



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2624
13 November 1985

ENGLISH

IN LIBRA

NOV 15 1985

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 13 November 1985, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. WOOLCOTT	(Australia)
<u>Members:</u>	Burkina Faso	Mr. BASSOLE
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Denmark	Mr. BIERRING
	Egypt	Mr. KHALIL
	France	Mr. de KEMOULARIA
	India	Mr. NARAYANAN
	Madagascar	Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA
	Peru	Mr. ALZAMORA
	Thailand	Mr. KASEMSRI
	Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. ALLEYNE
	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. OUDOVENKO
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. TROYANOVSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John THOMSON
	United States of America	Mr. OKUN

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME TO THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF INDIA

The PRESIDENT: I should like at the outset of the meeting to acknowledge the presence at the Council table of the Minister of State for External Affairs of India, His Excellency Mr. K. R. Narayanan. On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to him.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council in November, I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to General Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of October. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Walters for the diplomatic skill, tact and courtesy with which he conducted the business of the Council last month. I should be grateful if the representative of the United States would inform General Walters of my remarks.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

- (a) LETTER DATED 11 NOVEMBER 1985 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17618)
- (b) LETTER DATED 11 NOVEMBER 1985 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MAURITIUS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/17619)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cameroon, Canada, the German Democratic Republic, Mauritius, Senegal, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's 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 Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Seereekissoon (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 13 November 1985 from the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

"I have the honour to request that the United Nations Council for Namibia be invited to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item

(The President)

entitled 'The situation in Namibia'. The United Nations Council for Namibia will be represented by its delegation consisting of the Acting President and Vice-Presidents."

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 Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the rest of the delegation of the Council.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 11 November 1985 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, which reads as follows:

"On behalf of the Special Committee, I have the honour to request, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to be invited to participate in the Council's consideration of 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 on the Situation with

(The President)

Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I wish also to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 12 November 1985 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. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/17624.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Toivo ja Toivo in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Council is meeting today in response to the requests contained in letters addressed to the President of the Security Council on 11 November 1985 by the Permanent Representative of India (S/17618) and the Permanent Representative of Mauritius (S/17619). I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council

(The President)

to document S/17627, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 November 1985 from the Permanent Representative of South Africa addressed to the Secretary-General.

The first speaker on my list is the Minister of State for External Affairs of India.

Mr. NARAYANAN (India): I consider it a great privilege to be present in this historic Chamber and to participate in the proceedings of this body. For us it is a matter of particular gratification that you, Sir, are presiding over the Council during this crucial month. India and Australia are bound together by bonds of friendship and co-operation. It was only recently that the Prime Ministers of our two countries, working closely together at Nassau with other Heads of Government of the Commonwealth of Nations, presented to the world the Commonwealth Accord on Southern Africa, a document which is of direct relevance to the question now being discussed in the Council. I am sure that your direction will stand us in good stead. In you, Australia has a representative of great distinction and experience to be at the helm of our affairs this month.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, who conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of October with distinction, objectivity and good humour.

We are once again seized of the question of Namibia - a question which was first brought to the United Nations in 1946, on the initiative of India, as the question of South West Africa. Since then the General Assembly has terminated, in 1966, South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa and established, in 1967, the United Nations Council for South West Africa, now the United Nations Council for Namibia, making Namibia's independence the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

solemn resolution after solemn resolution was adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council providing for free and fair elections in Namibia, the withdrawal of South African control and the emergence of the Territory as a free and independent nation. During the past forty years the tide of decolonization swept across Asia and Africa, giving rise to new independent nations, extending dramatically the frontiers of freedom and equality and transforming the political complexion of the world. But Namibia remained and still remains a subject nation under the iron heel of South Africa, an exploited colony, an occupied and militarized Territory and a victim of arrogant racism. Namibia today is the last refuge of colonialism, and the problem of Namibia is simply and strictly one of decolonization. But attempts have been made to divert the attention of the world from this naked fact of colonialism by superimposing on it artificially an aspect of East-West conflict.

Successive delegations from India have spoken in this forum time without number, raising their voices against the colonial domination of Namibia by South Africa. The position of India and that of the Non-Aligned Movement on this question is well known. It was only five months ago that we had occasion to participate in the Council's debate on the subject, when my predecessor presented to the Council the resolutions of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of Non-Aligned Countries on Namibia held in New Delhi in April 1985. The Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement met subsequently in Luanda from 4 to 8 September 1985. They condemned the racist régime of South Africa for the installation in Namibia of a so-called interim Government in violation of resolution 435 (1978) of the United Nations Security Council. They further gave their full support to Security Council resolution 566 (1985), which declared that action of the South African Government to be illegal and null and void. The Luanda

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

meeting called upon the Security Council to meet again on the subject and decided to renew the call for the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Also at Luanda, the Non-Aligned Movement called for the convening of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1986 and also for an international conference on Namibia.

It is now seven years since this Council adopted resolution 435 (1978). Together with resolution 385 (1976), it adumbrated a plan for the independence of Namibia. It was a plan negotiated by those who enjoyed the confidence of South Africa and one which was accepted by all, including South Africa. The South West Africa People's Organization and the front-line States went along with the plan in spite of certain scepticism they had, showing a spirit of flexibility, accommodation and statesmanship in the face of an attitude on the part of South Africa which was intransigent and intolerable.

What the Government of South Africa has done is scornfully to defy the solemn resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, including those it had itself accepted. It has also turned its back on the rising tide of public opinion in the world. The Pretoria régime has actually proceeded to consolidate its illegal presence in Namibia and has intensified the militarization of the Territory, making it a launching pad for aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring independent African States. It has invoked one pretext after another for thwarting implementation of the United Nations plan. First it was the question of United Nations impartiality; then the composition of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group; then the electoral system. and now the linkage between the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and the independence of Namibia. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has foundered on these transparent pretexts and prevarications. The establishment in Namibia of an illegal

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

interim administration in defiance of world opinion has further complicated the situation. The Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report of 6 September 1985, has stated that:

"there has been no progress in my recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)" (S/17442, para. 12)

It is in this context that we have come to this Council again. It is also in pursuance of Security Council resolution 566 (1985), which warned South Africa that if it did not co-operate in the implementation of the resolution the Security Council would be compelled to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, to ensure South Africa's compliance with United Nations resolutions. We in India, along with the Non-Aligned Movement, have long believed that only comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa will make the Government of South Africa pay heed to the resolutions of this Council as well as to the demands of world public opinion. Resolution 566 (1985) of the Council has urged Member States to take appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa. There is a need to enlarge and intensify those measures, making them mandatory. In this respect, I should like to make an appeal to some of the Western countries which have not found it possible to accept the idea of sanctions. Far from hurting the people of South Africa, such sanctions would help them in finding a way out of an intolerable impasse and in avoiding a social, economic and political explosion in South Africa.

Public opinion in the world is becoming increasingly aware of this danger. Of late there has been an upsurge of public outrage in some Western countries against the reckless doings of the Pretoria régime. We have also noted with appreciation

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

the voluntary measures taken by Governments, including many in the Western world, against South Africa. Public figures, parliamentarians, trade unionists, artists, students, professors and growing sections of the press have raised their voices against apartheid and the repressive policy of the South African Government. As a matter of fact, even among some sections of the whites in South Africa a sense of unease has begun to manifest itself against the blind and senseless racial policy being pursued by their Government. Against this background, sanctions could produce effective and early results, enlarging, to use the words of the Declaration of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting issued at Nassau:

"the prospects of an orderly transition to social, economic and political justice in South Africa and peace and stability in the southern African region as a whole".

India was the first country to impose comprehensive voluntary sanctions against South Africa, as far back as 1946. We believe that such sanctions applied by all countries, including those which have the strongest links with South Africa, could bring about a peaceful change in southern Africa, bringing justice and freedom to the immense majority of the people in that unhappy region.

