



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2757

29 October 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 October 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BUCCINI

(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. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. TAIX
Count YORK von WARTENBURG
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. TANAKI
Mr. BELONOVOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Sir Crispin TICKELL
Miss BYRNE
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 EC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Document symbol: S/PV. 2757

**Best copy
available**

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: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. De Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Siddiky (Bangladesh), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Svoboda (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Ritter (Panama), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2755th meeting, I invite the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Damodaran (India), 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 2775th meeting, I invite Mr. Gurirab to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Botswana, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Mozambique, Nigeria and the United Republic of Tanzania 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. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Dah (Burkina Faso), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Ononaiye (Nigeria) and Mr. Majengo (United Republic of Tanzania) 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 28 October 1987 from the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which reads as follows:

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

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

(The President)

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on the agenda. The first speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, I have the honour to convey to you our appreciation for the very efficient and skilful way in which you have been guiding the work of the Security Council during this month. I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express to Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana our gratitude for the very wise and constructive way in which he handled the work of the Council for the month of September.

For 103 years Namibia has been subjected to colonial occupation, and 10 years will soon have elapsed since the Security Council adopted the plan for the independence of Namibia contained in resolution 435 (1978). This Council has had to meet on many occasions since 1978 to continue discussing the intransigent attitude of racist South Africa, which by every means at its disposal is delaying the implementation of that resolution, and thereby Namibia's accession to independence. While we are deliberating here in this Chamber, in Namibia there is a people suffering under cruel colonialism, a colonialism which goes even so far as considering people of the black race as inferior beings come from another galaxy, an attitude that only demonstrates the racists' own pitiful narrow-mindedness.

The international community, through many United Nations resolutions or statements by other forums, has expressed the opinion that there must be no further delay in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and, moreover, that no linkage or other pre-condition should hinder Namibia's accession to independence, since resolution 435 (1978) has clearly laid down the indispensable elements for Namibia's independence and, according to the Secretary-General's report - S/18767

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

of 31 March 1987 - all outstanding issues had been resolved and, consequently, there remained no alternative but immediate implementation of the plan agreed upon in 1978 by the Security Council.

It is obvious that the only obstacle to independence for Namibia is the intransigent attitude of the Pretoria racists, who are not only impeding the Namibian people's free exercise of its right to freedom and independence but also continuing a war - which is no longer covert - against the People's Republic of Angola, assisting the mercenary bands of UNITA and maintaining several battalions of regular South African forces in the southern part of that Republic, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter. The Angolan people have been subjected to incalculable suffering and losses as a result of that barbarous South African aggression, and the same aggression is being revisited upon the other front-line countries.

South Africa has no reason to maintain its policy of destabilization in the countries of southern Africa, and there is no valid ground for it to continue raising the pre-condition of "linkage" with regard to implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Long before 1975, when internationalist Cuban troops came to the assistance of Angola, at the request of the Government and Party of that country, South Africa was brandishing other arguments to do what it continues flagrantly to do today. And given the arrogance and contempt of the Pretoria racists in refusing to comply with the wishes of the international community, my country has long since taken the view that the only alternative left to promote peace and security in that region is to impose against South Africa the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided under Chapter VII of the Charter.

We request the members of the Security Council to give serious thought to this situation and to respond without delay to an outcry that has become universal. We

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

ask the members of the Security Council, in keeping with resolution 566 (1985), to adopt against South Africa the measures set forth in that resolution, otherwise the lack of concrete action will affect the credibility of this important organ of the United Nations system. We ask the two permanent members of the Security Council that have used the veto on two occasions to prevent the adoption of sanctions to abandon that attitude now and cease implicitly supporting a régime that is abhorred by nations, reason, common sense, and history itself.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Of those who would argue that sanctions will not work against South Africa it might be asked why, then, has my country been under a blockade for 28 years and why is the same action being taken today against Nicaragua, whose Sandinist revolution has sought to trace a destiny of their own for the Nicaraguan people.

Angola has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to facilitate with imagination and flexibility a solution that would permit the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978), but Pretoria always responds with subterfuges, encouraged by the co-operation it receives from those in Washington who have thought up the ill named "constructive engagement". My Government reaffirms the positions contained in the joint Cuban-Angolan communiqué signed in Havana last August and believes that we should give the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, all the necessary support in continuing his efforts aimed at the solution of this whole problem through the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

It is undeniable that the enormous efforts of the Secretary-General to date have been blocked by the contrived intransigence of seeking to link the independence of Namibia with the presence of internationalist Cuban troops in Angola. The international community has rejected that linkage repeatedly and said no to those claims. Consequently, the Council should empower the Secretary-General to submit a report before 31 January 1988 on the means of implementing the resolution in question, and a strict deadline should should be set for the racists to comply with the decisions of the Council, as was agreed at the ministerial meeting of the Council for Namibia held on 2 October here in New York.

Cuba once again reiterates its unqualified support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the people of

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Namibia. We are convinced that, sooner rather than later, Namibia, including the Penguin Islands and Walvis Bay, will be independent and that some day the State will be represented in this Council, together with all of us, to contribute to a world in which all have the right to life, development and peace, a world in which the shameful pages of colonialism will be a matter only for students of history. By that time, the blood of brave men will no longer have to be shed, while new pages are written, to put an end to that affront to the human person, colonialism.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Tesfaye Tadesse, 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. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), 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 (Special Committee of 24): On behalf 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, I wish to express my sincere appreciation 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.

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. I am confident that with your well-known diplomatic skills you will lead our deliberations to a successful conclusion. I wish also to take this opportunity to pay a warm tribute

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

to your predecessor, Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, for the effective manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the busy month of September.

As is clearly discernible in the report of the Secretary-General now before us, it is obvious that if anything has changed during the period of seven months since the abortive consideration of this question by the Security Council in April this year it is that there has been a deterioration of the situation in Namibia as a result of intensified repression of the Namibian people by South African occupation forces. South Africa's attempt to impose a puppet régime upon the people of Namibia by various devious means, under the so-called constitutional arrangements, continues unabated. The prospect of an acceptable solution appears to be fast dissipating and the situation prevailing in the region continues to pose a most serious threat to international peace and security.

South Africa, supported by its allies, defiantly continues to demonstrate in both its policies and its deeds its open contempt for the United Nations and its undisguised attempt to sabotage the goal of Namibian independence. As the United Nations body entrusted with the task of ensuring the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee holds the apartheid régime totally responsible for creating a situation that deprives the Namibian people of their basic freedom and inalienable rights while posing a serious threat to international peace and security. The sequence of events and developments in and around Namibia since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has clearly unmasked the true intent of the Government of South Africa: to gain time, under the guise of negotiations, and to consolidate its domination of the Territory through the proxy of a puppet régime.

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

It is against that background that we must view the present situation obtaining in Namibia. In this regard, it has been the Special Committee's consistent recommendation that the Security Council should act decisively against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime. The Special Committee has also strongly urged the Security Council to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime.

Throughout the same period we have witnessed, and whole-heartedly endorsed, the outstanding statesmanship displayed by the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in its earnest and sincere desire to do everything possible to bring about the full implementation of the United Nations plan under Council resolution 435 (1978). I wish also to pay a special tribute to the leaders of the front-line States for the crucial role they have played and are playing in their joint efforts in support of the cause of the people of Namibia.

In his report to the Council the Secretary-General calls for re-examination of the situation with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territory. On behalf of the Special Committee, I wish to express my earnest hope that the members of the Security Council will, at these meetings, be able to reiterate in unison once and for all their irrevocable commitment to and resolve to implement resolution 435 (1978) and request the Secretary-General to proceed forthwith to take all necessary measures to give effect to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

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

These measures should include arrangements leading to the cessation forthwith of the illegal occupying régime's armed repression of the people of Namibia, struggling under the heroic leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and to the emplacement in the Territory of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

Before concluding, I should like to express the Special Committee's deep appreciation to States members of the Organization of African Unity for having taken the important initiative of calling for this series of Council meetings on the situation in Namibia. With the full co-operation of the members of the non-aligned countries, I have no doubt that the decisions adopted by the Council at these meetings will prove to be decisive in the restoration to the people of Namibia of their long-lost human dignity and freedom.

I wish also to pay a particular tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his tireless endeavours in the search for a satisfactory solution to the problem of Namibia. I assure him of the Special Committee's continued full co-operation in that undertaking.

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.

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

Mr. RITTER (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, the delegation of Panama extends its warmest congratulations to you on the skill with which you have guided the deliberations of the Security Council this month. The objectivity and skill with which you have presided have been a source of great

(Mr. Ritter, Panama)

satisfaction to us. We also express our gratitude to Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, who with his customary talent so competently and efficiently presided over the work of the Council last month.

We extend fraternal greetings to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary of International Relations for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, who is with us for this important debate.

