Recalling further its resolutions 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 and 253 (1968) of 29 May 1968, by which it determined and reaffirmed, respectively, that the situation in Southern Rhodesia constituted a threat to international peace and security,

Having examined the report (S/12307) of the Mission to Botswana established under resolution 403 (1977),

Having heard the statement of the Minister for External Affairs of Botswana on the continued attacks and acts of provocation by the illegal racist régime in Southern Rhodesia against Botswana,

Convinced that international solidarity with Botswana, as a neighbouring State to Southern Rhodesia, is essential for the promotion of a solution to the question of Southern Rhodesia,

1. *Expresses* full support for the Government of Botswana in its efforts to safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence;

2. *Expresses its appreciation* to the Secretary-General for having arranged to send a Mission to Botswana to ascertain the assistance needed;

3. *Takes note with satisfaction* of the report of the Mission to Botswana (S/12307);

4. *Fully endorses* the assessment and recommendations of the Mission to Botswana under resolution 403 (1977);

5. *Further fully endorses* the appeal made by the Secretary-General in his letter of 18 April 1977 (S/12326) to all States to give the matter of assistance to Botswana their most urgent attention and to provide Botswana with the financial and material help it urgently needs;

6. *Welcomes* the establishment by the Secretary-General of a special account at Headquarters to receive contributions for assistance to Botswana through the United Nations;

7. *Requests* the United Nations and the organizations and programmes concerned, including the Economic and Social Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Programme and the World Health Organization, to assist Botswana in the fields identified in the report of the Mission to Botswana;

8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to give the matter of assistance to Botswana his continued attention and to keep the Security Council informed;

9. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

COMPLAINT BY BENIN

Decision of 8 February 1977 (1987th meeting): resolution 404 (1977)

In a letter[1454] dated 26 January 1977, the representative of Benin requested, in accordance with Article 35 of the Charter, that a meeting of the Security Council be convened for the purpose of discussing the cowardly and barbarous aggression committed by the imperialists and their mercenaries against the People's Republic of Benin. The letter charged that on 16 January 1977 a commando unit of mercenaries, brought by a military aircraft, had attacked the airport and city of Cotonou but had been forced to retreat, abandoning a considerable quantity of weapons and ammunition after causing the loss of some lives and material damage.

By a letter[1455] dated 4 February 1977, the representative of Guinea transmitted a message from the President of Guinea in which he objected to the alleged attempt by some members of the Security Council to refer the complaint by Benin to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and requested the President of the Security Council to call an immediate meeting of that organ.

At the 1986th meeting on 7 February 1977, the Security Council included the two letters in its agenda and considered the item at its 1986th and 1987th meetings on 7 and 8 February 1977. During these two meetings, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia and Togo to participate, without vote, in the discussions.[1456]

At the 1986th meeting, the representative of Benin opened the discussion with a very detailed description of the events of 16 January 1977 at Cotonou and charged that the aim of the act of aggression carried out by a group of mercenaries was to immobilize the armed forces of Benin and to place the city under military occupation as a first stage. He pointed out that the mercenaries carried highly sophisticated equipment in large quantities and gave rise to severe fighting leading to death and injury of soldiers and civilians as well as to substantial material damage. He accused imperialist and neo-colonialist Powers of having instigated this attack and called for a special Security Council mission to ascertain the facts, to determine who was responsible and who carried out the armed aggression and to help assess the damage caused. He also expressed hope that in a second phase appropriate action should be taken to prevent the recurrence of such barbaric acts of aggression by mercenaries.[1457]

The representative of Mauritius also condemned the mercenary attack on Cotonou and called for the dispatch of a Security Council mission of inquiry to Benin as soon as possible. In this connexion he introduced a draft resolution co-sponsored by the delegations of Benin, Libyan Arab Republic and Mauritius under which the Council would decide to send such a mission to investigate the *de facto* aggression.[1458]

Members of the Security Council and other speakers joined the representative of Benin in denouncing the attack on Cotonou and in seeking the establishment of the relevant facts surrounding the act of aggression by a Council mission.[1459] Several representatives underlined

[1454] S/12278, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1977*, p. 6.

