

**Professor Carlson Anyangwe's Interview with *La Nouvelle Expression*,
November 12, 2008**

Translated from French

1- In what terms can the anglophone identity problem in Cameroun be defined?

The question you have just asked appears to suggest that there is a community of people known as 'anglophones' who happen to find themselves in the French world of Cameroun Republic and who are suffering from an identity crisis. Cameroun Republic is of course the former French Cameroun which achieved national independence on 1 January 1960. I am not aware that there is within the frontiers of that country a community of people known as 'anglophones' and who now have an identity crisis. There are many citizens of Cameroun Republic who are proficient in English as a second language. You may speak of them as 'anglophones' but I very much doubt that they have an identity problem in their country.

I suspect though that your question could be referring, infelicitously, to citizens of the British Southern Cameroons, a captive people of Cameroun Republic for almost half a century already. You would recall that the former UN trust territory of French Cameroun acceded to independence on 1 January 1960. It did so under the name, style and political identity of 'Republique du Cameroun' (translated as 'Cameroon' or 'Cameroun Republic'). It acceded to national independence on 1 January 1960 and was admitted to UN membership on 20 September 1960 within the territorial framework of the French trusteeship. Under international law the frontiers of Cameroun Republic became frozen on that date of its accession to national independence.

Today, that same state, with that same political identity called 'Republique du Cameroun', is in armed occupation of the Southern Cameroons. I suppose you know that the British Southern Cameroons was also a UN trust territory. It was a separate unit of self determination within the trust territory of British Cameroons administered by the United Kingdom of Great Britain. I take it further that you also know that as a distinct and separate colonial territory, the British Southern Cameroons was not part of the territories comprised within French Cameroun either before or on the date of its achievement of independence on 1 January 1960. The territories of the two countries, the British Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic are separate and distinct and have always been and will always be so.

I figure you want to interject to recall the results of the UN sponsored plebiscite in the Southern Cameroons on 11 February 1961 and of the Ahidjo-Biya gigantic political swindle of 20 May 1972. In a land where there is so much fraud, cover-up, lies, deceit, self-serving distortions of facts and revisionist

history at the highest level of state it is imperative to set the record straight and to do so in some detail.

First, with the benefit of more information on the subject and the admission of a number of participant actors at the time, the 1972 swindle can be contemptuously dismissed offhand for the swindle that indeed it was. The purpose of that hoax was to effect the open and formal colonization of the British Southern Cameroons. It is now common knowledge that the entire event was a rascally nuisance stage-managed from beginning to end. The results were manufactured and so-called motions of support were scripted by the central committee of the *parti unique* dictatorship operating in cahoots with the ministry of territorial administration. The whole episode was the sick delusion of Ahidjo and his conspirators. The political rulers of Cameroun Republic continue with the illusion and self-deception they had manufactured. But this is because they are mixed-up nationally. I have no doubt that the 20 May nonsense will be discarded the day the people of Cameroun Republic will be able to dismiss their current domestically and internationally tainted and discredited rulers and give unto themselves a new, fresh and purposeful leadership.

Secondly, the plebiscite was the method by which the UN chose to decolonize the British Southern Cameroons. The primary purpose of the plebiscite was to enable the Southern Cameroons to accede to national independence in exercise of the right of self-determination. The procedure was consistent with the international law principle of self-determination of all peoples, the 1960 UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Territories and Peoples and Article 76B of the Charter of the United Nations. The British Southern Cameroons achieved independence within the territorial framework of the British trusteeship.

Notice that the first and principal component of the plebiscite question was 'do you wish to achieve independence?'. The people of the British Southern Cameroons answered affirmatively to that question. The second, a subsidiary, component of the plebiscite question was whether the people of the British Southern Cameroons wish to join Nigeria or Cameroun Republic. In relation to Cameroun Republic the term 'to join' was defined and understood by all concerned (the UN, the UK Government and the Governments of British Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic) to mean 'to form a federation of two states, equal in status'. In answer to the subsidiary question that was asked the people of the British Southern Cameroons opted for a two-state federal arrangement with Cameroun Republic.

Given the law on decolonization of trust territories and the phraseology of the plebiscite question the independence of the British Southern Cameroons had to precede the federal free political association of the British Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic. That is why UN Resolution 1608 of April 1961 endorsed the Independence decision taken two months earlier, on 11 February. However, the UN fixed 1 October 1961 as the date when the

following three occurrences were to take place: (i) the effective date of the Independence of the British Southern Cameroons (which means the frontiers of the British Southern Cameroons became frozen on that date); (ii) the date on which the federation was to come into being if the federal arrangement had by then become finalized; and (iii) the date of the termination of the trusteeship and thus the end of UK administration of the British Southern Cameroons.

