

UNITED NATIONS

UN LIBRARY
UN/SA COLLECTION
JUL 11 1994



SECURITY COUNCIL

OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2583rd MEETING: 10 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2583)	1
Expression of welcome to the Prime Minister, President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Egypt; and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of India ..	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	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.

2583rd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 10 June 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2583)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
 - (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
 - (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
 - (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

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

Expression of welcome to the Prime Minister, President of the Council of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Egypt; and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of India

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like at the very outset of the meeting to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Prime Minister, President of the Council of Ministers, and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru, Mr. Luis Pércovich Roca; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali; and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of India, Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan. On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to them.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

2. The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Council in June, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, on behalf of the members of the Council, to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Mr. Siddhi

Savetsila, and to Mr. Birabhongse Kasemsri, representative of Thailand, for their service in the Presidency for the month of May. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing to them our unreserved gratitude for the great skill with which they conducted the business of the Council last month.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

- (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
- (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
- (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, South Africa, the Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity 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. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Alatas (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Marin Bosch (Mexico), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco),

Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Kam (Panama), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a telegram dated 5 June from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to inform you that the United Nations Council for Namibia wishes to participate in the upcoming meetings of the Security Council on the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'. The Council's delegation will include the Acting President of the Council, Mr. Noel Sinclair, and the Vice-Presidents, Mr. Hocine Djoudi, Mr. Ignac Golob, Mr. Natarajan Krishnan and Mr. Ilter Türkmen."

On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the delegation of the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair (Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 7 June from the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which reads as follows:

*"I have the honour to request the Security Council to permit me to participate in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in the Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."*

On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Garba (Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*) took a place at the Council table.*

6. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 5 June [S/17244] from

the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization."

If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Council decides to agree to this request.

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

7. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in letters addressed to the President of the Security Council on 23 May by the representative of India [S/17213] and the representative of Mozambique [S/17222].

8. Members of the Council have before them document S/17242 which contains the text of a further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 1439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/17114, letter dated 19 April from the representative of India to the President of the Council; S/17119, letter dated 22 April from the representative of the United States to the President of the Council; S/17120, letter dated 22 April from the representative of the United Kingdom to the President of the Council; S/17123, letter dated 23 April from the representative of France to the President of the Council; S/17124, letter dated 22 April from the representative of China to the Secretary-General; S/17128, letter dated 24 April from the representative of Egypt to the Secretary-General; S/17141, letter dated 30 April from the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary-General; S/17145, letter dated 2 May from the representative of Italy to the Secretary-General; S/17152, letter dated 4 May from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General; S/17159, letter dated 7 May from the representative of Algeria to the Secretary-General; S/17184, letter dated 8 May from the representative of India to the Secretary-General; S/17190, letter dated 13 May from the representative of Uruguay to the Secretary-General; S/17207, letter dated 20 May from the representative of Japan to the Secretary-General; S/17243, letter dated 5 June from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General; and S/17249, letter dated 5 June from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples addressed to the President of the Council.

9. The first speaker is the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of India, Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan.

10. Mr. ALAM KHAN (India): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to offer you felicitations upon your assumption of the

high office of President of the Council. Our two countries enjoy cordial and co-operative relations, enriched immeasurably by the age-old ethnic and cultural bonds that reach out to span the geographical distance between them. We are happy that the representative of a friendly fellow-non-aligned country is presiding over the Council as it takes up the question of Namibia, an issue with which the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is vitally and intimately concerned. Your eminent personal qualities and diplomatic experience are well known. We feel assured that the Council is in good hands and that it will approach the task before it with a sense of purpose. We are confident that your wise guidance will enable the Council to achieve constructive results.

11. I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to you, Sir, and through you to the other members of the Council the greetings and good wishes of the Prime Minister of my country in his capacity as Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

12. We also pay a tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and to the representative of Thailand for the excellent manner in which the Council was led in the month of May.

13. I wish also to say how happy we are to see the Secretary-General with us. As we express our deep appreciation for his untiring and devoted efforts to promote the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, to implement the decisions of the United Nations in respect of Namibia, we assure him of our continuing support and wholehearted co-operation.

14. The Council is meeting in response to a call made by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of its Co-ordinating Bureau on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April. The Bureau sought an urgent meeting of the Security Council to resume consideration of the question of Namibia and to give effect to the Council's own resolutions in this regard, in particular resolution 435 (1978). The Bureau further invited the Foreign Ministers of a number of countries to participate personally in these meetings [S/17184, *annex, paras. 48 and 49*]. It is my privilege to be here in pursuance of that mandate. The presence here of several distinguished Ministers from non-aligned countries, including the Prime Minister of Peru, is a reflection of the high importance and urgency we attach to the cause of Namibia's independence.

15. The Council is now meeting to consider the situation in Namibia after a lapse of almost two years. That in itself is a sad commentary on the lack of progress towards implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, a plan which has been in existence for nearly seven years. When the Council last met on the situation in Namibia in October 1983, it took one of the most important decisions on the question of Namibia in adopting resolution 539 (1983). In that resolution the Council, *inter alia*, reiterated that resolution 435 (1978) was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, condemned South Africa for its obstruction of the imple-

mentation of that resolution by insisting on conditions contrary to the provisions of the United Nations plan; rejected South Africa's insistence on linking Namibian independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues; declared that the independence of Namibia could not be held hostage to the resolution of issues that were alien to resolution 435 (1978) and decided to meet as soon as possible following the Secretary-General's report for the purpose of reviewing progress in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

16. South Africa's response to resolution 539 (1983) came no later than the day after its adoption. With familiar arrogance and defiance, Mr. Botha once again insisted that no settlement plan could be implemented unless a firm agreement was reached on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola [see S/16106].

17. Members of the Council will therefore understand the deep sense of frustration and profound concern felt by the international community at the manner in which the situation has evolved. It is a frustration that stems not merely from the fact that an unequivocal and firm message from the Council was spurned and repudiated even before the ink on it was dry. In a more fundamental sense, it is frustrating—indeed alarming—to see the United Nations, which assumed direct responsibility over Namibia nearly two decades ago, watch helplessly from the sidelines. Meanwhile, efforts purportedly aimed at facilitating the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) continue to be talked about, and the impasse is prolonged.

18. For that reason alone, if for no other, we are happy that the Council is once again taking up the matter. In so doing, the Council is asserting its critical role and assuming its legitimate and inescapable responsibility in this regard. This series of meetings, therefore, is of crucial significance.

19. The recent Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, devoted especially to the question of Namibia, was a reflection as much of the high priority and importance the non-aligned countries have traditionally attached to the question of Namibia as of the urgency of bringing about the independence of Namibia through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Final Document of the New Delhi Meeting has already been circulated [S/17184, *annex*], and therefore I need not dwell in detail upon the assessment made by the Ministers assembled in New Delhi and the conclusions they reached. I may, however, recall that the Bureau, at that meeting, reiterated that the United Nations had primary responsibility for Namibia and that it was therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to ensure the speedy attainment of genuine and internationally recognized independence by Namibia. It remains the firm conviction of the Bureau that resolution 435 (1978), which seeks to put into effect the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, constitutes the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. The Bureau reiterated the categorical rejection of the linkage of Na-

mibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. It called upon the Security Council to act in a decisive manner in fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia and to take urgent measures in order to ensure that the United Nations plan, as approved in resolution 435 (1978), was immediately and effectively implemented, without modification or preconditions.

20. With regard to the latest obstacle placed by Pretoria in the way of implementation of resolution 435 (1978), namely, the decision to establish a so-called internal administration in Windhoek, the Bureau expressed its strong condemnation and observed that this development made it all the more imperative that the Security Council meet forthwith and assume its responsibility fully to ensure the speedy and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

21. It is pertinent to recall here that the Council, through the statement made by the President on 3 May 1985 [S/17151], has condemned and rejected any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978) as unacceptable, and declared the establishment of the so-called interim government in Namibia to be null and void.

22. It is again characteristic of South Africa that it should choose to defy international public opinion and the Security Council and press ahead with its plans to install a puppet administration in Namibia. We have learned with indignation and grave concern of reports regarding the ceremony planned for 17 June in Windhoek. In its communiqué of 4 June, issued in the course of its extraordinary plenary meetings at Vienna, the Council for Namibia called upon the Security Council

“to take appropriate measures to pre-empt the installation of the ‘interim government’ and to ensure the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence” [see S/17243, annex]. We fully endorse this call by the legal administering authority for Namibia until independence.

23. We have noted the contents of the latest report submitted by the Secretary-General, [S/17242] dated 6 June. His concluding remarks cannot but cause deep disquiet and profound concern. He noted that implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) continues to elude us for reasons which are irrelevant and extraneous and stressed that it is imperative for all concerned to respect the provisions of the United Nations plan, which is binding on the parties and remains the only agreed basis for the independence of Namibia.

24. The situation that confronts us today is strangely ironic. There is universal agreement that the travail of the Namibian people must come to an end and that Namibia must be free. Similarly, there is universal agreement that the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, as approved in Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), constitutes the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. We are thus all agreed on the end and

the means to achieve that end. Why, then, should it have taken so long to resolve this question? Why is South Africa being permitted to defy the unanimous call of the international community? With what conscience can anybody hold the independence of Namibia hostage to issues that have no bearing on it? Can we remain silent spectators of the suffering people of Namibia being used as pawns in a game involving larger strategic interest? Can we afford to continue to tolerate South Africa's aggressive actions against the front-line States and its duplicity—as evidenced once again by its latest act of sabotage deep inside Angolan territory?

25. The time has come for the Council to acknowledge what has become transparent to all—namely, that South Africa has no intention of abiding by United Nations resolutions. The Council must take action to compel compliance by South Africa.

26. As the Co-ordinating Bureau noted at its meeting at New Delhi, the international community has shown exemplary patience with an arrogant and intransigent régime. If South Africa persists in its intransigence, there can be no option but to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

27. It is our earnest hope that the current series of meetings of the Council will lead to more resolute action than we have seen in the past. It is our expectation that the Council will chart a course of action which will bring independence to the people of Namibia without delay, in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). We should also give the Secretary-General a clear mandate within that framework to monitor and secure compliance by South Africa.

28. I should like to add a word about the position of my own country with regard to the question of Namibia. Our attachment to the Namibian cause and our espousal of it is a matter of public knowledge and record. We were the first country to take up the question of South West Africa before the General Assembly in 1946. That same year, we became the first voluntarily to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. As a founder-member and Vice-President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, India has striven to promote the interests of the Namibian people. We are proud to be of assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)—the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people—whose leadership is present here today with us, in the person of its President, Mr. Sam Nujoma. We remain firm in our conviction that the people of Namibia will ultimately prevail, for theirs is a just cause.

29. I should like to close with a quotation from the inaugural address by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the recent New Delhi meeting, as follows:

“Just a few years ago, Namibia's progress towards independence appeared so sure. Today it has become a casualty to power politics and multinationals' profit. In the process, the very credibility of the institution that

had guaranteed this independence, the United Nations Security Council, has come under question. The issue now is whether a wronged and dispossessed people will be supported or deserted by the world body. It is thus a challenge to the United Nations. Will the United Nations now, in its fortieth year, fulfil its moral and political obligations, or will military and economic might prevail over right?"

30. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Noel Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, whom I invite to make his statement.

31. Mr. SINCLAIR, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: Mr. President, for myself, as representative of Guyana, it is with special pleasure that I see you, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of fraternal, neighbouring Trinidad and Tobago, presiding over the Security Council in this month of June. These feelings are rooted in the unshakeable and long-standing bonds of friendship and solidarity which unite our two countries, bonds which themselves are further strengthened by our joint endeavours within the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM), our regional integration organization, to make a reality of the shared aspirations of our peoples for development and the strengthening of our independence and of the unity of the CARICOM region. The Guyana delegation is confident that with your diplomatic skills, which we have come to know so well at first hand, and with your vast experience and vision, the business of the Council during the month of June will be successfully concluded.

32. I also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the efficiency and serenity with which he presided over the business of the Council during the month of May.

33. There are millions of people in South Africa and Namibia whose lives are as yet untouched by the benefits of international organization; people whose daily experience is oppression, marginality, alienation and exclusion; people for whom concepts of self-determination and freedom are without meaning.

34. The urgent request addressed to the Council by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Chairman of the Group of African States for a resumption of consideration of the question of Namibia is once again a sharp reminder of the plight of those people, in respect of whom the Organization has not yet discharged its responsibilities. This deficiency becomes all the more stark as we approach the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations.

35. The United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, welcomes the convening of the present series of meetings of the Security Council to continue consideration of the question of Namibia.

36. We wish first to say a special word to thanks to the Secretary-General for his continuing, indefatigable work to secure the liberation of Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia reiterates its unqualified confidence in our Secretary-General in the discharge of his efforts on behalf of the Organization, and assures him of our continuing support. We also express appreciation to him for his valuable report [S/17242].

37. Just 72 hours ago, the United Nations Council for Namibia concluded at Vienna its Sixth Extraordinary Plenary Meeting. On that occasion we adopted a Declaration and Programme of Action which we have requested to have circulated as a document of the Security Council [see S/17262, annex]. In the Declaration, the Council once again makes a fervent appeal for maximum international support for the early attainment of independence by Namibia. Among other things, the Council reiterates in that document that special responsibility rests with the Security Council to act without further delay to secure the implementation of its own relevant resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978).