[1455] S/12881, *ibid.*, p. 6. The President of the Council received three other letters supporting Benin's request: a letter dated 7 February 1977 (S/12883, *ibid.*, p. 7) from the representative of Sri Lanka, transmitting in his capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries a communiqué issued by that body regarding the attack on Cotonou; a letter dated 8 February 1977 (S/12284, *ibid.*, pp. 7-8) from the representative of Jordan who as Chairman of the Arab Group transmitted a communiqué from that group; a letter dated 8 February 1977 (S/12285, *ibid.*, p. 8) from the representative of Rwanda who as Chairman of the African Group reported that the African countries had expressed unanimous support for Benin's request.

[1456] For details, see chapter III.

[1457] 1986th mtg., paras. 10-41.

[1458] *Ibid.*, paras. 43-50. The draft resolution S/12282 was subsequently slightly revised and adopted as resolution 404 (1977). For the text of the original draft see *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1977*, pp. 16-17.

[1459] See the interventions by Rwanda, Madagascar, Guinea, Algeria at the 1986th mtg. and by the USSR, Libyan Arab Republic, France, Romania, Pakistan, China, India, Togo, Somalia, Mali and Panama at the 1987th mtg.

the basic responsibility of the Council to look into such situations,[1460] others emphasized the universal validity of the basic Charter norms regarding the maintenance of international peace and security and the non-use of the threat or use of force.[1461]

At the end of the 1987th meeting on 8 February 1977, the President stated that as a result of informal consultations, the members of the Council were agreed to adopt the revised draft resolution[1462] by consensus, without putting it to the vote, and accordingly, he declared the draft resolution adopted as resolution 404 (1977).[1463] The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter dated 26 January 1977 from the Chargé d'Affaires, a.i., of the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Benin to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Benin,

Bearing in mind that all Member States must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

1. *Affirms* that the territorial integrity and political independence of the People's Republic of Benin must be respected;

2. *Decides* to send a Special Mission composed of three members of the Security Council to the People's Republic of Benin in order to investigate the events of 16 January 1977 at Cotonou and report not later than the end of February 1977;

3. *Decides* that the members of the Special Mission will be appointed after consultations between the President and the members of the Security Council;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide the Special Mission with the necessary assistance;

5. *Decides* to remain seized of the question.

Following the adoption of the resolution, the President announced that he would begin consultations with the members of the Council on the appointment of the members of the Special Mission and keep the members informed of progress.[1464]

In a note[1465] dated 10 February 1977, the President of the Security Council reported that the Council members had agreed to appoint three Council members: India, the Libyan Arab Republic and Panama as members of the Special Mission and the Ambassador of Panama as Chairman.

In a further note[1466] issued on 23 February 1977, the President informed the Council members that on 22 February he had received a telegram from the Chairman of the Special Mission to Benin requesting, in view of the extensive volume of evidence acquired in the course of its investigation, an extension until 8 March of the deadline for submission of its report. The President added that the members of the Council had agreed to the request.

On 7 March 1977, the Security Council Special Mission to the People's Republic of Benin submitted its report,[1467] in which it gave an account of its investigation of the events of 16 January 1977 at Cotonou. During its visit to Benin from 16 to 25 February, the Special Mission had interviewed members of the diplomatic corps, witnesses of the attack and a captured mercenary and had examined material evidence including documentation left behind by the invaders. The report offered a detailed reconstruction of the events of 16 January, described step by step the operation launched by the mercenaries, the number and background of the attackers and the action of the Beninese forces who successfully repulsed the invasion.

The report concluded that on the basis of the testimony received and evidence examined, the attack of 16 January had been launched with the primary objective of overthrowing the Government of Benin and that the act of aggression had been carried out by mercenaries for pecuniary motives. According to the testimony of the prisoner held in Benin and parts of the documentation left behind by the attacking force, the attackers had been recruited in Europe and Africa, trained near Marrakesh, Morocco, transported from Morocco to Gabon on 15 January and flown in different aircraft to Cotonou arriving on the morning of 16 January. A Colonel Maurin, who was in charge of the operation, had been hired by an organization called the Front de Libération et de Réhabilitation du Dahomey, whose objective was to replace the Government of Benin with a régime of its own choice. According to the documents, a French national, Gilbert Bourgeaud, had been employed as an adviser to the President of Gabon since August 1976, and his photograph had been identified by the prisoner as that of Colonel Maurin. However, the Special Mission had decided that the terms of its mandate and the time at its disposal did not permit it to investigate further and verify the testimony of the prisoner pertaining to those matters.