The federation was conceived as a free political association of two independent states voluntarily submerging their sovereignties to form a new subject of international law, the Federal Republic of Cameroon, within which the two component states would become federated states, each continuing its political life according to the political culture and statecraft it had inherited.

A federal society involves a dovetailing rather than a supersession of legal orders. Sovereignty is divided between the federation, on the one hand, and the federated states, on the other hand. The competence to transact and the competence to perform exist disjunctively in the instrumentalities of government at the constitutional level. If the plebiscite had nothing to do with independence for the British Southern Cameroons and was only about the British Southern Cameroons 'joining' either of its two neighbours then the phraseology of the plebiscite question would simply have been, 'do you wish to join...?' That situation would have been the case of a colonial territory joining an independent country. But that was not the case. Moreover, self-determination entails self-preservation and not self-destruction.

The free political association in gestation was stillborn when Cameroun Republic suddenly developed colonial appetite by laying claim to the British Southern Cameroons as part of its territories in egregious mockery of international law. This is the evidence of that delinquent behaviour. On 1st September 1961, even as the British Southern Cameroons was still a trust territory, Cameroun Republic unilaterally enacted a so-called federal constitution supposedly binding on the British Southern Cameroons. Cameroun Republic did so in disregard of the international law principle of territoriality which prohibits states from exercising jurisdiction outside the area of their territory. That so-called federal constitution was actually in the nature of an annexation law, for the document claimed the British Southern Cameroons as part of the territory of Cameroun Republic returned to it. By mid-September, without the consent of either the people or Government or Legislature of the British Southern Cameroons, Cameroun Republic moved its troops into the British Southern Cameroons and started terrorizing the people. Those forces are, in relation to the British Southern Cameroons, a foreign army with a foreign culture, a foreign tradition, a foreign mindset, and speaking a foreign tongue. They have been in armed occupation of the British Southern Cameroons ever since. In October 1961 Cameroun Republic posted one of its citizens as viceroy ('inspecteur fédéral d'administration' was his official title) to the British Southern Cameroons. Cameroun Republic thereby assumed administrative control of the Southern Cameroons and thus in effect rendered

the territory's Prime Minister ineffectual and almost redundant. That made a complete nonsense of the so-called federal constitution framed by Cameroun Republic itself.

There was never any question of the British Southern Cameroons collectively committing political and cultural suicide by sinking itself into the French world of Cameroun Republic. There was, there could be, and there is, nothing to be gained by such a tragic action. Cameroun Republic has no valid instrument of law on the basis of which it can found its armed occupation of and colonial rule in the Southern Cameroons. Yes, the Southern Cameroons is under colonial occupation and its citizens under continuing brutal repression. Citizens of the Southern Cameroons are undoubtedly treated as colonial subjects. Those running the Southern Cameroons, *gouverneurs, préfets, sous-préfets, armée, gendarmerie* and *sûreté* personnel are appointed from Yaounde and are for the most part citizens of Cameroun Republic, people with a different politico-administrative and legal culture, tradition, midset and language. Today, in 2008, nearly half a century on, they act no differently from the host of French colonial administrators in French Cameroun, such as Marchand, Roland Pre, Pierre Messmer, Ramadier and so on, appointed *gouverneurs* etc. by Paris.

That is the problem the Southern Cameroons has with Cameroun Republic : a colonial question. The people of the Southern Cameroons are thus confronted with an issue of illegal territorial acquisition initiated at the time when British Southern Cameroons was due for independence by the manipulation of former colonial powers, Britain and then France, to serve their respective interests. De Gaulle is said to have referred to the British Southern Cameroons as 'a little gift to France from the Queen of England'. That is of course a complete nonsense.

What makes Cameroun Republic believe that it has the right to assert its independence, rule itself and fashion its destiny as it sees fit but that the Southern Cameroons has no right to assert its own independence, rule itself and fashion its own destiny as it sees fit ? And by what right has Cameroun Republic crossed its frontier and assumed a colonial sovereignty over the Southern Cameroons ? By what right does it presume to determine and define the status of the Southern Cameroons and its citizens on their own God-given land and internationally? By what right does it presume to impose on the people of the Southern Cameroons ?

Your readers may wish to know that the process leading to the eventual emergence of the British Southern Cameroons as a legal and political expression began in the mid-nineteenth century.

