 years of United Nations resolutions could be wiped out. South Africa and its supporters should know better and should acknowledge that every new step taken by the Organization could have been avoided if only South Africa had vouchsafed even a tenuous signal of receptiveness. For us now to take a step backward and to disavow our previous statements in favour of SWAPO would be tantamount to relieving South Africa of the responsibility it unquestionably bears for the present state of affairs.

122. A long and peaceful process of exhortation, persuasion and negotiation has thus been frustrated. South Africa gives us no hope of effectiveness if we try, against all evidence and particularly against the evidence of the Geneva meeting to limit ourselves to this process. There seems to be no other road open to the Organization but the Security Council's consideration of measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. However much we might have favoured other solutions, they have been tried, again and again, to no avail.

123. The time has come for further action.

124. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I have thought repeatedly, as I have followed these discussions, about the goal of these meetings. It seems to me that it is perhaps time that we focused again on the goal of this special series of meetings of the Security Council.

125. Presumably, that goal is to produce an independent, stable, self-governing Namibia. As I understand it, there is no disagreement on that goal.

126. A number of charges have been made in the past few days, and I have followed those charges with interest. There have been charges that the Western countries—the contact group—have failed to achieve the goal of an independent, stable, self-governing Namibia. There have been charges that the Western countries—the contact group—have failed to bring South Africa to its knees. There have been charges that the Western group—the contact group—is responsible somehow for the continuation of racism and colonialism in Namibia, in South Africa; indeed, in Africa. It has been suggested that because the contact group of Western States—like the African countries, like the Eastern bloc of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—has substantial economic relations with South Africa, it is somehow responsible for the continuation of repression in South Africa.

127. I have asked myself repeatedly in the course of these negotiations and discussions how the charges which are being made here relate to the accomplishment of the goal on which we are presumably all agreed: the goal of an independent, stable, democratic Namibia. Repeatedly it has been suggested in the course of the past few days that because we have not already succeeded, we should not try again, that we should try some other course than the continuing search for an internationally acceptable peace, arrived at through peaceable negotiations an internationally acceptable, independent Namibia arrived at through international negotiations; that we should adopt some other course—for example, make a declaration, commit ourselves to comprehensive compulsory sanctions.

128. But I think that if we are realistic—and if we are not realistic we waste our time and that of everyone else present—then we will understand that resolutions do not solve problems, sanctions do not solve problems, declarations do not make peace, declarations do not secure independence. Is it not past time that we considered here, realistically, the practical, actual alternatives to a continuing search for an internationally acceptable solution in Namibia?

129. My Government has no other objective than to achieve authentic independence and self-government for Namibia; indeed, I believe that the whole of the contact group of Western States has no other objective than this. We have no territorial objectives in Africa. We have no aspiration to station thousands of our troops in African countries. We have no desire to send armed surrogates to subject the independence of the new States of Africa. We have no desire to divide this body, or to divert its attention from the problem of self-government for Namibia to the creation of divisive diversions here.

130. Solving problems is much more difficult than adopting resolutions. But the problem of an independent, stable, self-governing, democratic Namibia will be solved because it must be solved. And it will be solved, eventually, only by the force of arms or by the exercise of reason.

131. No one has spoken much here about the true alternatives to the continued search for a negotiated, internationally acceptable solution to the Namibia problem, but I think it is past time that we faced those alternatives squarely. I should like, on behalf of my Government, to pledge ourselves, through continued effort at the maximum of our ability and our ingenuity, independently and with our colleagues in the contact group and with our associates here in the United

Nations, to the unflagging search for an internationally acceptable, truly, authentically independent, stable, democratic Namibia.

The meeting rose at 5.45 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 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 105th meeting.*