



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2755

28 October 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 28 October 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BUCCI

(Italy)

Members: Argentina  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
France  
Germany, Federal Republic of  
Ghana  
Japan  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Arab Emirates  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela  
Zambia

Mr. DELPECH  
Mr. GARVALOV  
Mr. YU Mengjia  
Mr. ADOUKI  
Mr. BLANC  
Count YORK von WARTENBURG  
Mr. GBEHO  
Mr. KIKUCHI  
Mr. BELONOGOV  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Sir Crispin TICKELL  
Mr. OKUN  
Mr. AGUILAR  
Mr. ZUZE

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 3.35 p.m.

#### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

#### THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

LETTER DATED 23 OCTOBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MADAGASCAR TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19230)

LETTER DATED 27 OCTOBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19235)

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Cameroon, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Turkey and Yugoslavia 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. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Ritter (Panama), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey) and Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter dated 27 October 1987 from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

"On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I have the honour, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, to request an invitation to the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, headed by myself, to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia' which begins on 28 October 1987."

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 President and delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zuze (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 26 October 1987 from the representatives of Congo, Ghana and Zambia, 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. Theo-Ben Gurirab,

(The President)

the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)."

That letter has been distributed as a Security Council document under the symbol S/19233.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Gurirab 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. Gurirab took a place at the Council table.

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

The Security Council is meeting today in response to requests contained in letters addressed to the President of the Security Council on 26 and 27 October 1987, respectively, by the Permanent Representative of Madagascar to the United Nations (S/19230) and the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations (S/19235). Members of the Council have before them document S/19234, which contains the text of a further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia.

The first speaker is the representative of Madagascar, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of October. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): It is my privilege to speak today in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of October in order to draw the attention of the members of the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

Security Council to the disquiet and profound concern of the members of the Group at the steady deterioration of the situation in Namibia. But first I wish to extend the warm congratulations of my delegation to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. Your political acumen and diplomatic experience ensure the success of the Council's debates.

I also extend to Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana our deep gratitude for the competent way in which he guided the work of the Council in September.

The Group of African States asked me to call for this meeting of the Council in order to express the concern of the Group not only at the tragic plight of the Namibian people, the victim of one of the most brutal and cruel forms of colonial exploitation, but also at the chronic inaction of the Security Council with regard to the question of Namibia, which remains a special responsibility of the United Nations and, in fact, of the international community in general.

This concern is all the more legitimate when one remembers that it has been more than two years now since the Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), in which, inter alia, it strongly warned South Africa that its refusal to co-operate in ensuring the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would oblige the Council to have recourse to appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII thereof.

The international community in general, and the African States in particular, were pleased at the time at the change of attitude on the part of the Council. For once the deadlock which had affected the Council since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) seemed to have been broken. We were convinced that the Council had given itself the means necessary to restore and preserve its credibility in the face of the arrogant defiance of South Africa.

In fact, the consultations conducted by the Secretary-General with all the

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

progress on many aspects of the question. In November 1985 all the parties reached agreement on a system of proportional representation for the elections envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), thus opening the way for the possible establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). The Secretary-General then concluded that all the conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan had been met.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

However, the Secretary-General's untiring efforts have been obstructed by the intransigence of South Africa, which has persisted in linking Namibia's independence to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. That delaying tactic by the racist régime came as no surprise to anyone, because we could hardly imagine South Africa's agreeing in good faith to co-operate voluntarily with the United Nations to lead Namibia to independence. For a long time now South Africa has always sought ways of getting round resolution 435 (1978).

In the meantime, the Namibian people continue to be subjected to oppression and political domination. Repression, militarization and economic exploitation under the South African occupation régime have reached intolerable, unprecedented levels. The general situation in southern Africa is rapidly worsening. The international Territory of Namibia is being used to launch acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line States, causing incalculable human suffering and material losses. The prospects of an independent and sovereign Namibia are far from becoming a reality.

Faced with South Africa's arrogant attitude, the Security Council has been unable to act in a concrete and practical way. Twice - in November 1985 and again in April 1987 - the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of African States have asked the Council to consider that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a breach of international peace, and have therefore asked it to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa under the relevant provisions of the Charter. We are all aware of the results of those two requests. The Council rejected them, because of the negative votes of some of its permanent members.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The African States deeply regret the fact that the Council has been unable to compel South Africa to implement United Nations resolutions on Namibia. But, in spite of that disappointment, and bearing in mind the real threat South Africa poses to regional and international peace and security, the Heads of State or Government of the African States have pledged themselves

"to step up diplomatic efforts to break the impasse that the policy of linking Namibia's attainment of independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola constitutes."

That is why we have again requested the convening of the Council to call upon it to find an effective course of action to achieve Namibia's immediate independence.

South Africa has for too long defied and undermined international morality and the influence and authority of the United Nations. We urgently appeal to the countries that are reputedly South Africa's allies - which, incidentally, once had the task of aiding the United Nations to speed up Namibia's democratic and peaceful transition to statehood - to join the efforts of the international community to end the suffering of the Namibian people. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has always supported resolution 435 (1978) and has frequently affirmed its readiness to co-operate with the Secretary-General to bring about its implementation, in particular through the conclusion of a cease-fire agreement.

It is now up to the Council to take the necessary measures to give effect to its decision. Our position in this respect has been unchanging. It is that the Council should demand the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa to compel it to begin implementation.