By letter[1468] dated 28 March 1977, the Secretary-General transmitted a copy of a telegram from the President of Gabon who expressed astonishment at the conclusion contained in the report of the Special Mission and disappointment at the cursory manner in which the inquiry had been conducted. He requested the documentation on which the report was based and invited the members of the Mission to visit Gabon to supplement their information and reiterated that his country had at no time been involved in the alleged aggression. Subsequently, by a letter[1469] dated 4 April 1977, the Secretary-General transmitted to the Council a letter dated 23 March from the President of Gabon who complained that a charade had been staged to discredit his country and requested that another fact-

[1460] See, for example, 1986th mtg.: Madagascar, para. 68 (Article 39), 1987th mtg.: Pakistan, para. 50 (Article 24).

[1461] See, for example, 1987th mtg.: Pakistan, para. 48 (Article 1(1)), India, para. 64 (Article 2(4)).

[1462] S/12282/Rev.1, adopted as resolution 404 (1977). The revision involved the deadline in paragraph 2 and the addition of paragraph 4 regarding the assistance to be provided by the Secretary-General.

[1463] 1987th mtg., para. 123.

[1464] *Ibid.*, para. 131.

[1465] S/12286, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for January-March 1977*, p. 8.

[1466] S/12289, *ibid.*, p. 9.

[1467] S/12994 and Add.1, replaced by S/12994/Rev.1, issued in *OR, 32nd yr., Special Supplement No. 3.*

[1468] S/12313, *ibid., Suppl. for January-March 1977*, p. 50.

[1469] S/12317, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for April-June 1977*, p. 2.

finding mission should be authorized to visit Gabon together with the witness to conduct a full counter-investigation on the spot.

Decision of 14 April 1977 (2005th meeting): resolution 405 (1977)

At the 2000th meeting on 6 April 1977, the Security Council included the report of the Special Mission to the People's Republic of Benin in its agenda and considered the item during its 2000th to 2005th meetings from 6 to 14 April 1977. During these meetings, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, Cuba, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania and Upper Volta to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the question.[1470]

At the beginning of the meeting, the President drew the attention of the Council members to additional documents, including the two communications from the Government of Gabon,[1471] and two letters[1472] dated 4 April from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of Benin requesting the circulation of reports prepared by his Government.[1473]

The representative of Panama, speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Special Mission, opened the deliberations of the Council and introduced the report giving special emphasis to its principal conclusions.[1474]

The representative of Benin expressed his appreciation for the thorough report submitted by the Special Mission and noted that other investigations carried out under Beninese or African auspices corroborated the conclusions of the Security Council inquiry. It was clear in the judgement of his Government that the act of aggression had been organized by the reactionary neo-colonialist circles in France who had never accepted the revolution of 1972 in Benin. He appealed to the representative of France to see to it that the criminals who had launched the operation from French soil be brought to justice. He stated that as a result of the attack on Cotonou, Benin was forced to pay particular attention to problems of defence and security; the civilian and military population had been mobilized since 16 January 1977, and for reasons of security, the Government had been obliged to close Benin's western frontiers for a time. He addressed an urgent appeal to the international community for assistance in repairing the extensive damages caused by the aggression and in ensuring its defence and security in the future.[1475]

The representative of Mauritius mentioned that the Council of Ministers of the OAU had already adopted a resolution condemning the act of armed aggression against Benin; the consideration by the Security Council should lead not only to condemnation of the events of 16 January and to compensation to the Government of Benin for the damages suffered, but it should also result in a further attempt by the Council to come to terms with the spreading disease of "mercenarism". He reviewed some recent provisions in resolutions of the General Assembly dealing with mercenary activities and international norms designed to prevent such occurrences, reported to the Council that the OAU was currently reviewing a regional draft convention on mercenaries and called upon the Security Council to seek actively a solution at the global level for this growing problem.[1476]