38. The entire southern African region is beset by tension and insecurity created by South Africa's *apartheid* policies, its sustained campaign of armed aggression against neighbouring States, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia, along with the policies of coercion, repression and oppression which accompany such occupation, and, most recently, its defiant attempts to exclude the United Nations from participating in change in respect of Namibia or in any aspect of the present or future situation of that Territory.

39. Quite apart from these considerations—which must be a cause of alarm to everyone seated around this table—the United Nations Council for Namibia does not view the situation in southern Africa in an isolated manner. The situation in this subregion is one of a few easily identifiable situations with a potential for seriously disrupting international peace and security. In this context, Central America and the Middle East come to mind immediately. To the extent that that situation deteriorates sufficiently to warrant a special convening of the Security Council, to that extent is the threat to international peace and security made greater and the need for the Council to reassert its authority more imperative.

40. During the course of this series of meetings of the Security Council, we will hear that 1985 is the year of several anniversaries, which reminds us of the inexorable passage of time. It is inevitable therefore that we also reflect on the way in which time has been passing Namibia by. To be sure, Namibia also has its anniversaries. It gives us little comfort to recall that it was 19 years ago that the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, or that it was 14 years ago that the Security Council first declared that States were under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's continuing presence in sovereignty. Much less comfort does it give us to recall that nearly seven years ago the Security Council adopted what is universally recognized as the only inter-

nationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

41. In a true sense, therefore, what we are also observing in 1985 is the seventh anniversary of the failure of attempts by the Security Council to deal decisively and resolutely with South Africa in respect of Namibia. With your kind permission, Mr. President, I should like to quote a few paragraphs from an earlier Security Council resolution on Namibia:

The fifth preambular paragraph reads:

“Mindful of the grave consequences of South Africa’s continued occupation of Namibia”.

and the sixth preambular paragraph:

“Reaffirming its special responsibility toward the people and Territory of Namibia”.

In paragraph 1, the Security Council

“Recognizes that the United Nations General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed responsibility for the Territory until its independence”.

In paragraph 2, it

“Considers that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and the previous decisions of the United Nations and is detrimental to the interests of the population of the Territory and those of the international community”.

In paragraph 3, it

“Calls upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory”.

In paragraph 4, it

“Declares that the actions of the Government of South Africa designed to destroy the national unity and the territorial integrity of Namibia through the establishment of Bantustans are contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations,”

and in paragraph 8, it

“Decides that in the event of failure on the part of the Government of South Africa to comply with the provisions of the present resolution, the Security Council will meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps or measures in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.”

42. Commendably tough and resolute-sounding language. That was the language of resolution 264 (1969) adopted by the Security Council as long as 16 years ago.

That resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none. There were two abstentions: France and the United Kingdom. I would, therefore, have been more correct to choose this resolution 264 (1969) as my reference point. In that case, 1985 would have represented a sixteenth anniversary for the Council.

43. Incidentally, the next time the Council met following the adoption of resolution 264 (1969) was on 12 August 1969, four months and three weeks later. On that occasion it adopted resolution 269 (1969), in which it condemned the Government of South Africa for its refusal to comply with resolution 264 (1969). Paragraph 8 of resolution 264 (1969), which had stated that the Council would meet immediately in the event of non-compliance in order to decide on necessary measures, became paragraph 6 of resolution 269 (1969). This time, there were 11 votes in favour, as opposed to 13 in the preceding March. There were four abstentions: Finland, France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

44. I chose resolution 435 (1978) as my reference point because that resolution was adopted at a particular point in time. That resolution, it will be recalled, had as its basis a number of ideas which were originally put forward by five States after an intense period of consultation with South Africa. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the African Group of States—we were all then prepared to suspend our scepticism as to whether five States, all friends and major trading partners of South Africa with heavy investments in South Africa and in Namibia itself, were prepared to stick with a plan which had as its objective the withdrawal of South Africa’s presence from Namibia and the eventual accession of the Territory to independence.

45. Since the adoption of that resolution there has been a noticeable period of drift in the Security Council’s relations with South Africa in regard to Namibia. The Pretoria régime has systematically put a widening distance between itself and the Council where Namibia is concerned. Its recent actions in Namibia have the clear purpose of undercutting and making irrelevant resolution 435 (1978). Meanwhile, in the face of South Africa’s defiance, the Council’s reaction has been one of effective retreat—not without protest, to be sure. But it has been a reaction, effectively, of retreat.

46. It is hardly possible to review the record of South Africa’s intransigence in respect of Namibia without wondering how it was possible for such a record to be maintained in the first place. However odious *apartheid* may be as a system of relations between peoples, it is a truth that certain powerful States do not perceive a sufficiently compelling interest in moving decisively for its abolition or in applying pressure against the régime that implements that abominable policy. In fact, the existence of *apartheid* creates an environment in which profits can be increased. For some, therefore, *apartheid* is good for business.

47. Also, there are some who, preoccupied as they are with what for them is the struggle against the advance of communism throughout the world, see an embrace of

South Africa as a strategic necessity. The South Africans, for their part, are vigorously exploiting this preoccupation.

48. It is the pursuit of these interests by the States concerned that has led them to shield South Africa from the wrath of the international community and that causes Namibia still to be on the international agenda nearly 20 years after the General Assembly declared South Africa's authority over the Territory to have come to an end. It is the complicity, the double-dealing and the cynicism of a few which are responsible for the Security Council's image of indecisiveness in respect of Namibia. Let there be no mistake about that.

49. Three years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council was called upon to impose sanctions against South Africa because of the Pretoria régime's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in respect of Namibia. The resolution was vetoed by three States which themselves had participated in authoring the plan included in resolution 435 (1978). How well founded was our scepticism!

50. The situation today is that the Pretoria régime is fortifying the barriers to freedom in Namibia. It is feverishly seeking to shut out the United Nations, to shut out and destroy SWAPO.

51. The presence of so many Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries on this occasion is certainly testimony to the gravity of the situation recently created in respect of Namibia and underscores the need for firm action by the Security Council at this present juncture.

52. While the Security Council's record in respect of Namibia gives little reason for encouragement, the United Nations Council for Namibia recognizes that the current series of meetings is being held in a particular international context. The environment in 1985 is different in some vital ways from that in which the Council met in 1978. Among other considerations, there is a new situation inside South Africa itself, where we see that the oppressed class of late has been rising up in greater numbers, with greater intensity and with greater militance than ever before, demanding that the rulers in South Africa allow them the enjoyment of their inalienable rights. The polarization now seen in South African politics is such as we have never seen before.

53. The reaction of the Pretoria régime to these intensified demands for change has been so brutal that it has embarrassed even those who have traditionally chosen to shield that régime. In fact, the South African rulers have recently been displaying such viciousness and cynicism that it will be difficult for their traditional Western apologists to continue defending them without displaying even greater cynicism themselves. For example, while echoing the contention originally advanced elsewhere that there could be no implementation of resolution 435 (1978) until Cuban troops were withdrawn from Angola, South Africa was found recently to have sent its commandos deep inside Angola, far away even from Angola's border with Na-

mbia, to conduct sabotage operations against Angolan installations. Do the South Africans truly want to see Cuban troops withdrawn from Angola? Or do they rather prefer to see those troops remain so that they can use that presence as an excuse for non-co-operation?

54. What South Africa has effectively done is to pull the rug from under the policy of "constructive engagement". It will be recalled that constructive engagement was being loudly proclaimed as a viable option, an alternative to sanctions, for which the United Nations Council for Namibia has been calling for more than a decade. It requires no great acuity for anyone to see that constructive engagement has not worked. The South Africans have done the opposite of what was promised.

55. At the same time, the international debate on *apartheid* and relations between the races in South Africa has recently gained in scale and intensity. The overwhelming feeling in that debate is in support of the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia and against the Pretoria régime. In this regard, the United Nations Council for Namibia has followed with keen interest and satisfaction the development in the United States of the campaign of pressure for disinvestment by American companies and for greater responsiveness by the United States to the demands of South Africa's oppressed peoples for change. This campaign has so far led to a decision for the imposition of a number of sanctions against South Africa.

56. While we await the internal processes which must take place before this decision can become law, the United Nations Council for Namibia wishes to express its appreciation not only to those in Washington but also to those throughout the United Nations who have worked so tirelessly and energetically to create an atmosphere in which such a decision could have been taken.

57. I have just outlined a few elements which characterize the new international context in which the Security Council's present debate is taking place. The United Nations Council for Namibia expects that this new environment will motivate different responses to its demands and to those of the member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for firm action by the Security Council against South Africa in respect of Namibia.

58. Another aspect of the new situation is, of course, the establishment of a so-called interim government in Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia has taken careful note of the public reactions to that development by States Members of the Organization. In particular we have noted the statement made on 19 April 1985 by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France [S/17123, annex]; that handed to the South African Government on 15 April by the Government of the United Kingdom [S/17120, annex]; and the statement issued by the United States Department of State on 19 April [S/17119, annex].

59. I recall that when the Security Council met and adopted resolution 435 (1978), it was against the background of a decision by the Pretoria régime to proceed

with internal elections in Namibia. After the adoption of that resolution, the representative of France said:

"I formally appeal to the South African Government not to impose an internal settlement that is doomed in advance and to decide to co-operate with the United Nations in order to enable Namibia to take its place in the community of independent nations. I ask it most formally to refrain from a choice that would disastrously isolate it from the rest of the international community." [2087th meeting, para. 57.]

60. The representative of the United Kingdom said:

"We are issuing no threats, but they should not underestimate the gravity of the situation that could arise if there were no solution in sight and we met here in the Council again. No one in South Africa should mistake the determination that underlies the reasonable and constructive attitude that we have shown for the last 18 months and will show over the next few weeks. The choice is now for South Africa. The rest of Africa and the world, in adopting this resolution, have shown which way they wish to go." [*Ibid.*, para. 81.]

61. The representative of the United States said:

"It is therefore a time for persistence and vigorous effort in persuading South Africa that its best interests and the best interests of the Namibian people lie in co-operating with the United Nations in the implementation of the resolution we have adopted, and not in permitting a return to the past spiral of violence and isolation." [*Ibid.*, para. 71.]

62. The establishment of a so-called interim government in Namibia, which is to be officially put in place next Monday, 17 June, confirms the fears expressed by those three representatives seven years ago. It removes all doubt, where such doubt might have existed, concerning South Africa's intentions. This development has serious implications for the Security Council and for its future relations with South Africa over the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

63. The representatives of France and the United States in 1978 both spoke of isolation as a consequence of South Africa's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in respect of Namibia. The representative of the United Kingdom, while not speaking of isolation, left no doubt about what should be the Council's response to such non-cooperation.

64. In their statement issued on 3 May 1985 [S/17151], the members of the Security Council declared that South Africa's action was contrary to the expressed will of the international community and in defiance of United Nations resolutions. The United Nations Council for Namibia expects that now, as a consequence, the entire membership of the Security Council, including those to which I referred earlier, will act to ensure that in the event of South Africa's non-compliance, its isolation in the international community will be effective. Accordingly, the Council

urges the Security Council to act decisively in the fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and to take, without further delay, appropriate action to ensure South Africa's co-operation with its resolution 435 (1978) without modification or preconditions.

65. The United Nations Council for Namibia believes that enough Namibians have suffered and died; the southern African region has been terrorized enough by South Africa; the authority of the United Nations and of the Security Council in particular has been defied enough. The Security Council's inability in the past to take decisive action against South Africa is a fact which itself has made for the increase of tension in southern Africa. We believe that the Security Council, which is entrusted with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must take firm, decisive action now. It is not enough simply to repeat yet again a determination to take such action sometime in the future, as the Council has been doing since 1969. Such a response would mean allowing the perpetuation of suffering, tension and insecurity in southern Africa. The Security Council needs to make a credible response to the developing situation in that region.

66. We believe that so long as all States demonstrate the necessary political will to so respond, South Africa's reign of terror in southern Africa will end, Namibia will soon be free, and peace in southern Africa will be protected and safeguarded.

67. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Prime Minister, President of the Council of Ministers, and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Peru, Mr. Luis Pérezovich Roca, on whom I now call.

68. Mr. PÉRCOVICH ROCA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Peru is participating in this special series of Security Council meetings with a clear awareness of the significance of the cause that has gathered us together. We are meeting to consider what the Council can do. It is, after all, the organ to which the Charter of the United Nations has entrusted supreme importance and clear, inescapable responsibilities for the maintenance and promotion of peace. The Council is faced with a situation which undermines peace in southern Africa, and the resultant hotbed of tension justifiably preoccupies the international community.

69. It is a great pleasure for me, Mr. President, to see you, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, a member of our Latin American region and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, guiding our debates. Your origin is a further expression of the harmonious relations between Trinidad and Tobago and Peru, which I am happy to emphasize in greeting you today on behalf of my Government.

70. As a Peruvian, I am particularly pleased to extend a warm greeting to my compatriot, the Secretary-General.

71. The current series of meetings has been expressly requested by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries at their Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting at

New Delhi last April [*S/17184, annex, para. 48*]. It was the Ministers' wish that the Security Council take decisive action to meet the United Nations' direct responsibility for Namibia and take urgent measures for the immediate, effective and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan approved in resolution 435 (1978).

72. The present situation in Namibia must be analysed in the context of global, political, strategic-military and economic trends in the world today. We can thereby identify, on the one hand, existing obstacles and opposition, and, on the other, ways and means to move towards a solution of this painful problem that affects not only the people of Namibia but also the very conscience of mankind.