Since all the questions concerning the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence have been resolved, as we have been told, the Council could envisage establishing UNTAG in Namibia.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held in New York on 2 October, suggested such a course in paragraph 16 of its final communiqué, saying:

"The Ministers urgently requested the Security Council to set an early date for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), no later than 31 December 1987, bearing in mind that all the necessary conditions had already been fulfilled, and to commit itself to applying the relevant provisions of the Charter, including comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII, in the event that South Africa continued to defy the Security Council in that regard. In that connection, they urged the Security Council to undertake forthwith consultations for the composition and emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia." (S/19187, para. 16)

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the attainment of self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia is vital to Africa. We want this question to be resolved within the framework of the United Nations. We hope that the Council, in keeping with its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, will affirm its authority to force South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, abandon its policy of apartheid and put an end to its acts of aggression and destabilization against the independent States of the region. The Group of African States remains prepared to give the Council its full co-operation.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Peter Dingi Zuze, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on whom I now call.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia:

I wish on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for accepting the request of the African Group to consider the critical situation in Namibia and for the kind invitation extended to the Council for Namibia to participate in the deliberations of these very important meetings. You have been magnanimous in acceding to the request by the African Group not because members of the Security Council are obliged to consider favourably such requests but because you too consider the present impasse on the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia to be intolerable and unacceptable. We in the Council for Namibia are pleased that this debate is taking place under your able and dynamic leadership. May your presidency bring about a successful outcome to this question.

I also wish to pay special tribute to a distinguished son of Africa my brother Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana for the excellent manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the month of September.

The Council for Namibia deeply appreciates the request by the Group of African countries to convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council on the question of Namibia. We believe that this request is a clear manifestation of the total commitment of the African countries to pursue this issue through the Security Council.

As the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until the attainment of independence, the Council has looked forward to meaningful opportunities to end the suffering of the Namibian people. We are happy to note that the Security Council has been convened to fulfil the issues on which the Security Council has already clearly and unequivocally pronounced itself. As we understand it, the Security Council is being requested to take the necessary steps for the implementation of

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council  
for Namibia)

resolution 435 (1978). This will include the observance of a cease-fire by the parties to the conflict and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. We wish to stress the known position of the United Nations, namely that the Cuban forces are in Angola by invitation of that Government and that South Africa is in Namibia illegally and nothing said or done by its sympathizers in the Security Council can alter that reality. South Africa cannot forever remain in Namibia against the expressed will and instructions of the Security Council.

The Council for Namibia has through the 21 years of its existence striven vigorously towards the fulfilment of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in order that the people of Namibia can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. We are concerned at the lack of progress on the question of the independence of Namibia despite the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and the wide international support that the struggling people of that unhappy Territory enjoy. The people of Namibia are tired of linkage and the so-called constructive engagement. Indeed the world is tired of listening to the meaningless story of linkage which is constantly being offered as a substitute for their independence and freedom. The people of Namibia do not deserve linkage. They deserve peace, dignity and, above all, the right to determine their own destiny. The United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, has an obligation to ensure that the people for whom it is responsible attain a measure of self-determination and independence.

The Security Council must decide on the arrangement of a cease-fire and the deployment of UNTAG in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). The Security Council must work to remove the artificial barrier of linkage which is being sustained for commercial gains. To this extent we appeal to the United States Administration to

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council  
for Namibia)

abandon the linkage policy. The Council for Namibia believes that the time has come for this course of action.

We in the Council for Namibia find it hard to believe that a country such as the United States of America that symbolizes human rights and democracy should seem to ally itself with the enemy of democratic principles and human rights.

Ordinary people the world over have expressed deep concern at the rate of plunder of the natural resources of Namibia in violation of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia. We in the Council for Namibia are aware that the activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia are a major impediment to the independence of Namibia. We are thus gravely concerned at the continuing pillage of Namibia's natural resources. Recent reports have indicated that the De Beers Corporation of South Africa had illegally exploited assets of close to £ stg. 1 billion through its subsidiary, the Consolidated Diamond Mines. We are concerned at the rate of overmining, extracting wealth which does not benefit the Namibian people.

We have been informed that on 31 July this year, Tsumeb Corporation, a foreign-owned mining concern which operates illegally in Namibia, dismissed 3,000 black workers - all members of the Mineworkers Union of Namibia - who were on strike seeking a pay increase, improved safety regulations and an end to discriminatory practices in the mines. This report represents the most recent revelations regarding the theft of Namibia's treasures. The plunder of the natural resources of the Territory by South Africa and other foreign economic interests must be brought to an end before the rich resources of that country are completely depleted.

The misery of the Namibian people must be a sad chapter in the history of decolonization. It is a chapter that should be closed once and for all. We in the Council for Namibia firmly believe that the time is long overdue for the Security

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council  
For Namibia)

Council to begin the implementation process of the United Nations plan for Namibia. From these meetings therefore should emerge a firm agreement mandating the Secretary-General to proceed with the arrangements for a cease-fire between the parties to the conflict and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group to ensure free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. We believe that it is not too much to ask of the Security Council to respect its own resolutions.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs 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. I call on him.