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, stated in the middle 1950s:

"... I think there is nothing more terrible than the infinite tragedy of Africa in the past few hundred years. Everything else pales into insignificance when I think of the infinite tragedy of Africa ever since the days when millions of Africans were carried as galley slaves to America and elsewhere, half of them dying in the galleys ... Even now the tragedy of Africa is greater than that of any other continent, whether it is racial or political".

Most of Africa today is independent and vibrant with new life but in southern Africa "the tragedy of Africa" of which Nehru spoke is still being enacted with callous disregard for human freedom and human rights. The world has a responsibility to put an end to this endless tragedy. The Security Council of the United Nations has a special responsibility particularly with regard to the tragedy of Namibia.

I should here like to pay a tribute to the fearless freedom fighters of Namibia led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. They have struggled so heroically and sacrificed so much under the leadership of Mr. Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, and Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, the Secretary-General of SWAPO, who has only recently come out of jail after eighteen years of imprisonment and who is with us here today. The leaders of SWAPO, despite the immense hardships and sufferings they have undergone and are undergoing, have shown statesmanship and the spirit of accommodation, but naturally they would be satisfied with nothing less than the granting of freedom and the right of self-determination for Namibia. To ensure that this is granted is the direct responsibility of this Council and of the United Nations. I am sure that the Council will fulfil its responsibility.

(Mr. Narayanan, India)

I should like to end with an extract from a message sent recently by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India and Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, SWAPO:

"India and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have stood steadfastly by the Namibian people, led by SWAPO as their sole and authentic representative. We shall remain unflagging in our solidarity and support until the racist colonial occupiers of Namibia are banished from its soil and Namibia finds its rightful place in the comity of free nations".

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister of State for External Affairs of India for his generous words addressed to me and to my country.

The next speaker is the representative of Mauritius on whom I now call to make his statement.

Mr. SEEREEKISSOON (Mauritius): Allow me, Mr. President, to express to you my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We are confident that under your able leadership the deliberations of the Council will be brought to a fruitful conclusion. I also wish to thank your predecessor, Mr. Vernon Walters, who conducted the work of the Council during the month of October with great efficiency and distinction.

Allow me, Mr. President, through you, to salute the presence of the Minister of State for External Affairs of the Republic of India and that of the Secretary-General of the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in our midst today.

I have the honour to address the Council during this debate on the question of Namibia in my capacity as Chairman of the African Group. We wish to thank you for convening this meeting at the request of the Non-Aligned Movement and the African Group of States.

(Mr. Seereekissoon, Mauritius)

This year as we mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization, we are reminded that it will also be nearly 20 years that South Africa's mandate over Namibia was terminated by the United Nations. During those 20 years, while millions of people in former colonies won their freedom, the people of Namibia have continued to groan under the yoke of the worst possible kind of domination, the tyranny of apartheid.

During the period of South African illegal occupation the human rights situation has greatly deteriorated as the racist régime has stepped up repression in its bid to liquidate opposition through intimidation, arrest, torture and even murder of the opponents of apartheid, particularly members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) who have been targeted for those measures. There are constant reports and shocking accounts of units of the notorious South African Special Task Force harassing, intimidating, beating and killing innocent civilians, as well as desecrating churches and other places of worship. Moreover, the South African occupation army in Namibia has imposed compulsory military conscription on all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55, forcing them to serve in the occupying colonial army and to fight against their own Namibian brothers.

South Africa has persisted, in defiance of the United Nations, the opinion of the International Court of Justice, the world community and in gross violation of international law, in refusing to bring to an end its illegal occupation of Namibia. A number of countries have disputed the legal foundation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) adopted on 27 October 1966 terminating South Africa's Namibian mandate. However in an advisory opinion expressed by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on 21 June 1971, at the request of the Security Council, the Court declared that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia, being illegal, South Africa was under the obligation to withdraw its

(Mr. Seereekissoon, Mauritius)

administration from the Territory; that States Members of the United Nations were under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and to refrain from any acts implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to such presence and administration. In its resolution 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971, the Security Council endorsed this opinion.

The termination of the mandate by the General Assembly was not simply an ad hoc political decision, but rather a recognition by the Assembly of a specific legal principle, namely, that a party to a treaty which ignores its provisions can no longer claim any benefits which might flow from the treaty and thus, in fact, renounces the treaty of its own accord. This principle was elaborated upon by the ICJ in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971, wherein it is stated that the General Assembly was simply taking note of the legal fact that South Africa, by its own actions, had disavowed the mandate over Namibia granted to it by the League of Nations.

(Mr. Seereekissoo, Mauritius)

It is regrettable to note that so far South Africa has been able to resist such intense international pressure, thanks largely to the support of certain Western Powers, through their collaboration in the economic and military fields and their use of the veto in the Security Council to block the most forceful proposals for pressure. Yet, over the years a number of opportunities have come up which could lead to a peaceful solution of the Namibian issue. Two Security Council resolutions - 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) - have laid down, first, the general principles of a settlement which was understood at the time to be acceptable to South Africa and, secondly, a specific plan which was also understood to be acceptable to South Africa. However, subsequent events were to prove that the Pretoria racist régime was at the same time proceeding in different directions, which culminated in the holding of illegal and manipulated elections in defiance of Security Council resolution 439 (1978) and in the recent installation of a so-called interim administration. That strategy, characterized as a "two-track strategy," allowed South Africa to appear responsive to international opinion by negotiating for an international settlement while, at the same, ruthlessly pursuing an internal settlement.

The racist minority has come up with a series of excuses to frustrate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It will be recalled that first came the flimsy argument that the military component of the proposed United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) was too large. Next came the objection that, in the United Nations plan, the armed forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) found inside Namibia at the time of the cease-fire would be restricted to bases within the Territory. The Pretoria régime was then presumptuous enough to complain about what it described as the United Nations lack of impartiality. And when finally there were no more issues outstanding with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan except for the choice of

(Mr. Seereekissoon, Mauritius)

electoral system, Pretoria suddenly concocted a new one related to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola - which is a totally extraneous matter and one exclusively within the province of Angolan sovereignty and independence. By its continuous attacks on and occupation of Angolan territory, which occasioned the presence of Cuban troops in the first place, Pretoria ensures that those troops will remain in Angola and provide it with a ready excuse to continue to sabotage the United Nations plan. On this issue we must all be guided by the very clear-cut criteria in resolution 435 (1978), because the dubious situation that arises from the introduction of other considerations into the settlement of the Namibian question destroys the principles the Security Council itself has proclaimed.

The excuses and actions of the racist régime since 1978 clearly demonstrate that it is still not prepared to allow the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination. They also demonstrate the will of South Africa to maintain its abhorrent policy of apartheid in Namibia and to continue the exploitation and plundering of that Territory for its own profit. The Territory of Namibia is also being used by the racist régime as a launching ground for aggression against neighbouring States. The policy of external aggression of the racist régime has been amply demonstrated by a long history of armed attacks, acts of sabotage and military support to rebel troops against the front-line States. The racist régime clearly intends to exert dominance and hegemony over the whole southern African region.

It is now time to deal effectively with that rebellious and intransigent racist régime. More than four years of so-called constructive engagement have led to no progress at all. Instead, Pretoria has increased internal repression and has banned all media from reporting its crimes, which it can now commit in the dark. Attacks against neighbouring countries have not diminished. Namibia is now further from independence following South Africa's internal-settlement measures. Since

(Mr. Seereekissoo, Mauritius)

the carrots of constructive engagement have clearly not worked, they should be withdrawn, and some sticks must now be used.

