



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

INITIAL

S/PV.2625

14 November 1985

NOV 18 1985

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 14 November 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

<u>President:</u> Mr. WOOLCOTT	(Australia)
<u>Members:</u> Burkina Faso	Mr. BASSOLE
China	Mr. LI Luye
Denmark	Mr. ULRICH
Egypt	Mr. KHALIL
France	Mr. de KEMOULARIA
India	Mr. BANERJI
Madagascar	Mr. RAKOTOND RAMBOA
Peru	Mr. ALZAMORA
Thailand	Mr. KASEMSRI
Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. ALLEYNE
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. OUDOVENKO
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. OLEANDROV
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. MAXEY
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 11.20 a.m.

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: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Seereekissoon (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of that Council to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite Mr. Toivo ja Toivo to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2624th meeting, I invite the representatives of Cameroon, Canada, the German Democratic Republic, Senegal, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, 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 letters from the representatives of Cuba and the Federal Republic of Germany 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. Velazco San Jose (Cuba) and Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French):

Mr. President, first of all I should like to perform the pleasant duty of offering you the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are quite sure that, under your wise guidance and thanks to your diplomatic experience, the Council will be able to discharge the responsibilities incumbent on it under the Charter.

I should also like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States, for the effective and distinguished way in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

During the solemn celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, which coincides moreover with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, many delegations emphasized the essential role played by the United Nations in the field of decolonization. Our satisfaction would have been complete if problems such as that before the Council today, that is, the question of Namibia, had been satisfactorily resolved. The Organization has clearly done all that it could to resolve this distressing problem, and in numerous resolutions we have always reaffirmed the legal responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia.

So many hopes have been and still are placed in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) which contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We are well aware of the obstacles impeding the implementation of that resolution, and they are all the work of the racist régime of Pretoria, namely, the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia in violation of United Nations resolutions; the use of Namibian territory as a launching pad for acts of

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

subversion, destabilization and aggression against neighbouring African States; the ridiculous attempts which have been made to establish a link between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola; the installation of what purports to be an interim administration in Windhoek; and the authorization given to foreign economic interests to exploit improperly the resources in Namibian territory.

In the face of the arrogance and intransigence of the South African racist régime and its persistent refusal to comply with the various resolutions of the Security Council, we have always said that the Council should act firmly and decisively to discharge its responsibilities towards Namibia. Our indecisiveness and our foot-dragging have helped to increase South Africa's scorn for the unanimous desire of the international community to see the Namibian people accede to independence. However, recourse to the provisions of the Charter would have enabled us to force the racist régime of Pretoria to comply with international legality.

When we adopted resolution 566 (1985) on 19 June, we achieved substantial progress in the sense that we requested States Members of the Organization to take certain selective measures voluntarily against South Africa, pending the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII of the Charter. In this respect, we wish to thank those countries - in particular countries known to be allies of South Africa - which have decided to take unilateral measures against South Africa under that resolution. However, in the light of recent developments in South Africa, in particular the heightened repression and the continuation of the blind massacres of defenceless demonstrators and the persistent illegal occupation of Namibia, we feel that the time has come for us at long last

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

to apply mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. This would make it possible to bolster the authority of our Organization and to show international public opinion and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate, authentic representative of the Namibian people, that we are at last prepared to meet our responsibilities.

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

The latest delaying tactic employed by the racist authorities of Pretoria to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia is the statement issued by the so-called cabinet of the transitional government of national unity in Windhoek, and distributed as document S/17627 of 12 November 1985. We ask the Council to foil all such tactics by acting resolutely and making use of the means provided by the Charter. We are thinking in particular of the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, which in our view would be the sole effective way of compelling racist South Africa to respect the Council's decisions. In that connection, the Council should decide, in keeping with its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to impose selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa to bolster the voluntary unilateral measures already taken against South Africa pursuant to resolution 566 (1985). We hope that the Council will prove able to meet that demand, which is the least we can ask given the gravity of the situation and its harmful effect on the maintenance of international peace and security.

In conclusion, we reaffirm our solidarity with the Namibian people in its heroic struggle under the leadership of its sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

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

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Permit me, Sir, to say how pleased we are to see you presiding over this Council, the members of which so greatly appreciate your personal and professional qualities. I also wish to convey our appreciation to Ambassador Vernon Walters of the United States for the distinction with which he conducted the business of the Council in October.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

In its 40 years of existence this Organization, and more particularly this Council, has for nearly 20 years been faced with the challenge to and defiance of its political and moral authority represented by the illegal occupation of Namibia. In a few months' time, on 27 October next, it will be precisely 20 years and unless this great damage to the international legal order is repaired that twentieth anniversary will have very negative repercussions on the reputation and good name of the Organization and the authority and effectiveness of the Council.

Therefore, on this occasion when the conscience of the majority of the world's peoples demands that this Council again address the question of Namibia, we must deal with that question by applying essentially political standards and viewpoints.

We can all see how quickly pressure is building in the cauldron that is South Africa. The Council's options are either to contribute to an explosion, by action or inaction, or to play the constructive role of peace-maker. The first option appears to be in no one's interest, and that compels us to step up our action to make South Africa agree to a genuine settlement of the problem. We must not permit it to avoid such a settlement by means of manoeuvres of political camouflage leading to a simulated process of self-determination which we all know to be nothing more than a fiction fabricated to sidetrack the action of the Organization, mock the will of the peoples represented here and deflect the inexorable course of history.