It is ironic that this week, romantically entitled the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, should find us here, debating what we should long since have been celebrating: Namibia's independence.

The Pretoria régime has long opposed United Nations decisions and has refused to allow the Namibian people full enjoyment of its inalienable rights. That same régime has contemptuously and irresponsibly dismissed the well-founded demands of the rest of the world whenever it has seen fit to do so, and it has thereby undermined the integrity of this society of nations dedicated to the building of a world of equity, justice and tolerance.

It is inadmissible that a single State, motivated only by its arrogance, its reactionary spirit and its unruly nihilism, should continue so fiercely and shamefully to oppress a people that has every right to be free and to follow its own path to a bright future without having to feel the lash upon its bare shoulders.

Namibian independence has been a source of concern and doubt for many years in United Nations deliberations. The systematic use of sophistry and diversions, the continuous use of action prohibited by law, and the frequent use of tactical instruments to obscure or nullify United Nations decisions have served only to strengthen the decision to support Namibia in its struggle to free itself from the rack of oppression.

(Mr. Ritter, Panama)

Contemporary man's desire to be free cannot be subjected to frivolous interpretation by would-be masters who assume the right to decide his fate. Freedom is a right not begged or pleaded for but conquered by reason. My delegation believes that the time has come to act with firmness and determination so that resolutions of the United Nations will not be like brittle dead leaves to be trampled under foot, nor a fleeting wind condemned to oblivion in a vacuum.

So long as Namibia has not attained its independence, the United Nations will continue to cause many to harbour misgivings and doubts as to the binding force of its decisions and to justify the criticisms of those who say the Organization is a forum where high-handedness can prevail over the freedom of nations.

The delegation of Panama hopes that in its deliberations this week the Security Council will, with a sense of historic responsibility, assume its duty of demanding unconditionally and without delay the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978) containing the plan for the independence of Namibia, which continues to be the only internationally accepted basis for the attainment of that aim. Two days remain in this Week of Solidarity with the Namibian People. I hope that before this week is over we can say that the protracted and painful trial of this long-suffering people is finally coming to an end.

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

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

Mr. MANLEY (South Africa): Sir, I wish first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

This Council meets yet again to consider the situation in South West Africa/Namibia against the background of a serious deterioration in conditions in Angola, which continues to be used as a springboard for terrorism perpetrated by elements of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) against the population of South West Africa/Namibia.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

The Security Council should not be blinded by rhetoric and propaganda. As has been stated by the Secretary-General in his report dated 27 October 1987, South Africa remains committed to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to bringing about internationally recognized independence in South West Africa/Namibia. The only obstacle to implementation of that resolution remains the refusal of Angola seriously to address the threat posed to regional security by the presence of Cuban and Soviet military personnel on its territory. It is inconceivable that the conditions provided for in resolution 435 (1978) can be met while this extra-continental force remains in Angola.

It will be recalled that when the Council met in April 1987 to consider the imposition of sanctions against South Africa, I made an appeal for the leaders of southern Africa to face the realities squarely and to enter into discussions with a view to resolving regional differences amongst themselves. That appeal fell on deaf ears. Inevitably the people of South West Africa/Namibia will have to decide on the future of their country themselves, and South Africa stands ready to facilitate a broad-based process of deliberation.

South Africa is not at war with any of the parties in South West Africa/Namibia. An examination of the record of the Namibian issue during the past 40 years shows that South Africa has consistently sought the peaceful resolution of this problem. It is precisely because of the South African Government's endeavours to find a peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa in general and South West Africa/Namibia in particular that it has called time and again for the withdrawal from Angola of the more than 40,000 Cubans propping up the régime of the Popular Liberation Movement of Angola (MPLA) in Luanda.

The President of the Council for Namibia has spoken of the desire of the people of Namibia for peace, dignity and the right to determine their own destiny. The South African Government is convinced that these objectives could be achieved

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

if the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) would terminate its violence against the inhabitants of the Territory.

I would also urge the Secretary-General to direct his concern to the plight of the people of Angola. Are the members of the Council oblivious of the suffering of the people of Angola, inflicted on them by foreign intervention in Angola and the deteriorating security situation brought about by the intransigence of the MPLA régime in the face of popular rejection of such intervention? One of the debilitating consequences of the presence of such a large foreign force in Angola and the militaristic policies of the MPLA régime is that the lives of a large proportion of the Angolan population have been seriously disrupted. Retrogression in all spheres of life in Angola has reached crisis proportions. Famine and disease are a threat throughout the country, primarily as a result of the fact that food production is decreasing. Medical facilities are not available to the vast majority of the Angolan people. These people must bear the burden of the lack of compassion and concern for their welfare by the MPLA régime. The economic retrogression in Angola can be halted only if the civil war is ended.

The Security Council should urgently concern itself with the political, social and economic crisis in Angola. Angola has attracted the attention of the super-Powers; this has tragic consequences for the Angolan people and threatens regional security and stability.

In contrast, the South African Government continues to make a generous financial contribution to the infrastructural development and administration of South West Africa/Namibia. This involves a considerable sacrifice on the part of the South African taxpayer. All sectors of the economy of that Territory, including agriculture, fisheries, mining, manufacturing, construction, commerce, banking, development, health services, education and public finance, are soundly administered and are structured to the needs of the people. There can be no

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

comparison between the well-being of the people of South West Africa/Namibia and the condition of the inhabitants of their neighbours to the north.

As has been reaffirmed time and again, the South African Government also seeks internationally accepted independence for South West Africa/Namibia. In March 1984 the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs called for a conference between all of the parties involved in the dispute, without any pre-conditions except the political will to achieve peace. On 4 March 1986 State President P. W. Botha offered to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provided a firm and satisfactory agreement could be reached on Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola. To date, South Africa awaits a reply to that sincere offer. Where, therefore, lies responsibility for the "stubborn refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council" - in the words of the draft resolution that is being considered? The stumbling-block must be sought in the political machinations of forces outside the region which do not have the interests of the peoples of the region at heart. It must be sought in the political aspirations of an organization which employs terrorism as an instrument of its designs to usurp power in South West Africa/Namibia through the barrel of a gun.

South Africa, however, has assumed a responsibility towards the inhabitants of the Territory to safeguard them from terrorist incursions, from wherever they may emanate. South Africa's role is protective in nature, in order to maintain conditions conducive to the implementation of a peaceful solution in South West Africa/Namibia which is in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the people of the Territory and which is internationally acceptable. SWAPO is welcome to participate, together with all other parties involved, in the peaceful search for a negotiated settlement. Were SWAPO, therefore, to cease its acts of terrorism and its cross-border raids against the people of South West Africa/Namibia, the need for South African security forces to operate against SWAPO would disappear. But

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

SWAPO has given no indication that it has any serious intention of abandoning its armed aggression against the inhabitants of the Territory. Through their actions and pronouncements, SWAPO leaders continue to maintain an intransigent attitude to a democratic resolution of the problem before the Security Council this afternoon.

Yesterday, at the very moment when the Council was being addressed by a SWAPO representative, the people of South West Africa/Namibia were still feeling the shock of a further atrocity perpetrated against them by SWAPO. At approximately 10 to 6 on Friday afternoon 23 October 1987, a group of four Owambo children, between two and eight years old, discovered an anti-personnel mine of Soviet origin, which exploded while being handled. Two of the children died instantly and another died later from his wounds. The fourth child is still in a critical condition. A subsequent search of the area revealed a cache of arms containing 10 anti-personnel mines and six 60-millimeter mortar bombs, all of Soviet origin. This type of war materiel is carried over vast distances from Angola by SWAPO terrorists who operate from the safety provided them by Angola to launch hit-and-run attacks against the Namibian people. As this barbarous incident has yet again shown, SWAPO does not discriminate in its campaign of violence. No one is spared.

SWAPO has, through its deeds, again reaffirmed that it will not abandon terrorism and indiscriminate violence to achieve its ends - namely, to impose a totalitarian ideology on the inhabitants of the Territory.

In conclusion, the draft resolution that is being considered seeks to authorize the United Nations Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between the parties to the conflict. The concept of a cease-fire is not a new one. The South African Government is not at war with any party of South West Africa/Namibia. The moment SWAPO ceases its violence against the Territory, the need for action against SWAPO will fall away.

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

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I wish once again to express our satisfaction at the able way in which you, Mr. President, have been conducting our work this month. Thanks to your wisdom, experience and unfailing courtesy, we have been able to carry forward the delicate and urgent tasks of the Council in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation and respect.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

I cannot allow this opportunity to pass, Sir, without once again congratulating your predecessor our colleague the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, on the able discharge of his duties as President of the Council for September, which once again revealed his abilities and his long diplomatic experience.

Venezuela was a member of the Security Council in 1978 and took part in the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) on 29 September of that year. At that time, little could we imagine that today, nearly 10 years later, we would still be considering the implementation of that historic resolution.