73. The situation is a particularly delicate and complex one, characterized by the persistence of trends that dangerously exceed the bounds of international coexistence. Similarly, we note an increasing deterioration in multilateral institutional co-operation, to the detriment of the United Nations as a whole. In the economic sphere, the prospects for the developing countries continue to be grim. The relative recovery of some industrialized economies is counter-balanced by a recession in the third world which stems from changes in the structure of world production and the maintenance of an international economic order of which the injustice is unparalleled in the history of mankind.

74. Precarious peace, a deep-seated economic crisis, sudden changes in strategic and military concepts, a deterioration in the quality of life and a severe intensification of poverty seem to be the order of the day, obliging us to redouble our efforts to eliminate hotbeds of tension and to remain steadfast in our multilateral quest for peace and the elimination of the persistent colonial situations that impede its achievement.

75. It is a notorious coincidence that the Security Council is meeting today especially to consider the problem of the independence of Namibia at the very time when we are commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), also known as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

76. For peace- and freedom-loving countries, it is reassuring to note that the balance sheet of the past 25 years of historic claims has promoted the cause of self-determination and independence of oppressed peoples. However, it is a matter of grave concern that some peoples, such as the people of Namibia, are still being subjected to foreign subjugation, domination and exploitation that have deprived them of their inalienable right to absolute freedom, to the exercise of their sovereignty and to the integrity of their national territory.

77. The persistence of any vestige of colonialism, in any manifestation, is a negation of fundamental human rights which flies in the face of history.

78. My Government attaches great importance to the situation of Namibia and gives it priority attention because it is one of the most serious challenges to the authority of

the United Nations and because of the serious consequences of an illegitimate act. The illegal occupation of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin and other offshore islands, constitutes a flagrant impairment of the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence of its people and, therefore, a serious threat to international peace and security. Similarly, the practice of *apartheid*, which the United Nations has described as a crime against humanity, must be condemned, as it infringes the fundamental rights of the broad African majority, while legislatively and through the South African Constitution, it favours a régime of domination, exploitation and racist separatism.

79. In keeping with the principles enshrined in article 88 of the Constitution of Peru, to reject all forms of imperialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination and to stand in solidarity with the oppressed people of the world, the Peruvian Government reaffirms its abidance by the substantive aspects of the Declaration which was adopted by the recent Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries [*ibid.*, paras. 16-47]. Thus we denounce the powerful international economic interests that have decisively contributed to South Africa's continued occupation and plunder of the natural resources of that rich Territory. Similarly, we express our strenuous rejection of the illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia and the abhorrent practice of *apartheid*, and deplore the resort to delaying tactics which impede dialogue on the independence of Namibia.

80. Convinced that the future always works toward the reign of justice, my Government is optimistic over the encouraging unanimity with which the Security Council adopted on 3 May last the statement of its President condemning the South African decision to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia [*S/17151*]. We believe that unanimity must now be reaffirmed if we are to serve the noble cause of decolonization and human rights.

81. Despite the fact that the people of Namibia has already experienced more than 100 years of abusive subjugation, it is gratifying to note the bold efforts of the United Nations, since its establishment, to find a final solution that will meet the just aspirations of the people of that Territory. The Peruvian Government congratulates the world Organization on this tangible demonstration of service to the cause of oppressed peoples and reiterates its unswerving commitment to demand the full and unequivocal implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as approved in resolution 435 (1978), which defines the only universally accepted framework to ensure a peaceful transition of Namibia towards independence. Similarly, my Government welcomed the historic decision of the International Court of Justice which confirmed in its advisory opinion on 21 June 1971 the illegality of South African presence in Namibia.¹

82. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate our full support for the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory, which since its establishment has spared no effort to protect the rights and interests of the Namibian

people in the face of repression and plunder under the intransigent régime of South Africa, which seeks to perpetuate its illegal occupation. Peru considers totally valid Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² promulgated by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. We deem illegal the exploitation of non-renewable resources by foreign enterprises.

83. The independence of Namibia has been emphatically and clearly stipulated by the United Nations. No extraneous conditions can be introduced at this time. The seriousness of the deadlock calls for formulas that will make possible a rapid dénouement of the negotiation process to achieve the defined objective. However, it must be clearly understood that the principle of the liberation of Namibia is not dependent upon, nor can it be the result of, factors extraneous to the dynamics in a Territory under illegal colonial control.

84. The non-aligned countries have professed faith in the principle of the non-use of force in international relations. That is only right, because in general our history has been marked by acts of force that frequently have been committed by countries having better technical resources and harbouring imperialist designs and hegemonistic pretensions. That is why we hold fully valid the principles governing the peaceful settlement of international disputes, for without strict respect for those principles, peace will be either precarious or unattainable. The definition of these principles was a lengthy process, but they are now enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, with which all of our countries have agreed to comply. Without due observance of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in their domestic affairs, the non-utilization of the threat or use of force, and compliance with obligations flowing from international treaties, it is impossible to see how there can be serious talk about a desired peaceful order. Respect for such principles is an unshakable position of my country, and upon it depends the future international order.

85. We should like to believe that, in the international sphere, all States harbour similar aims. However, there exist more threatening situations than encouraging ones. Colonialist and imperialist policies have not disappeared, nor have attempts to split the world into power blocs and spheres of influence. Institutionalized racism subsists, and fundamental human rights continue to be violated in various regions. Forms of political, economic, socio-cultural and religious discrimination continue to be practised in many developed and developing countries. Various forms or threats of intervention, troop movements, and even massive military concentrations of foreign forces are evident in certain regions.

86. On behalf of my Government, I wish to express my deep gratification at being able to participate in this meeting which was convened on the initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It should lead to lifting the moral and political lien which this question of Namibia holds on the Organization and on the entire international community. I wish also to extend a warm greeting to the

Ministers for Foreign Affairs who are attending these meetings. Their presence will undoubtedly be decisive in our efforts to achieve the long-overdue solution to this cause.

87. The normative framework within which the question of Namibia must be placed is in risk of crumbling if it fails to receive the necessary political will to ensure that concrete steps are taken within clearly defined time limits. My delegation considers that the talks between the parties directly concerned should be resumed under the aegis of the Secretary-General. All of us gathered here should give the political support necessary to ensure an end to unilateral measures or delaying tactics and to foster the negotiating process leading to implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

88. At this hour of decision regarding a worthy future of freedom for the people of Namibia, we cannot permit arrogance to fan the flames of the crisis, thereby postponing a final solution to a problem that has been with us for the past 40 years of steadfast struggle for the attainment of international peace and security.

89. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Benjamin Mkapa, who wishes to make a statement as the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

90. Mr. MKAPA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this, yet another series of meetings devoted to the consideration of the question of Namibian independence. I wish to convey to you our very warm and sincere wishes on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for this month and to assure you of our full co-operation. I am confident that your rich diplomatic experience will be invaluable in guiding the deliberations of the Council. In particular it is fitting that a representative of Trinidad and Tobago, a country known for its firm opposition to colonialism and other forms of oppression, should preside over deliberations on the issue of the liberation of the people of Namibia and the people of southern Africa as a whole.

91. When the Council met twice in 1983 to consider the question of Namibia, it sought to arrest the tragic situation there. The Council had decided to seek the speedy implementation of its plan for the independence of that Territory. Specifically, the Council was addressing itself to the challenge posed by the implementation of the Namibian independence process approved in resolution 435 (1978) and given momentum by the subsequent diplomatic consultations which culminated in the proximity talks in the summer of 1982. Those consultations were considered successful because all the outstanding issues pertaining to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved. The resulting resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) therefore specifically addressed themselves to the need to elaborate the modalities for a cease-fire between

the warring parties and of the electoral system so as to facilitate the commencement of unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan approved in resolution 435 (1978). But the reports submitted by the Secretary-General pursuant to both resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) pointed out clearly that one of the parties, namely South Africa, was unwilling to pave the way for implementation of the plan. Regrettably this remains the case today. The obstruction by the *apartheid* régime persists, and in consequence the people of Namibia continue to languish under colonial and racist tyranny.

92. When my delegation spoke before the Council in May and in October 1983, it expressed its deep regret that, notwithstanding the extensive and exhaustive negotiations which had taken place, one of the parties had unilaterally chosen to veto the implementation of the agreement reached. Today we reaffirm our unmitigated dismay. With new demands being made and new colonial measures being undertaken by the *apartheid* régime, there is no hope that that régime ever intends willingly to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. For that reason, the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa of the OAU and the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, meeting respectively at Accra in February and at New Delhi in April of this year, requested the Security Council to resume its consideration of further measures to give effect to its resolutions and to break the prevailing impasse. The present series of meetings has been made more urgent by the most recent decision of the *apartheid* régime, to impose an internal settlement in Namibia through the installation of a so-called interim government drawn from a coalition of its puppets under the umbrella of the so-called Multi-Party Conference.

93. The Council, therefore, no longer faces simply obstruction of the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978); it is also confronting the formal beginning of the bantustanization of Namibia. The representative of SWAPO, in the statement he will make later on, will forcefully put the case of Namibia. But his message is quite simple: the independence of Namibia has been denied too long, and the people of Namibia cannot wait in perpetuity.

94. Twenty-two resolutions of the Council over the last 17 years have not brought an end to colonial and racial aggression against the people of Namibia. All efforts by the front-line countries, SWAPO, the Secretary-General and the Organization have been frustrated by South Africa. Why do the Security Council and the international community brook South Africa's defiance and obstruction of their will?

95. No policy framework has done more to undermine the international efforts to free Namibia than the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Put into effect five years ago, that policy has attempted to lend the *apartheid* régime international respectability and has rewarded it with collaboration in all fields, as well as with general political protection. That collaboration has found concrete expression in closer diplomatic ties and contacts and in

scientific and military co-operation. In the economic field, the certificate of political respectability accorded by constructive engagement has paved the way for billions of dollars of new investments and loans for South Africa.

96. Can there be any doubt that constructive engagement has emboldened and sustained South Africa's defiance? I invite the Council to recall the way the *apartheid* régime brandished that political support and protection when it contemptuously rejected resolution 539 (1983) in a statement it issued on 29 October 1983 [see S/16106], when the Council was forced to meet under circumstances similar to the present ones.

97. Constructive engagement is the twin of linkage, that horrendously absurd precept making the independence of Namibia conditional upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. It must surely be obvious now that the presence of those troops is being used to mask the deep-rooted political opposition of the *apartheid* régime and its allies to Namibia's independence, as well as to protect the multinational interests which have convergent desires to continue plundering the natural resources of Namibia. Moreover, the *apartheid* régime and its friends have settled upon the course of using the presence of those troops to try to attain long-standing political objectives against Angola. As a result, resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented, and linkage stands in the way.

98. Linkage and constructive engagement have together been rejected and condemned by the entire international community as conducive to the reinforcement of *apartheid*, to the sustenance of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, in particular the continued occupation of Angola, and to the denial to the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence. That rejection still stands. Africa, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the international community in general have reiterated that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is without relevance to the decolonization process in Namibia.

99. The twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU held at Addis Ababa last November, underlined this position. It reiterated its rejection of "linkage" and "parallelism" between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as being manifestly incompatible with the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)³ and reprehensible and gross interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

100. The decision of Angola regarding those troops is a sovereign prerogative of that State. It is consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and with international law. No country has any right to violate the norms of international law. Angola, like any sovereign Member State, has an inherent right to determine the form and closeness of its bilateral relations with any other State. The United Nations is an organization of sovereign and equal Members. It is not an organization of greater and lesser sovereignties or of groups of countries whose rights under international law are more potent than those of others. It is extortion to make

the implementation of Security Council resolutions contingent upon the satisfaction of the geopolitical preoccupations of any Member of the Organization, especially a permanent member of the Council.

101. Resolution 435 (1978) was negotiated and adopted as a framework for the search for the independence of Namibia. That and that alone was its purpose. It did not, and was not meant to, encompass or promote issues irrelevant or prejudicial to that objective, and it was certainly not intended to be a vehicle for any Power or group of countries to attain by extortion national foreign-policy objectives otherwise unattainable or denied them.

102. There can be no doubt that those who want to pervert logic, falsify the truth and trample on the rights of peoples for the sake of ideological expediency do not want peace in southern Africa. Those who go to great lengths to manufacture for South Africa excuses with which to attempt to justify aggression cannot claim, any more than the *apartheid* authorities themselves, to be agents for stability in our region. Rather, their actions result in increased instability and violence.

103. South Africa is occupying Namibia illegally. It occupies parts of Angola. With characteristic duplicity it announced a false withdrawal of its occupation troops from southern Angola, only to have a unit of its expeditionary forces captured red-handed on a sabotage mission in a northern enclave of Angola. Yet an attempt is being made to obscure the fact of the occupation of Namibia and Angola and instead to propel into predominance considerations which do not relate to the independence of Namibia or even to the security of the region, but which seek to advance global cold-war ambitions. Why do we not hear condemnations of South Africa for its occupation of Angola? Why do we receive no proposals regarding practical measures of censure and isolation of this subversive and evil empire?

104. The veritable inertia of the contact group of Western countries is no less regrettable. It is saddening that, by allowing the unwarranted preoccupations of one member of the group to suspend its collective judgement on Namibia, it has in large measures so far facilitated the sabotaging of a plan it authored and promoted for international acceptance.