The most recent diversionary manoeuvres, carefully orchestrated to coincide with and confuse this debate, make use of conditions which have already been rejected by this Council and are therefore devoid of any real content or true effectiveness. As for the latest of these, deployed through so-called political

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

parties, we can only wonder what democratic credibility or representative capacity can be claimed by the supporters of a system which denies the fundamental political right of equality.

In this connection, the draft resolution to be sponsored by the non-aligned members of this Council represents the firm step forward required by developments in the process, consolidating in a comprehensive mandate the various sanctions called for by those developments and reflecting the growing determination to act now clearly evident in public opinion in all the countries represented here.

It is now for the members of this Council to meet those expectations and demands with the concrete, effective measures available only to the Council as both its attribute and its responsibility. That responsibility is twofold, for, as stated by the Secretary-General in his report of 6 September last,

"The failure to proceed on Namibia is affecting the reactions of the international community to other grave developments in the region". (S/17442, para. 13)

The purpose of the draft resolution sponsored by the non-aligned countries is to ensure fulfilment of that twofold responsibility; it will inevitably give rise, through the double channel of action or omission, to a new dynamic in the relentless movement towards the independence of Namibia.

The cards are on the table. Public comparison of positions and behaviour no longer permits indecision or postponement, and will never permit this again. Sooner or later we must all show where we stand on this question, which has shaken the legal, political and moral conscience of the world, for on the contemporary political scene the persistence in Africa of so grave a colonial situation is a historic aberration which no argument can justify.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

This Council has the ability to take this indispensable step in the process of decolonization. Peru is ready to shoulder the responsibilities it assumed when it became a member of the Council, faithful to its commitment to the Charter and to the principles of non-alignment, in the struggle for the liberation of all the world's peoples.

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

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

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): Permit me to congratulate you, sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. We appreciate the position that your country, Australia, has taken in the struggle against apartheid and for a just solution of the question of Namibia. My delegation is convinced that these extremely important meetings of the Security Council will have a particularly successful conclusion under your guidance. We wish you the best of success towards that end.

We would also express our appreciation to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Vernon Walters, for the skillful manner in which he discharged the duties of his high office in the month of October.

My delegation would also like to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Security Council, for giving me the opportunity to set forth the position of the German Democratic Republic on the question of Namibia.

This year the Security Council has repeatedly had to deal with the situation in southern Africa. As a result of its debates, eight resolutions have been adopted. Those resolutions condemn the Pretoria régime, which has been guilty of increasing terror in order to subdue the resistance of the united South African people, has committed continuing and flagrant acts of aggression against neighbouring States, particularly Angola and Botswana, and has persisted in its permanent and illegal occupation of Namibia. The resolutions demand a halt to that policy, which is a threat to international peace and security; they demand reparations for the damages caused by the attacks against the sovereign front-line States. What we have, therefore, are eight resolutions, but no practical results - at least not in the direction expected, if one can speak of expectations at all when soberly assessing the impudent and blatant policy of the racists.

Indeed, the opposite is true: the warnings that have been issued here in the Council or before the General Assembly have not been unjustified, as experience has

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

painfully shown. So long as no clear-cut decisions are taken in the Security Council against the racists, the Pretoria régime will not only continue but will even escalate its perilous policy of apartheid in all its manifestations.

Do the acts we are daily witnessing not provide sufficient evidence of that? In the face of violence and murder perpetrated against the fighting people of South Africa and the detention of their leaders, in the face of the colonial oppression of the Namibian people and South Africa's acts of aggression against peace-loving neighbours, the question arises: for how long is this going to continue?

At the present time, the region of southern Africa is one of the hotbeds of tension in the world, a flashpoint that may spark a new world war. The still-unresolved question of Namibia is an integral part of that situation in the south of the African continent, which is becoming ever more explosive. The Security Council must take decisive action to avert that danger. Our position on that is clear.

In his message addressed to the United Nations Secretary-General on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, pointed out that the German Democratic Republic:

"strongly condemns the South African régime of apartheid, which is escalating its State terrorism inside and outside the country. Such a peace-threatening policy that disregards the peoples' right to self-determination must be answered with effective sanctions by the United Nations Security Council."

Yesterday, we followed with great interest and sympathy the impressive statement by the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Ndimba Toivo ja Toivo. He spoke convincingly of the need for the Security

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

Council to adopt effective measures to speed up his people's progress towards independence. Sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter are overdue, particularly in view of the fact that the Pretoria régime continues to defy Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In his report to the Security Council, document S/17442, the Secretary-General was compelled to conclude that:

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

There can be no illusion. Progress will not be realized without our resolute action. It is time that the century-long struggle of the Namibian people against colonial oppression and the endeavours of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations over the past 40 years on behalf of the implementation of that people's right to self-determination are brought to fruition.

It is not only the apartheid régime that bears responsibility for the situation in southern Africa, a situation that is in the long run untenable. Responsibility must also be shared by the imperialist Powers that are backing up that régime. The drive of the racist rulers in Pretoria for regional domination ties in with the global strategic ambitions and economic interests of some Western States. The aim is to perpetuate Namibia's role as a springboard for imperialism to stem historical progress in southern Africa. The most striking manifestation of such designs is the policy of so-called constructive engagement.

For those reasons, Pretoria can safely rely on the overt and covert support of its patrons, just as it can defy with impunity all relevant decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations, including the Security Council.