Mr. GURIRAB: First, I have the distinct pleasure of congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the important post of President of the Security Council for the month of October. It is our sincere hope that your wisdom and long experience in the diplomatic field will stand us in good stead and greatly enhance the chances of a decisive outcome of the debate which will, at long last, pave the way for the expeditious commencement of Namibia's independence process.

Secondly, last month Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana provided to the Council, as its President, effective and laudable stewardship. We congratulate him warmly.

(Mr. Gurirab)

Thirdly, I wish to thank the delegations of Congo, Ghana and Zambia for requesting the Council, on my behalf, to extend an invitation to me to participate in the debate. I am greatly indebted to them and appreciative of the Council's concurrence.

Mr. President, yesterday you and many other distinguished participants, including the speakers who have preceded me here this afternoon, made important statements at the solemn meetings convened by the United Nations Council for Namibia to commemorate the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia has been organizing such solemn meetings for the past 10 years as a constant reminder to the United Nations itself and to the rest of the world community of the plight of the oppressed Namibian masses and of the moral and legal necessity of ending their suffering and speeding up Namibia's independence.

Twenty-one years after the revocation of apartheid South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, our beloved motherland is still under fire and her children are dying because Pretoria stubbornly refuses to leave, the West continues unabated its selfish economic and strategic pursuits and the Security Council is repeatedly hamstrung by abuse of the veto and prevented from adopting effective enforcement measures, particularly comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa.

It may be true that different speakers used different words yesterday in talking about this tragic situation facing our people, but the conclusion has always been the same, namely, that Namibia is not free while colonialism, illegality and criminal and ruthless exploitation of human and natural resources reign supreme in our troubled land.

(Mr. Gurirab)

I recall the eloquent words spoken yesterday by one of the participants, who said:

"Today we should have been celebrating the independence of Namibia and rejoicing in the freedom of the Namibian people.

"That, instead, we once again lament the oppression of Namibia by the apartheid régime in South Africa is a condemnation of those Governments which, day after day, refuse to implement the strongest and most widespread sanctions against the Pretoria régime for every day that they continue to prop up the evil of this régime they extend the occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the repression of the Namibian people."

What is in the minds and hearts of the leaders in Washington, Bonn and London? Is it racism? Is it greed for profit and world dominance only, or is it a callous disregard of the fate of fellow human beings? Perhaps it is dreadful evidence of a Frankenstein's monster in them whose perversity has denuded them totally of all human feelings, driving us all along like lemmings towards self-destruction.

In Europe, the whole world rose up to oppose Hitler's genocide and tyranny. Why is genocide and tyranny tolerated and actually encouraged and sustained in Namibia today? How can you give guns, matches and gasoline to the outlawed murderers and arsonists in Pretoria and claim that you are saving the lives of the African masses? This is how we see Western involvement and hypocrisy in Namibia.

After more than 103 years of colonial violence and the politics of eternal postponement, we make no apologies about telling the truth; after more than 21 years of unfulfilled promise of Namibia's independence, which the United Nations is supposed to usher in, we believe we have the right to condemn our tormentors and those who continue to hold our freedom hostage and prolong the years of our exile.

(Mr. Gurirab)

We now stand on the threshold of the tenth anniversary of resolution 435 (1978), which, when it was adopted, held out a promise of democratic, free and fair elections. It remains unimplemented. Self-adulation, excuses and more empty promises: that is what we have been listening to all these years. And, no doubt, we shall be treated to some more of the same from the usual quarters in this debate.

Are we not supposed to tell the truth about them? Are we supposed to say "thank you" to them for the senseless killings of innocent Namibian men, women and children? What is it that we are supposed to be grateful about, which will temper our language? Notwithstanding the continued validity and efficacy of resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally acceptable and peaceful basis for the decolonization of Namibia, there is absolutely no forward movement in sight. We all know this to be the case. We also know the names and location of the culprits, who sometimes act separately and at other times - which means usually - collectively to delay our freedom.

Earlier, in April of this year, the Namibia problem was debated in the Council and we were comforted by the unanimity of views which the participants expressed in support of our cause and by their urging the Council to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against racist South Africa in favour of free elections in Namibia, supervised and controlled by the United Nations.

Strictly on the merits of Namibia's case, we advanced strategic, legal, political and moral arguments to show that the call made by the sponsors of the debate was well-founded and that what was being advocated was a peaceful way out of the impasse, which South Africa's prevarication, Washington's "linkage" and other forms of obfuscation by certain Western countries have created.

(Mr. Gurirab)

The outcome was as predictable as it was unconscionable. Vetoes and negative votes by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany respectively dealt a death-knell to the draft resolution which the caucus of non-aligned countries in the Council had sponsored. The popular will of the majority was once again frustrated by a small minority, thanks to the dubious veto privilege. On that occasion I said that vetoes could not suppress the will and determination of our people to free themselves. I also said that we would return to this Chamber to ask once again for action.

Now here we are, and the reason that we have returned to this Chamber has been explained clearly and convincingly by the Chairman of the Group of African States, Mr. Blaise Rabetafika of Madagascar, and also by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Peter Zuze of Zambia. Theirs were words of reason and urgency on the imperative need for speeding up Namibia's independence.

We are here on serious business, to urge the Council to put aside the extraneous and irrelevant issues which hitherto have prevented prompt action in the Council towards triggering Namibia's independence process by the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and the signing of a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as a first step in that process.