105. My delegation cannot afford to equivocate. Constructive engagement with the *apartheid* régime is the sustenance of an evil system. It is not only inimical to the independence of Namibia; it undermines the chances for peace and security in the region. *Apartheid*, like all evil, grows on what it feeds on. Therefore, it cannot be destroyed by kindness and persuasion—much less so by a policy which could be otherwise described only as appeasement.

106. If the *apartheid* régime has found renewed vigour in the extension of its policies of intimidation and repression inside Namibia to destabilization and aggression against the neighbouring African States, South Africa is, through a combination of various forms of pressure, in particular

armed aggression, now posed to try to reverse the victories achieved by the people of Africa over the past decade. Inside Namibia itself, the situation has greatly deteriorated as the régime has stepped up repression in its bid to liquidate opposition. Through a combination of tactics, the régime has on the one hand now set up a coalition of puppets under the so-called Multi-Party Conference umbrella, and on the other, the régime has continued to intimidate, arrest and kill those who have expressed opposition to colonialism and *apartheid*. In particular, members of SWAPO have been targeted for indiscriminate arrests, torture and other forms of violence and death. Through this two-pronged strategy of the force of arms and political manipulation, including the recent imposition of the so-called interim government, the *apartheid* régime hopes to transform Namibia into another bantustan. Yet despite these manoeuvres and repressive measures, the people of Namibia have not succumbed to disillusionment or despair. Instead they remain undaunted in their resolve to oppose the occupation of their country. This resolute determination in the face of such violence has found expression in the ever-increasing support for SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. Indeed, as was the case with the Turnhalle Alliance, the Multi-Party Conference is doomed to collapse.

107. The problems of southern Africa should be seen in their true context. *Apartheid* in South Africa and the occupation of Namibia, made necessary by the desire of the racist régime to create a string of buffer States to cushion itself, constitute the root cause of the conflict. No amount of excuses, falsifications and even outright lies can obscure this fundamental element. Any attempts to interpret the struggle for the dismantlement of *apartheid* and for securing independence for Namibia in the context of ideological confrontation between East and West have to be strongly rejected by the Council, as they have been by the international community.

108. It will not come as a surprise if we are told, as we have been so many times in the past, to be patient while the racists in South Africa ponder the nature and form of change in Namibia and indeed in South Africa itself. We have been told so often in the past that a breakthrough was imminent and that we should be patient while the friends and allies of South Africa successfully led that régime into a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. Indeed, we have waited not only for the past five years in which constructive engagement has been in effect, but for the almost two years since we last came before the Council to plead the Namibian case. But what do we have to show for our patience? Increased destabilization, occupation and other forms of aggression; more repression inside Namibia, and now an internal settlement imposed on the people of Namibia. More of this, then, will be what the Council will be allowing if it fails to act decisively in response to the challenge before it. We have bought too much time as it is for the *apartheid* régime.

109. The manoeuvres, delays, deceptions and deviations of the *apartheid* régime have reinforced the universal recognition that the Namibian problem is a United Nations problem, and thus should be dealt with under the auspices

of the Organization. Both resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) underline that imperative. In this respect, I wish to register Tanzania's satisfaction with the manner in which the Secretary-General has dealt with the question, in particular in reasserting the central role of the Organization in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia.

110. Correspondingly, the Council must continue to reject attempts to circumvent the United Nations and must demand the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and call for the respect of the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with resolution 432 (1978).

111. Namibia is a problem from which the United Nations cannot extricate itself. The United Nations in general, and particularly the Security Council, must continue to play the central role in any efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement. In this regard, we already have resolution 435 (1978), which remains—and must remain—the only internationally acceptable and most viable framework within which the United Nations can fulfil that role. My delegation, Africa, and indeed the entire international community remain convinced that despite incessant attempts to dilute, circumvent and even undermine it, that resolution, along with the plan it approves, retains its intrinsic validity and continues to be the most acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. The Council can therefore afford to do no less than reaffirm its authority and undertake its immediate, total and unconditional implementation.

112. The continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia poses a unique challenge to the United Nations and its pre-eminent body, the Security Council. Eighteen years ago the United Nations decided to assume direct responsibility for the Territory. The persistence of the aggression against the Namibian people has serious implications for international peace and security. Evidently, in its persistent occupation, the régime has equally prevented the realization by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, which is a flagrant flouting of the Charter. But the *apartheid* régime has also continuously used the Territory as a staging ground for its acts of aggression and subversion against the neighbouring independent African States. The *apartheid* régime has not shown any regard for the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. As a result, conflict is bound to escalate. Failure to act now will only pave the way for a total conflagration in the region. The Council is the guarantor of international peace and security and the sponsor of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The Council has to act and institute effective measures against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter so as to force it to end its occupation of Namibia. This represents the last non-violent option to bring about the independence of that Territory.

113. Over the past few months, the anti-*apartheid* forces throughout the world have redoubled their opposition to *apartheid*. Outraged by the unrepentant and ruthlessly oppressive attacks launched by the *apartheid* régime

against the black population and its leaders, anti-*apartheid* groups are asserting their moral and institutional authority. People march by the thousands, legislatures act on divestment, cultural and sports organizations distance themselves farther and farther away from South Africa. We salute and thank them. Can the Council afford to ignore these spontaneous pleas and impassioned injunctions of the people, of legislatures and of Governments?

114. We have not come to the Council for yet another resolution. We already have 22 of them. We have come here to urge the Council to assume its responsibilities seriously and ensure that implementation commences. We have come again to impress upon the five Western members of the contact group their own responsibility in working for the scrupulous implementation of a plan which they were themselves instrumental in formulating.

115. We have come before the Council because we believe that the situation in Namibia has reached a crossroads. The challenge before the Council is therefore enormous. Through its actions, it can help pave the way towards the freedom of Namibia and avert the dangers of the growing confrontations in southern Africa in general. We earnestly urge the Council to respond to the anguished cry of the Namibian people for liberty.

116. Mr. BOUTROS GHALI (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me first to express to you, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of Egypt and on my own behalf, my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. I am confident that your diplomatic skills and political know-how will enable you to undertake this task in the best and most complete way. We are all the happier to see you presiding over the Council because of the close links between our two countries in all fields.

117. Allow me also to express our thanks and congratulations to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, who presided over the Council's work in the month of May with exceptional skill in a period that witnessed many international developments and events on many different fronts.

118. We are meeting here today to consider a serious issue endangering the peace and security of the African continent and threatening the introduction of the influences and setbacks of the cold war in a continent that has chosen for itself the path of non-alignment, a continent that has chosen to remain apart from the struggle of the major Powers. The issue is the independence of Namibia.

119. Today's meeting of the Council, convened to consider the question of Namibia, on the initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is a clear indication that the non-aligned countries and the overwhelming majority of members of the international community have run out of patience. They no longer accept procrastination and delaying tactics by the racist South African régime, which has been determined to place one obstacle after another in the way of Namibia's independence and the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which approved

a clearly defined plan for the achievement of that independence.

120. Egypt has always taken a clear stand on this issue, a stand that may be summed up as follows.

121. First, the occupation of Namibia by South African forces is illegal, and its continuation runs counter to international law and defies the will of the international community.

122. Secondly, we call for the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) forthwith, so that the people of Namibia may determine its own future and achieve its full independence.

123. Thirdly, we condemn the racist régime of South Africa as well as its policies and manoeuvres to delay the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), even though seven years have elapsed since the Council adopted that resolution. In particular, we condemn and reject the latest manoeuvre of that régime, by which it is attempting to install a provisional puppet régime in Namibia which would follow its orders and carry out its plans, thereby giving a false picture of self-rule. The States of the world as a whole, either individually or through the United Nations, regional organizations and other international groupings, have expressed their rejection of the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime. They have called for its immediate withdrawal, thus enabling the people of the Territory to exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence.

124. However, despite all the attempts and efforts of the international community in the past years, the people of Namibia still continue to languish under the yoke of South African occupation. Human rights continue to be violated in Namibia every day. Namibia's riches and natural resources continue to be plundered. Furthermore, the racist Government continues to tighten its hold on the Territory. It increases its military presence there and continues to use the Territory as a base for aggression against neighbouring States.

125. We must not consider the Pretoria régime's behaviour in Namibia and its insistence on perpetuating its illegal occupation of the Territory in defiance of the will of the international community as an abstract or individual phenomenon. Rather, we must look at its behaviour in the light of the nature of the régime and its basis and the principles and ideologies it has adopted. There is a radical fallacy related to the basis of the racist régime in South Africa, and because of that fallacy any attempts at reform or change are of no avail. What is needed is a general, comprehensive change.

126. The South African régime in its current guise can survive only through the use of force in its worst forms, whether inside or outside its borders. Within its borders, violence is considered the régime's only way to repress the majority which rejects its racist ideology and its position with regard to more than 72 per cent of the population

who have been deprived of their basic rights and human dignity. Beyond its borders, the Pretoria régime finds violence and aggression the only way to perpetuate its continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and its exploitation of Namibia's resources, against the will of the original inhabitants and in defiance of the international community.

127. Furthermore, violence is the weapon brandished by the régime in the face of neighbouring States which, rightly, oppose its colonial policy. History has taught us that such a régime based on violence and aggression as its only means of survival cannot survive in the long run. However, we have also learned that in the short term the presence of such a régime will always be an element for spreading unrest and instability in the region in which it exists, and for exporting such unrest and instability to other areas.

128. The most recent developments have clearly shown the nature of the racist Pretoria régime and the efforts being made to hide it from international public opinion, or at least some sections of international public opinion, in order to ensure support for the régime. Within its borders we have seen the strong resistance the régime faces from the people of South Africa, a resistance that is increasing every day, despite the ferocity of the régime's repression. The repressed masses—be they black, coloured or of Asian origin, according to the categories set up by the racist régime—reject, as do we, the *fait accompli* being imposed on them. They are not deceived, nor are we deceived, by the manoeuvres of the régime to conceal its inhuman racist nature.

129. Among the tactics the Pretoria Government resorts to we see new attempts to impede the implementation of Security Council resolutions in general and resolution 435 (1978) in particular. Here we are referring to that régime's recent decision to transfer some of the administration of the Territory to a so-called interim government, which, in fact, represents only a coalition of a few puppets who do not reflect the interests and wishes of the indigenous inhabitants of Namibia and whose only concern is their own interests linked to the perpetuation of colonialism and occupation. The international community, which has on previous occasions expressed its total rejection of the attempts by the Pretoria régime to link implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to conditions and demands totally unrelated to the independence of Namibia, has also expressed its condemnation and rejection of the latest manoeuvre by the Pretoria régime involving the establishment of a so-called interim government, for that act is nothing but a further obstacle to the implementation of Security Council resolutions on Namibia. It also runs counter to resolution 435 (1978), which clearly declares that all unilateral measures taken by the illegal administration in Namibia are null and void.

130. We shall not at this juncture waste time on a rejection and denunciation of this latest act; all the States of the world have participated in that rejection and denunciation, regardless of their systems and positions. We would, however, like to mention in particular the declaration issued at

the inaugural session of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia held at New Delhi in April, which expressed the condemnation of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and its rejection of this unilateral act of the Pretoria régime and called upon the Security Council to take the necessary measures forthwith under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to ensure respect by the racist Government of South Africa of Security Council resolutions on Namibia.

131. The members of the Council have expressed their position that the actions mentioned in the statement by the President of the Council dated 3 May [S/17151] are contrary to the expressed will of the international community and in defiance of United Nations resolutions and decisions, in particular Council resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which declared that any unilateral measures taken by the illegal administration in Namibia in contravention of relevant Security Council resolutions are null and void. The note also stated:

“Members of the Council condemn and reject any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978).”

132. I should like to reiterate from this rostrum of the international conscience and legality that the United Nations commitment to the need to achieve independence for Namibia, in addition to being a moral commitment based on the elementary principles of justice, is also a legal commitment founded on two bases—one, the historic responsibility of the United Nations as the successor to the League of Nations that entrusted South Africa with a Mandate over the Territory as a step towards Namibia's independence, and two, the instruments adopted by the Organization itself to ensure international peace and security. The persistent refusal by the racist Government in Pretoria to commit itself to the implementation of United Nations resolutions and Namibia's failure to achieve independence and national sovereignty represent a major threat to the peace, security and stability of the region and of the African continent as a whole.

133. Under the powers entrusted to it, the General Assembly has attempted to fulfil its responsibilities, and in 1967 it established the United Nations Council for Namibia to undertake the administration of the Territory until its independence. Each year the General Assembly also adopts a number of resolutions on Namibia in which it calls upon South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of the Territory and calls upon other States to adopt all necessary measures to force South Africa to comply with United Nations resolutions in this regard.

134. Furthermore, the Security Council has adopted many resolutions on Namibia, all of which endorse the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, stress the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and call upon South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of the Territory. Resolution 435 (1978) contains a concrete framework for a comprehensive and peaceful settlement by which the independence of Na-

mibia could be achieved. Everyone knows the intransigence with which the Pretoria régime has greeted those resolutions, either by rejecting them outright or by hindering or circumventing their implementation. The end result is that that racist régime has rejected and continues to reject Security Council resolutions and to defy the will of the Council and of the international community as a whole.