Nor does it come as a surprise - indeed, it is clear for all to see - that in Namibia corporations are still engaged in doing business, particularly those from the Western countries that have so far prevented effective - I repeat, effective -

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

measures to end the illegal occupation of that country. Here, too, the countries involved do not shrink from abusing their veto in the United Nations Security Council, thereby saving South Africa from sanctions and providing it with rear-guard protection. In addition, that approach is blocking what is perhaps the only possible path left towards a peaceful solution to the conflict in southern Africa.

The German Democratic Republic resolutely condemns any collusion with the racist régime in Pretoria. Such collusion, whatever its form, is a vehicle for the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia and the postponement to some vague date in the far and distant future the independence of that country.

My delegation vehemently opposes manoeuvres designed to obstruct implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), be it the so-called internal settlements, the installation by South Africa of a puppet régime in Windhoek or the linkage upon which a certain party continues to insist between a settlement of the question of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban contingent from the People's Republic of Angola.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

At their recent meeting in Sofia, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty adopted a Declaration outlining their principled position on, among other things, the situation in southern Africa. In that context they stated the following:

"In analysing the situation in southern Africa, support was voiced for the selfless struggle for freedom and independence of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, and the need to grant independence to Namibia immediately was emphasized". (A/C.1/40/7, p. 10)

So long as that objective is not achieved, so long as the Security Council has not resolutely enforced the implementation of its resolutions on the question of Namibia - in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) - the Namibian people will be forced to continue its hard and bitter struggle for the realization of its right to self-determination and for the independence of the country. We assure its sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization, of the unqualified solidarity of the people and Government of the German Democratic Republic in this truly just struggle.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for his kind words addressed to me and to Australia.

Mr. LI Luye (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should first like to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am deeply convinced that as the representative of Australia, given your rich diplomatic experience and talent, you will lead the work of the Security Council for the month of November to a successful conclusion.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

I take this opportunity also to express our thanks to Ambassador Vernon Walters, the Permanent Representative of the United States, for a job well done as President of the Security Council last month.

In June this year the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), in which it further condemned the South African racist régime for its installation of a so-called interim government in Namibia and declared that this action was illegal and null and void. At the same time, it demanded that the South African authorities immediately rescind that action.

Five months have passed. The South African authorities have refused to comply with resolution 566 (1985). On the contrary, they have stepped up their efforts to foster the puppet régime and to create new obstacles to the independence of Namibia. Hence, it was absolutely necessary for the Security Council to be called into emergency session, at the request of African and non-aligned States.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis, universally accepted by the international community, for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the front-line States in Africa have made tremendous efforts to ensure the early implementation of that resolution. The South African authorities, however, have responded to the resolution with intransigence accompanied by procrastination and non-compliance.

As for the kind of electoral system that would be installed, under the supervision of the United Nations, in order to achieve the self-determination of Namibia, for a long time South Africa failed to give any answer. The United Nations Secretary-General, in his follow-up report of September this year referred once again to these delaying tactics by the South African authorities. On the very eve of the current series of Security Council meetings, however, the Foreign Minister of South Africa suddenly wrote the Secretary-General alleging that, at the

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

request of the interim government South Africa had fostered, it had chosen an electoral system. At the same time, he requested that the statement by the transitional government of national unity of South-West Africa should be circulated as a document of the Security Council. That is merely an attempt to compel the Security Council to recognize the puppet régime that the Council has already declared to be illegal. It in no way indicates any sincerity on the part of the South African authorities about modifying their intransigent position. Rather, it is another serious provocation of the Security Council by South Africa.

In his statement on 13 November, the South African representative not only insisted on linking Namibia's independence with extraneous issues, but had the arrogance to engage in unwarranted accusations against the Security Council. South Africa's response to the various solemn resolutions adopted by the United Nations has escalated from sinister manoeuvring and the introduction of extraneous factors to open defiance. That is totally unacceptable.

Developments in recent years have made an increasing number of countries aware that political and moral condemnations of South Africa are not enough and that the international community must impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa to force it to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions. Since the beginning of this year, a number of Governments, parliaments and non-governmental organizations as well as people from all walks of life have successively adopted a series of sanction measures against South Africa in political, economic, cultural and sports fields, measures that constitute a certain degree of pressure. That is a praiseworthy development. At the same time, we hope that certain countries with major influence on South Africa will change their attitude of accommodation and concessions to South Africa and join the rest of the international community in denouncing South Africa and applying sanctions against it.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

In the view of the Chinese delegation, the South African authorities' prolonged obstruction of the independence of Namibia poses a great threat to peace and stability in the entire southern African region. The South African authorities have also turned a deaf ear to the warnings by the United Nations. The Security Council should therefore adopt effective measures against South Africa, in accordance with resolution 566 (1985) and the relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We therefore support the request by the African and non-aligned States for the imposition of further sanctions against South Africa. We call upon all States members of the Security Council, particularly the permanent members, to carry out their obligations in earnest and thereby contribute to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

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

I should like to inform the Council that I have just received letters from the representatives of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Tunisia 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. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic): First of all I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We have no doubt that your great diplomatic and political experience will be conducive to a successful outcome of the Council's work.

I should also like to extend our thanks to the Permanent Representative of the United States, Vernon Walters, who skillfully guided the work of the Council last month.

Once again the Security Council has resumed its consideration of the Namibian problem. In the recent report of the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia we once again see the following statement:

"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)

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In describing the existing situation, the Secretary-General uses the word "impasse".

