



# Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2745  
8 April 1987

ENGLISH

UN LIBRARY

APR 10 1987

UN/II COLLECTION

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 8 April 1987, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. TSVETKOV

(Bulgaria)

Members: Argentina  
China  
Congo  
France  
Germany, Federal Republic of  
Ghana  
Italy  
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. YU Mengjia  
Mr. GAYAMA  
Mr. BLANC  
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER  
Mr. GBEHO  
Mr. BUCCI  
Mr. AOKI  
Mr. BELONOGOV  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. BIRCH  
Miss BYRNE  
Mr. PABON GARCIA  
Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

LETTER DATED 25 MARCH 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GABON TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18765)

LETTER DATED 31 MARCH 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18769)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at its previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados), Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Biffot (Gabon), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Insanally (Guyana), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), Mr. Doljintseren (Mongolia), Mr. Bennouna Louridi (Morocco), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Miss Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria),

Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdoun (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with a decision taken by the Council at its 2740th meeting I invite the President and delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with a decision taken at the 2740th 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 (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Congo, Ghana and Zambia a letter dated 8 April 1987, which reads as follows:

"The undersigned members of the Security Council have the honour to request that the Council address to Mr. Francis Meli, a member of the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), who is also chief editor of Séchaba, the official organ of the African National Congress, an invitation to participate in our consideration of the

(The President)

item 'The situation in Namibia', in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure."

That letter has been circulated as a Security Council document (S/18787). If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to grant the request made to it to extend an invitation in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Francis Meli.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

(The President)

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

The first speaker for this meeting is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BUI XUAN NHAT (Viet Nam): I should like at the very outset to extend to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. It is fitting and encouraging to see you, an outstanding representative of Bulgaria - a country that enjoys world-wide respect for its unequivocal and determined position in the cause of world peace and security and national liberation - presiding over this series of Security Council meetings on one of the most important of questions: the situation in Namibia. Your vast diplomatic skills and rich experience in the matter under discussion, as well as your personal commitment to the cause of the Namibian people, give us confidence that you will lead the Council's deliberations to the desired success.

I should like to take this opportunity also to express the appreciation of my delegation to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina for the excellent manner in which he presided over the work of this Council as its President during the month of March.

Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council Chamber this year, allow me to take this opportunity to congratulate the new non-permanent members of the Security Council upon their election to their important seats, and to wish them and the other members of the Council a fruitful 1987 in which they will make the Security Council effectively live up to its responsibility.

This body is meeting again, for the second time in less than two months, to tackle a burning issue which after innumerable resolutions remains unresolved: in this instance, the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

It is 21 years since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and almost 10 years since the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), which if implemented would have brought independence to that Territory. Yet the Namibian people is still daily subject to acts of brutality and inhumanity which constitute an open challenge to the conscience of mankind. We are deeply concerned about the explosive current situation in Namibia, details of which were presented in the statements of Mr. Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Ambassador Zuze, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Midence of Zimbabwe representing the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations, and others.

We are also filled with indignation by the deceitful schemes of Pretoria, which, with the connivance of its Western partners, is attempting to set up a so-called interim government which has been rejected by the world community as null and void, but which is still being used by the apartheid régime to carry out colonialism in Namibia. As a result, realization of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is being further obstructed, and ever more barbarous crimes are being committed.

Together with our African friends and other peace-loving peoples the world over, Viet Nam demands that the Pretoria régime not be allowed to perpetuate its colonial domination in that Territory. The independence of the Namibian people cannot be eternally postponed because of the greed of transnational corporations and the politics of duplicity practiced by certain Western States. We are of the view that linkage, the by-product of the failed policy of "constructive engagement", is irrational and must be rejected. It is only a pretext for continuing South Africa's occupation of Namibia and for opposing Security Council

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

resolution 435 (1978). Linkage is "the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia" (S/18767, para. 32), as declared by the Secretary-General in his lucid report.

Debates have been conducted in many forums to find measures to force South Africa to comply with resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. At the Paris World Conference on Sanctions Against Racist South Africa, at the Vienna International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, at the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia and at the forty-first regular session of the General Assembly there was unanimity on the need for the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime. In the same vein, Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, at their eighth summit Conference, held at Harare, made it very clear that

"the accumulated evidence of the past 20 years ... irrefutably points to comprehensive mandatory sanctions as the most effective peaceful means of forcing South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia".

(S/18392, p. 57)

The Security Council has a moral and political responsibility towards the people of Namibia. It has powers it must exercise, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. Regrettably, it has been prevented from discharging its responsibility by those who time and again have used the veto power to prevent the adoption of the necessary measures. Opposing sanctions, in any way, on any pretext, is nothing but collaboration with apartheid.

The Security Council is the ultimate hope of all peoples for justice, peace and security. However, its credibility depends on how its members react to the issues at stake. The Namibian people, who have suffered far too long, and millions

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

of other men and women all over the world, are looking forward with anxiety to the result of the vote this time in this Chamber. Will the Namibian people at last have a chance to gain the independence for which they have fought so hard for so many years, or will this come to nothing, as has been the case until now? A positive vote for sanctions now will certainly enhance the credibility of the United Nations.



(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

The staunch struggle for freedom and independence waged by the Namibian people for more than 20 years has won the admiration of the world. It is the struggle of the oppressed and dispossessed for their alienable right to be masters in their own land, and for that reason we believe it is bound to achieve final victory. Once again I avail myself of this opportunity to express the unswerving solidarity of the Vietnamese people for the valiant fighters of South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Namibian people as a whole. I particularly share the view expressed by our brother from SWAPO in a statement he made in this Chamber two days ago:

"... we very much intend to fight on, whatever the cost, until final victory. That victory will come, sooner rather than later, with or without sanctions. This Council - no less than SWAPO [and] the Namibian people - bears a heavy responsibility to lessen the cost of that victory in terms of human lives".

(S/PV.2740, p. 47)

Let that call be heard in this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Viet Nam for his kind words about me and my country.

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

Mr. DOST (Afghanistan): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to extend my warm congratulations and best wishes to you on your assumption of the post of President of the Security Council for the month of April. Our two countries have the best of relations and I am happy to note that both are in full support of the militant Namibian and South African peoples. I am confident that, being the able diplomat that you are, you will provide wise and effective guidance for the success of this debate as well as for other activities of the Security Council during this month. I should like also to express our thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, the

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

Permanent Representative of Argentina, for the skilful manner in which he conducted the Council's affairs in the month of March.