135. Today, we believe that it is no longer enough to adopt theoretical resolutions. We must proceed with courage to fulfil our responsibilities by exerting the maximum pressure on the Pretoria Government to force it to abide by the will of the international community and to commit itself to implement the resolutions of the Council. The time has come—indeed, the time is long past—for the Council to consider the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, for it has become clear that all other attempts to convince the Pretoria régime to abide by Council resolutions have failed.

136. Here, we should like to refer to the hope expressed by the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries at its latest meeting at New Delhi that all members of the Security Council would display the necessary political will in this regard. In welcoming the further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia, dated 6 June [S/17242], and expressing confidence that that report will assist us in fulfilling our responsibilities, I should like to stress the central role of the Secretary-General in ensuring a speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without any amendment or linkage to any extraneous issues. Egypt wishes to place on record its appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General in this connection and its full support of the Secretary-General in achieving the desired goal.

137. The time has arrived for the Pretoria régime to come to its senses and realize that, on the eve of the twenty-first century, the world no longer accepts the application of colonial policies and racist practices based on obsolete ideologies and thoughts that are totally illogical and politically unrealizable. History has proved their failure and inability to survive. If the Pretoria régime is not ready to accept those facts voluntarily, the international community has the duty to force it to do so.

138. We in Egypt fully appreciate that our independence and that of our brothers in Africa—for which our peoples have paid dearly in blood and resources—will remain incomplete so long as our brothers in the south of the continent continue to languish under the yoke of colonial occupation.

139. Egypt, which served as host in its capital to the first Office of SWAPO, reaffirms its unflagging support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative. And here, I salute our brother Nujoma, who is with us in this chamber. I stress our determination to provide all possible moral

and material assistance until the heroic people of Namibia achieves its independence and joins its brothers on the African continent who have preceded it on the road to freedom.

140. Egypt reaffirms its commitment to assist and help the African front-line States in their honest stand in continuing to support the struggle of the Namibian people, despite the pressures and acts of aggression they have suffered at the hands of the racist Pretoria régime.

141. The achievement by the Namibian people of independence, freedom and national sovereignty is inevitable and inescapable. Therefore, despite the obstacles and difficulties we continue to face on the road to the achievement of that goal, we must not succumb to pessimism. We must redouble our efforts, because there are encouraging signs in the notable development in international public opinion in many States, including Western Europe and the United States, in favour of exerting both economic and political pressures against the Pretoria régime to force it to relinquish its intransigent position and co-operate with the United Nations to achieve Namibia's independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978).

142. Our responsibility here in the United Nations—in particular in the Security Council—is to act for the speedy achievement of that goal; to put an end to bloodshed on the battlefield and to the suffering of the Namibian people still under the yoke of occupation after 100 years of struggle against colonialism—a struggle the effects of which may spread across southern Africa and, indeed, to the whole of Africa. We must also contain the conflict, for its repercussions and dimensions cannot be foreseen.

143. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I now call on him.

144. Mr. NUJOMA: I should like at the outset to thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to appear once again before this body. Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the high office of President for the month of June.

145. In the same vein, I express sincere gratitude and appreciation to those who undertook the task of President of the Council for the month of May—the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand—for guiding the Council's deliberations with skill and efficiency, and particularly for reacting promptly to the decision of the racist régime of Pretoria aimed at installing a puppet administration in Namibia. By condemning as null and void the unilateral decision of the illegal régime, the Council, through its President, sent an appropriate and categorical message which underscored the seriousness with which the Council viewed that action.

146. Mr. President, you have assumed the stewardship of the Council at a time when there are, on the one hand, renewed challenges against the authority of the United

Nations, particularly in the field of decolonization, and on the other, greater opportunities for concerted action by the international community to end colonialism, oppression and exploitation. In you, Sir, we have a dedicated and able diplomat from a friendly country, Trinidad and Tobago, whose historical past, present aspirations and future destiny are linked to the African continent and its peoples. The role your country has played in the anti-slavery and anti-colonial struggle is widely recognized. Similarly, the outstanding contributions many of your compatriots have made towards giving birth to the noble ideal of Pan-Africanism have in no small measure added impetus to the decolonization process in Africa and the Caribbean. Needless to say, you and your predecessors have actively participated and continue to participate in United Nations efforts to bring about Namibia's independence. In acknowledging all this, we pay a tribute to all those whose lives and actions have advanced further the cause of freedom everywhere, and we urge those who are following in their footsteps to rededicate themselves in the common struggle for liberation, justice and progress. History and circumstances have thrust an awesome responsibility on you, Sir, as President of the Security Council at this particular time when this body is considering the question of Namibia. We repose trust and confidence in you in the knowledge that your wisdom, statesmanship and devotion to the Charter of the United Nations and the principle of the right to self-determination in particular will enable you to guide the Council's deliberations to a successful conclusion. I assure you of the readiness of the SWAPO delegation to give whatever co-operation may be required of us in this regard.

147. Allow me at this juncture to thank Mr. Krishnan of India, representative of the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as Mr. dos Santos of Mozambique, Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of May, for requesting the Council to meet to consider the question of Namibia.

148. The situation in Namibia is extremely grave and demands prompt and decisive action by the Council. Racist South Africa's intransigence is a matter of record. Its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and increasing military build-up have been condemned time and again; yet the aspirations of the Namibian people for freedom and independence remain unfulfilled.

149. How many more Namibians must be shot at and killed by the marauding murder squads of the racist Pretoria régime? How many more lives of innocent little babies must be snatched away by the poverty and disease imposed upon them by the colonial system? How long can mothers and fathers continue to witness their sons being forcibly conscripted into the colonial army of occupation, and their children subjected to arbitrary arrest, incarceration and torture? How many more children must become orphans? How many more Namibian patriots must disappear in the darkness of State terrorism, never to be heard of again? How many more homes and villages of Namibians whose only crime is their uncompromising demand for freedom must be destroyed? How much longer must the rape and plunder of our country and its

resources continue? How much longer must we listen to the repeated pleas for patience? How far can the *apartheid* régime be allowed to go in its defiance of United Nations resolutions? Is this not the time for the Security Council to declare that enough is enough?

150. These are some of the pressing questions that we bring before this pre-eminent organ of the United Nations.

151. In the Final Document adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April [S/17184, annex], the Security Council is called upon to assume its responsibilities fully and to act in a decisive manner in the fulfilment of the United Nations direct responsibility over Namibia by taking effective measures to ensure the implementation of the United Nations plan as approved in resolution 435 (1978). The Ministers placed strong emphasis on the imperative need for the immediate and unconditional implementation of that plan.

152. To this end, and to further underscore the importance and seriousness that the Movement attaches to the Namibian problem the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of 18 member countries of the Movement were requested personally to participate in this debate. We are happy to note the presence of such an impressive number of Foreign Ministers, which will enhance the importance of the debate and put further stress on bringing about the immediate resolution of the Namibian problem. In this context, I am particularly gratified to acknowledge the presence at this meeting of the Prime Minister of Peru, and I thank him for taking time from his demanding responsibilities to attend this debate, and specifically for his important statement.

153. The extremely grave situation which is prevailing in Namibia is singularly due to racist South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia. The policy of massive military build-up and the brutal repression of our people blindly being pursued by the occupationist régime has transformed the country into a police State. There has been no fundamental change in the repugnant system of *apartheid*, in terms of who holds power, benefits from the Namibian wealth and enjoys privileges. It still remains a master-servant relationship.

154. Then, of course, there are the other crimes emanating from the *apartheid* doctrine of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, such as the repeated acts of aggression, destabilization and military attacks by the racist Pretoria régime against independent African States, as well as its continued sabotaging of their economic infrastructures in a sinister campaign aimed at undermining the economic development and security of those States. In this connection, a case in point is the recent "Cabinda scandal", which once again exposed the bad faith and duplicity of the Pretoria régime, in terms of its hostile designs on Angola; it was a calculated, outrageous act of sabotage which clearly belied the declared intentions of that criminal régime to end its long-standing policy of aggression against Angola.

155. At the same time, it must be said that there is a wide credibility gap about the role of the United States Administration as a reliable interlocutor in southern Africa.

156. The Council must strongly condemn racist *apartheid* South Africa for the blatant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, considering the fact that the illegal régime continues to use Namibia as a military base from which to launch its military attacks, destabilization and sabotage. The Council must also categorically reject Pretoria's arrogated right to transgress the borders of the front-line States, whatever the pretext might be.

157. SWAPO would like also to call upon the international community to render, as a matter of urgency, all support and assistance to the front-line States, in a concerted effort to strengthen their defence capabilities in the face of racist South Africa's policy of regional expansionism and aggression. It goes without saying that the solidarity and support of those neighbouring States for the struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, is an indispensable factor in the common endeavours to hasten the decolonization process of Namibia.

158. The oppressed masses of South Africa and Namibia are greatly inspired by the emerging national consensus of Americans from all spheres of life advocating strong action against the obnoxious system of *apartheid* and demanding an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. What is even more heartening is their outright rejection of the infamous policy of constructive engagement. This widely condemned policy—call it an unholy alliance, evil or an unmitigated disaster—has increased the hardships and suffering of our peoples.

159. After more than four years, it should be obvious to every reasonable person that the policy of constructive engagement, or so-called quiet diplomacy, has failed to prove its case. On the other hand, emboldened by this pro-*apartheid* policy, the *apartheid* chieftains have further entrenched themselves in power in South Africa specifically by denationalizing the black majority in the land of their birth. The fraudulent schemes that have been imposed in South Africa in the name of the bogus constitutional reforms or a new political dispensation are in reality intended to undermine the solidarity and the unity of the oppressed sectors of the population. They are of no consequence to the demands of the struggling masses for political self-determination and the eradication of *apartheid*. Evidence abounds that the black majority is strongly resisting this frontal onslaught against their legitimate interests and just rights, which can truly be satisfied only when there is a new democratic order based on the principle of one man, one vote. Already the patriots and militants representing a cross-section of the South African society have taken up arms in order to confront the oppressors and their military machine in the countryside, in the townships, at the work place, and on the streets of the major citadels of the racist Power. The freedom fighters and democrats of the South African National Liberation Movement, under the overall leadership of the African

National Congress of South Africa, have the right to appeal for and receive all-round material assistance and continued political support from the international community in their heroic struggle against the evil system of *apartheid*, which stands universally condemned as a crime against humanity and as constituting a serious threat to international peace and security.

160. The adverse consequences of the policy of constructive engagement—a policy which should be called by its proper name, as a policy of destructive engagement—have not been limited to South Africa. We can actually point out its manifestations in various forms beyond the frontiers of the *apartheid* State. The evidence is there for everybody to see how Pretoria's efforts to destabilize the economies and to undermine the security of the independent African States have increased and continue to increase in frequency and intensity. Pretoria and its allies have continued the practice of training, financing and utilizing local traitors and reactionary elements in order to pursue their political and strategic objectives in southern Africa, including promoting regional domination and imperialist exploitation of the human and natural resources. A case in point is the recent shameful spectacle of the puppets, both local and foreign, and their American and South African corporate paymasters that was staged along the Namibia-Angola border. The ringmaster at this staged event was none other than Lewis Lehrman, a United States disgruntled reactionary, Reaganite politician who is looking for an international platform in hopes of enhancing his political ambitions for an elected office in that country. But the most revealing thing was that this gentleman let the cat out of the bag by reading aloud to the gathering a letter from President Reagan in which he—that is, Reagan—endorsed the goals of the so-called Democratic International and assured the assembled agents of colonialism and imperialism that “your goals are our goals”.

161. Those who are traitors to the sacred cause of the oppressed but struggling masses have by their own choice parted company with history and cannot consider themselves to be among those who will enjoy the fruits of victory and a glorious future. They have thus become part of the problem which will be eliminated; it is just a matter of time. When that comes about, these traitors will be cast into oblivion together with their mentors.

162. SWAPO reiterates here without fear or favour that the primary obstacle today to the attainment of Namibia's independence is the United States precondition of linking the independence of our country to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. To add insult to injury, those who implement this abominable policy have the arrogance to allege that we must accept this outrageous imposition as the reality of the situation whether we like it or not, and that there will be no independence for Namibia as long as the Cuban troops remain in Angola. In other words, the United States Administration is responsible for holding Namibia's independence to ransom and for prolonging the suffering and misery of our people. The racist régime of Pretoria is making full use of this situation, thanks to the linkage precondition. It is no secret that the Reagan Administration has, right from the time of its inception, engaged in endless

manoeuvrings to find alternatives to resolution 435 (1978) while publicly professing scrupulous adherence to it.

163. Let me now proceed directly to the heart of the matter, namely the decision of the occupying illegal Pretoria régime to install a puppet interim administration. Again I raise the question of the credibility gap of the United States Administration, which is supposed to be working on the minds of the chieftains of the Botha régime to make them stick to their acceptance of the United Nations plan as approved in resolution 435 (1978).

164. Notwithstanding the assurances given by Washington and others about their having strongly intimated to Pretoria that it should desist from going ahead with the installation of the puppet administration in Namibia, the racists will go ahead and impose yet another *fait accompli*, perhaps even while the Council is debating the question of Namibia.

165. In one sense, the problem before the Council involves a repetition of South Africa's arrogant defiance of United Nations resolutions, but in another sense it is a revealing example of the complicity of the major Western Powers with South Africa for the sake of their vested interests in Namibia, their objective being to prevent SWAPO from coming to power in Namibia, even through implementation of the United Nations plan, and also to bypass the United Nations.