The Pretoria régime continues openly to flout the will of the international community and to overrule the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It continues to pile up every conceivable obstacle to the solution of the Namibian problem. In addition to the notorious linkage, which has been repudiated by the international community, we now have the unseemly attempts to torpedo a settlement by means of the illegal establishment in Namibia of a so-called transitional government.

Now Pretoria and the puppet authorities in Windhoek have started talking about the holding of elections, which are supposed to lead to "the independence of South West Africa". They are thereby issuing an ultimatum to the United Nations. There can be no question of any United Nations observation of such elections unless the Organization and the Security Council agree to South Africa's conditions and the conditions of their henchmen. In other words, the elections, if they take place, will be held in the presence of the more than 100,000-strong South African military units and without the participation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

The purpose of such manoeuvres by the racists, manoeuvres which consist in the imposition of a new colonialist model on Namibia, has been completely unmasked, with all due arguments, at previous meetings of the Security Council on the matter. It has been rightly pointed out that the racist régime of South Africa would not have dared to overrule the will of the international community so brazenly and cynically and to disregard the decisions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia if it had not enjoyed comprehensive support, including support in the Security Council, from influential Western protectors, primarily the United States.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

At the same time, real ways and means to settle the Namibian problem do exist. They are contained in numerous decisions of the United Nations, which bears direct responsibility for the fate of Namibia and for ensuring its genuine independence.

The Ukrainian SSR resolutely advocates the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence in accordance with all the relevant United Nations decisions on the question, including resolution 435 (1978), and on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

It is essential to secure the immediate and complete withdrawal from the Territory of the South African forces and administration and the transfer of the full plenitude of power to the people of Namibia in the person of the South West Africa People's Organization, which is recognized by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement as the legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

The Ukrainian SSR supported Security Council resolution 566 (1985), which rejects the insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues. We resolutely condemn the American policy of constructive engagement with the racist Pretoria régime and the policy of the United States and a number of other Western countries and Israel of preserving broad links with South Africa, which effectively cancels out international efforts to fight for the granting of independence to Namibia and the elimination of apartheid and leads to the strengthening of the repression by the racists and increased aggressiveness against independent African States. The events of this year alone have irrefutably borne out that contention.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Ukrainian SSR opposes the continuing plundering by foreign monopolies and transnational corporations of Western States of the natural resources of Namibia, which are the inalienable patrimony of the Namibian people. Our Republic fully supports the demands of the African countries and the Non-Aligned Movement and also the repeated appeals of the Security Council and the General Assembly for the immediate application against South Africa of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is high time to take decisive and effective measures to compel the Pretoria régime to heed the voice of international public opinion.

The just struggle of the Namibian people, headed by SWAPO, for its national independence and freedom, a struggle it is waging with all the means available to it, will continue to enjoy the full support of the Ukrainian SSR.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, despite the huge distance that separates my country, Egypt, and yours, Australia, the friendly relations between the two countries are very close and strong. Therefore it gives me special pleasure to see you presiding over the work of the Council at this particular stage and during this particular month.

Before I come to the matter now before the Council, I have pleasure in expressing my delegation's appreciation of the exemplary manner in which Ambassador Vernon Walters conducted the work of the Council last month and the atmosphere of understanding he created during his presidency.

The question of Namibia is one of the matters most studied by the principal organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, which has been studying the matter since 1946, and the Security Council.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

Today I am not going to deal with the legality or illegality of the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa. This matter has been studied thoroughly during the long period that has elapsed since this item was first placed on the agenda of this international organization. It seems to us to us that there is no one among us today who questions the illegality of the continued occupation of that Territory by South Africa. A cursory glance at the resolutions of the Security Council is sufficient to prove the categorical position of the Council in this regard. We believe that the matter before the Council today is primarily one of the role of the Security Council and its duties under the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, and for bringing about the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, and the granting to the people of Namibia of their legitimate right to self-determination in accordance with the provisions of international law and in implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

Over the years the Security Council has adopted numerous clear resolutions on the question of Namibia. Those resolutions were crowned by resolution 435 (1978), which contained the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. That and subsequent resolutions all revolved around the same idea and all point in the same direction which, in brief, is that the presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal, and that South Africa must withdraw forthwith from that Territory to enable its people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Further, the implementation of that resolution cannot be linked to any extraneous matters which do not fall within the scope of the resolution.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

On the other side, what was the reaction of South Africa? The Pretoria régime has spared no effort since the very beginning to create pretexts and fabricate reasons to hamper the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, including those which it had declared it accepted. At the beginning it brought up the matter of the neutrality of the United Nations and its competence to supervise the implementation of the Namibian independence process. Then the South African régime created problems pertaining to the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG).

That was followed by the creation of other problems pertaining to the choice of the electoral system through which the Namibian people should exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with the United Nations plan. Then the Pretoria régime admitted that that was a secondary matter, thus creating room for its final manoeuvre, the last in a series of attempts to hamper the implementation of Security Council resolutions concerning Namibia. I refer to the linkage between its withdrawal from Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. To that were added many other manoeuvres, among which was the decision of the Pretoria régime to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia, an action condemned by the Security Council and declared to be null and void.