I should immediately state the obvious here. The linkage monster which is today the main impediment to our freedom was never a part of negotiations on Namibia. It was never heard of until 1981 with the change of Administration in Washington. The people that invented the widely discredited policy of so-called constructive engagement with fascist South Africa are the very same people as have imposed this notorious policy on us.

(Mr. Gurirab)

The linkage pre-condition is not a part of resolution 435 (1978) and stands rejected by the Security Council itself in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985). Prominent American citizens themselves representing various political viewpoints have strongly urged the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, to abandon this widely condemned policy in favour of democratic, free and fair elections in Namibia. While it is a non-issue, it has nevertheless contributed to many deaths and untold suffering for innocent Namibian people.

We should like to believe that this crucial debate would be spared the malaise and irrelevancies associated with the linkage policy jointly pursued by Washington and Pretoria. We want freedom, and linkage is the very antithesis of freedom.

In his important report of 31 March 1987 the Secretary-General reconfirmed that agreement had been reached with South Africa and SWAPO on the system of proportional representation for the elections envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General then concluded by emphatically stating the following:

"With this agreement, the last outstanding issue relevant to the United Nations plan was resolved." (S/18767, para. 31)

This was the only left-over following a series of concentrated meetings which took place during the period July to August 1982. During those meetings the delegations of the front-line States, SWAPO and the five Western States, which also served as interlocutors vis-à-vis Pretoria, together identified all racist South Africa's so-called concerns and finally hammered out a comprehensive agreement. This agreement now acts as a supplement to resolution 435 (1978). Our own scepticism notwithstanding, we elected to sign that agreement.

Together all those delegations subsequently called upon the Secretary-General to apprise him and his Special Representative of the fruits of our collective

(Mr. Gurirab)

labour. The agreement consisted of a check-list, the text of a press release, which was later issued, and a draft of the letter which the five Western States were going to send to the President of the Security Council the moment Pretoria indicated its choice of electoral system. The purpose of that letter was that once an agreement was reached on the electoral system the Security Council would meet to adopt an enabling resolution for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, following entry into force of a cease-fire. That is the story.

This is exactly what the Secretary-General has been reminding us of. By reconfirming the fact that the last outstanding issue relevant to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been settled, the Secretary-General has opened the way for the Council to act. What remains to be done now is to move on to the next stage, that of fixing a date for the cease-fire. For its part, SWAPO is ready to sign a cease-fire right now, here in New York or at some other place, except for apartheid South Africa and occupied Namibia.

We have time and again reassured the Secretary-General of our continued commitment to resolution 435 (1978) and preparedness to co-operate fully in order to ensure the success of the joint undertaking which is going to bring freedom to our country.

Now is the time for action. There can be no more excuses or prevarication. The truth is self-evident and the case is well made. We call upon the Security Council and the whole international community to set the course for the self-determination and independence of Namibia now. But, should those in the usual quarters which have always shielded Pretoria in this Council once again refuse to go forward with the rest of us, let them spare us the pain of meaningless verbiage

(Mr. Gurirab)

and political obfuscation, speaking from both sides of their mouths as allies and apologists of Pretoria.

We have reached a crossroads. There are two compelling options before the Council. One is the option of authorizing the Secretary-General to start implementing resolution 435 (1978) on the basis on his own conclusions with immediate effect. The other is, if apartheid South Africa should repeat its refusal to go along, to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against that pariah State in order to exact its compliance.

This is the case we submit this time before the Council. We impatiently await its final verdict. We expect justice, for that is the only logical and right action to take. Namibia must be freed.

In my concluding statement on 9 April 1987 I said that if the obstruction of the will of the majority in the Council continued to prevail, the General Assembly should, acting in consonance with the Charter, assume its responsibility fully in decolonizing Namibia.

(Mr. Gurirab)

In this connection the final communiqué adopted by the Ministerial Meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia on 2 October 1987 stated:

"In the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by 29 September 1988, the Ministers called upon the General Assembly to consider, at its forty-third session, necessary action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, cognizant of the fact that this was a unique instance in which the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility for promoting self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia". (S/19187, para. 20)

We wholeheartedly endorse that courageous and responsible position taken at such a high level by the member States of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the legal Administering Authority over our country until independence.

We are privy to and support the draft resolution which is currently the subject of consultations among the members of the Council. It is our strong expectation that it will be adopted unanimously.

In closing I wish to recall the inspiring words of our President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, who always says to the struggling Namibian masses:

"When the history of a free and independent Namibia is written one day, SWAPO will go down as having stood firm where others have wavered; that it sacrificed for the sacred cause of liberation where others have compromised."

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Gurirab for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): My delegation extends to you, Sir, our warm congratulations on your assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. We would also place on record our appreciation of the manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, carried out his responsibilities. May I also extend a word of welcome to Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, who is perhaps for the first time participating in the deliberations of the Security Council on this subject after assuming his additional responsibilities.

We would be deluding ourselves if we were to suggest that there is anything new that can be said on the question of Namibia. The arguments and the facts that have been stated in this Organization for more than 40 years still stand true today. Indeed, at various stages it has been suggested that the Security Council should no longer address itself to the question of Namibia in its essential and brutal form but that it should rather concentrate on tactics to demonstrate its unity of purpose.