Once again the Security Council is discussing the question of Namibia. It is only proper to remind ourselves that for more than one and a half centuries the Namibian people have lived under the colonial yoke. For more than 20 years, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, they have been continuing, like their brothers in South Africa, a valorous struggle for the attainment of their inalienable rights. Two full decades have passed since the United Nations decided that the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria racist régime should be terminated and legally assumed responsibility for preparing the nation for statehood. It has been almost a decade since Security Council resolution 435 (1978), embodying the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, was adopted by the Council.

Regrettably, however, Namibia is still not free. It has been criminally enslaved and its people brutally exploited. Its territory is being increasingly militarized and used as a springboard for aggression against front-line States. That constitutes a blatant example of State terrorism in action. Furthermore, in Namibia the oppressive and exploitative nature of colonialism has been coupled with the intrinsically inhuman policy of apartheid to subjugate the whole nation and trample under foot the dignity of the entire people. In defiance of all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the Pretoria régime has installed in Windhoek a puppet so-called interim government to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia.

The reason behind such intransigence on the part of the apartheid régime in South Africa must be sought in the economic, military, political and moral support constantly rendered to it, in gross violation of relevant United Nations resolutions, by certain Western States, and particularly by United States

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

imperialism, as well as by fellow racist régimes, such as that of Israeli Zionism. This assistance is being rendered not in spite of the apartheid policy of the Pretoria régime both in South Africa and Namibia but because of it. The dividends that these capitalist countries are receiving from the inhuman exploitation of the Namibian and South African peoples and the plundering of their natural resources is so great that they have a vested interest in the perpetuation of the apartheid régime and its illegal occupation of Namibia. The very policy of so-called constructive engagement which is pursued by the Washington Administration, and the destructive nature of which has become fully evident, smacks of collaboration and complicity.

It is to white-wash this complicity on the part of the United States Administration that Washington has joined the racist Pretoria régime in linking the independence of Namibia to a completely extraneous matter - that is, the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist troops from Angola. Such linkage is not valid. The international community as a whole, and in fact the Security Council itself, has rejected it. And yet the report of the Secretary-General clearly shows that linkage as a pre-condition is the main stumbling block on the path to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. In this regard the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan would like to express its appreciation for the constructive efforts made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations towards the implementation of relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia. It is our hope that such efforts will be continued in particular through the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority over Namibia. That undoubtedly would contribute to the just struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and genuine independence.

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

It is time that the Security Council took decisive steps towards the implementation of its own resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978). That is the demand of the whole international community, which wants to see an immediate end to the loss of innocent lives in Namibia. The Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity have expressed this demand by the international community clearly and irrevocably. Furthermore, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the subjugation and inhuman exploitation of its people by the racist Pretoria régime, as well as the latter's repeated aggression against Angola and other front-line States, constitute a breach of international peace and security.

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

The militant Namibian people, like the people of South Africa, have in their heroic struggle for freedom and dignity left no doubt that, sooner rather than later, they will attain what is theirs. The Security Council can and should assist in bringing that day closer. We believe that one of the effective steps the Security Council can adopt towards that end is the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In fact, comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime are something the majority of United Nations Members - the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan among them - are observing. However, it is time the Security Council gave a universal character to such sanctions by adopting an appropriate resolution during this debate. In this connection we join the whole international community in hoping that some permanent members of the Security Council will abstain from abusing their right to the veto once again and thereby assist in the elimination of this vestige of colonialism in Africa.

The Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole legitimate representative, are struggling for freedom, independence and self-determination and for human rights and dignity. The Security Council can and should do everything within its sphere of responsibility to realize those aspirations of the people of Namibia which every one of us cherishes so dearly in his heart.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Afghanistan for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): I should like first to convey to you, Mr. President, and, through you, the other members of the Council, my delegation's gratitude at having been given this opportunity to appear before the Council.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

I should also like at the outset to convey to you, Sir, the felicitations and greetings of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka. My delegation is happy to see you presiding over the deliberations of the Security Council, and we are assured that under your guidance and diplomatic skills our discussions will augur well. My delegation also wishes to convey to His Excellency Mr. Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, our appreciation of the good work he did during last month's presidency.

This is not the first time that the situation in Namibia is being debated in the Security Council. I will not, therefore, labour the history of this continuing debate now taking place. Suffice it to refer to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to express our concern that South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. Assuming that resolution 435 (1978) was acceptable to South Africa, the Council, in resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June 1985, mandated the Secretary-General to settle the electoral system for the elections for the constituent assembly that were to be held under United Nations supervision and control. We have been told that South Africa has no objection to adopting a system of proportional representation as a framework for the elections contemplated in resolution 435 (1978). However, progress has been aborted. South Africa has disagreed with the rest of the United Nations by stipulating as a pre-condition the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola prior to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We learn from the Secretary-General's report that is now before the Security Council that the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia is this linkage pre-condition.

My delegation views the callous disregard of world opinion by South Africa as a devious attempt to spite the United Nations and the Security Council. South Africa has set up a so-called interim government, in total disregard of United Nations recognition of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We are greatly reassured by the fact that, in its judgement, SWAPO has accepted the United Nations settlement plan and has confirmed its decision to abide by resolution 435 (1978), which calls for free and fair elections.

The present administration of Namibia, backed by South Africa, is in defiance of world opinion and of the wishes of the legitimate representatives of the peoples of Namibia. South Africa refuses to recognize its moral obligation because of its vested interests in exploiting the resources of that land. A colonial régime has been imposed on the peoples of Namibia, who are being deprived of their renewable sources of wealth so rapidly that soon that country's resources will be exhausted - not, however, before a situation is created which is bound over the next few years to explode and to reduce the southern African region to a smouldering heap of dust and ashes. Apartheid, that deadly virus, has eaten into the body politic of South Africa, and the economy of Namibia, now subject to ruthless exploitation, is lingering on the brink of disaster. The Security Council must take serious note of the actions of the irresponsible and immoral racist régime in South Africa and its actions in Namibia. Because of their geographic proximity, the front-line States are faced time and again with the vicious inroads of a régime that cannot see that its conduct is leading not only to its ultimate demise but also to social, political and economic chaos for its victims in all of southern Africa.