The application of certain multilateral sanctions has already been considered by this Council, and a few have been implemented. But they are clearly inadequate really to bring about fundamental changes in the internal and regional policies of the racist régime in Pretoria. In some cases the actions taken appear to be too little, too late. In others, in the case of the Nordic countries for example, some measures already implemented or to be implemented go beyond Security Council resolutions or recommendations. There is now increasing pressure in the major Western countries and in the international community for more decisive action. The Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity repeated its long-standing call for mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter at its Addis Ababa meeting last July. The Council of Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, meeting in September at Luanda, also called upon the Security Council to take similar action.

It is now the responsibility and duty of the Council to recommend all those sanctions being contemplated by certain States and to go beyond them. Notwithstanding the fact that certain States may adopt sanctions on their own, the responsibility for bringing South Africa to comply with United Nations decisions rests with this Council.

(Mr. Seereekissoon, Mauritius)

As the report of the Secretary-General of 6 September 1985, document S/17442, indicates, South Africa continues to refuse to co-operate with the United Nations in facilitating the implementation of the United Nations plan. It has still to communicate its choice of the electoral system and maintains its position on the linkage issue. It will be recalled that Security Council resolution 566 (1985) provided for consideration of the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, to put additional pressure on South Africa to comply with its provisions, in particular those contained in operative paragraph 11.

We wish to thank the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts deployed in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. We have complete confidence in his ability to carry out the task mandated to him by the Council.

We wish also to pay tribute to the front-line States which are bearing an enormous burden in their support of the liberation struggle in southern Africa. Given the present critical economic situation among many of them, their sacrifices are even more commendable since they need all their viable resources for development. We should like to salute the brave people of Namibia and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, legitimate representative, and we await the day when they will join the family of free and independent African nations.

Namibia will be free and independent. Which path to liberation is to be followed shall depend on the actions of this Council and its consideration of the appeals of the international community. It is our earnest hope that the right decisions will be made to avert a potential conflagration with its dire consequences for the region and beyond.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mauritius for the kind words he addressed to me.

(The President)

The next speaker is Mr. Andimba Toivo Ja Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, and I now call on him to make his statement.

Mr. TOIVO ja TOIVO: Mr. President, I am most grateful to you for allowing me to speak. I wish to thank also the members of the Security Council for allowing me to address this august body.

I owe a debt of gratitude to the Permanent Representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar, who jointly requested the Council to accord me an opportunity to participate in the present debate on Namibia.

At this juncture, Sir, I wish to join the speakers who preceded me in congratulating you warmly upon your assuming the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of November.

We wish you well in your heavy responsibilities, assured in the knowledge that your well-known diplomatic skill, political wisdom and high sense of moral integrity will enable you to conduct the debate to a successful conclusion.

The Security Council is meeting today following the simultaneous requests by the Permanent Representatives of India and Mauritius, who, acting in their respective capacities as representative of the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and as Chairman of the Group of African States, submitted letters to this effect. This is the first time for me personally to address the Security Council and I appreciate the warm words of welcome addressed to me.

The authority to call for the meeting derives from four important sources: first, Security Council resolution 566 (1985); secondly, the report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/17442 of 6 November 1985; thirdly, the pertinent resolutions on Namibia adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in July 1985 at Addis Ababa,

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo)

Ethiopia; and fourthly, the relevant sections of the Final Declaration of the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, adopted in September 1985 in Luanda, Angola.

In other words, there is an overwhelming demand for consideration of the Namibian problem in its own right as a burning issue. Likewise, there is a passionate and urgent plea for decisive action now.

In June, when the Security Council met to debate the question of Namibia, the President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Comrade Sam Nujoma, made an important statement which, inter alia, urged the Security Council and the international community in these words, and I quote:

"The world outside demands 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 [against the racist Pretoria régime] 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." (S/PV.2583, pp. 77-78)

This is a moment not for mere words but for action. We have come this time before the Security Council expecting that the Council will at last live up to its special responsibility by adopting effective measures designed to speed up the decolonization of Namibia on the basis of resolution 435 (1978).

Forty years ago, when the United Nations was founded, it was already too late for our independence. Twenty-five years ago, when the famous Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted, it was

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo)

already too late. Next year, 1986, will mark the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's mandate over Namibia; it is already too late. More than seven years ago, the Security Council adopted the United Nations Independence Plan for Namibia, contained in resolution 435 (1978); it is already too late, and the delay has, indeed, become intolerable. Once again we say, enough is enough.

The history of the intransigence, prevarication and arrogance demonstrated time and time again by the Pretoria racist régime is well known. Time and again the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, has issued warnings to the racists, but to no avail.

In June 1985, for example, the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985). Paragraph 13 of that resolution

"Strongly warns South Africa that failure to [co-operate fully with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of the present resolution] would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions".

(resolution 566 (1985), para. 13)

What was the response? Did the apartheid régime co-operate fully with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of that resolution? The answer is categorically: No.

The Secretary-General concluded his report dated 6 September 1985 as follows:

"In the circumstances, I must once again report to the Security Council that there has been no progress in my recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". (S/17442, para. 12)

The Pretoria racist régime has held on to a peculiar argument, which takes us around and around in a vicious circle. This argument has three elements: the choice of the electoral system, the fixing of the date for the commencement of the implementation process, and the linkage pre-condition. Pretoria's argument runs as follows: the choice of the electoral system will be made known as soon as the date for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) has been fixed; but the fixing of the date depends upon the solution of the linkage problem. That has been the position for quite a long time now.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo)

I am compelled to express SWAPO's views concerning the letter contained in document S/17627, dated 12 November 1985, addressed to the Secretary-General by the representative of the Pretoria junta.

The cynicism and delaying tactics of the racists have no limit. Just on the eve of this important debate, the Botha régime comes up with yet another subterfuge designed to hijack the debate in an effort to create confusion regarding what is to be done now. It is my sincere hope that the Security Council will not allow itself to be hoodwinked by this futile ploy. The position of the Security Council is clear as regards racist South Africa's puppet political entities in Namibia. In this connection, the texts of resolutions 435 (1978), 439 (1978) and 566 (1985) are specific and categorical in declaring those entities and groupings illegal and null and void. That position must be maintained and even strengthened if need be.

It is not my intention to make a long speech or to dwell too much on Pretoria's well-known gimmicks, which are always timed to coincide with any serious consideration of the question of Namibia. I must, however, underline the point that there is absolutely no change in the position of the Botha régime concerning the speedy and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The notorious linkage pre-condition remains the major stumbling block on this score. As long as the joint position of the Botha régime and the Reagan Administration remains intransigent on the independence of Namibia, there will, regrettably, be no progress anywhere on the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

It is against that background that I should like to refer back to the plea made last June in this Council by Comrade Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, for effective and binding sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. That should be the decision of the hour, here and now.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo)

Accordingly, we in SWAPO strongly advocate unequivocal support for the draft resolution which the members of the non-aligned caucus in the Security Council are planning to put before the Council. We believe it is in line with the commitment undertaken by the Security Council when it adopted resolution 566 (1985), in particular operative paragraph 13 thereof.

We reiterate our continuing readiness to co-operate with the United Nations Secretary-General and his Special Representative in their efforts to hasten the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. I wish to assure the illustrious Secretary-General that we appreciate his tireless efforts in this regard, and we extend our best wishes to him in his ongoing endeavours.

In conclusion, I cannot do better than repeat what my colleagues have been stressing time and again in this Council and elsewhere - namely, that the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the brave sons and daughters of the motherland, are confronting the oppressors on all fronts and courageously facing all the challenges. They are ready today, as ever, to continue to intensify the war of national liberation, adjusting to any given situation and solving problems as they arise in the field.

In the meantime, as long as Pretoria's illegal occupation and massive military build-up persist in Namibia, there is no alternative but to intensify the struggle on all fronts, including in particular the armed struggle.