During the subsequent extensive discussion of the report of the Special Mission and in particular of the causes and effects of the attack on Cotonou there was general agreement that the Republic of Benin had been the victim of a mercenary attack and that the Council should condemn this criminal act. Several African representatives and the representative of France, however, took exception to charges and allegations that were contained in the report[1477] prepared and distributed by the Government of Benin. The resulting exchange involved also the representatives of Benin and Guinea.[1478]

At the beginning of the 2004th meeting on 14 April 1977, the representative of Mauritius introduced a draft resolution[1479] sponsored initially by the delegations of Benin, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritius and subsequently also by the representatives of India and Panama;[1480] he presented its provisions in detail and expressed his pleasure that the draft would be adopted by the Council members by consensus.[1481]

At the conclusion of the 2005th meeting on 14 April 1977, the President stated that, as a result of consultations, the draft resolution would be adopted without putting it to a vote, and declared the text adopted by consensus as resolution 405 (1977).[1482] The resolution reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having considered the report of the Security Council Special Mission to the People's Republic of Benin established under resolution 404 (1977) of 8 February 1977,

Gravely concerned at the violation of the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of the State of Benin,

[1470] For details, see chapter III of this Supplement.

[1471] See notes 1468 and 1469.

[1472] For the letters and the attached reports see S/12138 and Add.1, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1977*, pp. 2-5, and S/12139 and Add.1, *ibid.*, pp. 5-26.

[1473] 2000th mtg., para. 9. See also his extensive statement at the 2005th mtg., paras. 166-203.

[1474] 2000th mtg., paras. 18-34.

[1475] *Ibid.*, paras. 49-83.

[1476] *Ibid.*, paras. 89-116.

[1477] See note 1472, for the report issued as S/12139/Add.1.

[1478] For arguments disputing Benin's charges see 2000th mtg.: Gabon, paras. 139-160; 2001st mtg.: Senegal, paras. 33-46; France, paras. 52-67; Morocco, paras. 72-96; Ivory Coast, paras. 101-138; 2002nd mtg.: Togo, paras. 57-90; 2004th mtg.: Senegal, paras. 57-83; 2005th mtg.: Gabon, paras. 30-42; Ivory Coast, paras. 108-126; Senegal, paras. 128-144. For views in support of Benin's position, see 2000th mtg.: Guinea, paras. 163-179; 2003rd mtg.: Benin, paras. 73-110; 2004th mtg.: Guinea, paras. 85-116; 2005th mtg.: Guinea, paras. 150-156.

[1479] S/12322, subsequently adopted without change as resolution 405 (1977).

[1480] The co-sponsorship of India and Panama was announced by the President at the 2004th mtg., para. 55.

[1481] For the statement by the representative of Mauritius, *ibid.*, paras. 5-22.

[1482] See 2005th mtg., para. 207, for the statement of the President.

Deeply grieved at the loss of life and substantial damage to property caused by the invading force during its attack on Cotonou on 16 January 1977,

1. *Takes note* of the report of the Special Mission and expresses its appreciation for the work accomplished;

2. *Strongly condemns* the act of armed aggression perpetrated against the People's Republic of Benin on 16 January 1977;

3. *Reaffirms* its resolution 239 (1967) of 10 July 1967, by which, *inter alia*, it condemns any State which persists in permitting or tolerating the recruitment of mercenaries and the provision of facilities to them, with the objective of overthrowing the Governments of Member States;

4. *Calls upon* all States to exercise the utmost vigilance against the danger posed by international mercenaries and to ensure that their territory and other territories under their control, as well as their nationals, are not used for the planning of subversion and recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries designed to overthrow the Government of any Member State;

5. *Further calls upon* all States to consider taking necessary measures to prohibit, under their respective domestic laws, the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries on their territory and other territories under their control;

6. *Condemns* all forms of external interference in the internal affairs of Member States, including the use of international mercenaries to destabilize States and/or to violate their territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide appropriate technical assistance to help the Government of Benin in assessing and evaluating the damage resulting from the act of armed aggression committed at Cotonou on 16 January 1977;

8. *Appeals* to all States to provide material assistance to the People's Republic of Benin in order to enable it to repair the damage and losses inflicted during the attack;

9. *Notes* that the Government of Benin has reserved its right with respect to any eventual claims for compensation which it may wish to assert;

10. *Calls upon* all States to provide the Security Council with any information they might have in connexion with the events at Cotonou on 16 January 1977 likely to throw further light on those events;

11. *Requests* the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution;

12. *Decides* to remain seized of this question.