Those are our perceptions of the situation in Namibia, removed as we are from the immediate scene of this crime against humanity. The Security Council has heard other speakers calling for a quick and prompt action to bring the erring régime of Pretoria to its senses. That régime is infatuated with its own pomp and power, built on a system of values that was wiped out at tremendous cost over 40 years ago. The régime in South Africa is the last flicker, the dying ember of a movement

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

that was stamped out by the blood and sweat of free people all over the world. The South African régime does not seem to realize the consequences of its actions.

The world is turning to the Security Council to deal unequivocally with the one remaining scourge that defies the dignity of mankind. Let us register our concern and displeasure not by force but by measures prescribed under the United Nations Charter. Mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter would undoubtedly hurt the front-line States, but that is the price which they have time and again declared that they would pay if only it can lead to freedom and liberation for the black peoples of South Africa and Namibia.

My delegation would urge this body to take a decision on the matter before it, one that will be just and fair to the long-suffering people of Namibia, whose views have been represented here by the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Sri Lanka for the kind words he addressed to me.

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



Mr. BENNOUNA LOURIDI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Moroccan delegation may I first of all warmly congratulate you, Sir, upon your accession to the post of President of the Security Council. Your skill and great experience are the best assurances that the Council will be able to discharge its task satisfactorily.

I wish also to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Mr. Marcelo Delpech, who skilfully and effectively presided over the work of the Council last month.

In speaking in this debate, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes first of all to reiterate its total and unconditional support for the Namibian people in its legitimate struggle for the attainment of its independence throughout all its national territory. Indeed, we and the entire international community are in duty bound to do our utmost to eliminate this last remnant of colonialism in Africa and perpetuation of the Namibian people's colonial status. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that the Namibian people is also confronted by an apartheid régime which has institutionalized racial discrimination as a system of government, thus flouting the most sacred human values and seriously threatening international peace and security.

It was hardly a month ago that the Security Council once again took up the question of apartheid and the chain of violence and crimes engendered by apartheid. On that occasion we recalled that South Africa was attempting to impose its model on Namibia, bringing in its wake the well-known racial laws, daily attacks on dignity and fundamental rights of the human person, harassment and repression of all kinds. It is therefore scarcely surprising that South Africa set up a so-called provisional government in Namibia, just as it set up bantustans in South Africa itself, as puppet creations intended to cloak its colonial policy and

(Mr. Bennouna Louridi, Morocco)

loathsome system of apartheid with a mantle of legality. There is no real alternative to the suppression of apartheid and the elimination of colonialism in Namibia. It must come about by a transfer of power to the Namibian people through free elections with the assistance of the United Nations and under its auspices.

It has been more than 20 years since South Africa lost all legal title to the continuation of its presence in Namibia, having been stripped once and for all by the General Assembly of the Mandate it exercised over the Territory. The efforts of the international community made it possible for the Security Council, after consultation with all parties concerned, to adopt a comprehensive plan to assure Namibia's accession to independence by peaceful means.

Since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) on 19 September 1978, our Organization has repeatedly appealed to South Africa to implement the plan and respect international law, while demonstrating its lasting solidarity with the struggling Namibian people. Indeed, only last year, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which met from 7 to 11 July at Vienna, was followed by a special session of the General Assembly on the same subject: it met in September, only a few days before the opening of the regular session of the General Assembly.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his part, has worked tirelessly to complete and expedite implementation of the 1978 plan, and we take this opportunity to pay warm tribute to him for his efforts. Indeed, in his latest report (S/18767) dated 31 March 1987, the Secretary-General recalls the series of steps taken by him to resolve the last question still outstanding with respect to the 1978 plan, namely, the choice of electoral system to be used for the election. That minor point would now seem to have been worked out. One must also commend the considerable efforts of the United Nations Council

(Mr. Bennouna Louridi, Morocco)

for Namibia over the years to expedite the peaceful settlement of the question, to protect the rights of the population and to mobilize international solidarity on its behalf.

However, all these efforts have run up against South Africa's intransigence and its contempt for all the fundamental norms of universal morality. Rather than getting involved in a process leading to the peaceful negotiated settlement, the Pretoria régime has opted for drastic measures, attempting to link the question of Namibia to disputes completely unrelated to it, or employing its territory as a base for aggression against neighbouring countries, thus worsening the threat to Africa and to international peace and security.

Furthermore, and this needs be repeated, the plundering of resources within the Territory continues, notwithstanding the relevant United Nations resolutions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the Protection of Natural Resources of Namibia.

Thus, if an end is to be put to the tragedy being daily experienced by the Namibian people, the Security Council must then resort to all peaceful means available to it, including adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

As far as international action is concerned, firmness of language is more necessary than ever to guarantee Namibia's accession to independence throughout its territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. If we are not to undermine the credibility of the Organization, the determination of the international community cannot be allowed to waste away in still-born resolutions.

The Kingdom of Morocco reiterates its active solidarity with the front-line States, which have suffered acts of aggression and destabilization at the hands of the South African régime and endured heavy sacrifices to defend their sovereignty.

(Mr. Bennouna Louridi, Morocco)

Yet they have continued their support of the Namibian and South African peoples in their just struggle against colonialism and apartheid.

As far as we are concerned, that support has always constituted a sacred obligation, one rooted in our deepest convictions and with which we are determined to keep faith. The Kingdom of Morocco, which pays tribute to the martyrs of the Namibian liberation struggle, sincerely hopes that international resolve will help to remove the last obstacles still impeding Namibia's ultimate and inevitable accession to independence.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Morocco for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic):

Mr. President, it gives my delegation great pleasure to see you guiding the Council's work this month. Your personal qualities make us confident that you will conduct our business with efficiency and wisdom. Similarly, I cannot fail to express our appreciation to our colleague, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

The colonial question of Namibia is one of the traditional problems before the United Nations; yet it is a unique problem, owing to the fact that colonialism, in addition to all its other vices, is racist in form and practice, thus adding to its illegality and inhuman character. Therefore, the question of Namibia constitutes an insult to the conscience of contemporary humanity.

Since the General Assembly's adoption in 1966 of resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, many significant developments have taken place, the most important of which were the establishment of the United Nation Council for Namibia in 1967 and the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice in 1971 committing Member States not to recognize the legality of South Africa's presence in Namibia, which was confirmed in Security Council resolution 301 (1971).