A luta continua; a vitoria e certa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Toiva ja Toiva for his generous words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Noel Sinclair. I now call on him.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana), Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. Your personal competence, your experience in international affairs, your wisdom and sound judgement, and the positive contribution of Australia to the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia convince us that the current debate of the Council, under your able guidance, will produce positive results.

I also wish to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States, for the efficiency and skill with which he presided over the business of the Council during the month of October.

Since the Security Council last met, in June, to consider the question of Namibia, the situation in the southern African region in general has continued to deteriorate. The brutality of the apartheid régime, whether towards its own people or towards neighbouring African States, continues unabated, as does its intransigence vis-à-vis Namibia.

The Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence, welcomes the convening of this second series of Security Council meetings in 1985 to continue consideration of the question of Namibia.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

I wish to express to our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Council's deep appreciation of his patience and perseverance in his efforts to secure implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We know well the special difficulties involved in trying to conduct diplomacy with the South Africans. We wish as much as he does that there had been no need to maintain this responsibility before him. If that responsibility continues, it is in large measure a function of the paralysis which has been imposed on the Security Council by some of its members where this question is concerned.

We see the current series of meetings neither as a ritualistic happening nor as mere compliance with a decision taken last June. Those who requested these meetings were, in so doing, reflecting pervasive, real and profound concern among the international community not only about the fate of the people of Namibia under the Pretoria régime but also about the image and authority of this body, which seven years ago adopted a resolution containing a plan for Namibia's accession to independence. This concern is all the more legitimate in view of the fact that Namibia is a Territory for which the United Nations itself assumed responsibility 19 years ago. Therefore, if these meetings of the Council do not produce results instead of rhetoric, not only will human suffering continue and intensify in Namibia but the authority of the Security Council and indeed that of this Organization will also suffer.

Any serious approach now to the question of Namibia must, of course, take account of certain developments in the southern African region as a whole during the past five months. The Pretoria régime has been demonstrating, by the brutality of its responses to the anger of the oppressed people, its intention to hold on to the reins of power at any price. The grudging reforms offered to the black people show that the rulers in Pretoria are still clinging to their belief in white superiority and still see race as an important point of reference where the future

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

of South Africa and Namibia is concerned. South Africa's invasion and occupation of southern Angola to give a boost to UNITA shows its intention to keep southern African States uncertain and afraid and to weaken them through acts of destabilization and so hopefully prevent them from giving any support to movements for dismantling the apartheid structure, whether in South Africa itself or in Namibia. Within the Territory of Namibia South Africa's efforts to eliminate the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have continued and intensified, all as part of a design to crush any resistance to its attempts to dictate the nature and pace of change in the Territory.

These are the attitudes we are confronted with in respect of Namibia. We need to keep them uppermost in our minds as we consider responses to South Africa's challenge where the future of that Territory is concerned.

The oppressed people of South Africa, answering bullets with stones, are sending a clear signal to the Pretoria régime that they have had enough and that they are unafraid even to die in order to compel a greater responsiveness to their demands for change. Their expressions of anger, followed by violent repression, than more demonstrations of anger, have aroused consciences throughout the world and brought home to a number of Governments and corporations in North America and Western Europe the need to exert greater pressure on the Pretoria régime to change its attitudes and its policies towards the demands of its people for change. Some of the actions taken by those entities go further than others, but they all proceed from the recognition that there needs to be firm, vigorous action by the international community against South Africa if change is to be brought about, and it is precisely that kind of action, I suggest, that this Council should now be considering.

Firmness and decisiveness have not been the most outstanding characteristics of the record of the Security Council in relation to Namibia. As long ago as 1969

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

this Council decided that in the event of failure by South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of its resolutions regarding Namibia it would meet immediately to decide upon necessary steps in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. That was 16 years ago. Since then the Council has adopted eight resolutions, specifically deciding on each occasion to remain seized of the matter of Namibia and to meet in the event of non-compliance by South Africa for the purpose of considering appropriate measures to be taken under the Charter of the United Nations. It has never decided on those appropriate measures. Its decisions have invariably had the effect of postponing the blow and of buying time for the Pretoria régime.

A régime that is as isolated internationally as that in Pretoria needs support. It needs the support of its friends in order to continue its domination of Namibia. In fact, it is that support which has enabled it continuously to defy the Security Council and international opinion. Therefore each delay in decisive action by this Council helps South Africa and consequently harms the people of Namibia, for these delays have been used by the régime not to bring itself into line where the Council's resolutions are concerned but rather to seek to undermine those resolutions and entrench its own policies according to its vision of what the future of Namibia should be.

South Africa has systematically and tenaciously followed this tactic. One reason, therefore, why the Council for Namibia criticized the policy of constructive engagement - which the South Africans themselves have effectively discredited by their own actions - was that it provided a cover to the Pretoria régime to dig in its heels on Namibian independence and on the dismantling of apartheid within its borders and to pursue its policies of destabilization of its neighbours.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

As I stated earlier, Mr. President, the current wisdom is that firm, decisive action needs to be taken against the Pretoria régime. This is clearly demonstrated in actions taken, particularly during the past six months, by States and corporations ranging from your own continent, in one corner of the map, to Western Europe, in another. The debate about the usefulness of sanctions against South Africa is decisively over. The issue now is rather how far States are prepared to go in imposing sanctions and how fast they are prepared to move.

The Council for Namibia hopes and expects that on this occasion the Security Council will be enabled to become part of what is a clear and undisputed international movement in respect of South Africa. I say "will be enabled" because everyone knows that the Security Council has been restrained by the threatened vetoes of at least two of its members that are major trading partners of South Africa with significant investments both there and in Namibia. At this time, when the corporate establishment in South Africa is itself conceding that apartheid is no longer good for business, we sincerely hope that these States will take note and will be moved to act on this occasion in a manner consistent with a concern for justice, legality and the well-being of the suffering people of Namibia.

The representative of the United States spoke well when he stated in this Chamber on 12 June last:

"We can all agree that the Security Council bears a unique responsibility for this troubled Territory and for moving it rapidly to internationally accepted independence.

"Namibia is an issue on which this Council, acting on behalf of the international community, should be prepared to send a strong and unified message. Our goals and our directions are clear: we should not allow extraneous issues to divide us." (S/PV.2587, p. 31)

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

Each passing time-frame has compounded the Namibian problem and added to the urgent need for firm action by the Council. The time is now for the "strong and unified" response which Mr. Sorzano called for on 12 June. If the need for such a response was urgent then, it is even more urgent now. That response must be consistent with the gravity of the situation in southern Africa and the threat to peace and security which the Pretoria régime's actions represent; it must respond effectively and credibly to the challenge to the authority of this Organization posed by South Africa's consistent contempt for its decisions; it must sustain the action already taken by several States to bring pressure on the Pretoria régime; and, even more, it must, through the imposition of mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, galvanize the international community to more widespread and effective actions to put pressure on the régime. The Council for Namibia is convinced that such a response will hasten implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which the Council has declared to be the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, and which is to be implemented without linkage or pre-condition.

The Council for Namibia has taken note of the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the South African régime (S/17627) concerning the choice of electoral system. The Council will wish to speak at a later stage to give its studied reaction to that communication.

For too long Namibia has been a nation-in-waiting. Its independence must no longer be delayed or held hostage. On behalf of the Council and the people of Namibia, under its sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), I call on the membership of the Council to act.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for his kind words addressed to me and about the role of Australia.

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.

Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): I should like at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency for November.

It is to be regretted that the Council should once again have to devote its time to the question of South West Africa. The world is full of threats to international peace which should be the subject of debate in the Council. At this very moment Soviet and Cuban forces are continuing their efforts to destroy the right of the people of Angola to self-determination, Vietnamese troops are massed along the border of Thailand, the Soviet Union is in the process of annihilating the population of Afghanistan and the Gulf War is dragging on into its fifth year.