The report of the Secretary-General of 6 September 1985 (S/17742) reaffirms anew that there has not been any progress in the consultations held by the Secretary-General recently with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also reaffirms that this continued delay in the implementation of the resolution is eroding the credibility of the Government of South Africa at a time when the world is witnessing the tragic developments in that region with growing concern.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

South Africa's refusal to implement the resolutions of the Security Council did not come as a surprise to us in Egypt. On the one hand we did not expect South Africa voluntarily to withdraw from that Territory. On the other hand we view the actions of the Pretoria régime, be they internal racist policies, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia or its continued acts of aggression against its neighbours, as different sides of the same coin. That régime, because of its racist philosophy and nature cannot survive and continue to survive except through internal and external violence or aggression.

What we are considering today is what the reaction of the Security Council must be in the face of the actions of the Pretoria régime and its continued refusal to implement the resolutions of the Council calling for its withdrawal from Namibia. The Council made it very clear in its resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June last, when it strongly warned South Africa that its failure to co-operate with the Council and the Secretary-General would compel the Council to consider the adoption of appropriate measures in accordance with the United Nations Charter, including those under Chapter VII, in order to guarantee South Africa's commitment to the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council.

The Secretary-General's report makes it quite obvious that there has not been any change in the position of South Africa in refusing to implement resolution 435 (1978). The question now is what will the Council do in view of the position adopted by South Africa?

As far as Egypt is concerned, the answer has always been crystal clear: Egypt believes that the Council must use all the means and possibilities available to it under the Charter, including the provisions of Chapter VII, in order to ensure that South Africa will implement its resolutions and comply with them. What is at stake

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

today is not only the prestige of the Security Council as the supreme international organ for the maintenance of international security. What is at stake is the life of the heroic people of Namibia, who are struggling for their independence and freedom in the face of a racist occupier who knows no limits to the use of force and oppression. What is also at stake is the security and stability of the whole of Africa. In addition, as the Secretary-General mentions in his latest report, the failure to achieve any progress affects the reactions of the international community vis-à-vis the other serious developments in the region.

Finally, I should like to reaffirm the absolute support of the Egyptian Government and people for the struggle of our brothers in Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole authentic representative. I should like to commend the wisdom and good sense displayed by the leadership of that organization and its efforts to achieve the independence of Namibia in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. The statement made by Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, the Secretary-General of SWAPO, before the Council yesterday was a case in point.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for his statement and for his generous words addressed to me and to Australia.

The next speaker on my list is 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, Mr. Abdul Koroma. I take the opportunity of welcoming him back to New York and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Chairman of the Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24): On behalf of the Special Committee I wish to express my sincere appreciation to you, Sir, and the members of this distinguished body severally and collectively for this opportunity to address the Security Council in connection with its consideration of the critical situation with which our Organization is confronted in respect of Namibia.

(Mr. Koroma, Chairman,
Special Committee of 24)

We continue to hold this Council in high esteem, even with reverence, because it is at the end of the day the final custodian of world peace and security. Our approach to this Council is therefore based on peace and justice, in this particular case self-determination and justice for the Namibian people.

I should also like to say, Sir, how happy and gratified I am to see you presiding over the deliberations of the Council on this occasion. We are all aware of your personal commitment to the principles and purposes of this Organization and, indeed, to the cause of decolonization, and of the commitment of the people and Government of Australia to the cause of decolonization and their outstanding contribution to the work of the United Nations in this field, as a member of the Trusteeship Council and of the Special Committee of 24.

We should also like to pay tribute to the Permanent Representative of the United States for the able and competent manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council last month.

Our Secretary-General has continued in his efforts to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and we wish to thank him warmly and to encourage him in his efforts.

As we meet here today for the second time in five months, to address ourselves to the question of Namibia, it is a source of profound regret that we continue to be confronted with the same grim reality. The prospect of an acceptable solution appears to be as remote as ever, while the situation prevailing in the region continues to pose a most serious threat to international peace and security.

In Namibia itself, the occupying régime of Pretoria has continued in its brutality and repression of the Namibian people, while externally it has continued in its acts of aggression against neighbouring States with the aim of intimidating them into accepting the prevailing situation and with the hope of denying Namibia its independence.

(Mr. Koroma, Chairman,
Special Committee of 24)

As indicated by an overwhelming majority of Member States during the general debate which took place at the outset of the current session of the General Assembly, it is patent that this perilous state of affairs is attributable to the racist régime of Pretoria which defiantly continues to demonstrate, both in its policies and by its actions, its open contempt for the United Nations and the goal of Namibian independence. All evidence, including the latest report of the Secretary-General on this question, indicates that the Pretoria régime has been devious and deceitful all along and has pretended to participate in negotiations in good faith for the sole purpose of obstructing the effective implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The racist régime's open defiance of the true aspirations of the Namibian people and its blatant disregard of the will of the international community should and must be brought to an end.

The position of the Special Committee of 24 on the question of Namibia is set out in no uncertain terms in a unanimous decision adopted at its extraordinary session held at Tunis this year. The Special Committee, first and foremost, holds the apartheid régime responsible for creating a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security. The Committee strongly condemns South Africa's persistent non-compliance with and violations of United Nations resolutions and decisions, its ruthless resort to acts of subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States, its continued manoeuvres to subvert the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and its sinister attempts to impose an "internal settlement" on the people of Namibia.