- (i) Beginning from 1844 upto 1884 the British concluded a number of treaties with Southern Cameroons coastal chiefs ;
- (ii) Victoria was settled in 1858 ;
- (iii) The whole Amba Bay area and its hinterland remained British until its transfer to Germany in late 1887 (i.e., a good three years after the

- Duala mudflat enclave, its environs and hinterland was proclaimed a German protectorate) ;
- (iv) By late 1914 Britain had seized back from Germany what was in essence the Amba Bay district and its hinterland ceded to Germany in 1887 ;
 - (v) The whole of that area together with a stretch of land going as far as to Lake Chad remained British from 1915 until 1961 ;
 - (vi) The mandates and trusteeship agreements brought the British Southern Cameroons under international tutelage ; the territory thereby became possessed of international personality.

Your readers may also wish to know that the boundaries of the Southern Cameroons were not described, defined, determined or demarcated by Cameroun Republic. The boundaries are frontiers attested by the following boundary treaties:

- (i) *the frontier with Nigeria to the west and north* : the 1913 Anglo-German treaty ; the British 1946 Order in Council, second schedule determining the boundary between Southern and Northern British Cameroons ; and the British 1954 Order in Council (boundary definition) determining the boundary between the Southern Cameroons and Eastern Nigeria ;
- (ii) *the frontier with Cameroun Republic to the east* : the Anglo-French [Milner-Simon] Declaration of 10 July 1919 defining the frontier between British and French Cameroun, this frontier being more exactly determined in the Anglo-French [Graeme-Marchand] Declaration of 9 January 1931. The territorial framework thus determined was confirmed by the League of Nations, reiterated by the UN, became frozen when the British Southern Cameroons achieved independence on 1 October 1961, and was continued by Cameroun Republic by its UN vote against Resolution 1608 and by the fact that it maintained its political identity but deceptively masked the same with sham entities for 23 years before openly acknowledging the fact that it had all along maintained its legal and political identity.

2- Do the anglophones feel they are in a position of being "colonized", as the secessionist assert, or of "forced assimilation", as others have suggested?

I have already mentioned the terminological confusion and politically incorrect language that consists in referring to citizens of the Southern Cameroons as 'anglophones' in implied contrast to 'francophones' both of who, it is further implied belong to one and the same country. Nothing could be further from the truth as I have detailly demonstrated in my answer to your previous question. I take it then that your question refers to the citizens or people of the Southern Cameroons.

The people of the Southern Cameroons do not just feel themselves a colonized people. They are actually colonized. They find themselves in a

classic situation of colonial subjugation. "Colonialism is the extension of a nation's sovereignty over territory beyond its borders by the establishment of either settler or exploitation colonies in which indigenous populations are directly ruled, displaced, or exterminated. Colonizing nations generally dominate the resources, labor, and markets of the colonial territory, and may also impose socio-cultural, religious, and linguistic structures on the indigenous population." The situation that obtains in the Southern Cameroons fits in every respect this classic definition of colonialism. The Southern Cameroons situation can be considered even more tragic because on one view the Southern Cameroons is in fact the colony of a Cameroun Republic that in every respect still appears to be a colony of France. The Southern Cameroons is thus the colony of a colony!

Cameroun Republic has extended its sovereignty beyond its borders into the territory of the Southern Cameroons and is there exercising a colonial sovereignty. The people of the Southern Cameroons are directly ruled from Cameroun Republic and by citizens of Cameroun Republic. Cameroun Republic has imposed social, economic, linguistic, cultural, administrative and political structures on the people of the Southern Cameroons. It is currently in the process of imposing its educational and legal culture in the Southern Cameroons. For nearly half a century now Cameroun Republic has been plundering the resources of the Southern Cameroons for the overall benefit of Cameroun Republic. Cameroun Republic has destroyed not only the political, administrative, educational and cultural institutions and economic infrastructure of the Southern Cameroons. It particularly targeted for neutralization Southern Cameroons sovereign vibrant economic infrastructures: Tiko International Airport, the Tiko and Victoria burgeoning seaports, functional roads, agricultural infrastructure, Powercam and its Yoke power plant along with our private businesses and its operators.