Regrettably, the facts show us that in spite of the repeated pronouncements of the Council and the General Assembly and the persevering efforts of the Secretary-General, the question of Namibia, which is essentially a problem of the exercise of a peoples' right of self-determination, continues unresolved. The racist South African Government continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and persists in its arrogant disregard of resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

Heedless of the universal outcry against its criminal policy of apartheid, the Pretoria Government continues to make the people of Namibia a victim of this policy and maintains in that Territory a military-political machine of repression that has caused and continues to cause human losses and great suffering for the Namibian people, as was demonstrated to the Council in the presidential statement of 21 August 1987.

According to the further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of the aforesaid resolutions, contained in document S/19234 of 27 October 1987,

"Regrettably, successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition." (S/19234, para. 25).

The Security Council clearly and unequivocally expressed itself with regard to this linkage in resolution 539 (1983) of which I will quote the third operative paragraph:

"Rejects South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) [of 14 December 1960]".

We must once again reject the attempt of the South African Government to make Namibian independence contingent upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola or upon anything else. The inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination cannot be subject to the interests or whims of South Africa or any other State. What is essentially involved here is a colonial problem that must be resolved in the same way as all other problems of this kind, through the full exercise of the right of peoples in such situations to decide their own fate through the free expression of their will. To attempt to place the question of Namibia in the context of the interests of South Africa or of the East-West confrontation is to evade the essential and sole question in this context: does the Namibian people have the right to opt for full independence and sovereignty or does it not? Consequently, it is necessary categorically to declare once again that this linkage is inadmissible and that all pending questions relating to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved, as is stated in the reports of the Secretary-General of 31 March and 27 October 1987.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

The fact is that the so-called linkage is merely a pretext used by the Pretoria racists to maintain their colonial domination and policy of racial discrimination in Namibia and to continue taking advantage of the natural resources of the Territory for their own benefit.

What explanation can there be for the fact that, nearly 10 years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), it has not been possible to resolve a problem which is simple since, as we have said, essentially it implies the application of universally accepted principles and standards? The answer, clearly, is the reluctance of some permanent members of the Council to use the measures and remedies provided under Chapter VII of the Charter of the Organization.

For our part, we reiterate the support of Venezuela for the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions to compel the unco-operative Pretoria régime to fulfil its obligations. The result of the Council's inability thus far to implement its resolutions in this matter is the unjustified prolongation of a situation that affects not only the long-suffering people of Namibia but the whole region and constitutes a clear threat to world peace and security.

Given this long and painful process, our admiration, respect and solidarity go to the people of Namibia, which has shown an admirable combative spirit and, at the same time, continuous willingness to engage in dialogue and negotiation, as is shown in the statement of the representative of the South West Africa Peoples Organization (SWAPO) and to sign and respect a cease-fire agreement with South Africa in order to facilitate implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

For our part, the least we can do is to express our appreciation for that gesture and authorize the Secretary-General to reach an agreement of that kind with South Africa so that the necessary administrative measures can be taken for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

I should not like to conclude these brief comments on a question that is tending to become another of the chronic problems of the Organization without reiterating, as we have in many other forums, our unwavering solidarity with the people of Namibia and our willingness to continue and strengthen the close relations we have established with SWAPO. Venezuela, of course, had an opportunity to express these sentiments of its Government and people directly to Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of that organization, during his recent visit to Caracas.

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

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): Let me first congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. The delegation of Zambia is happy that as we take up the question of Namibia again this year we are doing so under your able and enlightened leadership. You represent a country that has for a very long time been associated with many African countries in various fields of development. We are confident that our deliberations will lead to a successful outcome.

May I also commend your predecessor, my brother and colleague, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, for the skilful manner in which he guided the Council's work during the busy month of September.

The African Group at the United Nations has once again decided to seek an urgent meeting of the Security Council in order that this body may consider the necessary practical steps for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It does so with a clear conscience, knowing full well that all outstanding issues relevant to that resolution have long been resolved, as the many reports of the Secretary-General have confirmed.

Our request is simple and reasonable: we ask of the Security Council justice and fair play. In doing so, we seek to preserve the Council's credibility, which has been tarnished by the reckless behaviour of some of its Western member States. Our plea for reasonableness is an attempt at the restoration of the Council's credibility.

It sadly occurs to me that in talking about South Africa and its occupation of Namibia we are playing the same gramophone record over and over again. We may change the record player, we may change the stylus, we may even change the person putting the record on the machine, but I fear the record is still the same.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

It is sad but salutary, for example, to imagine that a child born in 1966 was born in the year the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate in Namibia and ordered it to withdraw from that country. That child will be 22 years old this year. South Africa is still in Namibia and still a participating member of the United Nations.

We in Zambia regard the United Nations as a club of nations and the General Assembly as the greatest seminary of Member States, and, as with any club, membership should require, among other things, that all who belong to it should observe its rules and regulations and submit to its sanctions - or quit. South Africa has ignored the Security Council instructions to pull out of Namibia, while still remaining a member of this world body. Competing national interests of powerful and greedy Member States of the United Nations have prevented decisive action against South Africa for crimes committed in Namibia and for disregarding the United Nations Mandate over that Territory. The international community waits in hopeless desperation for a miracle to change the course of events in Namibia.

Let me start from the basic fact: the essence of all that is done in the name of government in South Africa is perpetuating, without a time limit, white control of political and economic power in both South Africa and Namibia. If, as we must, we accept that immutable fact of life so far as the South African Government is concerned, then all its actions, covert and overt, all its words, all its juggling of apartheid rules, all its policies, political, military and economic, fall into line, and destabilization of surrounding countries becomes an integral part of the overall plan. There is nothing surprising about this. It is rather like a game children play - if one can make one's opponent take two steps backwards, by fair means or foul, it looks as if one has moved forward and one's position in the game is more secure.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The main target of South Africa's aggression has been Angola, which has been subjected to repeated attacks and invasions, even from before it gained independence in 1975. None of the independent States of southern Africa has escaped the consequences of South Africa's destabilization, which even, as we know, included an attempted coup in the Seychelles.

I now want to consider for a few minutes the option which is sometimes paraded at the United Nations. We are sometimes told - indeed, the representative of South Africa said it today - that if only there were a meaningful dialogue with the South African régime we could all be better neighbours and live peacefully with each other, and confrontations and destabilization would cease. We are told that we have only to enter into dialogue, so that we understand each other's point of view, and the future of southern Africa as an area of peace and prosperity is guaranteed. That, of course, is a myth propounded by Governments that either do not understand the régime's psychology or simply do not want to know, because of the danger of losing lucrative markets.

The West has been involved in dialogue with South Africa for almost a century. We know that. What has it achieved? Can we tell the family of Steve Biko, the husband of Ruth First, Winnie Mandela, Mrs. Sisulu or Helen Joseph that dialogue is changing events in South Africa? Can we tell the families of the hundreds of Africans who have been killed in recent years that dialogue is working? Has the so-called constructive engagement helped Mozambique? The Nkomati Accord was born out of the so-called constructive engagement. What is happening in Mozambique now? South Africa is still supporting the MNR. Dialogue did not prevent discrimination against Asians in the 1940s, nor in the 1950s did it prevent racial classification, the Group Areas Act, the abolition of the African franchise and the Cape coloured vote. It did not prevent the Sharpeville or Soweto massacres.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Must we just wait? The answer must be a firm "No". The world must be alerted to what is going on within and outside our borders. It is in the power of the West to bring this shame to an end. If the West fails to use its power effectively, substituting rhetoric for decisive action, it will remain an accomplice in what follows.

These facts, though well known to the Council, must be restated. We restate them because of our unreserved faith in the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, the organ charged with the primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. Zambia's position, which is shared by many other countries, is that the Security Council cannot remain passive while the situation in Namibia deteriorates by the day. The Security Council has a grave responsibility to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa. South Africa cannot continue to give itself a mandate to supervise and protect the people of Namibia. We continue to hear fairy stories from that quarter. The Security Council must not be used for the partisan self-interest of one of its members, because that defeats the concept of collective responsibility that has for decades now characterized the decision-making process of the Council.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The failure by the Council to respect its own decisions seems to set a dangerous precedent and is clearly an affront to common sense.

As far as my country is concerned, that solemn promise to deliver Namibia to genuine national independence has been broken. We regard the linkage to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from the People's Republic of Angola, which I am afraid is being offered as a price for the independence of Namibia, as a diversionary tactic for commercial gain and totally irrelevant to the United Nations plan for Namibia. We do not accept it and the world does not accept it. We now know that even the South African surrogates in Namibia who make up the so-called interim government have at least realized that linkage is meant to serve the interests of outside Powers. It is a self-centred and misguided policy and one that must be rejected. It is a discredited policy which no one should respect. Namibia deserves fair consideration by the Security Council. It deserves fair play. It deserves independence.