All subsequent Security Council resolutions on the subject reaffirmed the Namibian people's right to independence - notably, resolution 435 (1978) which reaffirmed the legal responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia. It also embodied the plan for the settlement of the question of Namibia through a

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

cease-fire and Namibia's subsequent accession to independence through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

Despite the consistent efforts of the Secretary-General to implement that resolution, the South African Government has continued to procrastinate, linking settlement of the question of Namibia to other matters irrelevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). My delegation sees no "linkage" between implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as embodied in resolution 435 (1978), on the one hand, and the presence of the Cuban forces in Angola on the other.

We agree with what the Secretary-General stated in his report:

"I do not recognize the validity of the linkage pre-condition, nor can I accept it as a pretext to delay any further the independence of Namibia. The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a separate matter ...".

(S/18767, para. 32)

Therefore, we believe that, day after day, the South African Government is confirming its unwillingness to co-operate with the United Nations for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

The solution of the question of Namibia brooks no further delay: the Namibian people has already borne too much oppression and displacement; the question of Namibia falls within the direct purview of the United Nations, which has assumed direct responsibility for the Territory; hence it is a matter of commitment to the Charter, which recognizes the right of colonial peoples to self-determination. Moreover, the racist, inhuman South African régime, by its oppression of more than 74 per cent of South Africa's population, by its illegal occupation of Namibia, by its attempts to destabilize neighbouring States and by its repeated acts of aggression, constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

On that basis, we cannot lend credence to the offer of co-operation extended by the racist South African Government. We believe that Pretoria will fabricate further pretexts to perpetuate its occupation of the Territory and to continue to plunder its riches because, according to the racist point of view, the end justifies the means.

The Charter is the framework of United Nations efforts. Hence the will of the international community, as embodied in numerous resolutions adopted by the Council and the General Assembly, must be reflected in the relations still maintained by some members of the international community with South Africa. This can be achieved only through the adoption of all relevant measures provided for in the Charter - in particular, those set forth in Chapter VII. Therefore, when we call for the imposition of mandatory, comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, it is an expression of our firm belief that the international community has exhausted all other available means. It has become abundantly clear that, in pursuit of its policy, the racist South African Government exploits every loophole and every weakness of the international will. Therefore, we believe that those loopholes must be closed until the racist Government heeds the voice of reason.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to the heroic struggle waged by the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We support that struggle in the belief that it is the most decisive and essential factor for their attainment of freedom and independence. I pay a similar tribute to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Council for Namibia for their valuable roles.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United Arab Emirates for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): It is an honour for the delegation of Burkina Faso to participate in this important debate, and I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for having given me an opportunity to do so.

At the outset, Sir, I convey to you the heartfelt congratulations of the delegation of Burkina Faso on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. My delegation is convinced that, thanks to your great experience and skill, the work of the Council will be successful.



(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

Similarly, may I also convey congratulations to your predecessor, Mr. Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, for the skill with which he guided the Council's deliberations on the important questions before it last month.

I shall not go into the background of this issue, since previous speakers have already done so very eloquently. My delegation is participating in this debate to reaffirm once again the strong support of the Revolutionary Government of Burkina Faso for the valiant people of Namibia, which is carrying out a just and legitimate struggle for freedom and national independence. We in Burkina Faso express solidarity with that people.

The Security Council has again met to resume consideration of the situation in Namibia, following the combined effort of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of African States. The Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement at various important meetings have consistently engaged in a thorough consideration of the situation in Namibia and each time called upon the Security Council to act decisively so that the United Nations might shoulder its direct responsibility with regard to Namibia and take urgent steps for the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

It is a tragedy that nearly two decades after the termination of the Mandate by a decision of the United Nations the racist régime of Pretoria should continue to maintain its illegal presence in Namibia through its racial policies based on apartheid. Thousands of Namibians have been killed, tortured, imprisoned and driven away from their lands merely because they rejected the abominable practices of apartheid, which have been declared by the United Nations as a crime against the conscience and dignity of man.

It is also a tragedy that Pretoria should still have no intention of implementing resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted eight years ago and which was

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

then viewed as the resolution of hope, the last resolution on Namibia. Indeed, that resolution was sponsored by the Western countries. My delegation believes that it remains valid to this day, for it contains the promise of a democratic and peaceful solution of the Namibian problem. It envisages the holding, under United Nations auspices and supervision, of free and fair elections in Namibia, to be preceded by negotiations between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa and also by the arrival in Namibia of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and the Secretary-General's Special Representative responsible for the transition.

Whereas SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, constantly reaffirms its support for resolution 435 (1978) with a view to bringing the Territory to complete independence, whereas it remains prepared to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Council to achieve that goal, South Africa is still intransigent and arrogant and defies the United Nations. It has recourse to gross and shameful political manoeuvres. This arrogance and defiance adopted by South Africa emanate from the constant support some permanent members of the Security Council give to the Pretoria régime. Those States have a serious responsibility: to take immediate effective measures for the immediate effective implementation of the plan for Namibian independence, contained in resolution 435 (1978), without modification or pre-conditions.

With regard to pre-conditions, my delegation strongly denounces the notion of linkage which, according to the Secretary-General in his report, is the only obstacle to the immediate implementation of the Namibian independence plan. Indeed, South Africa has linked the independence of the Territory of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. My delegation is convinced that demanding that withdrawal is a spurious manoeuvre aimed at ensuring for the Pretoria régime the co-operation of certain Western countries in its grim designs.

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

The Revolutionary Government of Burkina Faso has always done everything in its power to eliminate apartheid and to establish a non-racist democratic society in South Africa.

The President of Burkina Faso, Comrade Thomas Sankara, has taken every opportunity to reaffirm the unconditional support of Burkina Faso for SWAPO and his faith in the inevitability of Namibian independence. Here I shall recall, among other specific steps taken by the Revolutionary Government of Burkina Faso, the establishment, by decision of the Council of Ministers on 6 August 1986, of a fund in support of the anti-apartheid struggle. While this is a modest contribution, it nevertheless reflects the desire of my people to see peace reign among the peoples of our continent. This goal presupposes the elimination of all forms of domination, exploitation and subjugation of which Africa is the victim.

My delegation commends the laudable efforts of the Secretary-General to find a just and fair solution to the problem of Namibia. His important report contained in document S/18767, dated 31 March 1987, provides a full and clear picture of the subject of our current deliberations.