The token and decorative placement of a few Southern Cameroons citizens in the colonial administration is designed to serve three strategic ends for Cameroun Republic, namely, to assimilate the people of the Southern Cameroons into the French world of Cameroun Republic, to camouflage the dependent status of the people of the Southern Cameroons, and to pacify the people of the Southern Cameroons lest they rise and revolt against colonial oppression. In any event such marginal placement of citizens of the Southern Cameroons in Cameroun Republic's institutions is no different from the colonial decorative presence of Africans in the French parliament and government during France's brutal colonial rule of Africa. Leopold Sedar Senghor and Houphouet Boigny, just to name those two, were government ministers in France; Ahidjo, Arouna Njoya and Manga Bell were members of the French colonial parliament at Paris; Félix Eboué, the West Indian, was governor of French Equatorial Africa which at that time included French Cameroun.

Not content with its continuing physical and psychological repression in the Southern Cameroons, Cameroun Republic has now opened yet another

chapter in its continuing colonial assault on the people. This new chapter is that of forced assimilation and population dilution. These actions are indistinguishable from cultural genocide. Colonialism is like robbery and rape combined. It thrives on the use of bullets and other forms of violence and terror. In the absence of such violence and terrorization colonialism cannot last a single day because the colonized people will quickly revolt and expel the colonizer. It is not for nothing that international law reckons colonialism as aggression and a crime against humanity. It is not for nothing that no colonized people have ever welcomed the colonizer.

3- *The debate also revolves around the form of the State of Cameroun. What would be the ideal formula? Is the decentralization advocated by Yaoundé not a more consensual option in the current context?*

Cameroun Republic must forthwith end its colonial occupation of the Southern Cameroons, leave the Southern Cameroons and return to the international borders that define Cameroun Republic under international law. Whether Cameroun Republic does so peacefully as happened between the Slovaks and the Czechs, between Senegal and Mali or as between the component Republics of the USSR, or through war as happened in the former Yugoslavia is up to Cameroun Republic. We would prefer the former because at the end of the day we have no quarrel with the ordinary people of Cameroun Republic, many of who are thoroughly embarrassed and scandalized by the colonial pretensions and conduct of their rulers and the daily brutal repression of the people of the Southern Cameroons. The people of the Southern Cameroons did not choose their present geographical location and are condemned to live side by side with the people of Cameroun Republic as citizens of two good neighbourly sister states.

The so-called decentralization from Yaounde is irrelevant to the legitimate aspirations of the people of the Southern Cameroons to take full control of their Homeland. It is a political manoeuvre, a distraction that does not address the fundamental question of the colonial occupation of the Southern Cameroons by a neighbouring country, Cameroun Republic. France, Austria and Poland would never have accepted the decentralization of their respective countries as a panacea to German occupation of their respective territories. East Timor and Eritrea would never have accepted the decentralisation of their respective countries as a panacea to the occupation of their respective territories by Indonesia and Ethiopia respectively. Algeria would never have accepted the decentralization of Algeria as a panacea to French colonization of Algeria. The Southern Cameroons would never have accepted the decentralization of the Bakassi Peninsula as a panacea to Nigerian occupation of that part of Southern Cameroons territory. When one country occupies another there is always a legal and moral obligation on the occupier to vacate the occupied territory.

The so-called decentralization being touted by Yaounde is not an issue of concern to the people of the Southern Cameroons whose focus is on freeing

the Southern Cameroons from a predatory colonial occupation. It might be an issue of interest to citizens of Cameroun Republic. But you will recall that Cameroun Republic has been down that road before without much success because meaningful decentralization defeats the centralist political culture it inherited from France. Consider Cameroun Republic's constitution of 4 March 1960, articles 46 to 48 and the decrees made in pursuance of those provisions. How Cameroun Republic chooses to structure itself is entirely the business of that country. But I suspect the decentralization talk is a gimmick designed to distract the people of Cameroun Republic from their true yearning for democracy, governmental accountability, a robust and justiciable bill of rights and freedom from despotic rule and outside control. It is said you can fool some people some time but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

4- *What is your assessment of Yaoundé's attitude in relation to the secessionist movement claims?*

Ah! ha! 'Mouvement secessioniste'! So there is such a 'movement' in Cameroun Republic? Could it be that you are referring to those advocating and preparing for a Fang or Beti republic or to the proponents of a separate 'Nord Cameroun'? I am not qualified to speak to those issues which are purely internal matters of Cameroun Republic.