The Special Committee categorically rejects and denounces all manoeuvres by South Africa to bring about a sham independence in Namibia through fraudulent schemes, including the establishment of the so-called interim government designed

(Mr. Koroma, Chairman,
Special Committee of 24)

to perpetuate their domination and exploitation. In this regard, the Special Committee condemns and rejects the policies of linkage and constructive engagement, which have further emboldened the apartheid régime to intensify its repression of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

The Special Committee is convinced that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces, and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Special Committee also calls for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without modification, qualification or pre-conditions. The Special Committee is aware that the Security Council has been prevented from discharging effectively its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security in the region owing to the opposition of certain of its permanent members. The Special Committee recommends, none the less, that the Security Council respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

The foregoing position of the Special Committee is founded on its strong conviction that the United Nations is in duty bound to do everything possible to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation. The validity of this position has been clearly affirmed in Security Council resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June.

The report of the Secretary-General before us speaks for itself: there has been absolutely no progress whatsoever in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) since the Council met in June, while, on the other hand, the

(Mr. Koroma, Chairman,
Special Committee of 24)

colonial régime of Pretoria continues its blatant defiance of the will of the world community. Therefore there cannot be any ground for further equivocation on the part of anyone in the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.

The repeated attempts to bring about an independent, stable, self-governing, democratic Namibia by the exercise of reason, through negotiations at an international level, have been ignored and, still worse, ridiculed by the racist régime, as amply demonstrated by its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. The time is overdue for the Security Council to act, and act positively, by imposing on South Africa a comprehensive programme of economic sanctions. At the same time, measures must be adopted without delay to extend all possible assistance to the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). That is the very least we should expect if we are not to see the present armed struggle degenerate into full-scale war with all its due consequences, and the effectiveness and respect of this Council as the custodian of international peace and security, further compromised.

Before concluding, may I be permitted to express my deepest appreciation to States members of the non-aligned countries and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) for having taken the important initiative of calling for this series of Council meetings on the situation in Namibia. I have no doubt whatsoever that the decisions adopted by the Council during these meetings will prove to be a decisive factor in restoring to the people of Namibia their long-denied human dignity and freedom.

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

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

Mr. VELAZCO SAN JOSE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, Mr. President, I wish to offer you my most sincere congratulations upon your assumption of the Presidency of the Security Council for the current month. We are convinced that, given your experience and diplomatic skill, you will conduct the business of the Council most successfully.

It would be difficult to find another question dealt with by this body that arouses so much concern and which at the same time is the object of such universal consensus as the question of the independence of Namibia.

This fact was borne out once again, if it were necessary, by the interventions during the general debate in the General Assembly and the commemorative session of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Above and beyond the framework of our Organization, the question of the independence of Namibia is being given greater priority in many other international forums, as was seen recently in the last summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held in Luanda, the capital of Angola.

It is precisely as a result of the pronouncements of that last Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned States that we find ourselves meeting again to consider the question of Namibia.

The international consensus that is emerging more strongly with each passing day on the Question of Namibia is reflected in the following positions: the demand for the early independence of Namibia in accordance with the provisions of

(Mr. Velazco San Jose, Cuba)

resolution 435 (1978); the unequivocal rejection of the attempts to link the independence of Namibia with any other question extraneous to that process; the recognition and support of the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia; the condemnation of the policy of apartheid which the South African Government has extended to the Territory of Namibia; and the strongest condemnation of South Africa's acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola.

Together with that, we have seen how the international community is calling more forcefully for the adoption of mandatory sanctions by the Security Council against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter if the racist authorities persist in their refusal to comply with the resolutions of the Council, including resolution 566 (1985).

As stated by previous speakers, in particular the Secretary-General of SWAPO, Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, the time has come for the Security Council to take effective measures to compel South Africa to abide by the will of the international community.

The best proof of that is this debate itself. The representative of the racist Prétoria authorities, with his usual arrogance and unbelievable contempt for this body, whose responsibility concerning Namibia has been clearly established, once again calls into question the authority of the United Nations, levels threats against the international community, insists on the linkage theory, requests that the members of the Council recognize the representation of the puppets who represent no more than the interests of apartheid in Namibia, and, in short, has come to tell us that South Africa will continue to disregard the resolutions of the Council and intends to continue occupying Namibia illegally, making martyrs of its

(Mr. Velazco San Jose, Cuba)

people, exploiting its natural resources and carrying out its policy of terror against the front-line States.

The pretext of linking the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces which are in Angola at the request of the legitimate Government of that country, precisely to defend its territory against South Africa's aggression, is among the manoeuvres and dilatory tactics of the racist Government with the support of its main ally, the United States, designed to obstruct the negotiating process and prolong the illegal occupation of Namibia and the plundering of its wealth.

South Africa's aggressiveness, its intransigence and dilatory tactics, including the linkage thesis, are not only nurtured by the policy of constructive engagement of the present United States Government, but are also stimulated and revitalized by the actions of its ally and protector, such as the revocation of the Clark Amendment and the decision to increase material assistance to the UNITA bandits.

Cuba which, together with the international community, rejects any pretext that may be adduced to impede the independence of the people of Namibia, maintains the position set forth in the Cuban/Angolan communiqué of 4 February 1982, the first and ninth paragraphs of which state:

"The permanence and the withdrawal of the Cuban forces stationed in Angola are a bilateral question between two sovereign States, the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Cuba, in accordance with the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter."

"If the selfless struggle of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and the demands of the international community, were to achieve a real solution of the Namibian question based on strict compliance with resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council of the United Nations and

(Mr. Velazco San Jose, Cuba)

were to lead to a truly independent Government and the complete withdrawal of South Africa's occupation forces to the other side of the Orange River, which would considerably diminish the dangers of aggression against Angola, the Angolan and Cuban Governments would consider the resumption of the implementation of the programme of gradual withdrawal of Cuban forces in the time frame to be agreed on by the Governments."