Decision of 24 November 1977 (2049th meeting): resolution 419 (1977)

By letter[1483] dated 13 October 1977, the representative of Benin transmitted the revised report by his Government evaluating the damages resulting from the act of armed aggression committed at Cotonou on 16 January 1977. The revised report[1484] was based on new statistical data and on the reports prepared by two expert consultants who had visited Cotonou in accordance with paragraph 7 of resolution 405 (1977). Copies of the reports of the two expert consultants on material damage and on damage to persons were annexed.

By letter[1485] dated 4 November 1977, the representative of Benin requested the President of the Security Council to convene a meeting of the Council to resume consideration of the question of armed aggression of 16 January 1977 against Benin.

At the 2047th meeting on 22 November 1977, the Security Council included the letter dated 4 November in its agenda and considered the item at its 2047th to 2049th meetings from 22 to 24 November 1977. During these meetings, the Council decided to invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, the Congo, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique and Viet Nam to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1486]

The representative of Benin opened the deliberations by recalling the resolutions 404 and 405 (1977) which the Council had adopted in response to the events at Cotonou and charged that the hostility against his country continued in overt and covert ways: after the imperialist aggression in January Benin was now subject to economic reprisals consisting of denial of credits that were routinely granted in the past and other forms of economic coercion. The Government of Benin regretted in particular that the Government of France had not yet responded to its request for assistance in investigating the origin of the mercenary aggression of 16 January as far as it could be traced to French nationals acting on French territory.

He urged the Council members to consider the attack on Cotonou once again for two reasons: The case offered an exceptional opportunity to adopt effective measures to eliminate the scourge of international mercenaries. Moreover, paragraph 7 of resolution 405 (1977) had requested the Secretary-General to assist the Government of Benin in assessing and evaluating the damage resulting from the aggression against Cotonou. Two experts whom the Secretary-General had made available conducted surveys regarding human losses and material damages and arrived at a total estimate of 7 billion CFA or $28 million. The reports prepared by the two experts indicated that their estimate was on the low side. The Government of Benin did not ask for charity but only for justice, as far as these damages were concerned.[1487]

At the same meeting, the representative of France rejected the charges of the Beninese representative, reiterated his Government's commitment to the principle of respect for the independence of States and non-interference in their internal affairs and noted that his Government had carried out an independent investigation, following the request by the Benin authorities, which, however, had produced nothing; the Government of Benin had been informed of the outcome of the French inquiry. He concluded by once again declaring his Government's principled condemnation of all forms of interference and by reiterating its denial of any involvement in actions by adventure-seekers, such as the attack of 16 January.[1488]

General support in the subsequent discussion for the concerns expressed by the representative of Benin result-

[1483] S/12415, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Oct.-Dec. 1977*, pp. 27-33.
[1484] It superseded the first report circulated on 5 April as document S/12318/Add.1 (see note 1472).
[1485] S/12437, *ibid.*, p. 51.
[1486] For details, see chapter III.
[1487] 2047th mtg., paras. 8-31.
[1488] *Ibid.*, paras. 78-83.

ed in the adoption without a vote of a draft resolution,[1489] slightly revised,[1490] at the end of the 2049th meeting on 24 November 1977.[1491] Resolution 419 (1977) reads as follows:

The Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Benin to the United Nations, especially regarding the threats of aggression by mercenaries,

Deeply concerned over the danger which international mercenaries represent for all States, in particular the smaller ones,

Convinced of the necessity of co-operation between all States, in conformity with paragraph 10 of resolution 405 (1977) of 14 April 1977, to collect more information about the mercenaries who operated against the People's Republic of Benin on 16 January 1977,