On the other hand, South West Africa, by comparison with many other parts of the world, is relatively peaceful. The violence which does exist has been initiated by SWAPO, which has been supported and encouraged by the United Nations - by this Organization, which was established 40 years ago to promote the peaceful resolution of disputes. For its part, South Africa has consistently tried to solve the problems of its region peacefully. Twice last year we offered to enter into a cessation of hostilities with SWAPO, which would then have been free to return to South West Africa to participate peacefully in the domestic political process of the Territory. SWAPO rejected those offers.

The fact is that, unlike the situation in most of the countries of Africa, there is a multiplicity of political expression in South West Africa today. The fact is that the views of all of the components of South West Africa's population are reflected in the political debate in the Territory, which sometimes leads to the airing of different views, but which also ensures genuine, uninhibited debate

(Mr. von Schirnding,
South Africa)

on the key issues which confront the people of South West Africa. That is a refreshing change from the sterility and regimentation of political expression in one-party States.

As the Council will be aware, it has been South Africa's position that it would make a decision on the electoral system to be employed in the proposed election in terms of resolution 435 (1978) once a date had been set for the implementation of the settlement plan. That position was consistent with understandings which South Africa had reached with the contact group and also with the terms of the settlement plan itself.

However, on 6 November 1985 the Government of National Unity in Windhoek reached a decision on how it wished South Africa to deal with the choice of the electoral system. On 12 November 1985 it issued the following statement in that regard:

"This issue of an electoral system is, however, one which is, in our opinion, easily resolved. The South West Africa People's Organization has apparently indicated that it has no objection to either of the two systems. Neither, given the choice between the two systems advocated by the five nations of the Western contact group, do the parties represented in the transitional Government of National Unity have a preference for either one of the two. In the interests of economy, however - the cost of organizing and administering an election on the basis of proportional representation being substantially less than arranging one on a constituency basis - and of restricting the debate about the modalities of independence at this stage to matters of more immediate interest, the Cabinet of the transitional Government calls on the South African Government to select, from the options now available, a system of proportional representation as a framework for elections leading to the independence of South West Africa." (S/17627, pp. 3-4)

(Mr. von Schirnding,
South Africa)

After considering the request of the Government of National Unity, the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs yesterday informed the Secretary-General that the South African Government had consistently consulted the leaders of South West Africa on matters affecting the future of the Territory and had been guided by their wishes. Accordingly, the South African Government had no objection to the request of the Government of National Unity. However, agreement would have to be reached on how the proportional system would be implemented in practice.

Despite the rather weird argumentation in that connection that we have just heard from the Secretary-General of SWAPO, we hope that the decision on the electoral system will go some way towards achieving progress towards the resolution of the last outstanding problems affecting the international settlement plan. The fact remains that a firm agreement must still be reached on the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola. Although some progress has been made in that regard, and although some momentum was recently restored to the negotiations between the United States and South Africa on Cuban withdrawal, a great deal of work must still be done in order to achieve agreement on that question.

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

In the meantime it is important to note that, although we have succeeded in removing other obstacles to the implementation of the settlement plan, the agreements which we have thus far reached, though welcome, are not enough. We require evidence that when it comes to the implementation of the settlement plan the parties involved in these agreements will be willing and able to carry them out in a scrupulous manner. Thus, although we reached agreement during phase II of the negotiations with the West, when matters of security and impartiality were discussed, that the United Nations would adopt an impartial attitude to the parties of the territory once an implementation date had been set, the record of the United Nations thus far raises serious doubts concerning the willingness or even the ability of its main organs to honour this agreement. If impartiality is generally held to be a virtue, why is the United Nations so persistent in its adherence to bias in favour of SWAPO? We have reached an understanding with the Secretary-General on impartiality, but will the main and the subsidiary organs of the United Nations consider themselves bound by agreements entered into by the Secretary-General?

While on the subject of impartiality, I wish to say that I have received a copy of a communication, which has been addressed to you, Mr. President, and I believe to other members of the Security Council, in which certain South West Africa political parties request permission for their representative to participate in the discussion of this item. The parties involved are the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, the Labour Party of Namibia, the National Party of South West Africa, the Rehoboth Liberated Democratic Party, the South West Africa National Union and the SWAPO Democrats. I trust that, in the interest of impartiality, the members of the Council will take prompt and positive action to accede to the request of the South West Africa political parties.

(Mr. von Schirnding, South Africa)

South Africa will not allow debates such as this to deflect it from the course it has set for itself in working for internationally acceptable independence for South West Africa.

As I have already pointed out to the Council on an earlier occasion, South Africa will continue to search for a reasonable formula for genuine Cuban withdrawal from Angola. If a firm agreement can be reached in this regard, we will carry out our 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 and not by violence. We will continue to encourage dialogue and reconciliation 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. Finally, we will continue to insist that all the South West African parties be treated equally and impartially. Let me repeat: if the United Nations wishes to play a role in the future of South West Africa/Namibia, it will have to demonstrate that it will be able to carry out its functions impartially.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of South Africa for his congratulations addressed to me, and I invite him to resume the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Sir, allow me to extend to you my sincerest congratulations on your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for this month and to wish you complete success. I should like also to take this opportunity to say that my delegation greatly appreciates the work of the outgoing President, Ambassador Walters of the United States, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian
Arab Republic)

We are pleased that the African Group and the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, the two largest international groups, have invited the Council to continue its consideration of the question of Namibia. Great efforts have been made by the United Nations Security Council to secure the withdrawal of the illegal South African administration from Namibia, so that the Namibian people can exercise its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence. The Namibian people, languishing under the yoke of South African racist domination, has unceasingly proved its firm determination to achieve effective independence, notwithstanding the barbarous repression measures taken by the occupation authorities against that noble people, which is existing, through its daily struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, settlement colonialism and continues to do so by every possible means. The international community has supported its struggle and has paid tribute to everything it has been able to accomplish.

Although the international community recognizes the need to eliminate colonialism in Namibia completely, and despite the appeals made to South Africa to withdraw its forces from Namibia and to solve the problem of Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), which contains an internationally acceptable plan for Namibia's accession to independence, South Africa still continues systematically to violate that resolution and attempts to strip it of all substance. That is clear from the Secretary-General's report to the Council.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab
Republic)

That is clear from the Secretary-General's report to the Council.

Instead of complying with the relevant Council resolutions, Pretoria, as usual, had recourse to the subterfuge of an "internal settlement", and then sought to impose an internal administration and a puppet government, in contravention of Council resolutions. It has plundered the natural resources of the country and sought to divide it by applying administrative arrangements on an ethnic basis in an attempt to destroy the unity of the people and create conditions conducive to an outbreak of civil war. The racist régime of Pretoria has imposed compulsory military service on the people of Namibia so that Namibians will have to kill each other. Furthermore, 100,000 soldiers have been mobilized in the country. This shows clearly that the régime seeks to consolidate its occupation and colonization.

We have repeatedly and firmly condemned in the Council the repressive, subversive and delaying measures used by Pretoria to deny to the Namibian people their right to independence, destroy Namibia's territorial integrity and terrorize the people by all possible means. We have participated in most of the meetings of the Security Council on this subject in order to reaffirm our full solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Namibian people, who are fighting to achieve true independence within their national borders.

The non-aligned countries and all other peace-loving countries that oppose imperialism and colonialism have categorically rejected the notion of linkage, of parallel withdrawal, as running counter to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and constituting flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Angola in order to deny it its political rights as an independent nation. The Council has categorically rejected the notion of linkage in successive resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 566 (1985).

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

We fully support the position of SWAPO and its struggle to free Namibia. We also support the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which met in Addis Ababa from 25 February to 5 March 1985, in which it firmly condemns Pretoria and its allies, in particular the United States, for impeding the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the United States policy of constructive engagement with the racist régime of South Africa. For what is called constructive engagement perpetuates the unlawful occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its natural resources and encourages the policy of destabilization and terror directed against the front-line countries, in particular Angola and Mozambique.