In conclusion, let me say that it is high time for the international community to shoulder its responsibilities. It is high time that it take all necessary steps to ensure the implementation of the Organization's decisions to promote Namibian independence, eliminate apartheid and, hence, eliminate the threat to freedom, peace and security in southern Africa.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Burkina Faso for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): When on 6 April 1987 I asked to speak in the current debate on the question of Namibia it was in my capacity as Chairman of the African Group for this month. With your permission, Sir, I wish today to say a few words on behalf of the Ghana delegation.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The decision to intervene in the debate at this point has been taken by my delegation for the purpose of clarifying a number of points that have been raised in the debate primarily by the South African representative. His statement on 6 April was full of distortions of substantive aspects of the question of Namibia, in addition to obvious slander. Let me therefore try to set the record straight.

The representative of the Pretoria régime, members of the Council will recall, said at the beginning of his statement that it had become customary in deliberations on the Namibia issue to ignore the spirit of the United Nations Charter and to refuse to address the real issues standing in the way of the resolution of the long-standing dispute.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Nothing could be further from the truth, as the debate so far has shown.

Let me explain for his benefit, and for the benefit of his Government in Pretoria, that the letter and spirit of the Charter is reaffirmation of

"faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small".

Apartheid negates all of these. The letter and spirit of the Charter means

"to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained".

South Africa's actions in Namibia and elsewhere in southern Africa undermine those very principles, as this very Council has repeatedly asserted.

The representative of the Pretoria régime claimed that the only remaining obstacle to the independence of Namibia is the lack of commitment on the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban forces there. Since there is a likelihood that that sentiment will be repeated by supporters of the racist régime before the current debate is over, let me state that the introduction of this issue is a surreptitious attempt to have linkage accepted as a pre-condition for the final resolution of the issue of Namibian independence.

The Council has already considered the matter and ruled that the presence of Cuban troops in sovereign Angola should have nothing to do with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) of the Council. To re-open that issue now, in whatever form, would be retrogressive and should be avoided. As the Secretary-General has pointed out in his report, all the recognized conditions outstanding have now been fulfilled, and the Council must proceed to put the plan in resolution 435 (1978) into action forthwith. It is precisely the sinister and callous delay of that process by the racist Pretoria régime that has impelled the Group of African States

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

and many other delegations at the United Nations to call on the Council at this time to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

It is indeed surprising that the representative of the Pretoria régime should charge that, instead of facilitating the independence of Namibia, military and weapon supplies and systems of Soviet origin have continued to pour into Angola. He even went further to imply that Cuban forces in Angola would menace free elections in the Territory, were the Council to begin implementing resolution 435 (1978). If anyone has poured arms and troops into Angola, it is his country, South Africa. As we speak now, thousands of South African forces are stationed permanently in southern Angola against all norms of international law. South African military aircraft are sitting on runways in Angola, ready to fight if the Government forces of Angola should threaten the renegade Savimbi forces. It is the South African Government that has poured arms into Angola for use by its own forces against the Government of Angola and also for use by the traitorous bandits under the leadership of Jonas Savimbi.

Furthermore, it must be clarified that Cuban troops have never threatened Namibians. The Council has never received nor considered such a complaint against Cuba, nor the Government of Angola. Indeed, both Angolans and Cubans openly sympathize with Namibians and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and could not conceivably threaten them. It is, rather, those who commit aggression against sovereign States and fight lawfully constituted Governments that are likely to be a menace to free and fair elections. It is those who supply arms and ammunition, including Stinger missiles, to bandits who threaten peace in the region.

Sanctions have again been called into question as a means of dealing effectively with the present impasse. I know this will be tediously repeated from

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

the usual quarters because of their own reluctance to be part of the pressure tactic. We owe it to those few countries, however, to say openly and with courage that we do not share their view, nor their attitude. If they are indeed serious about bringing South Africa to facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), then we would propose to them that they should allow the Council to try comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, even if within a specified and reasonable period of time, and, if the sanctions do not work, proceed to abolish them formally. It would be immoral to oppose sanctions and do nothing, because that would be tantamount to support for the delay in Namibia's independence. We are sincere in this proposal, and we hope for a response in reciprocal feeling.

We are calling for global and mandatory sanctions because we also agree that sanctions would be most efficacious if applied by all States and over all items. We are therefore being careful not to create avenues for unscrupulous Governments and companies to rush into areas of trade and business where others have left in deference to the wishes of the international community. We wish to avoid a situation in which some may wish to ingratiate themselves with South Africa at the expense of others. Sanctions should be a measure of the international community against an obstinate and dangerous Member State of the United Nations, as its overwhelming majority have determined.

At the end of the statement of the representative of the Pretoria régime, he threatened that if all endeavours to break the deadlock failed his Government would give consideration to other parties and alternate means of granting independence to Namibia.

That statement is more serious than it looks on the surface, and I urge Council members to pay close attention to it. We are all aware of the illegal

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

government that has been installed in Windhoek, and which the Council has declared null and void. South Africa is now implying that if the Council fails to accept its minority position in this matter - and this infamous linkage theory is a minority view - then it would compound illegality by declaring a government for the Territory and granting Namibia unilateral independence. South Africa will presumably use force to defend such illegality. This is pure and simple threat to peace in the Territory and in the region.

I urge Council members to re-read that portion of the Pretoria régime's representative's statement.

In the face of such a threat - and it is in black and white - should the Council wait for the deed to be done before it considers action? That would be an expensive and tragic way to proceed. My delegation is of the view that the Council should act now to pre-empt such an eventuality by imposing sanctions against that recalcitrant régime as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.



(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Let me say in conclusion that what my delegation has heard in the debate so far is in many ways reassuring. None has backed the racist régime in its benighted policies in Namibia or in its continued attachment to the policy of apartheid, even in the Territory. Indeed, there have been strong condemnations of South Africa's stalling tactics. If that is the case, then I hope we can proceed to do what is necessary and perhaps the only route to the early independence of Namibia. This Council should uphold justice and oppose subjugation by voting for the draft resolution before it. Any vote deliberately to prevent the Council from taking that course of action will be an unfriendly act against Namibians, against African States and against progressive forces in the international community.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Ghana for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. BIFFOT (Gabon) (interpretation from French): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. I congratulate your predecessor on the effective discharge of his duties during the month of March. I wish you every success during your term of office, which has begun with the consideration of a problem which has been debated for a woefully long time and which continues to be debated. It is a problem concerning which the variety, multiplicity and clash of thinking and approaches on one hand and of opinions, attitudes and actions on the other are so great that I truly do not know where to begin or how to end.