Nine years and one month ago, in this very Chamber, a resolution was adopted by which the Security Council decided to establish, under its authority, a United Nations Transition Assistance Group to ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It set a deadline in its request to the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the implementation of its resolution. That deadline passed nine years and five days ago. The Security Council was willing; South Africa was not; and the Security Council's will was compromised.

Let us browse through the saga of betrayal. Let us recall, even with the unhappy hindsight of history, the self-assurance with which South Africa's Foreign Minister so loftily declared in his letter of 20 February 1979 that

"South Africa cannot be one of these parties now placing an interpretation of the settlement plan which differs from the plan."

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

Let us recall the eagerness with which we were prepared to believe South Africa when it said, on paper, that

"there are no outstanding issues of such a nature as to prevent the commencement of the implementation of the settlement plan".

And now witness the slow but steady slide.

On 26 February 1979 the Secretary-General addressed a letter, consisting of only two paragraphs, to the South African Government and to the South West Africa Peoples Organization (SWAPO). It requested a simple assurance in writing that the terms of the cease-fire had been accepted and that all necessary measures had been taken to cease all warlike acts and operations. Those were to include tactical moves, cross-border movements and all acts of violence and intimidation in or having effect in Namibia.

On 5 March 1979 the reply from Pretoria came to the Secretary-General's two paragraphs, and that reply waffled through a meandering 28 paragraphs. And there, suddenly, in the second paragraph, was the astonishing claim put forward by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa that

"it has consistently been the policy of the South African Government to consult fully with the people of South West Africa. Their interests are at stake. They must decide on their future".

Their interests! Their future! What guts! What cheek!

And so immediately we have Security Council resolution 435 (1978) being circumvented by implicit disregard for another Security Council resolution, resolution 439 (1978), which condemned the decision of the South African Government to proceed unilaterally with the holding of elections in the Territory in December 1978 and stated categorically that that contravened Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

But did that make a difference? Sure enough, the so-called Constituent Assembly of South West Africa met. It put it on record that it was

"shocked by the letter from the five Western Powers dated 28 February 1979 in which they supported the latest decisions of the Secretary-General and described them as fair and reasonable".

I do not intend to go on page by page or letter by letter. Every line of response from the racist régime reflects a travesty of truth, and treachery. It sought to destroy the idea of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group by describing it as "a stalking-horse for SWAPO", a view shared only by the Trojan Horse it had infiltrated into Namibia in the guise of a constituent assembly.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

As long as the question of Namibia remains on the agenda of the Security Council, its expressed will, manifest in the resolutions it has itself adopted, remains. The composition and membership of the Security Council undergoes change each year but the institution endures. It has a chartered and mandated responsibility and it cannot let the distance of time or the patience of a people deflect it from its objective.

When UNTAG was originally to be placed in Namibia, India was honoured to have been asked for the services of one of its most distinguished military officers for appointment as commander designate of its military component. My Government continues to be ready to contribute in whatever manner it can to the placement of the Transition Assistance Group to facilitate the holding of elections in Namibia and its full and complete independence.

However, we must not be unaware that this delay of nine years has given the racist régime in South Africa every opportunity to manipulate a series of administrative and structural changes in Namibia, particularly within the army and the police, on the pretext of giving authority to the Namibians but in reality to entrench its own control. Such schemes have been parallel to a number of self-styled reforms in the administrative, legislative and constitutional fields.

This underscores the importance - the enormous importance - to set ourselves a definite deadline and time frame for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General has said that all elements are in place in this regard. Someone obviously is trying to displace the pieces. That someone has been doing so for nine years. Only the collective will of the Security Council can ensure that the elements are not disturbed.

We have reached a stage where it is no longer a question of the end justifying the means, but rather of securing means which will assure the end. We maintain that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions are those means. The vast majority of

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

Members of this world body have agreed with that policy. A few have differed. By a curious irony the special responsibility vested by the Charter in those few has been used as an instrument of negation of international will.

We must set a target day. But we must be prepared in our minds for concerted action if that date is sabotaged, as in the past it has been, by South Africa, or allowed quietly to pass. As the Secretary-General has noted in his further report of yesterday concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978):

"... if the question of Namibia is re-examined with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territory, it should be possible to open the way for implementation of the United Nations plan."

And, as he goes on to conclude:

"The concerted action of the international community is needed to achieve this objective." (S/19234, para. 25)

When the Secretary-General suggested 15 June 1980 as the target date for the settlement plan for Namibia to go into operation, why did South Africa introduce so many new demands? What major development occurred between September 1978 and June 1980 to strike panic home to the self-seekers and self-protectors in Pretoria? Was it not the freedom of Zimbabwe?

When South Africa cringed in abject acceptance of resolution 435 (1978), when it said the settlement, and the settlement plan alone, could premise independence for Namibia, when it cowered in its self-delineated corner of history, who linked Namibia's right to freedom to Angola's right to security? South Africa, yes; South Africa alone, no.

When the world urged sanctions, the world was told to be patient. When southern Africa said it was prepared to suffer, it was told to be patient. When Namibia laid its claim upon our conscience, it was told its time would come.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

On a BBC interview the other day, a caller from South Africa asked Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi why we could not accept the "carrot-and-stick" policy some Governments feel would work with Pretoria. My Prime Minister replied that some people seemed to be getting all the carrots and some all the sticks.

And what is the Security Council going to offer Namibia this time? The worn, mildewed carrots of our promise or the stick of our unconcern? Or can we, finally, prove that the spark that infused our collective will in 1978 has still not completely extinguished itself?