166. In this context, we should like to recall the strong condemnation and rejection of racist South Africa's illegal and unilateral action by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and, as has been noted, by the President of the Security Council in a statement on 3 May [S/17751].

167. The Council, meeting against the backdrop of this challenging situation, is now called upon to assume its responsibilities fully and to act decisively in fulfilment of the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia, which must be met soon through Namibia's attainment of freedom and genuine independence. Specifically, we urge the Council formally to condemn and reject racist South Africa's decision, which paves the way for an internal settlement in violation of resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). Moreover, the Council should urge all States to refrain from according any recognition to or undertaking any kind of co-operation with the puppet administration in Namibia or any other entity installed in Namibia by the illegal régime.

168. We are also of the view that the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority over Namibia until independence, should, through a legislative act, declare as international criminals Namibians involved in this illegal action, and call upon Member States to arrest them wherever they might be found.

169. In pursuance of its goal of the bantustanization of Namibia, racist South Africa is now scheming to achieve

the secession of the eastern region of our country, the Caprivi Strip. The régime has, in fact, already sent to the Caprivi its colonial agent, an Afrikaner by the name of Lucas Kruger, to draw up a "constitution" under the slogan of "a constitution for Caprivi by Caprivians" and to instigate that section of our population to regard itself as separate from the rest of the Namibians. It should be recalled that in past years the racist régime has built up a huge military and air base at Mpacha from which to attack and destabilize the neighbouring independent States of Angola, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe and an independent Namibia. Already the racist Pretoria régime is using that base to supply huge quantities of arms and to provide other forms of support to the Angolan bandits of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). SWAPO strongly urges the Council to prevail upon racist South Africa to desist from its evil intention to balkanize Namibia and to ensure the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

170. The world outside is demanding economic sanctions against *apartheid* South Africa. The Security Council bears a special responsibility and must act now, promptly and decisively, to secure the implementation of its resolutions, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Now is the time for this most important organ of the United Nations to do what is called for and what is necessary, namely, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as the most effective additional means to ensure South Africa's acceptance of the authority of the Organization and its compliance with United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

171. That should be the message that goes out from the Council in response to the repeated calls for the implementation of effective measures against the Pretoria authorities. In this connection, we call upon the Western permanent members of the Council who have shielded South Africa in the past to display the necessary political will by joining the rest of the Council in adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

172. This year, 1985, marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. While we take note of the preparations that are being made to observe that important event in a proper and fitting manner, we should like to appeal to the Organization and to the rest of the international community that these festivities—including the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)—reflect the fact that Namibia, which has been a subject of annual debates in the United Nations for the past 40 years, is not yet free. Therefore, there is an imperative need for recommitment by all the nations and peoples of the world to increase their diplomatic, political, financial, humanitarian and military assistance to the struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for freedom, self-determination and national independence.

173. SWAPO reiterates its full support for the United Nations Council for Namibia and calls upon it to continue

to promote the political and other interests of the people of Namibia, with the attainment of independence as the primary goal. We should also like to stress that the United Nations system should continue existing assistance programmes which are now and will continue in the future to be of direct benefit to Namibians, including such outstanding United Nations initiatives as the United Nations Institute for Namibia, the Namibia Vocational Training School, the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and various scholarship programmes. What is needed most is an increase in funds for these indispensable schemes.

174. It goes without saying that SWAPO supports wholeheartedly the central role of the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We renew here our trust and confidence in the Secretary-General and commend him for his tireless efforts to hasten that process. We believe that the Secretary-General should be given the necessary support by the Member States to carry out his mandate and to undertake such actions as would help pave the way towards the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan. To this end, SWAPO wishes to renew its readiness to co-operate fully with him and his staff.

175. More than 18 years ago the Namibian people were forced to take up arms to resist colonialism and to liberate themselves. That commitment and the determination to leave no stone unturned in the struggle remain resolute and enduring.

176. The combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the brave sons and daughters of the motherland, have met the oppressors on all fronts and live up to the challenge. They are today ready as ever to continue to intensify the war of national liberation, adjusting to any given situation and resolving problems as they arise in the field.

177. SWAPO leads the nation at home and abroad; it is the people organized who, acting as their own liberators, are certain of the final victory. The cause of Namibia is the cause of the United Nations. Let us, therefore, work hand in hand to make the year 1985 the year of Namibia's independence. In the meantime, as long as Pretoria's illegality and military occupation persist in Namibia, there is no alternative but to intensify the struggle on all fronts.

178. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Post and Telecommunications of Algeria, Mr. Boualem Bessaïeh. I welcome him and invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

179. Mr. BESSAIEH (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is my pleasant duty to congratulate you most warmly on behalf of my delegation on your accession to the presidency of the Council. We are convinced that your vast experience and your well-known personal qualities will ensure that the Council will have sound guidance in its work.

180. At this time I should like also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, who

guided the work of this body in an enlightened and effective manner during the past month.

181. The problems stemming from the critical evolution of the situation in southern Africa unquestionably constitute one of the constant concerns of the international community and therefore require the unflagging attention of the Security Council. The dangerously persistent tension prevailing in that region of the world is the fault of a South African régime obstinately bent on ceaselessly introducing new sources of instability in southern Africa. In fact, the orchestrated escalation of tension pursued by South Africa with an obstinacy made possible only by its impunity reflects three aspects of a single threat.

182. This threat stems, first, from a constant defiance of the universal conscience by the persistent maintenance of the odious system of *apartheid*. It also arises from a permanent affront to the authority of the United Nations by the illegal maintenance of South Africa's presence in Namibia. Lastly, it arises from the built-in danger to international peace and security constituted by the doctrine of aggression so perilously followed by Pretoria in its relations with the countries of the region.

183. Those are the unchanging facts of a situation clearly perceived as extremely grave by the international community. Thus, once again, the calm observation of events has allowed it alone, and from the outset, a clear understanding of the underlying nature of a régime which has institutionalized racism as a means of government and established aggression as a way of dealing with its neighbours.

184. In fact, since 1946, the year when it decided to extend its administration and its *apartheid* system to what it now Namibia, the Pretoria régime has never ceased to carry out open acts of illegality and institutionalized absorption of that Territory. A sudden and irreversible halt to those plans might have been brought about by means of resolution 435 (1978) if South Africa had not continually done its utmost to thwart its implementation, as was demonstrated early on when it attempted, in 1978, to impose a so-called internal solution on Namibia, which was strongly opposed by the Council in its resolution 439 (1978).

185. At the same time, the introduction of linkages extraneous to the clearly established facts of the Namibian question was of a piece with its attitude of obstruction. Encouraged in its attitude by the absence of an energetic international reaction commensurate with its intransigence, South Africa is today preparing a new manoeuvre in its unilateral attempt to bring about a so-called internal solution, ignoring the fundamental problem of the decolonization of Namibia.

186. Moreover, when called upon to put an end to the intolerable *apartheid* system, the racist minority régime recently once again used the fallacious pretext of an alleged gradual internal constitutional change to inflict further blows on the dignity of the South African people.

187. Similarly, urged to respect the independence of neighbouring countries, the South African régime could not for long hide its true nature; for breach of commitments dictated by tactical considerations is an irresistible temptation to a régime which has made aggression a regional strategy, as is borne out by its recent violation of Angolan territory even as far as the Cabinda region.

188. This in brief is the grim record of successive recantations and repeated prevarications.

189. Faced with a situation marked by a new escalation in provocation, the non-aligned countries then had the duty to alert the international community and to call upon the authority of the Security Council.

190. This is a legitimate response to the commendably strong disapproval with which the international public has unanimously reacted, in some cases resulting in decisive initiatives and leading certain countries to adopt new political attitudes towards South Africa.

191. In keeping with that international condemnation, the United Nations Council for Namibia has also, as the Administering Authority for the Territory, expressed its vigilant concern and appealed to the Security Council firmly to oppose the new South African manoeuvres in Namibia.

192. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people, which accords with the original historic legitimacy of their Movement, met at New Delhi in April of this year unanimously to condemn South Africa's new manoeuvres and to call for the implementation of the plan for Namibia's accession to independence endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). They also called on the Security Council to take every appropriate measure under the Charter of the United Nations, including those provided for in Chapter VII, to ensure the implementation of that resolution. The new situation created by South Africa lends urgency to those calls for appropriate, effective action. A new *fait accompli* is being prepared, one that would seriously—perhaps irreversibly—damage the standing of the Organization and the Security Council, and the very authority of its decisions. To tolerate such a manoeuvre would be to agree to legitimize the extension of the geographical area of racist domination and would mean permitting an indefinite continuation of the exploitation and oppression of the Namibian people, as well as the establishment of a new base for aggression against South Africa's neighbours. To accommodate to such a situation would be to sanction the triumph of the policy of violating international law and the universal conscience, a policy that is openly aggressive, executed with impunity and adopted with arrogance.

193. That is the meaning of the challenge that the international community faces today, one that must be met with energetic measures, so that powerlessness when confronted with a *fait accompli* does not become the natural tendency generally or, above all, in the Security Council, on which it is incumbent finally to ensure the implementation of its own decisions.

194. A new conspiracy is being prepared against the Namibian people, who appeal to each and every one of us in our respective commitment to the independence of peoples but, above all, to all of us jointly, in our solidarity against colonial oppression and racial discrimination.

195. The year 1985 is one of several anniversaries: the fortieth anniversary of the Organization, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the struggle of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

196. The happy coincidence of those three anniversaries thus commemorates the united affirmation of the legitimacy of the cause of national liberation, the relevance of a historic Declaration and the primary responsibility of the United Nations to promote the emancipation of peoples. Therefore, one cannot conceive of a better way to celebrate those three anniversaries than by reviving, with renewed determination, the commitment of the Organization to ensure the accession to independence of the Namibian people.

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

198. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): Allow me on behalf of the South African delegation, Mr. President, to convey to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency.

199. It would be unrealistic to consider the question of South West Africa outside the regional context to which it inextricably belongs. Developments in neighbouring countries will inevitably have an effect on South West Africa, just as developments in South West Africa will have an important influence on the course of events in southern Africa as a whole.

200. Furthermore, South Africa is an integral part of the southern African region. Whether one likes it or not, this is a fact. We have clear-cut regional interests, and, together with other States, insist that countries in the region should abide by certain ground rules.

201. First, no State should make its territory available to individuals or organizations that wish to promote or prepare for violence against other States in the region. The fact is that all the countries of southern Africa have disaffected groups and dissident movements. If this ground rule is not accepted, there is no limit to the potential escalation of cross-border violence in the sub-continent.

202. Secondly, no foreign forces should be permitted to intervene in the region. The intervention of foreign forces in any country in southern Africa is a potential threat to the security and sovereignty of all of the countries of the region. This is particularly so when such forces are acting on behalf of an expansionist super-Power. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country has repeatedly appealed

to the leaders of southern Africa to consider this threat very seriously, regardless of the rhetorical positions which they may adopt in this forum. Let them consider the fate of other countries which invited the Soviet Union or its allies to come to their assistance or that were unfortunate enough to be liberated by them. Let them consider the fate of the peoples of Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, South Viet Nam and Cambodia. Let them think very carefully about what is happening at this very moment to the people of Afghanistan. The lesson is clear: once a country allows the Soviet Union and its surrogates to establish a strong presence within its borders, it is very difficult indeed to get rid of them.

203. Thirdly, South Africa believes that the problems of conflict in our region should be solved by peaceful means rather than by violence.

204. Fourthly, we believe that the problems of southern Africa should be solved on a regional basis. We have our differences, but we must resolve those differences ourselves. As President Botha said at the time of the signing of the Nkomati Accord [S/16451, annex I], States with different socio-economic and political systems can live together in peace and harmony and work together in the pursuit of common interests. Each country has the right to order its affairs as it deems fit, and inter-State relations, particularly between neighbours, should not be disturbed by differing internal policies. This is only sensible and practical, as it affords recognition to the fact that each country has its own set of circumstances for which it must seek its own solutions in the interests of its citizens. President Botha also pointed out that uncomfortable facts should not be swept under the carpet and that divergent outlooks should not be allowed to distract Governments from carrying out their duty to accord their first priority to the welfare and prosperity of their peoples. Only on this basis can we all, as Africans, give our subcontinent a chance to grow and to develop.

205. It is significant that participants in this debate this afternoon should have referred to developments in Angola in conjunction with the question of South West Africa. Although my Government does not agree with the statements which were made in this regard, the debate underlines the fact that the problems of Angola and South West Africa are inextricably linked. They are linked in the following respect: in the first, place, the peoples of Angola and South West Africa both wish, above all else, to exercise their right to self-determination. They are linked, secondly, because the presence in Angola of a large number of surrogate troops of a super-Power represented in the Council has made it impossible for the people of Angola and the people of South West Africa to determine their own future free from intimidation. Thirdly, they are linked because in both cases political objectives are pursued by violence rather than by peaceful means and national reconciliation.

206. Where does the Republic of South Africa stand with regard to these issues? First, South Africa supports the right of the peoples of both countries to self-determination

and independence; secondly, South Africa insists on the withdrawal of foreign forces from the region; and, thirdly, it believes that the problems of both countries should be solved by peaceful means, through national reconciliation rather than through violence.