We of southern Africa see clear complicity between South Africa and some major Western countries; complicity between the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; complicity to delay the independence of Namibia in order to plunder the Territory's natural resources.

The present meetings of the Security Council have been called in order that practical measures can be taken, first, to mandate the Secretary-General of the United Nations to arrange a cease-fire between the two parties to the conflict, namely, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on the one hand and South Africa on the other; and, secondly, to mandate the Secretary-General to begin the process of deploying the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

There is no doubt that, for the Secretary-General to succeed, he will need the co-operation of both parties. SWAPO for its part has repeatedly expressed its readiness to co-operate in this regard. South Africa has been the stumbling-block all along. I wish to stress the point that the Security Council must make it clear to the racist régime that failure to co-operate with the Secretary-General will result in punitive measures being applied against South Africa. There should be no equivocation on this. A defiant and genocidal régime must be removed from that Territory. The Security Council should take measures to ensure that this is done without delay.

All States members of the Security Council, and in particular the permanent members, must scrupulously adhere to the goals of the United Nations, which, inter alia, seek to ensure the attainment of self-determination by all colonial peoples and countries. We cannot therefore tolerate South Africa's violations of the resolutions. The emphasis at this meeting is on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), not on whether the Cuban forces in Angola should be withdrawn before the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) commences. This is our goal. Linkage has no place in resolution 435 (1978).

I wish to conclude by commending the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his tireless efforts to end the agony of the people of Namibia. I thank him most sincerely and urge the Council to give him the mandate he needs to proceed. The people of Namibia yearn for freedom and national independence. Let us help them attain that lofty goal.

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

Mr. LI Luye (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Although the Security Council is about to complete its heavy work of this month under your leadership, Sir, I still wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your talent for leadership has made a deep impression on us, and I wish you complete success in guiding the Council in its consideration of the situation in Namibia. I should also like to express my appreciation to your predecessor, an outstanding diplomat, Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana.

Our consideration of the situation in Namibia coincides with the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I should like to reaffirm our solidarity with and salute the people of Namibia and their liberation movement, SWAPO, which are waging a heroic struggle for the independence of Namibia.

Since the Security Council considered the question of Namibia last April, the situation in Namibia has continued to deteriorate. The South African occupying authorities, in total disregard of the strong condemnation by the international community, have intensified their frenzied suppression of the Namibian people, wilfully arresting and persecuting SWAPO and trade union leaders, and bombing schools, churches and workers' compounds, while stepping up their efforts in drafting a so-called constitution and planning "local elections", in an attempt to consolidate the "interim government" composed of pro-South-Africa elements and achieve an "internal settlement". At the same time, the armed invasions and acts of political subversion against neighbouring countries launched by the South African occupying forces have never stopped. Recently, they launched air raids 300 miles deep into Angola. Their actions have undermined stability in southern Africa and gravely threatened international peace and security.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

The international community has followed the deteriorating situation in Namibia with intense concern. It demands that the United Nations, which has direct responsibility for that Territory, take effective steps to bring about an early solution to the Namibian question so as to ensure the early independence of Namibia.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has provided a sound basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. The plan for the independence of Namibia as endorsed by the resolution - namely, a cease-fire and the withdrawal of foreign troops under United Nations supervision and control, and the achievement of independence through elections - reflects the Namibian people's desire freely to exercise their right to self-determination. It represents important action by the international community in the interest of a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. However, nine years have elapsed since its adoption and resolution 435 (1978) remains on paper only.

As is known to all, the responsibility for the failure to implement the United Nations plan rests entirely with South Africa. In contrast to the constructive efforts, utmost restraint and patience on the part of SWAPO and the front-line States, the South African authorities have repeatedly gone back on their words, raised unexpected side issues and tried stubbornly to obstruct the implementation of the plan.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

In November 1985, in his reply to the United Nations Secretary-General, the South African Foreign Minister expressed agreement on the system of proportional representation for the election envisaged in resolution 435 (1978), thus solving the last outstanding issue concerning the specific arrangements for the implementation of the United Nations plan. However, just as the Secretary-General was about to consult with the South African authorities to set the date for the commencement of the implementation, they refused to reach agreement on this question, insisting on their "linkage" pre-condition.

The "linkage" was designed to link the independence of Namibia with the solution of the question of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, which are questions different in nature. This has not only been rejected by SWAPO and the front-line States, but also widely opposed by the international community. The United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted resolutions on many occasions making it clear that "linkage" is irrelevant to resolution 435 (1978) and constitutes an obstacle to the achievement of Namibian independence. The South African authorities' continued insistence on "linkage" only serves to lay bare their real intention to use it as a pretext in order to delay the settlement of the Namibian question.

In the view of the Chinese delegation, the Security Council should no longer tolerate the South African authorities' endless procrastination with regard to implementing the United Nations plan. Since all the issues relating to the specific arrangements for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have already been solved, the Security Council should give the Secretary-General the mandate to commence the work of implementing the resolution. If the South African authorities should once again arbitrarily obstruct the process, the Security Council should then consider, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, adopting mandatory sanctions against them.

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

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

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): First, Mr. President, I thank you and the other members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to make a statement on the question of Namibia.

I wish to extend to you, Sir, as an eminent representative of a country which is a close friend and ally of Turkey, the warm congratulations of my delegation on the occasion of your assumption of the presidency for the month of October. I wish also to pay tribute to the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, for his diligent leadership in the conduct of the delicate tasks of the Council during the month of September.

The question of the independence of Namibia represents for the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, a unique responsibility. The Security Council is vested with a central role in this regard, since it has always been directly and substantially involved in the process of leading Namibia peacefully to independence. In resolution 435 (1978), adopted in September 1978, the Council endorsed a comprehensive plan for the independence of Namibia, a plan which was finally accepted by the Republic of South Africa and is fully supported by the international community. Among other things, that plan provided for the creation of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

It is a cause of profound indignation that, despite this state of affairs, Namibia has continued to remain under the illegal occupation of South Africa. Given that all the pending questions related to the implementation of

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved, there is no justifiable excuse for the delaying tactics that South Africa has pursued since 1978. The core of the problem that we face today is how to devise and agree on the means by which the Government of South Africa can be effectively induced or eventually compelled to fulfil its obligations without further delay.

We must express our concern that since the inconclusive meetings of the Security Council in April 1987, and despite the serious situation prevailing in the Territory, there has been no decisive move towards the settlement of the Namibian question. However, we note with satisfaction that during this period the Secretary-General has pursued his diplomatic efforts to ensure the independence of Namibia. In his report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General notes that the latest contacts he has made in the region through his Special Representative confirm that

"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". (S/19234, para. 25)

I wish to express my Government's appreciation of the tireless and skilful efforts that the Secretary-General continues to deploy in order to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). These efforts of the Secretary-General must be supported by the members of the Security Council, in particular its permanent members, with a view to securing a firm commitment on the unconditional and speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

These meetings of the Security Council are taking place at a crucial time. In South Africa there are no encouraging signs as to fundamental changes in the policies of the Pretoria régime in the foreseeable future. It seems unlikely that

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

the South African Government will be willing to embark on moderate policies with the aim of reducing violence and preparing the ground for the dismantlement of apartheid. It is also improbable that its intransigence on Namibia will diminish. We have therefore no choice but to proceed on the assumption that the South African Government will continue to insist on pre-conditions and to flout the previous resolutions of the Security Council. This situation invites the Security Council to find a way out of this stagnation and challenges it to take a new step towards the implementation of the United Nations plan.

In assessing the present situation we also have to bear in mind another factor. It should be taken into account that the perception about South Africa in the world, in particular in Western countries, is undergoing a profound change. The conviction that time is running out and that more resolute policies need to be elaborated and vigorously pursued if a terrible catastrophe in South Africa is to be avoided is constantly gaining ground.

All these trends have to be carefully evaluated in order to widen international support for Namibian independence. While we should no doubt act consistently with the previous resolutions of the United Nations on this matter, we should also endeavour to take advantage of the new and fast-developing circumstances by bringing increasing pressure to bear on South Africa. Needless to say, this necessitates first and foremost a firm and effective stand by the Security Council.

The time has certainly come to request the South African Government to accept unequivocally implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without any linkage or pre-condition, and we hope that the Security Council will be able this time to take a strong and resolute stand on this issue. The resolution that the Security Council will adopt this time should constitute the beginning of the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

As a member of the Council for Namibia, Turkey has always been closely associated with the developments concerning Namibia. The position of my Government has been repeatedly made clear during the debates on the question in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. We firmly believe that southern Africa will have no stability or peace as long as South Africa persists in maintaining by force its presence in Namibia, in subjecting the people of Namibia to the system of apartheid and threatening peace and security in the region by carrying out military activities and acts of aggression beyond the borders of Namibia and in the territories of neighbouring independent States.