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): Sir, at the outset, I should like to congratulate you on the assumption of the duty of President of the Security Council for the month of October. Your diplomatic skill and great experience will be an important contribution to the successful consideration of the problem of Namibia.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, on the skilful and indeed very competent manner in which he conducted the deliberations of the Security Council during the month of September.

The fact that South Africa continues to hold Namibia under colonial occupation and that the people of Namibia do not yet enjoy its inalienable right to self-determination, independence and freedom can no longer be tolerated. The racist régime continues to pursue the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination in flagrant violation of the human rights of the people of Namibia. The tragic course of events in Namibia and South Africa inevitably leads to new blood-letting and represents a threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The prolongation of the present situation will bring new suffering to the people of Namibia and increase terror and exploitation. This will bring about new acts of aggression and subversion against independent African countries, particularly against Angola. It will also increase the danger of greater interference of external factors and of changing the character of the problem of Namibia as a colonial issue.

What is involved here, however, is a colonial problem and it must be resolved in the way in which all other similar problems have been resolved within the United Nations. The central role in that process should be played by the Security Council, which must not allow the United Nations plan for Namibia, which it adopted, to become a dead letter. Verbal support for the implementation of the United Nations plan is, however, no longer enough. What is needed now is urgent and resolute action.

These meetings are, in our view, a test of the resolve of the entire international community finally to set in motion the process of Namibia's accession to independence without further delay, no matter what pretexts and actions contrary to this aim might be used. The solution of the question of Namibia would contribute greatly to the general relaxation of tension and the improvement of stable international relations.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The United Nations plan for Namibia is almost 10 years old. The hopes that it would bring about a solution are still not fulfilled to the present day. For 10 years now the régime in Pretoria, using the most transparent and unacceptable pretexts, has blocked all the efforts to ensure the implementation of the plan. When the last outstanding issue relevant to the United Nations plan for Namibia was resolved by the agreement on the choice of the electoral system, it seemed that the road to Namibia's accession to independence was wide open. However, in order to prolong the illegal occupation of Namibia and plunder its natural resources, South Africa continues to link Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues. The insistence on linking the implementation of the United Nations plan to the presence of foreign troops in independent Angola has created an impasse which has not yet been overcome.

The position of Yugoslavia, as well as that of almost all other countries, is that the process of Namibia's accession to independence should not be made contingent on anything unrelated to the United Nations plan for Namibia. The presence of foreign troops in Angola is a question which only independent Angola can decide. This question has never been - and certainly not when the United Nations plan for Namibia was adopted - relevant to Namibia's accession to independence. The linkage therefore cannot be understood as anything but obstruction of the implementation of the United Nations plan. It is necessary for all factors to realize this and remove this obstacle which stands in the way of the independence of Namibia.

The Security Council must also show its resolve and readiness to put an end to these stratagems by setting an early date for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia; by finalizing arrangements for the composition and emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia; and by

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

requesting South Africa to accept without further delay the proposal of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to cease fire. During the period envisaged for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the Security Council should follow the problem and monitor the process of implementation so as to be in a position to intervene in a timely fashion and remove all possible obstacles.

If the Security Council fails to break the current impasse, Yugoslavia will support all measures of pressure on racist South Africa, including actions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Yugoslavia considers that comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria are the most efficient and the only remaining peaceful means to eliminate apartheid, liberate Namibia and maintain peace in southern Africa. We consider that in the meantime all countries should resort to voluntary sanctions and other measures of boycott and pressure against South Africa. This is particularly true of those countries that continue to co-operate and maintain relations with the régime in Pretoria.

Yugoslavia supports the proposal that if the Security Council fails again to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the General Assembly should launch action in accordance with the Charter for the implementation of that plan.

Yugoslavia has always maintained that the Secretary-General also has a very important role to play in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. We appreciate his efforts so far and expect that they will lead towards ensuring Namibia's accession to independence.

Other channels of negotiations should not be excluded from the process of resolving the problem of Namibia. However, they must be supportive of, and within, the United Nations plan for Namibia. No attempts to remove the solution of the question of Namibia from the competence of the United Nations must be accepted.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

We are all duty-bound to support the actions of the United Nations Council for Namibia. For a number of years now the Council has been initiating numerous missions aimed at assisting the people of Namibia to achieve its independence. The recently held Ministerial Meeting of the Council adopted an important document containing concrete recommendations for further action. My country fully supports these recommendations and will actively work for their implementation.

As part of the action to bring about the final liberation of Namibia, the international community should continue and indeed increase political and material support of and assistance to SWAPO in its struggle for freedom and independence.

For the people of Namibia and for SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, the strengthening of the liberation struggle is the only way to respond to the illicit policy of South Africa and its refusal to accept a political solution.

In accordance with the principles of its independent and non-aligned policy, Yugoslavia will continue to pledge its support to the urgent implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and to assist the just struggle of the people of Namibia, headed by SWAPO, until the final achievement of freedom and independence. My country's support for this struggle is considered by my country to be a debt of honour to its people and the ideals and principles born in its own liberation struggle.

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

The next speaker is the representative of Nicaragua. I invite her to take a seat at the Council table and to make her statement.

Mrs. ASTORGA GADEA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Allow me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council this month. We are certain that your experience and diplomatic skill will be very important factors in the successful conclusion of the discussion.