The Syrian Arab Republic, which took part in the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of non-aligned countries on the subject of Namibia, which was held in New Delhi this spring, most emphatically endorses the Declaration adopted at the conclusion of that meeting. We believe that it constitutes a sound basis on which to speed up the process of the liberation of Namibia and includes constructive proposals which could assist the Council in securing compliance with resolution 435 (1978).

We reiterate our support for the Declaration of the Ministerial Meeting of non-aligned countries, in Luanda, concerning Namibia and South Africa.

We categorically reject attempts to divert attention from the main issue, the elimination of colonialism in Namibia, which are designed to introduce into the question of the liberation of Namibia elements extraneous based on the concept of linkage and parallelism, and the installation of a puppet régime.

It is the Council's duty to declare now that the unlawful occupation of Namibia is an act of aggression against the people of Namibia, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), of 14 December 1974. It

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

is high time that paragraph 13 of Security Council resolution 566 (1985), dated 19 June 1985, was implemented. The Council would thereby immediately take the necessary measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter and forthwith impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa on the ground that the maintenance of its illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes armed aggression against that country, which is under the provisional administration of the United Nations.

We are convinced that if the Council is not able this time to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter the situation in southern Africa in general and Namibia in particular cannot but deteriorate to the point at which it endangers regional and world peace and security.

In addition to adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions, the Council must vigorously and clearly reiterate its rejection of the concept of linkage and parallelism. It must support and strengthen the armed struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole, legitimate representative. It must take whatever measures are needed to put an end to direct and indirect imperialist and racist aggression against Angola.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): The representatives of the front-line States have requested me to thank you, Sir, and through you to extend our appreciation to the members of the Security Council for giving us the opportunity to participate in this debate on the question of Namibia.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

We wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. We are confident that you will guide the deliberations of the Council to a successful conclusion.

We wish also to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, on the able manner in which he directed the proceedings of the Council last month.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

We are once more assembled here in the Security Council to review the file on Namibia. We are aware that there are those who bemoan the fact that a shocking lack of progress obliges us to come once again before the Security Council. And, at the same time, there are probably others who question the reasons for our wish to resort to the Council. In fact, our need and our reasons are simple. Our strong commitment to working through the Security Council is an expression of our desire to reach a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. The Africans do not find joy in coming to the Security Council so frequently, but for them the question of Namibia is a vital, burning problem, one of the highest political priorities on the African continent, and legitimately brought before the United Nations and the world community.

So that it may understand better, we ask the Council to imagine on the North American continent a country that would have been, until 1918, a colony of Germany. In 1918, on the defeat of Germany, that country would have been placed under United States mandate or administration because at that time its people were considered primitive and incapable of ruling themselves. After the Second World War, the mandate system was progressively abolished. Peoples under mandate or trusteeship were to become independent. Suppose this had taken place everywhere in the Americas except for that one country, what would the world say? What would this Security Council say if that were the case? Council members would certainly be holding constant meetings. It would be the top political problem of this continent.

Well, this is what Namibia is for Africans. The West fashioned a system of self-governing, independent nation-States which it gave as a model to us while we lived in a completely different way. And now the West does not put its full weight behind the eradication of this anomaly in its own cherished world political system. North America must be all the more concerned with this problem since all

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

its countries were former colonies and had to fight for their independence and liberty. From a historical, philosophical and ideological point of view, the Namibian problem, which has now lasted for a long time, is therefore a direct concern and responsibility for the North American countries.

It is most disagreeable that those who deplore the resort to armed struggle are those who make it much more difficult for peaceful methods to succeed. We are, nevertheless, determined to explore every avenue to see what can be achieved through the Security Council. We must confess, however, that the past performance of the Security Council in efforts to implement its own decisions on Namibia does not give us much reason for optimism.

We presume that we are all in agreement that the international community, through the United Nations, bears responsibility for Namibia. There is also agreement that South Africa continues to occupy that Territory illegally. The highest world tribunal, the International Court of Justice, has made a ruling to that effect. We have all at one time or another criticized the use or misuse of the veto by some permanent members of the Security Council. But the Security Council, after many twists and turns, adopted resolution 435 (1978) in 1978 to approve the United Nations plan for the rapid movement of Namibia towards its independence through free and fair elections under international supervision and control. There is thus a consensus in the Council that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represents the only basis for putting an end to the illegal régime in Namibia by peaceful means.

A great deal of energy and diplomatic efforts - and, I should add here, money - have been given and spent to remove the innumerable obstacles impeding the implementation of the United Nations plan. From past deliberations in the Council it is obvious that the overwhelming majority of Council members continue to reject all attempts to link the Namibian question to issues totally extraneous to the

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

goals of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Since all the parties acknowledged by the Council have accepted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, why then have we been unable to ensure full implementation of resolution 435 (1978)?

The one central factor is that South Africa is determined to circumvent resolution 435 (1978) and to continue its illegal régime in and occupation of Namibia. In addition, the legally binding decision of 1978 became the victim of cold-war politics when extraneous factors were injected. No one has yet been able to explain to the international community why the independence of the Namibian people should be mortgaged to a policy that requires the removal of Cuban troops from Angola. And yet all along it has been determined not only that South Africa is occupying Namibia illegally but also that its troops have invaded and continue to occupy a part of Angolan territory. Namibia has been used and continues to be used by South Africa as a base for committing acts of aggression against Angola. Furthermore, rebel UNITA forces dedicated to the overthrow of the Angolan Government are being openly supported by South Africa and others. All these factors and more are known to those who have devoted time and energy to international affairs.

We believe that we need to educate the public about these facts. We need to understand why the United Nations has failed in this particular case. The irony of it all is that we know that some countries have threatened or used force in certain cases to change the situation. And yet we continue to speak about peaceful transition in the context of Namibia.

We believe also that the United Nations has done its part in the form of speeches, decisions, resolutions and the mobilization of public opinion to get the South African régime to withdraw from Namibia. The United Nations has not advocated the use of force to achieve that end. Instead, the Organization has

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

emphasized that comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions are a peaceful means of bringing about an end to South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia.

It will be recalled that the Security Council itself called for a review of the question of Namibia should South Africa fail, as it has already failed, to carry out fully resolution 435 (1978). Then the Council was going to meet again. This was reinforced by the decision of the Ministers of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, who also called for the current meetings at their September meeting in Luanda, Angola.

We are all aware, of course, that momentous developments have been taking place inside South Africa itself and that these have focused the attention of the international community on the internal situation in South Africa. The revolt of the people of South Africa against the criminal and inhuman practices of apartheid has already prompted many Governments to adopt economic measures against South Africa. We welcome this awakening of the conscience of the international community, but we must say that in many instances those economic and diplomatic measures against the apartheid régime have been the bare minimum.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

We in the front-line States are not starry-eyed about the impact of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. We have, in a deliberate manner, examined thoroughly the indirect impact of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa on our own economies and welfare. Despite these repercussions, whatever they may be, our leaders, taking fully into account their international responsibility, have called strongly for comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.

We have heard so much about how economic sanctions will affect the black people of South Africa, Namibia and the neighbouring independent African States, but very little or nothing about the loss which will result when foreign investments go up in flames. Those who own all those investments in racist South Africa - pension funds and so forth - stand to lose everything, in the final analysis, unless they take concrete action now to put out the flames which apartheid South Africa has ignited.

In any case, if we who will directly bear the brunt of the impact of economic sanctions against apartheid South Africa continue to appeal to this Council for legally binding sanctions against South Africa, we fail to see why others that, by their own admission, will not feel the same direct effect should not show a decent respect for our views.