In the present circumstances, it is evident to us that the Security Council should send a clear and definite message to the Government of South Africa that the international community demands Namibia's immediate independence. An agreement in the Security Council at this stage would be of immense significance.

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

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

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. President, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak before the Council on behalf of the Arab States, over which I have the honour to preside this month.

At the outset, I should like to convey to you the congratulations of the Arab Group on your stewardship of the Council for this month. Your extraordinary diplomatic skills ensure the successful conduct of our deliberations. Your country and the Arab nations are linked by mutual interests and good-neighbourly relations.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome and thank your predecessor, James Victor Gbeho, the Permanent Representative of fraternal Ghana. Both a colleague and a friend, he conducted the work of the Council last month with great skill.

Almost 10 years have elapsed since the Security Council unanimously adopted resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), containing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Still deprived of their right to self-determination, the Namibians long for freedom and independence. Day after day they are subject to assassinations, exile, oppression, unspeakable suffering and arbitrary arrest; like their South African brothers, they languish under martial law.

The apartheid régime remains an intransigent, cynical, arrogant régime that disregards the will of the international community. It is unrivalled except by the Zionist entity, which occupies Arab territories, having ousted the indigenous population by means of assassination and terror and installed its own settlers from abroad.

Events over the last two years show with alarming clarity that the white minority régime is fully capable of defying the international will by setting its war machinery against Namibia, the front-line States and its own internal opposition. The Security Council must therefore take firm, urgent action to put an end to the sufferings of the Namibian people.

We appeal for concerted international action. That is the only peaceful way of putting an end to the misery in that oppressed country and of preventing a further deterioration of the situation that is exacting an increasingly heavy toll in human lives.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

We call in particular for Pretoria's international isolation - political, economic and social - because of the illegal colonization of Namibia and other crimes against humanity perpetrated by that loathesome régime.

This appeal was also made at the Arab Islamic summits, at meetings of the Organization of African Unity and of the non-aligned countries, not to mention the Vienna and Paris Conferences on Namibia and on adoption of sanctions against South Africa.

Indeed, there have been appeals in many forums for serious and unequivocal action; there has been similar rejection of the policy of linkage, advocated by those who would make Namibian independence conditional upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

Over the last 10 years the international community has used the language of persuasion and dialogue through the Contact Group and the policy of "constructive engagement". But it was a total failure; it has merely given the racist régime a chance to gain time and, through subterfuge and prevarication to tighten the noose around its victims and to impose a puppet régime recognized by nobody other than Pretoria itself.

Can the Security Council convince us that further persuasion is the peaceful way out, in the light of the irrefutable evidence of repression, and violence, and of torture inflicted on men, women and children in Namibia - evidence of arbitrary detention, the denial of political and civil rights, political assassinations, repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African States and supposed but hollow reforms. There is a second peaceful option - binding sanctions, called for by the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community, and their Governments.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

We very much fear that the repeated backtracking and postponement called for by some will jeopardize the credibility of the Security Council, the supreme organ, the last hope for international peace and security. Thus the Council faces a great challenge in this crucial matter of binding sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, which is quite rightly on the agendas of most international forums.

We urgently appeal to members of the Council and to the United Nations to come to the aid of the Namibian people against this racist régime. We implore them to give up their short-sighted considerations and to say "Yes" to the adoption of specific, strong measures against the Pretoria racist régime.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

This is the humanitarian appeal which can be heard in international forums. Those who continue to impede the adoption of the necessary measures are not serving the interests of the Namibian and South African peoples. They put their own selfish interests before the lives of the Namibians, thus increasing their sufferings.

The Arab States condemn South African acts of aggression against Angola, a fraternal country, and reaffirm full support for Angola's right of self-defence against South African aggression.

In conclusion, we condemn most strongly the illegal colonization of Namibia by the inhuman apartheid régime and also the plundering of its natural resources. We express full solidarity with the people of Namibia in their struggle, guided by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the people. We call upon the international community to provide every assistance required so that the freedom of the Namibian people may not be futile and so that the racist régime of apartheid can be uprooted. The Arab States are committed most strongly to a boycott of South Africa, in keeping with resolutions of the Arab League and the Organization of African Unity, as well as United Nations resolutions on this question. The Arab Group renews its commitment to any resolution adopted by this Council to strengthen international steps to put an end to the apartheid régime and enable Namibian independence to be achieved.

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

The next speaker is the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council and to make his statement.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Allow me to welcome you, Sir, to the lofty post of President of the Security Council. Your great diplomatic and political experience will enable you successfully to guide the work of the Security Council in the month of October. I should like also to commend the work done by Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, who performed the duties of President last month. We also welcome the special representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, whose efforts to resolve the Namibian question we highly commend.

Our complex modern world is becoming increasingly interconnected and interdependent; therefore a solution to the Namibian question cannot be separated from the overall improvement of the political climate throughout the world, the cessation of the arms race and the struggle to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

The situation in Namibia has been tense for many years, through unceasing aggressive raids by Pretoria against independent African countries, attempts to destabilize them and subjugate them to its diktat, attempts to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia, to plunder its natural resources by the use of weapons, terror and repression, all accompanied by political manoeuvring and machinations to establish a so-called interim government, and similar tricks. This tense situation in Namibia, which poses a serious threat to international peace and security, arouses profound concern in the international community.

In spring of this year the Security Council once again considered the question of Namibia. Because of the negative position of two permanent members of the Council, the draft resolution was again not adopted, a resolution which, at a time when South Africa refuses to implement resolution 435 (1978), could have exerted pressure on Pretoria to settle the Namibian problem by imposing comprehensive

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The Security Council once again made an appeal to South Africa to comply fully with the provisions of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), in the form of a presidential statement made in August of this year. Many times decisive support for a speedy cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the granting to it of genuine independence on the basis of existing United Nations resolutions has been expressed by the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity and virtually all countries of the world. The special organ of the United Nations - the Council for Namibia - has been actively working in this area and recently held meetings at the level of foreign ministers.

A desire for the attainment of an immediate solution of the Namibian problem is to be seen in the draft resolutions worked out by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the General Assembly on this question. All the United Nations decisions on the question of Namibia, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), offer a realistic, generally recognized basis for such a settlement, but those agreed decisions need really to be implemented now. However, Pretoria continuously persists in disregarding those demands by the international community and thwarts United Nations decisions; and what we have heard today from the representative of that régime is clear proof of that.

It is perfectly clear that the Pretoria régime could not have sabotaged the process of the decolonization of Namibia for so many years - and after all, the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia over 20 years ago - if it were isolated, if it were not for the support given by some influential protectors. South Africa, despite the clear decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, continues to persist in its attempts to link the problem of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola,

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

which is a completely extraneous problem. The overwhelming majority of the international community, as is clear from the discussions taking place here in the Security Council, categorically rejects such a wrongful linkage. This notorious linkage policy is nothing but a desire by the racist régime of South Africa artificially to prevent the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to genuine self-determination and independence.

The additional report by the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia again notes, as have previous reports, that

"... successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition".

(S/19234, para. 25)

It is high time to take effective action against the racist régime of South Africa, to force Pretoria to give genuine independence to Namibia. For this we need joint, focused efforts as was recently noted by Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev in his article "Reality and safeguards for a secure world":

"A more concerted effort to combat apartheid, as one of the destabilizing factors of international significance, would also be justified."

(S/19143, p. 7)

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic strongly favours an immediate and unconditional halt to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the withdrawal from that Territory of the armed forces and administration of South Africa, the free and unimpeded exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence in a single territorially integrated State, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, and the transfer of all power to the people of Namibia represented by their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic calls upon the Security Council to heed the demand of the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community and to take effective action against the racist régime of South Africa by adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Other measures against the racist régime of South Africa could play a useful role until comprehensive mandatory sanctions are adopted. In this respect, an important role is played by trade with South Africa in oil and petroleum products, which are of enormous significance for South Africa's economy. At the present time, the Intergovernmental Group to monitor deliveries and shipment of oil and petroleum products to South Africa, of which the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a member, is preparing a report on that issue to the United Nations General Assembly. The Group has considerable evidence of continuing deliveries of that strategic commodity to the racist régime. In our opinion, the Security Council could consider the question of imposing a mandatory embargo on the delivery and shipment of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. Certain other selective measures might also be useful. However, in order for those measures to be effective, they must be binding on everyone.

A number of appeals have been made, in particular in resolutions 566 (1985) and 569 (1985), which were adopted when the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

a member of the Security Council. Those resolutions contain earnest appeals to adopt a number of voluntary measures against racist South Africa. Those measures should now be made mandatory.