The most varied and contradictory of arguments have been put forward with respect to the problem of the independence of Namibia. One statement in particular monopolized my attention because of its apocalyptic visions and predictions and because of its language, which was that of a sham good shepherd and protector,

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

apart from the threats mouthed by the spokesman of a State which knows itself to possess crushing military might. That statement has been sufficiently dissected by many other speakers, who have revealed its deceptive, machiavellian aspects, so I shall not dwell on it now.

The States most highly developed technologically have now invented very lethal weapons, weapons to make one shudder. But there is something more terrible, more terrifying than those weapons: history; the verdict of history; the immortality that the uneradicable memory of peoples and nations reserves for those who at crucial moments - such as the present moment in the Security Council Chamber - must take a decision on the fate of other human beings.

Hitler strove to dominate the world, and he nearly succeeded. He nearly achieved the enslavement - worse: the cleverly, cynically conceived extermination - of peoples and nations.

South Africa has been striving and stubbornly continues to strive to dominate - for the time being - at least a part of Africa: Namibia. It has succeeded. The subjugation and enslavement of the Namibian people is an eloquent and convincing manifestation of the clever, machiavellian plans and objectives of the South African Government.

History has immortalized Hitler. History will immortalize the present Pretoria Government. History has sought out and will continue to seek out all Hitlerite henchmen and collaborators. It will implacably do the same sooner or later - it matters not when - with all those who overtly or secretly, deliberately or subconsciously support and continue to support the racist South African régime in its quest for a "rational" solution to the problem of the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

Any manner of connivance, complicity or flirtation - or even abstention, whether an imitation or a reproduction of Pontius Pilate's gesture - any such conduct reflects advocacy of or a desire for perpetuation of the status quo.

It is time for a rational choice. The time for wavering and choosing one's affinities should come to an end forever; continued procrastination is no longer possible. A spiritual morality must finally prevail over a materialistic morality. The Namibian people is not asking for a gift; it is demanding its due: freedom, genuine independence, rule by a government of its own choosing, not a government imposed by an occupier, an invader that clings to power because it knows that any time it likes - thanks to the fire-power that the decades of vacillation by others have enabled it gradually to acquire and consolidate - it can terrorize, it can cause mass death, it can dictate the rule of silence, if not participation and connivance, even to great Powers which cherish peace and humanism.

The withdrawal of some 42,000 Cuban soldiers based in Angola has been touted as a firm pre-condition. It is tenaciously, even stubbornly, claimed that those troops would invade - or "might" invade - Namibia when it has regained its national independence. "Prevention is the best cure", the argument goes, and it is therefore wise and advisable for Cuban troops to leave Angolan soil before the South African occupying forces leave Namibian territory.

That argument is fallacious. It is drawn from the arsenal of pretexts contrived in order to conceal the true motivations on which the illegal occupation of Namibia is based.

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

The departure of the Cuban troops - as the Pretoria Government knows but dares not admit - is something Pretoria desires in order to be left free to pursue its expansionist ambitions. Once Namibia has gone under, Angola will be an appropriate prey. The invasion of Angola will be greatly facilitated if the 42,000 Cuban soldiers, whose courage is well known, are no longer there. The strike force of the racist South African State could operate under cover of night, and the world would wake up to a fait accompli.

Let us leave aside the frenzied appetite aroused among more than one financial Power of the globe by the contents of Namibian soil. The arms manufacturers contribute in no small way to the maintenance and growth of the economies of many highly industrialized societies. Recent studies have indeed made it clear that if a particular country, which I shall not mention by name, were to stop the production of weapons, or even to reduce the annual production of weapons, that would result in a considerable drop in the country's standard of living and a disturbing increase in unemployment. The continued production of weapons is thus an economic imperative for that country. If other States and Governments are likewise subject to such constraint, it goes without saying that all of them would subsequently find themselves obliged to get rid of the weapons they had produced and, consequently, to find purchasers, to perpetuate or create around the world trouble spots or rebellions of all kinds.

In order to distract attention and to justify certain elective affinities, we hear talk of the spread of communism in Africa. Have people asked themselves whether more than one African State did not turn to communism because more than one country in the capitalist bloc failed to - or perhaps chose not to - understand that State? It is sad to observe that in the rivalries and struggles between communism and capitalism the innocent victims are the developing countries, in this

(Mr. Biffot, Gabon)

case Namibia. Capitalists and communists sometimes know how to get along together, when it is in their interests to perpetuate the division of States that previously had been united. If they want to now, they can also reach agreement so that a unanimously affirmative vote can finally bring an end to the crucial problem of Namibia's independence. I sincerely hope that such a consensus can be reached this time.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Gabon for the congratulations he 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): On behalf of the Ethiopian delegation, allow me, Sir, to congratulate you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. The commitment of your fraternal country, Bulgaria, to the cause of decolonization and your diplomatic skills as well as your firm position on the question of Namibia give us ample reason to believe that the Council's deliberations on this important issue will be effectively guided.

In the same vein, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina for the able manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month which has just elapsed.

The question of Namibia has been under consideration in this Council Chamber for over two decades. Countless resolutions have been adopted and well-intentioned strategies mapped out. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), members of the African Group, members of the Non-Aligned Movement and indeed the international community at large have expressed deeply felt hopes and aspirations for the speedy accession of Namibia to a long-awaited independence. Numerous appeals have been made to all those who have a measure of influence or leverage on South Africa, in spite of the transparent link of some States to the racist régime.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

When Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, at the initiative of the five Western countries, we hoped, almost against hope, that at long last the most acceptable formula for the independence of Namibia was within reach. Unfortunately, the events that followed were characterized by duplicity, deceit and prevarication on the part of South Africa as well as hesitation, reluctance or inaction on the part of some traditional collaborators with that apartheid State. Those States that could have been instrumental in exerting the necessary pressure on South Africa were found wanting when it came to the question of taking concrete action against a régime which they have unfortunately perceived as a reliable outpost of Western civilization. As one can readily discern from the overall traits of the apartheid system, there is nothing Western or civilized about the régime in Pretoria. Yet, almost at the behest of that régime, some Western countries have advanced unjustified pretexts for the delaying of Namibia's independence, including the question of linkage. Thus, it seems that the saga of Namibia is a story not only of a trust betrayed but indeed of trust misplaced.