On second thought, though, I suspect you probably have in mind the Southern Cameroons national liberation struggle. If so I would suggest you have not betrayed journalistic rigour in your choice of words. How does the legitimate struggle of the Southern Cameroons to expel the colonial occupier of its Homeland amount to secession? Secession from what? That struggle does not entail the claim of land beyond the frontiers of the Southern Cameroons as determined by international treaty. It does not entail the loss of an inch of Cameroun Republic's lawful territory or the loss of a single Camerounese subject. It does not entail the impairment of the territorial integrity of Cameroun Republic. It does not entail the dismemberment of Cameroun Republic. The territorial framework of Cameroun Republic remains the same exactly as it was when it achieved its national independence from France on 1 January 1960.

So what secession could you be referring to? All too often one finds people intellectually too lazy to inquire into the true state of affairs regarding the Southern Cameroons Sovereignty Question. For them even the little effort of looking up an appropriate word in a dictionary is a real mental drudgery. Was the Southern Cameroons, which has existed as a legal and political expression since 1924, ever carved out of or is being carved out of the territory of Cameroun Republic? Did Cameroun Republic secede from France? Did Algeria secede from France? Remember that for 45 years the British administered the Southern Cameroons as part of Nigeria and tried very hard to sink the Southern Cameroons into Nigeria. But the Southern Cameroons vigorously resisted that and opted out even though the Southern Cameroons shared and still shares many things in common with Nigeria. No song and

dance was made about the Southern Cameroons seceding because both sides recognized the truth regarding the status of the Southern Cameroons.

Cameroun Republic's addictive and obsessional characterization of the legitimate struggle of the Southern Cameroons for freedom as 'secession' is cheap propaganda that cannot stand the test of historical record. It is cheap propaganda meant to elicit cheap sympathy and to prompt sheep-like behaviour from an ignorant and uninquiring section of the public.

Cameroun Republic is congenitally averse to any form of dialogue aimed at solving problems. Many reasons account for this attitude. Cameroun Republic has always been ruled by despots. It inherited from France a culture of violence and opacity as a methods of governance. It inherited from France a mindset that adores dictatorship and that has very little regard for democracy, human rights and government accountability to the governed. Before its pretended grant of independence to French Cameroun France imposed on it secret so-called co-operation agreements that included military pacts. In terms of those military pacts France assures Cameroun Republic military and diplomatic support.

Buoyed by these assurances Cameroun Republic has always obstinately refused any form of discussion to solve disputes. We saw this in the Bakassi imbroglio where Yaounde first opted for violence in the hope of getting French armed support until it became obvious that its option was doomed to failure ; and only then did it go to the ICJ. We saw a similar attitude in play in Rwanda where the French-backed regime in Kigali opted for intransigence and violence, which option failed dismally leading to one of the world's genocidal tragedies of modern times. We have seen it in the Southern Cameroons where the French Ambassador at Yaounde, acting in the manner of the French governor of Cameroun Republic, has interposed himself to announce French support for Cameroun Republic during and after various incidents in the Southern Cameroons territory of the Bakassi Peninsula. There is a French military operational presence in the Southern Cameroons to shore up Camerounese military presence. We have seen French troops, like mercenaries, in Victoria and Ndiang divisions.

What the French call 'operation Aramis' is no secret. For all we care France can operate within its self-proclaimed African *précarré*. The British Southern Cameroons was never, has never, and will never, be part of that French backyard. It is therefore totally unacceptable that the French should hide under the smokescreen of its military pacts with Cameroun Republic to sponsor, aid and abet Cameroun Republic's imperialistic adventure in the Southern Cameroons, thereby posing a threat to international peace and security in the Gulf of Guinea. Such action is indistinguishable from mercenarism. All this manoeuvring by the French gives Cameroun Republic a false sense of security and invincibility as one has seen on many occasions. It comforts Cameroun Republic in its intransigence and obstinacy in the use of brutal military force to remain in occupation of the Southern Cameroons. Given this

context there is room for serious doubt that Cameroun Republic will, without help, opt for dialogue with the Southern Cameroons.

5- Mr. Carlson Anyangwe, in his address of January 19, 2008, advocated non-violence as the method of the British Southern Cameroons Restoration government despite the clashes of the 1st October 2000 in Bamenda and Kumbo between the army and the secessionists. Is an armed option conceivable?

I did not exclude resistance to colonial occupation. I did not exclude self-defence measures against brutal repression. The behaviour and actions of Cameroun Republic constitute international delinquency and breach of peace. To propound the doctrine of « the force of argument, not the argument of force » does not mean a cowardly submission by the people of the Southern Cameroons to premeditated and organised armed repression and other violence in their Homeland by Cameroun Republic. The people of the Southern Cameroons are not so naive as to exclude before hand a critical tool in their national liberation struggle against a murderous colonialism. In fact, under international law the people of the Southern Cameroons are under a duty to fight and end colonial domination, and colonial occupation of their territory, by Cameroun Republic.