207. The conflict in Angola has its origins in the violation of the Alvor agreements of 1975. It will be recalled that, under the terms of those agreements, Portugal recognized three movements, the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA), the MPLA [*People's Liberation Movement of Angola*] and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). These movements, together with Portugal, were to have formed a transitional Government which would have held nationwide elections for a constituent assembly before the end of October 1975. Such elections were never held, because the MPLA imported foreign troops to impose its rule over the country. This is a fact. There have never been free elections in Angola, and, despite the fact that the Alvor agreements were widely endorsed by the international community, hardly anyone protested at the fact that the MPLA régime disregarded the agreements and seized power for itself. What became of the strong support for the FNLA and for UNITA which existed in January 1976, when half the countries members of the OAU had steadfastly refused to recognize the MPLA? What became of the call of a large number of OAU members for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Angola? The fact of the matter is that the right of the Angolan people to self-determination has been brushed aside. It would seem that the United Nations is concerned about self-determination, human rights and responsible Government only on the southern side of the Cunene River.

208. South Africa, on the other hand, accepts the right of the peoples of both South West Africa and Angola to self-determination. It has, however, insisted that when the people of South West Africa decide on their future they should do so in circumstances of fairness, peace and security. In 1978, a nationwide election was held in South West Africa in which 78 per cent of the electorate participated. That election was observed by over 300 journalists and international experts and was judged to be as free and fair as elections anywhere in the world. But the Security Council rejected the outcome of that election.

209. Again, in 1980, second-tier elections were held for most of the communities in South West Africa, and once again there was a very large voter turn-out; once again, the United Nations rejected the step to give the people of the Territory a say in the management of their affairs. When responsibility for important aspects of the administration of South West Africa was transferred to elected leaders in the Territory in 1980, the Council rejected the step, even though the new administration was unquestionably democratic and carried out important reforms.

210. Now, when South Africa, as an interim mechanism, is once again transferring important powers for the internal administration of South West Africa into the hands of South West Africa's leaders, members of the Council are once again displeased. Apparently they prefer that total

power should reside in the hands of one man, the South African Administrator-General, even though they have repeatedly called upon South Africa to withdraw its presence and its administration from the Territory.

211. The Angolan people, who are now classified by the Council and by the international community as having been "liberated", desperately desire the same opportunity of expressing their political wishes as the people of South West Africa have enjoyed. They would very much have liked to have been able to participate in free elections of any kind. They would have appreciated the opportunity of being able to administer their own affairs and bring about the reforms which they regard as necessary in their country. However, this opportunity has been denied to them by the MPLA régime, by the Cuban interventionists and by their Soviet masters. Can anyone in the Council seriously maintain that the people of Angola under the MPLA régime enjoy civil and political freedoms?

212. My Government's position with regard to the proposed transitional administration in South West Africa is well known. It was set out by President Botha in a speech which he delivered to the South African Parliament on 18 April of this year [*S/17152, appendix 2*]. Let me repeat some of its salient points.

213. President Botha emphasized that, for as long as there is a possibility that the present international negotiations held any prospect of bringing about the genuine withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, the South African Government would not act in a manner irreconcilable with the international settlement plan. The proposed arrangement in South West Africa/Namibia should accordingly be seen as an interim mechanism for the internal administration of the Territory, pending agreement on internationally acceptable independence for South West Africa.

214. However, the people of South West Africa/Namibia, including SWAPO, cannot wait indefinitely for a breakthrough on the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola. Should it eventually become evident after all avenues have been thoroughly explored that there is no realistic prospect of attaining this goal, the parties most intimately affected by the present negotiations will obviously have to reconsider how internationally acceptable independence may best be attained in the light of prevailing circumstances.

215. In the meantime, South Africa will continue to work for an internationally acceptable independence for South West Africa. It will continue to search for a reasonable formula for genuine Cuban withdrawal from Angola. If a firm agreement can be reached in this regard, it will carry out its undertaking to implement the international settlement plan. South Africa will continue to strive for stability and peace in the region by encouraging all the parties, including SWAPO and Angola, to resolve their differences around a conference table instead of by violence. It will continue to encourage dialogue between all the South West African parties in the hope that they will find a basis for still broader consensus in respect of the future of the Territory. South Africa will continue to insist

that all the South West African parties be treated equally and impartially. And if the United Nations wishes to play a role in the future of South West Africa/Namibia, it will consequently have to demonstrate that it will be able to carry out its functions impartially.

216. I should like to know with what aspects of this programme the Council disagrees. Does it favour the retention of the surrogate forces of an expansionist super-Power in Africa? Is it opposed to the peaceful settlement of disputes? Is it not prepared to accept that there should be dialogue between the parties of South West Africa on the future of their country? Does it not believe that the parties of South West Africa are entitled to equal treatment in terms of the United Nations settlement plan? Or do they share Mr. Nujoma's view, stated earlier at this meeting, that they are international criminals? If Council members disagree with these propositions, then let them say so, so that we may all know where we stand.

217. As I have already emphasized, South Africa has consistently supported the withdrawal of foreign forces from the region. And by accepting the international settlement plan, South Africa has already agreed to the reduction and the ultimate withdrawal of its own forces from South West Africa. It strongly supports the wish that was expressed by many members of the OAU in 1976 for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Angola. South Africa is prepared to enter into an international agreement in terms of which all foreign forces, regardless of their origin, would be withdrawn from Angola.

218. Lastly, South Africa's position on the peaceful resolution of disputes is equally clear. We have consistently urged all parties in southern Africa to resolve their differences by peaceful means. Last year, *inter alia* through the good offices of the Secretary-General, we tried to engage SWAPO in a process which would lead to the cessation of hostilities in South West Africa. We made it clear to them that they could return to South West Africa to pursue their political objectives by peaceful means. However, they rejected those offers and decided instead to intensify their so-called armed struggle. Within South Africa itself, we have stated that we are prepared to enter into dialogue with any party or individual who rejects violence.

219. Speakers this afternoon have referred in passing to recent events in South Africa and, without conceding the right of the United Nations to interfere in South Africa's domestic affairs, I should like briefly to comment on current developments in South Africa.

220. The actions of the South African Government have proved its commitment to reform. Coloureds and Indians are now exercising authentic power in Parliament and in the Cabinet. South Africa has proposed the establishment of an open-ended, non-statutory forum to negotiate with black leaders over the political future. It is establishing second-tier authorities in which all population groups and communities will co-operate on bread-and-butter issues affecting the daily lives of the peoples of South Africa. Trade union rights are now enjoyed by all workers; sport is played on a completely open basis; central business dis-

tricts, and more and more public amenities, hotels and restaurants are open to all; and all South Africans will soon be able to marry whomever they like and to belong to the political organization of their choice.

221. However, as we make progress with the resolution of our problems, so our opponents become more vitriolic in their rejection of peaceful change. As we create new and authentic channels for all the peoples of South Africa to deliberate together on the problems which confront us, so they propagate violence and kill, maim and intimidate the genuine representatives of the vast moderate majority of black South Africans.

222. This reaction proves that our critics are not interested in rational debate and equitable reform. On the contrary, they will ultimately be satisfied only when they have utterly destroyed everything that has been created in South Africa and have replaced it with their own totalitarian alternative. Western States might not agree with this analysis, but I suspect that they would limply accept such an outcome in southern Africa, just as they have done in other parts of the world, shrugging their shoulders in dismay and saying how much they regret this tragic outcome.

223. The time has come for Western countries in the United Nations to take a stand for the promotion of the democratic values which they profess to espouse. We challenge them to commission some impartial and reputable organization such as Freedom House to carry out an objective and comparative study of the state of human, political, economic and civil rights in all the countries of the world. Such a study should judge whether Governments are attempting to increase possibilities for participation in the political process or to restrict such developments. It should also provide an analysis of the constitutions, the record, the associations and actions of movements such as SWAPO and the ANC. South Africa would be prepared to co-operate fully with any such study.

224. In Angola, we have also urged a peaceful resolution to the current conflict between the MPLA and UNITA through a process of national reconciliation. Although we accept that this is a question which the people of Angola themselves must resolve, we are deeply concerned about the ongoing civil war in Angola, not only because of the suffering which it has caused to the people of Angola but also because of the instability which it has created in our region. This instability has presented opportunities for the Soviets and the Cubans to exploit the suffering of Angola for their own advantage.

225. South Africa has also sought a peaceful resolution of its dispute with Angola. In a number of ministerial meetings last year, it sought to persuade the MPLA régime to accept the advantages of peace. It entered into the Lusaka agreement with the MPLA in good faith and carried out all of its obligations in terms of that agreement. Under the agreement, the Angolan Government undertook to exclude SWAPO elements from the territory from which South Africa had withdrawn. In the same manner, South Africa expressed its grave concern to the Angolan Govern-

ment over the activities of large numbers of ANC terrorists in various parts of Angola.

226. The South African Government repeatedly urged the Angolan Government to remove these terrorists from its Territory and to cease assisting them with training and equipment and by making its Territory available to them for the furtherance of their violent activities. On 21 May 1984, the South African Government proposed that both South Africa and Angola should issue a joint declaration that they would not allow any person or organization to be trained or accommodated on their sovereign Territory to operate against one another or to practise violence against one another. Thus far the MPLA Government has failed to respond to these representations.

227. The ANC elements in Angola cannot simply be characterized as harmless refugees. On the contrary, they pose a direct threat to the people of South Africa and southern Africa. South Africa has disconcerting evidence that northern Angola is now the main base area for the training of ANC terrorists, who are then despatched via other countries to South Africa. In addition, it is clear that SWAPO is still being allowed to launch terrorist attacks from Angolan territory against the people of South West Africa/Namibia.

228. It is an established principle of international law that a State may not permit or encourage on its territory activities for the purpose of carrying out acts of violence on the territory of another State. It is equally well established that a State has a right to take appropriate steps to protect its own security and territorial integrity against such acts.

229. That is why the South African Government has repeatedly urged the Angolan Government not to permit such activities in its Territory and why the South African Government has no alternative but to take whatever action it deems appropriate for the protection of the peoples of South Africa from such acts of violence.

230. In the circumstances, the South African security forces have felt it necessary to gather intelligence on the activities of the ANC and SWAPO terrorists in Angola and to consider appropriate counter-actions.

231. In the course of such an operation, a small team of South Africans recently clashed with Angolan military elements. Their objective was to reconnoitre a suspected ANC camp close to the well-guarded Malongo oil installations near the town of Cabinda. Two South Africans were killed and one was captured. The South African Government immediately informed the MPLA régime of its willingness to discuss the incident.

232. There should, however, be no doubt about the root cause of what happened in Cabinda. It was the Angolan Government's blatant disregard of international law in allowing and encouraging the ANC to train and to prepare for acts of violence against South Africa. The Angolan Government is, however, not the only culprit. The United Nations and many members of the Security Council must

share the responsibility for having actively encouraged and supported the terrorist activities of the ANC and SWAPO.

233. The international community and the Council should be in no doubt as to what South Africa's position is in this regard: it will not tolerate such activities. Although it is committed to resolving its differences with its neighbours by peaceful means, South Africa will not hesitate to take whatever action may be appropriate for the defence of its own people and for the elimination of terrorist elements who are intent on sowing death and destruction in our country and in our region. We will not allow ourselves to be attacked with impunity. We shall take whatever steps are appropriate to defend ourselves.

234. Nevertheless, South Africa is convinced that the problems of our region cannot and will not be solved by violence.

235. Despite the heated rhetoric, despite the incidents which flare up from time to time, there is a new understanding throughout the sub-continent of the common interests which we share. There is a new awareness of the dangers of cross-border violence, of the importance of reconciliation, of the threat of foreign intervention and of the benefits which regional co-operation can bring. The ground rules of coexistence are slowly but surely gaining acceptance. It is within this context that we are confident that the people of South West Africa will before too long be able to move forward to internationally recognized independence.

236. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Mr. Ibrahim Agbolla Gambia. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

237. Mr. GAMBARI (Nigeria): May I extend to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of office as President for this month. It is a month in which the determination of the United Nations to fulfil a solemn promise to the Namibian people is going to be tested. Your task, therefore, as President of the Council, will not be an easy one. However, I am confident that you possess the experience, the skill and the wisdom to guide the Council's deliberations to a conclusion which will enhance its prestige and effectiveness.

238. It is almost two years since the Council last met to consider the question of Namibia. The decision of the Council at that time was that the main outstanding issue in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) was the determination of the electoral system to be used for the election of the constituent assembly. The Council, therefore, called upon South Africa to communicate to the Secretary-General forthwith its choice of the electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan approved in resolution 435 (1978).

239. That was in October 1983. South Africa has since not communicated its choice of the electoral system to the Secretary-General. It has not permitted any advance to be

made in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Rather, Namibian independence has been stalled and the Security Council has not met on this question. In the interval, initiatives have been taken and negotiations conducted on Namibia which almost give the impression that the United Nations has become irrelevant in the matter. It is as though the independence of Namibia were no longer a subject of decolonization but a pawn in the ideological chess game invented by South Africa to draw a super-Power to its side.

240. It became convenient to sidetrack the timetable carefully negotiated by the Council for Namibian independence and in its place to substitute a scheme designed to install a puppet régime in that country. Namibia is being held ransom for the achievement of an unacceptable "pax South Africana", which will reduce neighbouring States to no more than client States of the South African *apartheid* régime.

241. No amount of subterfuge can disguise the fact that Namibia is a classic case of decolonization. It falls squarely within the competence of the United Nations and will remain so until the Organization discharges fully its responsibilities and the people of Namibia attain genuine self-determination, as envisaged in resolution 435 (1978).