As we the members of the international community have learned from our very often frustrating, indeed harrowing, experience with South Africa, that entity could not and should not have been accorded even a modicum of trust. By its disregard for the will of the international community, its contempt for the resolutions of this Council and its suppression of the Namibian people, as well as its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa has amply revealed its true colour.

To date South Africa not only has rebuffed all meaningful proposals and plans for the peaceful and expeditious independence of the Territory but has attempted to consolidate its hold over that Territory by installing puppet régimes, the current one being the so-called transitional government.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

Furthermore, Namibian youths at their most tender age have been forcibly conscripted into the occupation army of South Africa, Namibian villages have been devastated by the occupation forces, the indigenous working people subjected to untold misery and the natural resources of the Territory exploited without any consideration for present and future generations of Namibians. Adding insult to injury, South Africa has conducted its odious scheme of destabilization against neighbouring States.

All this affronts the dignity of every Namibian and, indeed, of every African. Yet the Security Council has been unable to impose mandatory sanctions against the unruly régime in Pretoria owing to the reluctance of some Western countries to join in the only viable international concerted action that can bring South Africa to its knees.

The countries that have gone so far as to cast a negative vote in the service of South Africa have argued that mandatory sanctions will be too comprehensive and indiscriminate. More often than not they have argued that such sanctions are likely to jeopardize the economies of front-line States and to upset the living standard of black South Africans. We fail to see any merit in that paternalistic argument, for the representatives of those very front-line countries have in this very Chamber expressed their willingness to accept any sacrifice involved if the imposition of such measures will contribute to the independence of Namibia and the total liberation of South Africa from the monstrous system of apartheid.

Although it is not the wish of the Ethiopian delegation to apportion blame or to point a finger at the culprit in this classic case of miscarriage of justice, the facts in the Namibian case make it very clear that it is imperative for us to state the obvious, after two decades of perseverance. While we recognize the positive trend among those Western countries that have adopted a limited set of sanctions against South Africa, we shall continue to express regret at the

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

reluctance of some members of the Security Council to join us in imposing the mandatory sanctions which the intransigence of South Africa has made imperative.

From those who describe apartheid as a crime against humanity we demand basic co-operation in our collective effort to exert pressure on South Africa and to compel it to comply with all the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council relating to Namibia. As we have had occasion to point out in the past, those who have expressed concern over respect for human rights in Namibia and South Africa are morally obliged to co-operate in all international efforts aimed at bringing apartheid to a definitive end. Need we remind those States that to work for a sustained relationship based on equity with the entire continent of Africa is much more prudent than to hang onto an apartheid régime condemned to the waste-basket of history? Need we inform the very countries that pride themselves on their immaculate civilization that apartheid is uncivilized? Need we reiterate to those technologically advanced countries that the military hardware and technology they provide to South Africa is being used to main and murder Namibian children? Need we bring to the attention of those States the fact that South Africa is threatening regional peace and security as a result of the collaboration it enjoys with those States in the advanced field of nuclear technology?

The Ethiopian delegation is convinced that the Council must take the necessary measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. We believe that a historic decision must be taken to avert a blood-bath in Namibia. We also hope that those Western members of the Security Council opposed to the imposition of mandatory sanctions will reconsider their position and allow the United Nations to advance the cause of peace and independence in southern Africa. At this historic moment it is our earnest hope that those countries will not be the ones to block our collective march into the future once again.



(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

I would therefore like to conclude my statement by fully supporting the draft resolution before the members of the Council and by reiterating Ethiopia's unswerving solidarity with and total commitment to the just struggle being waged by the heroic people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Ethiopia for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

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

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to convey to you, Sir, our warmest congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. Your wisdom, courtesy and considerable knowledge of the procedures and traditions of this body, as well as the close relations that exist between our two countries, make us fully confident that the Security Council will be successful in its deliberations.

I should also like to convey to His Excellency Mr. Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, our heartfelt appreciation for the able, serious and skilful manner in which he presided over the Security Council last month. His dedicated leadership of the Council during its meetings and consultations on the issues before it were clearly unbiased and most able. He can take pride in his achievement.

The deterioration of the situation in the Territory of Namibia since the Security Council last met to consider that question today requires the Council to undertake urgent and serious action that will reflect the deep concern of the United Nations membership with regard to the question of Namibia. From reading the Secretary-General's report (S/18767), it is clear that he has undertaken intensive and comprehensive consultations with all interested and concerned parties aimed

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian  
Arab Republic)

at paving the way for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia as set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In his report the Secretary-General concludes that, although all the conditions necessary for the implementation of that plan have been established, South Africa's persistence in linking the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is an obstacle on the road to an early settlement of the issue. All the arrangements have been set up since 1985, but Namibia is not yet independent.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

It is truly disappointing that no progress has been made in setting up the necessary arrangements for that Territory's early independence. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has reasserted its support of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only means to achieve full independence for the Territory. From the very outset, SWAPO has demonstrated its willingness to co-operate with this Council and with the Secretary-General. However, South Africa continues to insist on linkage. Furthermore, South Africa has flouted Security Council resolutions and continued to exacerbate the element of illegitimacy in the Territory by helping the so-called interim government in shoring up its tenuous position, all at a time when the Namibian people continues to live under conditions of oppression, torture and political hegemony. This issue has been taken up by many bodies, including the African summit conference, the Non-Aligned Movement in its summit held at Harare, the summit meeting of the Islamic Conference in Kuwait, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia held at Vienna, and at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, as well as at its forty-first session. All these bodies have condemned South Africa's continuing occupation of Namibian territory. The whole world is agreed that the only peaceful basis for solving the question of Namibia's independence is the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Previous speakers spoke at length on the background of the issue and on the measures taken so far. Reports prepared by the Secretary-General have been clear in pointing to South Africa's prevarication in implementing Security Council resolutions, the latest of which - 566 (1985) - inter alia, affirmed that South Africa's choice of electoral system was the only outstanding issue standing in the way of implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In the absence of such a choice,

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

the Security Council would be compelled to meet to consider implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter.

What is encouraging South Africa to continue challenging the international community? It is the political support and assistance provided by some Western States and in particular the policy of "constructive engagement" that encourages that racist régime to defy the international community and to persist in its policy of apartheid, the occupation of Namibia and acts of aggression against neighbouring African States.