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

now under way. Similarly, we congratulate the Ambassador of the sister Republic of Ghana, Victor Gbeho, on the very skilful way in which he directed the Council's work in September.

In 1978, following intensive consultations and negotiations between the so-called Contact Group of Western Powers, South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the then Secretary-General of the United Nations sent the Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari, and a group of experts to Namibia to prepare a report on measures necessary to ensure that Territory's independence.

The final proposals of that report were approved by the Council on 29 September of that year, in historic resolution 435 (1978). The world was full of joy. Almost 100 years of suffering and injustice were going to come to an end. We were assured that the independence of Namibia was just around the corner.

But from that very moment - and certainly even earlier - plans and tactics to avoid implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were being developed by Pretoria and some permanent members of the Security Council that publicly were affirming their support for the resolution but, as the events subsequent to 1978 have demonstrated, already had plans to betray the hopes of mankind by resorting to one pretext after another to postpone indefinitely and frustrate Namibia's independence.

On the basis of reasons described as "technical and operational problems", South Africa put into practice delaying tactics in the negotiations, in order to gain time to develop its strategic plans in Namibia and to try to create conditions to impose a unilateral solution to the problem of Namibia.

The escalation of repression and violence which began with the Kassinga massacre and continues without interruption to this very day has as its primary objective, on the one hand, the destruction of SWAPO and, on the other, the establishment of a puppet government which might at some point declare independence unilaterally but under South African domination and control.

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

At the same time, and with the objective of covering all fronts, South Africa has embarked on the establishment of an economic and military structure which ensures not only the perpetuation of its hold on the Territory but also the destabilization of any future legitimate and independent Government in Namibia, as well as the regional destabilization of all southern Africa.

In 1980 South Africa created the so-called territorial forces of South West Africa in order to give the impression that there was in Namibia a "legitimate Namibian force" which would not be affected by resolution 435 (1978). These "territorial forces", composed of Namibians recruited by force, are nothing but occupation forces. They are organized, trained, directed, financed and equipped by the South African defence forces.

South Africa intends to use those territorial forces in the future as a factor of destabilization against a SWAPO Government. The same thing occurred in similar decolonization processes, such as those in Angola and Mozambique, countries in which we see acting under the guidance of Pretoria the mercenary forces of UNITA and RENAMO, whose origins date back to pre-independence days. Those are the contras of southern Africa.

The country that developed the linkage theory gave the best of gifts to South Africa. That latest pretext has made it possible for South Africa to perpetuate and deepen its domination of Namibia. That country, the United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council, was in this Hall in 1978 when resolution 435 (1978) was approved unanimously. That country, which today remains a permanent member of the Council, is the most important factor in the attainment of Namibia's independence or in the continuance of the suffering of millions of human beings who today bear the consequences of occupation and colonialism.

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

At the same time as it insists on linkage, South Africa is increasing its threats and attacks against the People's Republic of Angola, in the knowledge that the causes of the presence of those troops in that country are precisely the acts of aggression and destabilization carried out by South Africa against Angola. Meanwhile, time passes, the resolutions of the Security Council are vetoed, and in the field Pretoria and its allies continue to develop their strategic plans in Namibia.

So the international community wonders how much longer we are going to continue to permit that barbaric behaviour. How long will it be before the suffering of the Namibian people and the clamour of so many men, women and children penetrate the ears and reach the conscience of those that perpetuate that situation? How many human beings will have to die in order to touch, even to the slightest degree, the hearts of those who claim to be defenders of human rights, democracy and freedom?

The Council cannot remain chained to the veto. It cannot accept the failure to implement resolution 435 (1978). The Council must fulfil its obligation. The Council must fulfil its preventive, not curative, role. The international community must act without delay and without accepting further pretexts. Peoples do not wait; peoples rebel, they struggle, they triumph.

The international community is once again giving an opportunity to the Council to shoulder its responsibilities. We appeal to those countries that have systematically exercised a veto on this issue to reconsider and to place themselves on the side of justice and international law.

It is exactly 20 years since the South African Government adopted the Terrorism Act, which was applied to South Africa and Namibia and made retroactive to the year 1962. Since then South Africa has acted with impunity against its

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

people and the people of Namibia. None the less, the international community has not been able to take the necessary measures to oblige South Africa to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia. Today, more than ever before, there exists a clear conviction that the imposition of mandatory sanctions is the only peaceful means left to the international community by which to help those peoples to eradicate apartheid and put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

In this respect, we recall the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which was held in Vienna in July 1986 and which, in the Programme of Action that it adopted, stated:

"The Conference appeals to the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, permanent members of the Security Council, which have thus far prevented the Council from acting effectively, to reconsider their position in the light of the grave situation in southern Africa and the accumulated evidence of the past 20 years, which irrefutably points to comprehensive mandatory sanctions as the most effective peaceful means of forcing South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia." (A/CONF.138/11, p. 32)

Nine years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), once again an opportunity has been put before the Security Council. The alleviation or prolongation of the suffering and struggle of the Namibian people will be decided by the attitude of each of the members, because the solution to the problem is only a question of time and method. At the end of this nightmare we will see a Namibia free of foreign domination and independent, because, as an African proverb says, "No one can stop the rains".