The elimination of racist arrangements in Namibia, and in South Africa itself, through a political settlement would be in the interests of all peoples. We must seek and find ways to bring about such a settlement. I repeat: comprehensive mandatory sanctions alone could be a truly effective measure.

The just struggle of the Namibian people, headed by SWAPO - a struggle for national independence and freedom it has been waging by all available means - will continue to enjoy the full support of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

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

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

Mr. KIILU (Kenya): My delegation is pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over the deliberations of this important debate on the situation in Namibia. Your country, Italy, has in the past played a leading role in solving problems obtaining in Africa. We are particularly grateful to Italy for the massive assistance it gave to Africa during the recent famine and drought in our dear continent. We hope that with your proven diplomatic skills you will steer this Council debate to a successful conclusion.

My delegation would also like to record its deep appreciation to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Ghana Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, who skilfully presided over the affairs of the Council during the month of September. Ghana is an African country that we in the continent warmly salute for the leading role it played in ushering in the era of independence for black

(Mr. Kiilu (Kenya))

Africa. It is therefore no surprise that it has worthy sons and daughters, such as Ambassador Gbeho, of whom Africa is proud.

Our appreciation also goes to all the other members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate, which is dear to my delegation and other African delegations.

My delegation will refrain from recounting the sad history of this question, which has been eloquently outlined in the statements made by the Chairman of the African Group for the month of October, the Permanent Representative of Madagascar; the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia; and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In requesting the convening of the Security Council, the African Group has been prompted by the deteriorating situation in Namibia as a result of the continued illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa. Kenya vehemently condemns the stubborn refusal of the racist régime to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), embodying the United Nations independence plan for Namibia.

During past considerations of this item, the international community, and the African Group of States in particular, have been told to be patient. In the meantime, Namibia continues to remain under illegal occupation while the racist régime persists in its devious attempts to defeat the will of the international community and instead seeks to install a subservient puppet régime so that it may continue to use Namibian territory as a launching pad for its destabilization activities against Angola and other neighbouring independent African States.

My delegation wishes to salute the brave Namibian people for their valiant struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of

(Mr. Kiilu (Kenya))

the Namibian people. We commend SWAPO for its foresight and magnanimity manifested by its expressed readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with the racist régime so as to facilitate the implementation of the Security Council independence plan for Namibia, as contained in its resolution 435 (1978). In this connection Kenya wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to put in place administrative and other logistical arrangements necessary for the implementation of the Namibian independence plan. In the concluding remarks in his report, dated 27 October 1987, the Secretary-General states:

"Regrettably, successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition. Despite this, I remain convinced that, 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." (S/19234, para. 25)

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

In this regard, Kenya calls for the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), without any modification. We reject any linkage of Namibian independence with irrelevant and extraneous factors such as the matter of withdrawal of Cuban troops in Angola, which is the prerogative of Angola, a sovereign, independent State.

To that end, we urge the Security Council to take the necessary action to enable the Secretary-General to proceed with the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. For its part, Kenya will continue to render its modest contribution both within the context of the United Nations and to SWAPO until Namibia gains its full independence. In this context, we note with appreciation the Secretary-General's report confirming that all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved. It is therefore our fervent hope that all members of the Security Council, including those permanent members whose negative votes have in the past prevented the Council from taking decisive action, will join hands in approving a unanimous resolution for the immediate implementation of the United Nations independence plan for Namibia.

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

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

Mr. SVOBODA (Canada): May I at the outset, Mr. President, congratulate you on your assumption of office for the current month. In wishing you every success in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities, we also express our utmost confidence in your ability to do so.

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

We wish also to express our appreciation for the tireless efforts of your predecessors in the presidency of the Council since we last addressed it - by no coincidence on this very subject before us today.

We are again most grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Council for giving my country an opportunity to participate in this debate. One cannot but feel bitter, however, that the debate must take place at all. It is tragic for the people of Namibia that two decades after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory the people of Namibia are still being denied their right to self-determination. It is also an infuriating insult to the international community that we should still be calling on South Africa to end its illegal and immoral occupation of Namibia nine years after the adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978). While our patience has worn out, we grow stronger in our resolve that we should not mark a full decade in this way.

The Secretary-General in his further report on the question of Namibia has provided the Council with a succinct account of developments since April concerning efforts to implement its resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on Namibian independence. The discussions held by the Secretary-General and his senior staff have demonstrated the unflagging commitment of the Secretary-General to carrying out, faithfully and conscientiously, the mandate entrusted to him by the Council. Canada also admires the commitment of those leaders in the region who have worked so hard and for so long towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and we take their commitment and their dogged persistence as an example to us. We shall not cease our efforts.

Two weeks ago the Commonwealth met in Vancouver to discuss, among other pressing international issues, the situation in southern Africa, including Namibia. Canada's Prime Minister joined other leaders from all continents in

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

expressing grave concern over the impasse in Namibia's progress to independence. Canada and other Commonwealth members renewed their determination collectively and individually to induce South Africa to dismantle its abhorrent system of apartheid and to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. At the previous Commonwealth meeting, in Nassau, it was made clear that Commonwealth action against South Africa was directed equally towards ensuring South Africa's compliance with the wishes of the international community on the question of Namibia. This was reaffirmed in Vancouver.

Through participation in the Contact Group, Canada has been intimately involved in plans for Namibia's independence and remains fully committed to resolution 435 (1978). This resolution embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence. Namibian independence must be achieved in accordance with the wishes of the Namibian people, as expressed through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Canada stands ready, with the United Nations and the Contact Group, to carry out its full role in any implementation of that settlement plan for Namibia.

As stated in the draft resolution that we understand is before the Council, all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved. South Africa has professed its intention to implement this plan. Regrettably, its actions have indicated otherwise. By systematically raising new and extraneous issues and imposing pre-conditions unrelated to Namibia's independence, Pretoria has perpetuated its control over that Territory.

As indicated in the Secretary-General's report, the South African Government continues to make the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) conditional upon prior agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The South African

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

President has stated - and his Ambassador here has reiterated today - that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola constitutes not only an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) but a serious threat to Namibia, making free and fair elections impossible. This argument has no credence. South Africa cannot hold Namibia hostage to such irrelevant and extraneous issues. What clearly constitutes the most serious obstacle to Namibian independence is South Africa's illegal and oppressive occupation, and its denial of the right of the Namibian people to free and fair elections under United Nations auspices.

South Africa's intransigence serves only to prolong the suffering and oppression of the Namibian people, who for so long have been denied their basic political and human rights. We view the continuing deterioration of the situation with grave concern and condemn the brutal repression of the Namibian people by the South African occupation forces, particularly in the so-called operational zone in northern Namibia. South Africa's interminable delaying tactics, its oppressive military occupation of Namibia, its use of that Territory as a base for military actions against its neighbours, and its establishment of a so-called interim administration designed, as we see it, to frustrate the will of the Namibian people reflect South Africa's utter contempt for the legitimate rights of Namibians and the demands of the international community. Freedom for Namibia has only one obstacle - South African intransigence. Our challenge is to find effective ways to build pressure for change that Pretoria cannot afford to ignore, forcing it to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia.

In this Week of Solidarity with the Namibian People it is useful to recall this statement in the concluding remarks of the Secretary-General's report:

(Mr. Svoboda, Canada)

"if the Namibian situation 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 the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia". (S/19234, para. 25)

We recognize the obstacles to the goal but we must share the hope engendered by the Secretary-General's statement.

The draft resolution that we understand is before the Council would authorize the Secretary-General to proceed immediately to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We would encourage the Secretary-General to continue his efforts, including those envisaged in the resolution, to further the process leading to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

Namibia's independence will not be an unattainable dream; it must become an inevitable reality. The challenge to the Council and to the international community is to help ensure that it comes soon and peacefully.

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

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

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): Permit me, Sir, to express to you, and through you to the other members of the Security Council. My delegation's profound gratitude for the opportunity you have afforded us to participate in the debate on this important item. We are confident that your able guidance will enable the Council to undertake successful deliberations with a view to discharging its responsibilities to the oppressed people of Namibia.

In the same vein, permit me also to congratulate my dear colleague the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, on the able manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the busy month of September. I also wish to pay a tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his sensitivity to the problems of the Namibian people and the tremendous effort he is exerting towards setting in motion the implementation of Security Council decisions in general, and resolution 435 (1978) in particular.

Given the importance we all attach to the Namibian question, it will not be taken as a figure of speech if I state that right at this moment the eyes of the international community are riveted on the Security Council. Freedom fighters in their occupied motherland, exiles in their refuge, the world community standing against Pretoria - all are awaiting the verdict that the Council may give in the exercise of the powers vested in it by the Charter. Cognizant of this power, we, too, have turned to the Council once again to seek redress of the gross miscarriage of justice in respect of the people of Namibia.