We believe that economic sanctions will not merely have a direct economic impact on the South African régime but also carry with them strong diplomatic and political messages to the political and economic leadership of South Africa. We are often reminded that economic sanctions have not worked well in the past. This may be so in some cases, especially if assessed primarily by economic criteria, but from our own analysis we are aware that economic sanctions have in many instances been used successfully in conjunction with other factors to bring about significant changes of policy. However, this is not the place and time for me to enumerate

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

these instances. Suffice it to say that we are firmly of the view that mandatory economic sanctions can, if applied assertively and comprehensively by all, bring about a change of direction in South Africa. It is therefore of the utmost importance that this Council, which represents international legitimacy, give its whole-hearted support to our appeal for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa as eloquently advocated by earlier speakers.

No one should be in any doubt as to our ultimate goal in Namibia. We affirm that speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is our immediate objective. Implementation of this resolution will ensure the independence of Namibia and the exercise of the right of self-determination by its people. When we assert the right to armed struggle by the people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic representative, or call for the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions, we are not doing so just to be vindictive. We will readily dispense with these measures if we can be given full assurance today that the régime of South Africa is prepared to withdraw its illegal régime from Namibia and thus bring about the emancipation of the Territory.

What we have just heard from the representative of the illegal régime has, as usual, dampened any lingering hope of the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We are somewhat intrigued by the timing of the response of the illegal régime to the contacts which were initiated by the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General, in his report of 6 September 1985, reported to this Council that he had not been able to obtain any encouraging response from South Africa regarding the choice of an electoral system. However, on the eve of our meeting today the Secretary-General has been handed a response which, on the face of it, would appear to meet the requirement. The representatives of the non-aligned States and the African States and the Acting President of the Council for Namibia have all dealt

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

at length with the essential factors relating to the question of Namibia. The representatives of the front-line States endorse the views expressed by them. They have specifically commented on this latest manoeuvre to confuse members of this Council. I am sure that this attempt will not succeed.

On one level it is possible to argue that, on the assumption that the question of an electoral system has been resolved, the Council should immediately proceed to request the Secretary-General to commence implementation of resolution 435 (1978). I say this without being oblivious to the untenable demands by the representative of the South African régime regarding the so-called linkage, which this Council has never endorsed. The language in resolution 435 (1978) is quite unambiguous. It does not refer in any way to other extraneous matters, such as the presence, at the request of the Government of Angola, of Cuban troops in Angola. Failure by the Council to act in these circumstances would prove exceedingly damaging since we now know that all the terms of resolution 435 (1978) have now been met - that is, if we are to give any credence to the recent communication has now been placed before this Council.

I know that in previous deliberations in this Council we have made numerous appeals to those who have the capacity to influence events in South Africa to enhance the role of this Council in meeting the challenge presented to it by the South African régime. I regret to say that the tone of the representative of South Africa before this Council and his obvious contempt for the Council is an indication of his confidence that, no matter what we may say here, by the end of the day this Council will fail in its responsibility to take effective action.

During the commemorative meetings of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations it was appropriate that the membership as a whole heard from all the permanent members of the Security Council. Members may recall that each one of them spoke about the need to enhance the role of the Security Council in the

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

resolution of disputes and conflicts. Here is a glaring case history and a genuine opportunity for the permanent members to put into effect the commitment they made to the membership as a whole. In this connection, none of us should forget for one moment that the permanent members of this Council bear a heavy responsibility to all the Members of the United Nations.

Talks held at Yalta in February 1945 on the question of voting in the Security Council emphasized the requirement that the permanent members should not make use of the right of veto in the resolution of disputes. Those permanent members which have hitherto threatened to utilize the right of veto to frustrate attempts at implementing resolution 435 (1978) should now rethink their position. South Africa, no matter how it views itself as a major and original Power in southern Africa, does not have, and must not be allowed to assume, the influence or the authority to frustrate this Council. If this Council is prevented from carrying out its responsibility to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978), it is because one or other of the permanent members wants it to be so.

(Mr. Lusaka, Zambia)

We, for our part, cannot see any reason whatsoever why any of the permanent members of the Security Council should still, directly or indirectly, permit South Africa to continue its illegal presence in the international Territory of Namibia. So the time is now ripe for us to act. Failure to do so now will only increase the frustration not only of the people of Namibia but also of all southern Africa.

I therefore feel obliged to conclude our remarks by once more appealing to those permanent members that have not been willing to proceed expeditiously in allowing this Council to send a clear message to South Africa, that it can no longer delay the emancipation of the people of Namibia.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Zambia for the warm words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): We should like first of all to express appreciation to the members of the Security Council for the opportunity of again addressing the Council, today. We are here not merely to swell numbers but to help demonstrate the intensity of African emotions, which are central to the universal indignation about the situation in Namibia as well as in southern Africa as a whole.

Mr. President, permit me to salute your predecessor in office, Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States, President for the month of October, for his diplomatic skill and leadership.

We are particularly pleased to see you assume the high office of President of the Security Council for this month. Your nation, Australia, shares aspirations with mine in a number of critical topical fields related to the maintenance of international peace and security. You have actively supported disarmament as a peace process. You joined with us to press for a productive review of the

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

constructive and critical role that this universal body, the United Nations, was established to play in consciously constructing and maintaining conditions of international peace and security, without which there is no notion of development that could ever attain fulfilment.

We look up to your experience, to your personal as well as your national passion for domestic and international peace and security; yes, we look up to you as the youth and the aged alike across the globe look up to this Organization, and especially this Council, with cherished hopes but with mounting frustrations that the dream of the United Nations for the freedom of peoples and the fostering of their right to enjoy the benefits of civilised conduct among nations and among people is fading.

You bear in your hands the same responsibility to history and to mankind as a whole that a representative of a super-Power bore during the month of October. We expect even more of you because the smaller one is, the greater is one's appreciation of the constant pain experienced by the downtrodden and the deprived. We encourage you to insist on getting this Council moving to enhance its credibility as the instrument of lasting peace and security.

The Namibian issue presents perhaps the most grotesque paradox of our times. There can be no doubt that when future historians address the events and issues of this period in time, they will find difficulty in categorizing our generation. For, on the one hand, we demonstrate the capacity to document an inherent spiritualism seeking to install great ideals of morality and decency and, on the other, we systematically take steps to demonstrate what equally appears to be an inherent impulse for cruelty and injustice - the kind of impulse we ourselves, perhaps improperly, ascribe to the prehistoric man.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

This generation has access to natural wealth and enlightened human resources in dimensions unknown to history. We have made great strides in enriching man's potential for development and peaceful coexistence. Yet how troubled our planet is because of the absence of the imperatives of spiritualism that can sustain a fruitful drive for our collective survival and provide an opportunity for the employment of wealth to guarantee such survival.

The Security Council meets today to address a critical question that transcends the curse of apartheid. The members of this Council must understand the mood of explosive crisis vibrating not only in our African region but across the globe. The central issue is no longer just what the diabolical "religion" of apartheid and the archdeacons of racism in Pretoria are doing to shock mankind; it is more important to review, as a matter of urgent priority, what our response - the response of the rest of the world and this Council in particular - must be if bloodshed and everything else that we jointly decry are to be stopped.

We are now at the stage in which brilliant speeches made in mere condemnation of apartheid or of racism result only in providing depressing irritants to the frustrated, the oppressed, the deprived, the dying and the bereaved. It has all been said - indeed said too many times. We have told the world of the horrors of the handy system called apartheid, of all it brings with it: cruelty, immorality, murder, defiance of decency. The constantly unimpressive performances of the representatives of Pretoria at this Council - and we have witnessed another one today - have underlined the depressing predictability of the racists' defiance of the rest of the world.