We have all been witness to the growing frequency with which this body has been obliged to meet, especially in these last few months, to consider the aggravation of various situations created in South Africa - all of them brought about by the policy of aggression of the racist Pretoria régime and its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council concerning the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Velazco San Jose, Cuba)

That explains the increasingly unanimous rejection of the theory of linkage and the appeals - including those of this Council - to Member States to increase their assistance to the People's Republic of Angola to enable it to face up to the systematic aggression of racist South Africa. There is also an increase in solidarity with the just struggle of the people of Namibia and in the number of appeals addressed to the international community, such as that of the ministerial meeting of non-aligned countries, held at Luanda, to intensify material, financial, political, diplomatic and military assistance to the legitimate armed struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole legitimate representative.

In that context, the members of the Security Council could today cut short the suffering and sacrifices of the Namibian people, and contribute to the elimination of that dangerous hotbed of tension which poses a threat to international peace and security. That can be achieved only if the Council decides at last to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

In the meantime, and in keeping with our policy of principle and our historical commitment to the just cause of peoples struggling to throw off the colonial yoke, I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the unshakable solidarity of the people and the Government of Cuba with the fraternal people of Namibia.

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

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

Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for November. Your country, Australia, is well known for its devotion to the principles of the Charter, in particular the principle of decolonization. You yourself have earned the admiration of us all for your ability and great diplomatic skill. We have great hope that, under your wise guidance, the Council's consideration of the important question of Namibia will advance the cause of justice and peace in southern Africa.

I wish also to convey my congratulations to your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Vernon Walters, Permanent Representative of the United States of America, for the effectiveness and authority with which he guided the work of the Council in October.

We have just commemorated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, yet we cannot avoid a certain feeling of bitterness at the fate of Namibia. By its adoption of the Declaration, the international community sought to bring about the end of the colonial era. Fifteen years earlier, the authors of the San Francisco Charter had already proclaimed the need for equality among nations and the right of all nations to determine freely their own future. They assigned a vanguard role to the Organization in the decolonization process. And indeed, the United Nations has made an effective contribution to the accession to sovereignty of a large number of countries in Africa, Asia, the Americas and Oceania.

Today, despite past successes, the Organization is unable to complete the task entrusted to it. In certain cases, such as that of Namibia, it displays a remarkable lack of authority. Yet no other question before it has been the subject of a clearer consensus or more precise guidelines. The question of Namibia,

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

moreover, should be one of the Organization's priorities, since it involves the special responsibilities it assumed when, in 1966, it decided to place the Territory under its own administration.

How, then, can we explain the present deadlock on the Namibian question and the Organization's paralysis? How can we explain the fact that the apartheid régime continues with impunity to oppose the international consensus?

The consensus on Namibia is clear; it is well known; it was arrived at unanimously in the Security Council; it offers the possibility of peaceful, just change; it is summed up in resolution 435 (1978). Seven years have passed since the adoption of that resolution, which at the time had the approval of the Pretoria régime. Seven years have passed, during which that régime has stepped up its delaying tactics to hinder the United Nations plan and to perpetuate its illegal occupation. Today the hopes aroused by resolution 435 (1978) have been dashed, and the independence of Namibia seems more remote than ever before. To undermine the United Nations plan, the Government of South Africa has invariably tried to pass off this question of decolonization as an East-West conflict and, by the subterfuge of linkage, to bind the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

In the meantime, the long list of its crimes has grown longer still. It has heightened its repression; it has fuelled tribal divisions; it has imposed mandatory conscription; it has imposed an interim government, which is in its pay; in collusion with corporations, particularly Western corporations, it has speeded up the pillage of Namibia's resources; and it has used that country's territory as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring countries.

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

It is clear that Pretoria has no intention of withdrawing from Namibia. The Secretary-General confirmed that pessimistic impression in his previous report, of 6 June 1985.

In the face of this challenge, all Member States are duty-bound to react strongly. For its part, Tunisia joins the majority in reaffirming that resolution 435 (1978) as the sole acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and in rejecting the argument of "linkage". We urge those Powers which thus far have been indulgent towards Pretoria to change their attitude to it.

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

Those Powers that continue to advocate a negotiated solution say that they are against a war of liberation in Namibia and invoke, inter alia, what they call moral reasons. Since the policy of persuasion and so-called constructive engagement has failed, the only peaceful means available to the international community is the stepping up of pressure against South Africa through the imposition of exemplary coercive measures.

Those same Powers oppose both armed struggle and comprehensive mandatory sanctions. That attitude is obviously dictated by reasons connected, among other things, with short-term economic advantages. Such reasons are neither rational, defensible nor effective.

Tunisia, reiterating its unflagging support to the fraternal Namibian people, and their heroic struggle and to their sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), urges the Security Council - and, in particular, its permanent members - to take serious and logical action to meet the challenge thrown down by the Pretoria Government, to destroy the last bastion of colonialism and racism in Africa and thus to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Tunisia for his kinds about Australia and myself.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to convey to you my delegation's warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of November. Thailand and Australia became members of the Security Council at the same time, and the Thai delegation is much gratified by this happy coincidence, since both our countries enjoy excellent relations and are motivated by similar interests and aspirations, particularly in the strengthening of peaceful co-operation in the vast region of South-East Asia.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

and the South Pacific. My delegation is confident, therefore, that with your personal qualities and your diplomatic skill and experience, the deliberations of the Council will proceed smoothly and with fruitful results.