1. *Reaffirms* its resolution 405 (1977), in which it had, among other provisions, taken note of the report of the Security Council Special Mission to the People's Republic of Benin established under resolution 404 (1977) of 8 February 1977 and strongly condemned the act of armed aggression perpetrated against the People's Republic of Benin on 16 January 1977 and all forms of external interference in the internal affairs of Member States, including the use of international mercenaries to destabilize States and/or to violate their territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence;

2. *Takes note* of the report on the evaluation of damages contained in document S/12415;

3. *Calls upon* all States to work in close co-operation in order to gather all useful information concerning all mercenaries involved in the events of 16 January 1977, in compliance with paragraph 10 of resolution 405 (1977);

4. *Takes note* of the desire of the Government of Benin to have the mercenaries who participated in the attacking forces against the People's Republic of Benin on 16 January 1977 subjected to due process of law;

5. *Appeals* to all States and all appropriate international organizations, including the United Nations and its specialized agencies, to assist Benin to repair the damage caused by the act of aggression;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to Benin for the implementation of paragraph 5 of the present resolution;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to watch over the implementation of the present resolution, with particular reference to paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6, and to report to the Security Council not later than 30 September 1978;

8. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

THE QUESTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

By letter[1492] dated 9 March 1977 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of Nigeria, Chairman of the African Group for the month of March, requested the convening of a meeting of the Council to consider the question of South Africa, in conformity with previous relevant General Assembly and Council resolutions, in particular General Assembly resolution 31/6 and Council resolution 392 (1976).

By letter[1493] dated 21 March 1977 addressed to the President of the Security Council the representative of Liberia transmitted the text of a message by the President of Liberia on the question of South Africa. He called on the Council and all Member States to demonstrate through positive action that *apartheid* was indeed a crime against humanity which contravened the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and was increasingly leading to a racial conflagration in southern Africa. In his view, positive action meant application against South Africa of Chapter VII of the Charter, in particular Article 41.

By letter[1494] dated 18 March 1977 addressed to the President of the Security Council the Acting Executive Secretary of OAU to the United Nations transmitted the text of a message from the Administrative Secretary-General of OAU stating that OAU expected the Council to impose economic sanctions and a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

At the 1988th meeting on 21 March 1977 the Security Council adopted[1495] the agenda and considered the item at the 1988th to 1992nd, 1994th, 1996th, 1998th and 1999th meetings between 21 and 31 March 1977.

In the course of its deliberations the Council invited the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia, at their request, to participate, without vote, in the discussion of the item.[1496] It also extended invitations to the President and other members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to Mr. Mfanafuthi Johnstone Makatini of the African National Congress, to Mr. Potlako Leballo of the Pan Africanist Congress, to Mr. Olof Palme, to Mr. Abdul S. Minty and to Mr. William P. Thompson.[1497]

At the 1988th meeting the representative of Mauritius drew the attention of the Security Council to the imminent danger of a general war in southern Africa. Rapid and effective measures were needed to deal with the real causes of the conflict which otherwise would inevitably grow more serious and might spread to other parts of Africa. It could produce the most serious international crisis. South Africa, he said, possessed an awesome military power and continued to develop its military capabilities at a rapid rate, building the most powerful military machine in Africa south of the Sahara for the purpose of maintaining and protecting its system of minority rule. This military power constituted a threat to neighbouring States and other States farther afield; it had mounted a full-scale invasion of Angola, imposed an occupying army on Namibia, attacked Zambia and was giving military assistance to the Smith

[1489] S/12454, sponsored by Benin, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Mauritius and introduced by the representative of Mauritius at the 2048th mtg., paras. 74-86. It was replaced by S/12454/Rev.1.

[1490] S/12454/Rev.1 differed from the original draft only in that the language of paragraph 1 underwent a very small editorial change.

[1491] For the adoption of the draft, see 2049th mtg., para. 96.

[1492] S/12295, *OR, 32nd yr., Suppl. for Jan.-March 1977*, p. 12.

[1493] S/12301, *ibid.*, p. 19.

[1494] S/12303, *ibid.*, p. 20.

[1495] 1988th mtg., preceding para. 5.

[1496] For details, see chapter III.

[1497] *Ibid.* At the 1991st meeting the representative of the United Kingdom raised a procedural point concerning the invitation of Mr. Thompson (see 1991st mtg., paras. 6-9).