A little over 12 years ago, on 30 January 1976, with the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), hope was generated in the international community in anticipation of a final settlement of the Namibian question. That forceful resolution, among other things, called for the immediate withdrawal of the illegal

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

administration South Africa maintains in the international Territory and for the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations. In that same resolution the Council demanded urgently that South Africa comply with this decision and make a declaration accepting its provisions.

Refusal to comply with decisions of the international community is so inherent in the Boer mentality that, in response to this demand by the Council, less than two months after the adoption of resolution 385 (1976), racist Pretoria invaded Angola and later, in July 1976, used the international Territory of Namibia as a base for launching armed attacks against Zambia. One could go on listing thousands of instances of refusal by South Africa to comply with the Council's decisions, but nothing can testify to this better than the fact of its continued occupation of Namibia and its illegal presence in the international Territory. Following this, between 1976 and 1978 a series of resolutions was adopted by the Security Council. Again, they were all rendered ineffective.

What happened as a result is obvious. The very objectives of the decisions unattained, the constructive attitude of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) rebuffed, Pretoria to date persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia, unleashing terror against innocent men and women. The daily life of Namibians has turned into a life of terror and fear. Daily arrests, disappearances, detention without trial, and cold-blooded murders and assassinations have become the order of the day, as Pretoria's single-minded method of muffling the popular demand for freedom and independence.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978, was yet another breath of fresh air in the effort by the international community to dispense justice to the people of Namibia and restore peace to the subregion. In the nine years since the adoption of this resolution, a golden opportunity has been missed by South Africa, equally denying itself the chance to enjoy the fruits of its

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

development in a just and peaceful society. In denying Namibians their inalienable right to freedom and independence and in undermining the will of the international community, apartheid South Africa not only continues to deny itself the virtues of freedom, but also poses a serious threat to international peace and security.

In spite of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), racist South Africa's intransigence continues. As a result, the situation in Namibia has deteriorated so much that the Territory has become a military zone with the presence of over 100,000 heavily armed troops and thousands more of South Africa's infamous secret police force. Furthermore, the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), (S/19234) refers to the grave concern of Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, at "the atrocities and massacres" perpetrated by these racist forces in Namibia.

In our view, and as the reality in the subregion clearly shows, through its intransigence and refusal to comply with the decisions of the Security Council and the norms of international conduct, the South African racist régime has obviously declared a war against the international community. If that is not the case, we fail to see the logic behind such defiance and preparation for war. We have resolution 435 (1978) as a basis for the negotiated settlement of the Namibian question and SWAPO's expressed readiness, as further reaffirmed yesterday before the Council, to sign a cease-fire agreement immediately to set in motion the United Nation's plan for the Territory's accession to independence. Therefore, the only obstacle is Pretoria's intransigence, which feeds on the abuse of the veto power by some permanent members of the Security Council, which also advocate the so-called constructive engagement policy, as well as Pretoria's insistence on the linkage subterfuge.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

True to its steadfast position, my delegation firmly believes that the parties to the conflict are the Namibian people, headed by SWAPO, and the racist régime of Pretoria. The United Nations plan as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978) is the only practical basis for the negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. We are convinced that the reference to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is not only extraneous to the very plan engineered and agreed upon by all the membership of the Council, but also an attempt to give an East-West dimension to this issue, which is basically one of decolonization.

Until Namibia wins its independence, the United Nations will remain obliged to fulfil its promises to the people of the Territory. No organ or organization is better equipped than the United Nations Security Council to ensure fulfilment of the fundamental aspiration of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. Our request to this body is simple. We urge it to exercise its full authority. And, as the Secretary-General has requested in his report of 27 October, the Council must be able to open the way for implementation of the United Nations plan. In the interest of implementing its own decisions, the Security Council now needs to move beyond slap-on-the-wrist measures. In the event of further defiance by South Africa, it must adopt measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

For our part, we commend SWAPO for having the courage of its convictions and for its commitment to pursue freedom and independence through a negotiated settlement.

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

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

Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): At the outset it gives me great pleasure to convey to you, Sir, my congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to express to you our full confidence that your great diplomatic abilities will enable you fully to discharge your responsibilities. My country, Mozambique, and yours, Italy, enjoy the best of relations. During the struggle for the liberation of my country, we always found solace and support in your people. Contrary to what happened in some Western countries, we always found your people ever ready to understand the cause of our struggle. Since our independence this relationship has grown to such an extent that your country has become our first partner in Western Europe.

I am not going to congratulate my elder brother, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, on his excellent stewardship of the Council during September. As his country and my own entertain such close sisterly relations, and as I always benefit from his long and rich experience, to congratulate him would be tantamount to congratulating myself.

I wish to thank the Council for its generosity in acceding to my request to take part in the discussion, albeit the Council was not as generous to me as to my elder brother, the Permanent Representative of Zambia, who was given room enough to oblige him to switch from one place to another whenever he changes his hat.

It is with a deep feeling of frustration that we meet here today, 21 years after the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, to denounce once again the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime.

The question of Namibia has been one of the subjects most dealt with by the United Nations since the Organization's first session in 1946, when General Assembly resolution 65 (I) was adopted. Ever since then the question has been before the General Assembly and the Security Council. Many resolutions have

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

been adopted by both organs, including a resolution on the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of 1966, and on the United Nations assumption of direct responsibility for the Territory's administration, which also established the United Nations Council for Namibia to act as the organ through which the international Organization would discharge its responsibilities to the Territory and its people until the attainment of independence.

The adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represented the consensus arrived at by the international community with regard to the question of Namibia. The United Nations plan for Namibia contained in that resolution has been universally accepted as the only basis for the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the question. Its adoption raised hopes of a negotiated, just and peaceful solution to the problem. Those hopes, however, have gradually faded, owing to the intransigence and arrogance of the racist South African régime and the connivance of a handful of its friends, some of which have a permanent seat on the Council.

Through persistent delaying tactics, apartheid South Africa has managed to stall the process of Namibia's independence. Racist South Africa's insistence on linking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is being used by the régime to torpedo Namibia's independence process. It must be recorded here that Cuban troops are in Angola at the request of the legitimate Government of that country, made when South Africa invaded it in 1975. It was a sovereign decision taken by a sovereign State and consistent with Article 51 of the Charter.

Those who have vociferously demanded the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola seem to have forgotten that racist South African occupying troops have maintained a permanent presence in southern Angola since 1982, in flagrant

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

violation of the Charter of our Organization and the resolutions adopted by the Council and the General Assembly.

Namibia has been systematically used by the occupation authorities for acts of terrorism, aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States, particularly Angola. As we meet here, South African soldiers of aggression are inside Angola fighting against a legitimate Government and its people. Recently the South African aggression against Angola reached unprecedented proportions, with the massive use of South African ground and air forces against civilian and economic targets, resulting in great human and material losses.

I am sure that the Council will agree with me that South African occupying forces in Namibia are not there at the request of its people. Indeed, what is at stake in Namibia is the issue of colonization and occupation. Therefore, the issue should be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Recent news from Namibia is more than worrying; it is alarming. The reports testify not only to the savagery of the occupying régime in Namibia, but also to its utterly callous disregard for human life. They have shown that there is an ever-increasing and continuing repression in that country, as well as acts of terror and murder perpetrated by the racist régime against innocent people. In that terrorist campaign not even houses, schools and churches are spared. The continued plunder and pillage of the natural resources of Namibia and the exploitation of the Territory's human resources, in collaboration with foreign economic interests, continues unabated. That practice is in full violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in September 1974.

In a vain attempt to exclude the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, from the

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

process of self-determination, the racist régime continues its attempts to impose a so-called internal solution.

Namibia's independence cannot be linked to irrelevant and extraneous issues. We are of the opinion that the determination of the Security Council to free Namibia should henceforth be reflected in the actions of its members, particularly its permanent members, so that South Africa can no longer misinterpret the Council's position. A clear message must be sent to the racist South African régime.

The time has come for the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), without any linkage or pre-condition, and we hope that the Security Council will be able to take a strong and resolute stand on the issue.

It is our earnest wish that this time the Security Council will be able to adopt a resolution which will allow the Secretary-General to put into effect, without delay, the plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed in resolution 435 (1978).

To those who in the past have so unwisely and unjustifiably cast negative votes whenever concrete and effective measures were proposed in the Council we have this message. Their narrow economic interests and self-interest should not stand in the way of the quest for international justice and morality and for the defence of the fundamental human rights, dignity and equality.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Namibia's independence can be delayed and has been delayed, but it cannot be denied for ever. While Namibia's independence is delayed the Namibian people will be subjected to untold physical suffering. However, this suffering will be over sooner rather than later. Sooner rather than later Namibia will be free. But race relations will suffer permanently. How long will our egotistical interests keep us blind to this long-term effect? Let us not sow the seeds of future racial conflicts in the region.