This meeting of the Security Council takes on an added dimension because the Peoples of the world are publicly and increasingly stating their strong sense of

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

outrage and frustration, not only at the atrocities of brutal murder and oppression in southern Africa but also - perhaps more so - at the apparent refusal of this universal institution to exercise its legal powers to save poor men, women and children from the scourge of conditions of war, from the nightmare of the effects of retrograde racism and cruel repression in the land of their birth.

The maintenance of peace and security is the central role and fundamental responsibility of the Security Council. The situation in southern Africa as a whole and Namibia in particular has assumed the most serious proportions. In the absence of action from this Council, the oppressed victims of the system imposed from the headquarters of apartheid are now compelled to employ their meagre means and resources to defend body and soul, father and mother, brother and sister, family and fellow travellers on the path of resistance against unequal armed force.

Inevitably, the provoked breach of peace is spreading and the powerful States, among them certain nuclear-weapon States, are taking a steady and active economic and military interest in the deteriorating situation in the subregion. The Pretoria régime has armed itself and established for its domain a nuclear capability. In a world depressed with economic and political issues, southern Africa threatens to provide the match to ignite yet another major global war. Time is indeed running out on the peaceful process.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We once again call on the major Powers, and especially the United States and the Soviet Union, to make the situation in southern Africa an item in which conflict has no place. Africa sought freedom not to enable the establishment of new forms of slavery imposed by masters from without. We want to be friends of all and to co-operate with all countries to attain better standards of living for all. The future leaders of the subregion must not be compelled to seek refuge in camps and various alliances in the global political and ideological spectrum. Confidence building will effectively commence if we show a struggling people that there is concern for their well-being in this universal body and that the two ideological blocs of today's world are united in seeking speedy peace and justice for all.

We must aid future generations of Namibians and also of South Africans to build bridges of peace, security and development, bypassing the old roads trod by the misgivings of the past. White, black and all colours and races will need understanding for nation building. They cannot attain it if the current bitterness and the drugs of hatred are fanned.

If we must deplore violence and senseless killing, let us use the more powerful weapons of sanctions, which alone the unprogressive racists understand. The sanctity of human life means little to them, and armed conflict alone cannot work while they enjoy superiority. Only economic and political pressure can change the materialistic minds of the so-called leadership. Recent events have made this phenomenon obvious.

We call for sanctions. If anyone is swayed by the argument that they will hurt the blacks, let them listen to the story of the victims. Tell the doubting elements of the plight of the black man and of those seeking freedom. They know best what is good for them, as well as the full scope of their plight. They want freedom, not slavery - the right to participate in guiding the destiny of their lives, the future of their country, and to give reasonable hopes to their children

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

for the future. Equality of opportunity and human dignity transcend the servitude that provides mere subsistence earnings. Our brothers and sisters are determined to die for these ideals. That is a fact all should note.

The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) is not the problem. It represents the movement of the heroic Namibians for peace. The problem lies in the impediments to freedom. Let us ensure that they are removed.

We close with an expression of full solidarity with, and commitment to, our brothers in Namibia in our collective struggle for freedom as they are led by the sole and inspired representative, SWAPO. We invite those who love peace and human brotherhood to contribute openly and with resolve to hastening the dawn of the freedom of that African subregion from the deprivations decreed by a retrograde generation of racists and their occupation forces.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Cameroon for his generous words addressed to me, and especially for his remarks on Australia's role in this body.

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

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like first of all to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. Australia is well known for its attachment to the self-determination of peoples, the protection of human rights and the strengthening of the role of the United Nations. You have always defended that creed most successfully, and that is why I am happy to see you presiding over the Security Council at a time when it is considering a question of paramount importance for Africa, namely the question of Namibia.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

At the same time I should like to pay tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States of America, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the month of October. We diplomats have been greatly enriched by having such a soldier among us.

Lastly I should like to thank the members of the Council for allowing me to take part in this debate.

In the course of this year, and more than once, we in Africa have hastened to come before the Council and to request its co-operation in putting an end to apartheid and South Africa's policy of destabilization of its neighbours. We have now come before the Council to request that, in its wisdom and in keeping with its mandate, it take all the necessary steps to ensure that the sister nation of Namibia, under the guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), at last accedes to independence as provided for in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and in accordance with international law and morality.

The fact that once again the Security Council is meeting on this item bears witness to the importance the United Nations attaches to this crucial question. As members are aware, by its persistent defiance of the international community, South Africa continues to occupy Namibia illegally despite the decision of the United Nations to place that Territory under its own trusteeship.

I shall not repeat the background of the Namibian question, nor return to all the points so eloquently elaborated on by previous speakers. It has become clear to everyone that the racist South African régime has no intention of withdrawing from Namibia.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

In fact, not content with having installed in Windhoek its so-called transitional government, which incidentally the international community unanimously and unequivocally rejected, the Pretoria régime has decided to flout the decisions and warnings of this Council and has chosen to spurn it. That is precisely why, quite rightly, the Acting President of the Organization of African Unity, His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, declared here on 21 October, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary:

"The failure and subsequent break-down of the Western contact group, along with Pretoria's obduracy towards all proposals, clearly show that South Africa has no intention of withdrawing from Namibia. Moreover, the Pretoria régime, emboldened by the paralysis of the Security Council, which has been unable to implement a solution in keeping with international law, has installed in the Territory, through a so-called multi-party conference, an 'interim government', which has been unequivocally rejected by the international community". (A/40/PV.42, p. 18)

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

yet in its most recent resolution on the subject, resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June 1985, the Security Council, after declaring the installation of the so-called interim Government, through an alleged multi-party conference, to be illegal, null and void, urged Member States that had not yet done so to consider in the meantime taking appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa. I am happy to pay tribute to certain countries, some of them permanent members of the Security Council, which have begun to implement the resolution.

Similarly, the Council, in its wisdom, decided to remain seized of the matter and to meet immediately upon receipt of 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 act in accordance with resolution 566 (1985).

The resolution warned South Africa that its refusal to co-operate would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Council on settling the Namibian question.

An objective assessment of the situation in Namibia since the Council's adoption of resolution 566 (1985) leads us to conclude that South Africa is continuing to subordinate the settlement of the Namibian question to the settlement of questions extraneous to resolution 435 (1978); that the Pretoria régime has clearly demonstrated its refusal to co-operate with the Secretary-General, as can be seen from the Secretary-General's report to the Council, and that it is so arrogant as to use Namibia as a base from which to commit acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line States, thus violating their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

There could be no clearer answers.

Given that its principal task is the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council should, faced with South Africa's obvious desire to consolidate its illegal occupation of Namibia, be consistent with its decisions and, for example, as a first step adopt selective mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. My delegation believes that such a warning may induce South Africa to understand that the international community cannot continue to be passive when faced with its constant defiance. Such a warning would also have the merit of inducing Pretoria to be more accommodating with regard to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which had the general agreement of the parties directly concerned and the backing of the international community.

The immediate, unconditional implementation of that resolution for the independence of Namibia, which is the sole internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, would contribute greatly to easing tension in the region. With that responsible, concerted action, the United Nations, through the Security Council, would thus assume the major responsibility incumbent upon it of assuring the exercise by the heroic people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, under the guidance of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, in conformity with the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Finally, by taking the only possible decision, the Security Council would live up to the expectations of the Organization of African Unity, currently presided over by His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, and of the Governments and peoples of Africa. Such a decision would strengthen international morality, respect for human rights, peaceful coexistence between nations and peoples and international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me and for his generous remarks about Australia's role in the United Nations.

There are no further speakers for this meeting.

If I heard him correctly, the representative of Cameroon said that I should insist on getting the Council moving. I suspect that he was speaking in a political sense, but in a practical sense, too, I think it would be helpful if we made a prompt start tomorrow. I know that some other meetings are scheduled, but, given our time-frame, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 14 November, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.