The close support and co-operation between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv have become common knowledge. We have all read or heard media reports on the amount of weaponry and the level of support supplied the Pretoria régime by its counterpart in Tel Aviv. That information came to light during preparation of the report to the United States Congress on relations between South Africa and other States. For example, the Washington Post on 28 March 1987 quoted Israeli reports that the value of Israeli sales of weapons to South Africa ranged between 600 million and 800 million dollars, while the Wall Street Journal on 28 March 1987 mentioned that the value of current weapons contracts between Israel and South Africa were estimated at between 200 million and 500 million dollars yearly. That is in addition to the political, economic, cultural and other co-operation between Tel Aviv and Pretoria, because both régimes maintain a racist policy that is oppressive to the indigenous peoples and deprives them of their legitimate rights by every means.

Two of the most serious problems threatening international peace and security are the question of Namibia and its counterpart, the question of Palestine. Namibia continues to be a moral and political responsibility to be shouldered by the Security Council. The Security Council should begin by taking decisive

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

measures to ensure the independence of the people of the Territory without further delay. The only path open to the Security Council today is the implementation of binding sanctions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter in order to compel South Africa to implement resolution 435 (1978) and achieve Namibia's immediate accession to independence by ending South Africa's occupation of that Territory. Continued occupation means a continuation of the pillage of Namibia's wealth and natural resources that is currently taking place in co-operation with a number of States Members of the United Nations. That was made crystal-clear in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia dated 9 June 1986, paragraph 18 in particular.

In conclusion we wish to declare the full solidarity and support of the Syrian Arab Republic for the Namibian people and its liberation movement, SWAPO. We urge the Security Council to uphold its authority by imposing binding comprehensive sanctions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter until the racist régime is forced to open the way to Namibian independence.

Victory is always the ally of peoples fighting for independence and freedom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): First allow me to express my gratitude to all members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to speak on the item before us.

The Mongolian delegation is very happy to see you, Sir, the representative of fraternal Bulgaria, in the lofty post of President of the Security Council for this month. Bulgaria is a country with which Mongolia has very close fraternal

(Mr. Doljintseren, Mongolia)

relations. We are sure that under your able, wise and experienced guidance the Security Council will successfully discharge its duties for this month. I should also like to pay tribute to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Argentina, for his skilful guidance of the Council's work last month.

The Security Council is once again discussing a question whose solution brooks no delay. As is known, Namibia is the last major colonial Territory where the indigenous population suffers from colonial oppression and racial discrimination.

Despite the many decisions taken by the United Nations, and the universal condemnation and demands of world public opinion, the racist régime in South Africa not only continues its occupation of Namibia, but has spread to that Territory its inhuman system of apartheid, which has been condemned by our Organization as a crime against humanity.

(Mr. Doljintseren, Mongolia)

The recent news from Namibia has shown that there is continuing, increasing repression in that country, as well as terror and the murder of completely innocent people. For a long time now the 100,000-strong racist South African army has been committing outrages. All this is a serious challenge to world public opinion and our Organization. Moreover, the South African racists have turned Namibia into a base for attacking Angola, Botswana and other neighbouring independent countries of Africa. This is borne out, inter alia, by the fact that for 10 years now Pretoria has been waging a war against the People's Republic of Angola and has occupied part of its Territory. All this clearly demonstrates that the criminal actions perpetrated by Pretoria in South Africa are a direct threat to international peace and security within and outside the region.

The People's Republic of Mongolia again expresses full solidarity and support for the struggle of Angola and the other front-line States, which are defending their freedom, independence and sovereignty against the aggression of the forces of racism and imperialism.

It is a well-known fact that the racist Pretoria régime has managed so far to persist in its criminal policies and arrogantly defy the international community only because of the universal support and assistance it is given by a number of Western Powers. The most recent specific example of this open support of Pretoria by the West can be seen in the negative votes cast by three Western countries last month in the Council on the draft resolution to institute certain partial sanctions against the racist South African régime. In this context, our delegation, like other delegations, decisively calls upon the Western Powers to stop supporting Pretoria and to renounce their obstructionist policy on the problems relating to southern Africa.

(Mr. Doljintseren, Mongolia)

My delegation also condemns the ruthless exploitation and plunder of the natural resources of Namibia by South Africa and the transnational corporations of the imperialist Powers.

As has been stressed by previous speakers, in recent years the racist Pretoria régime and its sponsors have been using new ploys and tricks to delay their withdrawal from Namibia. These tricks include, of course, the so-called linkage of the solution to the Namibian question with completely extraneous matters, for example, the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban internationalist forces.

The Mongolian People's Republic, like many other countries, fully rejects and strongly condemns this artificial so-called linkage as an attempt to prolong the presence of the racists in Namibia, and at the same time to weaken Angola's defence capability in the face of the increasing acts of aggression by Pretoria.

It is high time to take decisive steps against the racist Pretoria régime, and thus force it to withdraw from Namibia and eliminate the criminal system of apartheid. One effective measure would be to institute comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria under Chapter VII of the Charter.

In this respect the Mongolian delegation, like many other delegations, expresses the hope that the Security Council will institute these sanctions against Pretoria without delay.

My delegation also supports the demands of previous speakers that Council members which have adopted a negative attitude on these sanctions revise their position and not stand in the way of the adoption by this body of effective measures against South Africa.

In the same context we fully support the conclusion contained in the Political Declaration of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, namely, that those who have refused to institute comprehensive economic



(Mr. Doljintseren, Mongolia)

sanctions against racist South Africa have become accomplices in this régime's operations. I refer to document A/41/697.

As far as our country is concerned, the people and the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, basing ourselves on our position of principle, have always had sincere feelings of solidarity with all peoples struggling for social and national liberation. Our country has always supported the just cause of the Namibian people and the people of South Africa in their struggle against the racists for freedom and independence.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural, Comrade Jambyn Batmunkh, in the report of the Central Committee to the XXIXth Congress of our party stressed:

"The Mongolian People's Republic strongly supports the peoples of Namibia and South Africa who are struggling for liberation from the yoke of colonialism and racism".

I should like to take this opportunity once again to voice warm solidarity and support for the Namibian people and their sole authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in their struggle for liberation from colonial and racist enslavement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Mongolia for the kind words he addressed to me.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I propose to adjourn the meeting now. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 9 April 1987, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.