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

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

Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I warmly congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. We trust that your diplomatic skills will be brought to bear in steering the work of the Council. Our expectation is especially anchored on the importance we attach to the question of Namibia and the high premium we place on a successful outcome. My delegation also wishes to salute your immediate predecessor, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, whose tenure last month witnessed an active and constructive phase in the role of the Security Council especially with regard to one of the burning issues of our time. The matter at hand is no less important. It is our hope that the Security Council will exhibit a similar unanimity of purpose on the item currently before it.

The Security Council is meeting once again to deliberate on the question of Namibia, its independence and the freedom of its people, more than 20 years after the termination of racist South Africa's mandate over that unhappy and shackled Territory and nearly 10 years after the Security Council - which the founding

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

fathers of the Organization vested with primary responsibility to maintain international peace and security - adopted resolution 435 (1978) for the peaceful transition of the Territory to independence. As a responsible member of the comity of nations, Nigeria is not known to indulge in excessive loquaciousness. The chequered history of the Namibian situation, which, inter alia, is a pathetic story of rising expectation turned into unabated frustration, is very well known by us all and by the international community at large. Our delegation will therefore not indulge in a litany of repetition. The arguments have been made and the solutions have been outlined.

What has been regrettably lacking is the political will and honesty, not on the part of the vast majority of the world community but on the part of a powerful minority of Governments. Those that continue to hold Namibian independence hostage have failed to match rhetoric with action. Intentionally perhaps, they continue to perpetuate the suffocating grip of apartheid South Africa on Namibia and its people. It is ironic that those that successfully mustered all the resources at their disposal to combat Hitler's fascism; countries which have vigorously expressed strong condemnation of apartheid, racism and racial discrimination; countries which have publicly and repeatedly declared commitment to freedom, justice and human dignity, have been actively engaged in giving solace and succour to the Pretoria régime in its defiant and condemnable colonization and brutalization of the Namibian people.

It is as distressing as it is hollow for those who preach the gospel of participatory democracy to maintain a posture and practise policies that pointedly ignore the expressed wishes of their own populations, which, clearly and unmistakably, are in favour of immediate and unconditional independence for Namibia. Is it possible that those who support apartheid South Africa have learned nothing and forgotten nothing from their history? Or do they lend support because

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

the victims of apartheid are black Africans? Let them know that black is indeed beautiful and we are proud to be black.

My delegation believes that while Namibia's freedom and independence can be delayed by racist South Africa and its supporters and allies, it cannot be denied. World history is replete with indisputable evidence of victories won and just causes successfully promoted by oppressed and colonized peoples in spite of the formidable array of forces ranged against them by their oppressors and colonizers. The people of Namibia will surely, sooner or later, take their rightful place in the comity of nations of free peoples because justice and morality underscore their cause and their inevitable and unstoppable march to victory.

Nigeria believes that what is at issue before us now is the integrity and authority of the United Nations and especially the Security Council vested with a sacred responsibility in the Charter. The Security Council must assert its authority and call the bluff of apartheid South Africa. The developing countries, including mine, are often sanctimoniously reminded of the need to respect and uphold international obligations willingly and freely entered into. Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which embodies the United Nations plan for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence, was a product of the free will of nations, including the five Western countries which were parties to the negotiations.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

It is therefore only reasonable that the international community should demand that all parties which freely and voluntarily committed themselves to Namibia's freedom and independence should not renege on their obligations. It is very sad that thousands of innocent lives - children, women and the elderly - have been lost and are still being wasted in Namibia because of the vacillation over the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is a betrayal of trust.

The draft resolution currently before the Council seeks to reaffirm the United Nations role in facilitating freedom and independence for the Namibian people. It is a modest request the Security Council should not hesitate to adopt. It only seeks the authorization of the Council to enable the Secretary-General to proceed with the implementation of this Council's own resolution by arranging a cease-fire between the parties in conflict in Namibia and also emplacing the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), as expressly provided for in resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General has repeatedly indicated that, with the resolution of the issue of the electoral system for the United Nations supervised elections envisaged under resolution 435 (1978), all outstanding issues pertinent to implementation of that resolution have been satisfied. The Namibian people have time and again expressed their readiness to co-operate in the immediate and full implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has been unequivocal in its declarations of willingness and readiness to co-operate in the immediate and full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Let us all now - let the Security Council - give the Secretary-General the authority to commence the administrative measures with a view to implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia. This Chamber must serve notice to apartheid South Africa that it is sick and tired of the irrelevant and extraneous excuses which

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

have consistently been used to defy its authority. The friends and allies of South Africa should demonstrate to the pariah régime that the global community of nations has decided to choose the path to freedom, dignity and justice, not only in Namibia but also in the whole southern African region. That is what the draft resolution before us seeks to achieve. It is a modest request, the barest minimum request which Africa, indeed, the entire world is making to the Security Council.

In the words of one of America's greatest sons, the late
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

"There comes a time when people get tired of being trampled by oppression. There comes a time when people get tired of being plunged into the abyss of exploitation and nagging injustice."

The Namibian people are tired of being oppressed and trampled upon and the time to act to free them from racist South Africa's imposed manacles is now.

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

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

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is very pleased, Sir, that the presidency of the Council should currently be exercised by the representative of Italy. The developing countries feel that modern Italy is sensitive to their concerns and to their hopes. We are aware of its sense of universal solidarity, its commitment to freedom and justice, and its respect for the dignity of man. We trust, furthermore, that the course of this debate will be consistent with those principles and those values.

In conveying our warm congratulations to you, we should also like to extend

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

similar congratulations to Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana for the distinguished and effective way in which he exercised the presidency during the month of September.

When in ancient Greece Aristotle wrote Politics, he distinguished between two classes of power: political power which attends to the interest of the polis, that is, the people organized into a community; and despotic power which is based on the exclusive tyrannical interests of those who possess force.

Twenty centuries later, this classification of power continues to be applicable in describing the attitude of South Africa in Namibia: the tyranny of the colonialist minority over the oppressed majority and the tyranny of the rebellion of an individual group against the legal and political mandate exercised by the international community.

It is this concept and this tyrannical exercise of power which enables South Africa to challenge international law, systematically to violate the decisions of the United Nations, to continue through the practice of apartheid to commit a crime against mankind, to flout the mandate of the Security Council and, ultimately, to become the sole and exclusive case of an outlaw State.

The independence of Namibia is being held up by the action of a régime which in every way violates the international legal order but which, paradoxically, is able to act with impunity and in violation of international law, thanks to the vetos in the Security Council. Perhaps that is why the Nigerian writer, Wole Soyinka, who received the Nobel prize for literature, in referring to colonial domination said that:

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

"Man will continue to die as long as he puts up with tyranny."

We have faith in the triumph of law and ours is the faith of those who persevere in the knowledge that our cause is just and that we shall not brook tyranny. We have come here today to ask the Security Council for Namibia's freedom, for the Council holds in its hands the keys to the prison in which the Namibian people are locked up, suffering from South Africa's colonialist occupation

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The Council has the responsibility to bind the great wounds to international law, the conscience of the international community and the image and prestige of the United Nations, all of which are undermined by the veto.

For half of its 42 years of existence the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, has been subjected to affronts to its political and moral authority caused by the illegal occupation of Namibia; for 10 years it has been confronted by a challenge to its decision to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia. The policy of the veto, far from resulting in condemnation and the ending of this violation, has protected and endorsed it.

All these considerations are of fresh relevance today given the development of objective conditions conducive to implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as described in the Secretary-General's report.

Peru trusts that this historical paradox, this breach of international law which has been tolerated and condemned for so long, will now give way in the minds of leaders and the decisions of Governments to a new policy based on fresh thinking and a new approach consistent with peace, security, freedom and justice in Namibia. We hope that members will take this opportunity to enable the Council to adopt the historic commitment to begin immediately implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, energetically sanctioning any rebellion against the decision, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

Peru is at this time celebrating the Day of Peruvian-African Friendship established by the Government on 19 October 1986 to reaffirm every year in Peru and abroad our identification with the justice of the cause of the peoples of Africa. On this day within Peru and in its embassies in Africa, activities are under way to stress the contribution of Africa's cultural values to the Peruvian society, the community of interests between the countries of the third world and the struggle against racial discrimination.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

I should therefore like to conclude my statement by quoting from the words of President Alan García, who, in celebrating the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and SWAPO said:

"We pay our fervent tribute to all those Namibian patriots who have sacrificed their lives for dignity and freedom, to their liberation movement under the heroic leadership of SWAPO, to the freedom fighters who are still in jail, and to those suffering persecution and the violation of their civil and human rights. To all of them and to the entire Namibian people, Peru reiterates its unconditional and steadfast support.

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

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place tomorrow, Friday, 30 October 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.