(Mrs. Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

In conclusion, I wish to quote the words of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly. He said:

"The peoples will not wait for permission to fight, to struggle, and to triumph. The peoples will give an impetus to their own processes of change, and then there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth by those that never wished to listen to the peoples and were the accomplices of the oppressors."

(A/42/PV.30, p. 26)

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nicaragua for the kind words she addressed to me.

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

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): My delegation congratulates you warmly, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. We very much appreciate the very competent way in which you have guided the work of this body since the beginning of your term of office. We salute you as the representative of a country with which Algeria so happily enjoys relations of friendship and co-operation in the mutual interest of our two peoples and in the service of preserving peace and stability in our Mediterranean region.

To your predecessor, my brother Victor Gbeho, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, I wish to express our full satisfaction with and our pride as Africans in the skilful and successful way in which he presided over the activities of the Security Council last month.

Here in New York, on 2 October this year, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a ministerial meeting which was the manifestation of our serious concern and great impatience regarding the unacceptable situation which persists in Namibia.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The meeting was a reaction to the denial of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people and their ever-increasing oppression by the South African régime. It was also a stirring tribute to the Namibian people for their glorious fight and an expression of support for them and their unshakeable determination in their national liberation struggle, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic representative.

The meeting was also an expression of our indignation over the persistent challenge to the United Nations presented by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia. Finally, it represented an urgent appeal to the international community, and in particular an appeal to the Security Council that its own decision on Namibia should at last be implemented.

That is the appeal the African Group has just transmitted to the Council in requesting the convening of this urgent meeting. By this new initiative supporting the triumph of the Namibian cause Africa once again affirms that it has made the fight its own and that it is a matter of a persistent quest for its own rights.

The Security Council has become accustomed over the years to indicting Pretoria as often as South Africa's many infamous acts occur. The policy of apartheid is constantly debated in the Council, in time with the ever-growing racist violence, committed while the South African people proclaim by their sacrifices their will to defeat the domination of one human being by another.

In the aggression against and destabilization of the States of southern Africa, the Security Council finds a dramatic and overwhelming record of attempts at hegemony on the regional scale. Moreover, the letter sent by the representative of Angola to the Council on 20 October brutally makes the point that that country alone has suffered since the beginning of this year 900 South African violations of its airspace and 40 acts of aggression on land.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Similarly, the Security Council has been seized for two decades of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa. From its resolution 245 (1968) to resolution 566 (1985) it has adopted a total of 19 resolutions on the question, despite the many occasions when draft resolutions were not adopted because of the abusive use of the right of veto.

Resort to violence, raised to the level of standard conduct, repression of the right of peoples to self-determination and constant aggression against independent States - these typify the absolute denial by the Pretoria régime of the fundamental principles on which our Organization is based.

Unless it wishes to accept the risk of a trivialization of the systematic use of force, the Security Council must take the necessary measures to restore the authority of law and preserve the credibility of its own special status with regard to the preservation of international peace and security.

If there is one outstanding opportunity for the Council to give substance to its will to implement its numerous decisions vis-à-vis the Pretoria régime and restore its effectiveness, it is to be found in the subject of these deliberations.

The occupation of Namibia has been declared illegal. The nature of the question has been identified as a problem of decolonization yet to be accomplished. The process for carrying that out was laid down in resolution 431 (1978) and the necessary means for implementing that resolution were set out in resolution 435 (1978). Finally, all the necessary conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence are already in place, thanks to the persevering action of our Secretary-General, to whom special tribute is due for his untiring commitment in this mission of peace, whose goal is the realization of the right of peoples to self-determination.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Therefore, nothing can justify making Namibia's independence hostage to the policy of fait accompli of the South African régime. Similarly, nothing can justify delays and manoeuvres, in view of the urgent need to restore justice.

Today the Security Council must respond to the persistent appeal of the Namibian people and the impatient request of the whole international community by finally deciding resolutely to begin the process of implementing its own resolution 435 (1978), with a binding timetable.

That means first setting an absolute deadline for implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence; then mandating the Secretary-General to begin the necessary consultations for deploying the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia; and, finally, mobilizing the necessary means to carry out that operation, which is intended to guarantee that legislative elections are held freely in Namibia.

The people of Namibia are again following the Security Council's deliberations in the expectation that it will act. Therefore, the will and decision of this body must be geared to nothing other than the restoration of their inalienable rights. Faithfulness to what brings us together means that there can be no alternative.

The United Nations, the embodiment of freedom, indivisible freedom, will not be fully following its calling while areas that should be free are still not free. The fight of the Namibian people is, in the final analysis, the fight of all of us, and their claim is an integral part of what we are working for collectively.

This, then, is the basis of our legitimate hope of finally seeing these deliberations end in action, so long awaited, which, while restoring the independence of Namibia and soon giving it its rightful place, also accelerates the irrevocable dynamic of history and brings us closer to the dawn of an era of peace, stability and justice in the whole of southern Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The representative of the United States has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on her.

Miss BYRNE (United States): One or two representatives have alleged that my Government is opposed to self-determination and independence for Namibia, and is blocking the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Such statements fly in the face of the facts. My Government has been in the forefront of those nations working for the peaceful transition of power to the inhabitants of Namibia. Those to whom I refer reject the concept of peaceful transition and appear to embrace violence as a solution. Is that the policy that this body, devoted to peace, should endorse?

The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this meeting.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 29 October, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.