I should also like to pay a warm tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Vernon Walters, the distinguished soldier-diplomat and Permanent Representative of the United States of America, for the dignified and effective manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council last month.

This is the third time within six months that the Council has had to consider the situation in Namibia. It stems from the fact that the racist régime of South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia in arrogant defiance of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and in disregard of the legitimate wishes of the people of Namibia.

On this occasion my delegation, therefore, fully supports the requests made by the Group of African States and the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to convene this meeting in order to consider the situation in Namibia, and we are gratified at being given the opportunity once again to reaffirm Thailand's position on this important item.

It has been almost 20 years since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and 14 years have elapsed since the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 on this question. However, the situation in Namibia today remains unchanged. This year also marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of our Organization and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and yet the Namibian people are still under the yoke of illegal occupation and subjugation imposed through the most brutal means by the apartheid régime in Pretoria. It is therefore a matter of gravest concern that

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

South Africa should be permitted to continue its abhorrent presence and practices in Namibia in defiance of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Furthermore, it is with deep regret that we note that, while the Namibian people are being kept waiting for the freedom and independence that are their birthrights, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations Plan for Namibian Independence, is being subjected to stalling tactics and met with shameless prevarication by the Pretoria régime.

It has been reiterated here time and again that resolution 435 (1978) embodying the United Nations Plan for the Independence of Namibia is the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. And yet, despite the repeated demands for its immediate and unconditional implementation, South Africa is allowed to procrastinate and to undermine it by various means.

On 19 June this year, the Council once again adopted a resolution, resolution 566 (1985), in which, inter alia, it decided:

"to mandate the Secretary-General to resume immediate contact with South Africa with a view to obtaining its choice of the electoral system to be used for the election, under United Nations supervision and control, for the Constituent Assembly, in terms of resolution 435 (1978), in order to pave the way for the adoption by the Security Council of the enabling resolution for the implementation of the United Nations Independence Plan for Namibia".

(resolution 566 (1985), op. para. 11)

In response to that resolution, the Secretary-General submitted his report to the Council in document S/17442 dated 6 September 1985. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute to the Secretary-General for his

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

untiring efforts in accordance with his mandate and to take note with appreciation of his latest report, which sums up the current impasse 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). I cannot let this occasion pass without reiterating my appeal to the South African Government to heed the unanimous call of the international community to proceed forthwith with the implementation of that resolution. The continuing delay undermines the credibility of the South African Government at a time when the world is watching with growing concern the increasingly tragic developments occurring in that area." (S/17442, para. 12)

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

In fact, the tragic situation prevailing in Namibia and South Africa has aroused the mounting feeling of outrage on the part of international public opinion, especially in the countries that have taken a lenient approach to the problem. This is reflected in increasing public demands on such Governments to respond more fully to the dictates of conscience. The Pretoria régime should by now realize that time is not on its side. Moral compulsion and revulsion on the part of decent human beings can and will ensure that the shameful situation does not continue.

The recent chronicle of Pretoria's action has further convinced my delegation that the racist régime intends to scuttle the United Nations plan as contained in resolution 435 (1978), not merely by means of the linkage of the issue to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, but also by seeking unilateral settlement through a so-called multi-party conference and the establishment of a so-called interim government in Namibia. Hence, the Council is now facing an enormous challenge in dealing with the defiant Pretoria régime. It is therefore the primary responsibility of the Council to redouble its efforts in seeking all appropriate measures to remedy the situation, in order to ensure the speedy attainment of Namibia's independence.

The latest move by the Pretoria régime is, we hope, perhaps an indication of its change of attitude.

My delegation joins with the international community in resolutely denouncing the Pretoria régime's insistence on the so-called linkage of the Namibian question to the extraneous issue of Cuban troops in Angola. Furthermore, we strongly condemn South Africa's use of Namibian territory for launching military attacks against and incursions into the neighbouring States, such as the recent acts of aggression against Angola and Botswana. Such illegal actions not only threaten the stability of the southern African region but also undermine international peace and security.

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

My delegation also condemns the racist régime of South Africa for its establishment of a so-called interim government in Namibia and denounces it as null and void. We are of the opinion that such heinous actions will only aggravate the situation and prolong the agony of the oppressed Namibian people.

We firmly believe that the United Nations plan as contained in resolution 435 (1978) remains the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the issue. Its unconditional implementation without further delay by South Africa is essential to ensure a just and lasting solution to this problem.

Thailand will continue to support the people of Namibia in their quest of sovereignty and independence in a united Namibia. In the message he recently, on 28 October 1985, addressed to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Namibia and Their Liberation Movement, SWAPO, my Prime Minister stated:

"I would like to reiterate, on behalf of the Royal Thai Government and the people of Thailand, our firm commitment to support the people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle for independence and sovereignty under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, which is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We strongly believe that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia must be implemented in order that peace and stability may be restored in the region. Only then can the Namibian people enjoy fully their freedom and human dignity".

My delegation would like to avail itself of this opportunity to place on record its deep appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the distinguished leadership of Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia, for its dedicated labour in behalf of the international community on the question of Namibia.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Thailand for his generous words addressed to me and to Australia and its policies.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of this item will be held at 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.