This is what international law ordains :

- (i) *The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights* :- « All peoples shall be equal ... Nothing shall justify the domination of a people by another » (art. 19). « All peoples shall have the right to existence. They shall have the unquestionable and inalienable right to self-determination. ... Colonized or oppressed people shall have the right to free themselves from the bonds of domination by resorting to any means recognized by the international community. All peoples shall have the right to the assistance of the States Parties to the present Charter in their liberation struggle against foreign domination, be it political, economic or cultural. » (art. 20).
- (ii) *UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples* :- « The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation. ... All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected. »
- (iii) *UN Declaration on Principles of International Law* :- « Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples ... of their right to self determination and freedom and independence. ... In their action against, and resistance to, such forcible action in pursuit of

the exercise of their right to self-determination, such people are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. »

Yes, armed struggle cannot be excluded. International law and the law of nature entitle the Southern Cameroons, like any other country in similar circumstances, to defend itself in the face of colonial occupation, in the face of colonial domination, in the face of colonial plunder, and in the face of aggression. The people of the Southern Cameroons have every right to existence. They have every right to sovereignty over their Homeland. They have every right to sovereignty over their natural resources! Cameroun Republic has no power or authority whatsoever to say, and can never say, that the people of the Southern Cameroons do not have any such rights.

6- *Since the declaration of independence by the SCNC on December 31 1999, is the instauration of a dialogue between Yaoundé and the secessionist movement still possible? If yes, what would be the outlines?*

Dialogue is always a possible and necessary part of dispute resolution between nations, even in the face of violence. Yes, dialogue is still possible between the Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic. But every day Cameroun Republic seems determined to rule out this possibility by its continuing dastardly repressive measures and actions in the Southern Cameroons : the Southern Cameroons continues to be militarized, a fact that shocks even a casual visitor to the territory ; the cultural genocide in the Southern Cameroons has been intensified ; the extrajudicial execution of citizens of the Southern Cameroons has known no respite ; the armed brutal repression of citizens of the Southern Cameroons has known little mitigation ; the terrorization of the people continues ; the institutionalised and systematic abduction and arbitrary imprisonment and torture of citizens of the Southern Cameroons has not abated, a recent example being the arbitrary arrest and false imprisonment of dozens of Southern Cameroons citizens in Kumbo, Bamenda and Tiko, including that of Chief Ayamba, Chairman of the SCNC and 23 others in Tiko on October 6th.

But dialogue or no dialogue, the colonial occupation of the Southern Cameroons will end, and those responsible for plotting and fostering the occupation as well as those responsible for crimes during the occupation will surely be hunted down and prosecuted. Our people are continually making notes and jotting down names. You may wish to recall the well deserved fate of the Quislings and Pétains of this world and the legitimate action of Israel in hunting down and bringing to justice Nazi criminals.

7- What could be the most acceptable and least painful outcomes for the parties?

The most acceptable and least painful outcome is what is just and legal. What is just and legal is for Cameroun Republic to immediately stop operating outside international law and return to its international borders as they stood on the date of its achievement of national independence on 1 January 1960. That way, the governments and peoples of the Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic will be able to develop relations of good neighbourliness and fruitful co-operation. Cameroun Republic will then be able to concentrate its efforts and resources on building a law-abiding and democratic state. It will then be able to use its material resources for the wellbeing of its citizens. There could be fruitful cooperation between the two African states of the Southern Cameroons and Cameroun Republic as the example of the Czech and the Slovak Republics or Senegal and Mali show following their peaceful separation.

Cameroun Republic's colonial occupation of and armed repression in the Southern Cameroons drains huge resources, constitutes a threat to the peace in the Gulf of Guinea and is demonstrably not sustainable, even if one factors in the huge resources daily being plundered from the Southern Cameroons.

The Southern Cameroons in relation to Cameroun Republic is much smaller in size and population. There is therefore no good reason why Cameroun Republic should, like a leach, cling on to the Southern Cameroons as if without the Southern Cameroons it shall perish. France did not perish when it finally pulled out of Algeria ! Ethiopia did not perish when its take-over of Eritrea was ended ! Indonesia did not perish when it finally pulled out of East Timor ! Similarly, Cameroun Republic will not die when its colonial occupation of the Southern Cameroons shall be ended!

***Interview by Omer Mbadi Otabela
La Nouvelle Expression***