242. Namibia is not the first colonized Territory to have neighbouring States. Its fate should not be dictated by the bilateral relations of its neighbours. Nigeria has viewed with great disquiet the evolution of events in the past two years on the question of Namibia.

243. Like other members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Nigeria has been amazed at the latitude given South Africa to continue to determine the fate of a Territory over which it ceased to have legal responsibility almost 19 years ago. The non-aligned countries which requested this meeting of the Security Council should be congratulated for putting a stop to a procedure that has been clearly shown to be in the interests neither of Namibia nor of the United Nations, but is calculated to serve the selfish interests of South Africa and those outsiders who wish to continue to exploit the resources of Namibia.

244. By this meeting of the Council the international community in general, and the Namibian people in particular, are being reassured that the Namibian question still belongs to the United Nations and that the Organization owes a primary responsibility to the Namibian people for the finding of a speedy and just solution to their plight.

245. It is for these reasons that my country attaches particular importance to this meeting. I wish therefore to express my gratitude to the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries for the decision taken at its Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting which was held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April to request an urgent meeting of the Security Council.

246. Nineteen years ago, on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly, through resolution 2145 (XII), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct

responsibility for the Territory. Since then, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions and decisions all aimed at finding a peaceful, just and acceptable solution to the Namibian question. The landmark of these efforts was the adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978), which approved a plan for the independence of Namibia.

247. Resolution 435 (1978) was arrived at after lengthy and protracted negotiations during which SWAPO was prevailed upon to make numerous concessions—concessions which were never reciprocated by the racist régime of Pretoria. All this was in the hope that in the end a solution would be found.

248. It is almost eight years since resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, but the Namibian people are today no closer to independence than they were prior to 1978. The problem is not with the plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978), for it provides adequate safeguards to take care of the interests of all Namibians. Rather, the problem is that that resolution is not being given a chance through faithful implementation.

249. What is needed therefore is not a new plan, nor bilateral negotiations brokered by outside powers, but the will of the international community, and particularly of the United States, to prevail on South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in ensuring the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without any further delay.

250. The record of South Africa on Namibia's independence is replete with deceit and bad faith. The racists have just spoken before the Council, and their evasions, their diversions and their lies have multiplied. Racist South Africa has always been determined to settle the Namibian question on its own terms and outside the framework of the United Nations. In order to circumvent the call for its withdrawal it set up the sham Turnhalle Conference to create the impression of the commencement of democratic process in Namibia. When that failed, and resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, South Africa raised the issue of the impartiality of the United Nations as an obstacle to its acceptance of the framework.

251. While agreeing to attend the pre-implementation Conference at Geneva in 1981, it made sure that it sabotaged the Conference. So, also, has it sabotaged the efforts of the Western contact group of five, whose members cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered by Pretoria to be hostile to South Africa. Even the members of the contact group had to admit that they were dealing with an unreliable interlocuter which did not negotiate in good faith but shifted its grounds each time a preoccupation was satisfied.

252. It is significant that, of the Western contact group of five, only one, the United States, has persisted in negotiations with South Africa on Namibia. The other four countries have seen what many other countries, including my own, saw much earlier, and that is that South Africa will not willingly give up Namibia. Thus the non-aligned countries which called for this meeting of the Council are not

alone in drawing the conclusion that South Africa has merely been dreaming up one excuse after another to deny independence to Namibia. Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and even the United Kingdom came to the same conclusion when they quietly discontinued the activities of the contact group.

253. The United States unfortunately creates the impression that South Africa is right in defying the international community, and indeed the Security Council, in ignoring the demand for the unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The United States stands alone in having faith in the Pretoria group.

254. Yet two years of the most intense and wide-ranging negotiations between the American and South Africa have not yielded any results that point in the direction of resolving the dilemma created by South Africa over Namibia. In other words, South Africa has not made the efforts of the United States appear worthwhile, at least in the eyes of the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the United Nations, or even the close allies of the United States. If any further proof of South Africa's traditional bad faith is required, the recent action by the racist régime in Cabinda provides it. Rather than negotiating faithfully with Angola, the racist régime continues to intimidate and destabilize Angola and its other neighbours.

255. The introduction of the extraneous and irrelevant issue of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola into the Namibian independence debate has been vehemently rejected and condemned. Nigeria has on several occasions made its position very clear: Nigeria unreservedly rejects the linkage and believes that any negotiations predicated on it are totally unacceptable and futile. Here again my Government is greatly disappointed that South Africa has been able to count on the support of the United States in imposing this condition.

256. The independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that bear no relationship to the Territory. Let those who have ideological scores to settle choose other venues. In the meantime, let us be careful lest South Africa accomplish its diabolical plan through a carefully conceived method of playing the ideological delaying game.

257. Another disturbing aspect of the South African plan was vividly revealed when South Africa announced the establishment in Namibia of a so-called interim government. On 20 April, the Federal Government of Nigeria issued a statement which read in part:

"It should be clear now to the international community that South Africa is resolved to settle the Namibian question on its own terms, and outside the framework of the United Nations. In this connection, it has proceeded to circumvent the United Nations plan by promoting an internal settlement as part of its nefarious attempt to impose a settlement that leaves the people of Namibia in perpetual bondage. It is not a surprise, therefore, that it has decided to set up a puppet interim

government in Namibia in its continuing efforts to forestall an internationally acceptable agreement for the independence of Namibia and to prepare the ground for a settlement that would deny SWAPO, the authentic representative of the people, the chance of coming to power in a future government based on elections supervised by the United Nations.

"The Federal Government of Nigeria reaffirms its total commitment to the settlement of Namibia's independence under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It therefore urges the Security Council to assume its full responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations and expedite Namibia's independence."

258. Nigeria, and, indeed, most members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have come to the Council with a simple request. The Council should assume full responsibility for the unconditional implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) without any further delay. In this respect the Council should reiterate in no uncertain terms its total rejection of any linkage between Namibia's independence and any other issues extraneous to resolution 435 (1978).

259. In its statement of 3 May [S/17151], the Council most appropriately condemned and rejected any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978). The Council must now proceed to make it unmistakably clear that South Africa's persistence in installing a puppet régime in Windhoek, which it intends to do this month, will be considered to be a threat to international peace and security and a great affront to the Council, which will call for appropriate sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

260. The Council cannot continue to spare the rod and spoil South Africa. The recalcitrant child which South Africa has proved to be deserves to be chastised with the full weight of the Council's authority. My Government stands ready to assist the Council fully in enforcing any sanctions the Council may impose. In the meantime, the Federal Government of Nigeria will continue to assist SWAPO to intensify its armed struggle against the forces of oppression, until total liberation of its fatherland from illegal occupation by a racist, brutal colonial régime.

261. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Liberia, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for the month of June. I invite him to make his statement.

262. Mr. KOFA (Liberia): It is with great pleasure, Sir, that the delegation of Liberia congratulates you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. Your competence and personal qualities as a diplomat experienced in international affairs, as well as your talents as a seasoned negotiator, convince us that the current debate of the Council under your able guidance will produce satisfactory results.

263. I should like also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the excellent manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the month of May.

264. I thank you and the other members of the Council most sincerely for the honour the Council has bestowed on my delegation by acceding to its request to participate in this debate in its capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for this month. Liberia is gratified to be afforded this opportunity at a time when the Council is again considering the question of Namibia, with which Liberia has a profound sense of identity dating back more than 20 years, to when Liberia and Ethiopia, on behalf of the African States, instituted proceedings against South Africa in the International Court of Justice to secure the freedom and independence of that Territory.

265. After a gap of two years, the Security Council is once more called upon to consider the burning question of Namibia, which in many ways has become the responsibility of the United Nations. Nearly 19 years have passed since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and established the United Nations Council for Namibia, with direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory. Fourteen years have passed since the International Court of Justice pronounced itself on the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia.¹ Also, seven years have elapsed since a tenable plan for the independence of the Territory, as approved in resolution 435 (1978), was adopted by the Security Council with the concurrence of all the parties, including South Africa.

266. While the unrelenting efforts of the Council to promote the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people deserve high commendation, Africa remains gravely concerned about developments affecting the future of the Territory. Our concerns emanate from the sinister attempt by South Africa to install a puppet government in the Territory by 17 June 1985, in violation of resolution 435 (1978). The continued military build-up, including the recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies and the use by the racist régime of South Africa of mercenaries to suppress and exploit the Namibian people, are obstacles to the peaceful settlement of the conflict. We also note with concern that the Council has always been prevented from taking effective measures against South Africa in fulfilment of its responsibilities under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations because of the vetoes cast by one or more of its permanent members.

267. We reiterate once more Africa's full support for and recognition of SWAPO as the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people. In the face of South Africa's intransigence and unprovoked aggression against the people of Namibia, SWAPO has shown commendable restraint and statesmanship by making concessions to Pretoria that have gone even beyond acceptable limits. In saluting its leadership we are widening the frontiers of peace and freedom which the people of the world cherish so dearly. We congratulate also the leaders of the front-line States on the courage and fortitude they have

shown and the invaluable support they have extended to the cause of Namibia.

268. Forty years ago, South Africa helped draft the Charter which commits all Member States to upholding the principles of self-determination and equal rights for all peoples. Yet today that same South Africa remains the hard core of resistance to the applicability of those principles in respect of Namibia. We recall that on 27 July 1978 Mr. R. F. Botha, Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa, declared in the Council: "South-West Africa will be independent. The people of the Territory demand it; it is their will and their inalienable right." [2082nd meeting, para. 252]. To further nourish the illusions of those who believed him, he announced that Pretoria had "accepted the proposal in its final and definitive form" [*ibid.*, para. 265].

269. Despite these pronouncements, South Africa continues to occupy the territory and to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States and to endanger the peace, security and development of the region of southern Africa.

270. What is at stake here is not only the dignity of the humiliated people of Namibia, whose right to self-determination and independence has been denied; it is also the dignity and prestige of the Security Council, whose primary function, to safeguard international peace and security, is being called in question. South Africa must be made to realize that it cannot disregard with impunity world opinion and the dynamic developments and progress taking place in Africa. Its obstinate refusal to implement resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to the question of Namibia has been possible only because it enjoys the blessings and support of certain Western members of the Council. The co-operation of such countries with the racist régime extends to the military, economic and nuclear domains, thus making them accomplices in the crime of *apartheid* and in the continuing occupation of Namibia.

271. The problem of Namibia, which in essence is a colonial issue, must be settled free from the influence of the East-West confrontation. Therefore we reject all attempts to link the independence of the Territory to any extraneous issues that might alter its fundamental nature. Accordingly, resolution 435 (1978) must be implemented without modifications or preconditions and must be applied with the realism the situation demands. That is why we fully share the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report submitted to the Council in 1983 when it was seized of this question. He stated:

"It is evident that the delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) is having a destructive impact not only on Namibia itself but also on the prospect of a peaceful and prosperous future for the region as a whole. The delay also has an adverse effect on international relations in a wider sphere, adding to the prevailing sense of frustration and mistrust, with all that that implies for peace and security in the region." [S/15776, para. 16.]

272. It is important for us to abandon the persistent position of retreat in the face of Pretoria's intransigence. The administration of Namibia does not belong to South Africa; it is the responsibility of the United Nations, which should carry out this monumental task to restore its own reputation. It has become abundantly clear, in the light of recent developments, that only through the attainment of full independence by Namibians can progress be made in the re-establishment of general stability in southern Africa, and only with the emergence of a united, sovereign and independent Namibia can the prolonged sufferings and sacrifices of the people come to an end. This would be possible if the Council could take actions to define the system for the election of a constituent assembly to be held under United Nations supervision and control and to establish the United Nations Transition Assistance Group force. The Secretary-General should be provided with all the necessary powers to finalize the consideration of the electoral process.

273. We believe that it is the duty of the international community to exert every effort to ensure the achievement of this goal in the shortest possible time. We are confident that the Council will consider ways and means to set in final motion the process of independence for Namibia. In this regard, we commend the Secretary-General for his valuable and untiring efforts on behalf of the people of Namibia. He continues to be a symbol of the aspirations and hopes of the international community in general and of the countries of the third world in particular for the high degree of dedication and seriousness with which he discharges his responsibilities with respect to Namibia.

274. When the struggle of the United Nations for the reacquisition of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Namibia is recorded for posterity, it should be said that the conclusion of the present debate in

the Council was the final chapter of the long and grievous human tragedy, followed by independence. Africa stands ready to associate itself with any positive and effective actions that might hasten this process and dispel the unfortunate impression that the whole history of the Territory has been that of a mission betrayed. We are all witnesses to the fact that the people of Namibia are suffering from domination, racial discrimination and repression at the hands of the racist authorities in South Africa. Their resentment, frustration and anger have reached the end of human endurance, not only in Africa but throughout the world where freedom is considered a non-negotiable goal. In the present circumstances, we implore the Security Council to take appropriate measures to implement its resolution 435 (1978), approving the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, so that a free and independent Namibia may emerge. That is our demand as representatives of peoples guided by the ideals of freedom, justice, peace and progress. Additionally, the Council should consider the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter as a necessary pressure to ensure that country's compliance with its decisions. It is hoped that the conclusions that are reached at this series of meetings of the Council will mark a new and decisive stage in the already overdue process of Namibian independence.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24 (A/35/24)* vol. I, annex II.

³ A/40/87, resolution on Namibia (AHG/Res.125 (XX)).