



Security Council

UN LIBRARY
APR 9 1987
UN/SC COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2743
7 April 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 7 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. LI Luye
Mr. BALE
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. TIMERBAEV
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 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, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, 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. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Biffot (Gabon), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), 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. 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 a letter from the representative of Guyana in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity 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. Insanally (Guyana) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them document S/18785, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia.

(The President)

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

Mr. LABERGE (Canada) (interpretation from French): Allow me at the outset to extend to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We are confident that your diplomatic skills and wisdom will enable you to discharge your responsibilities with great success in the weeks ahead. I should also like, on behalf of Canada, to express our thanks and appreciation to your immediate predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, who conducted the deliberations of the Council during the month of March with great skill. Canada also wishes to congratulate those countries which have taken up their Security Council responsibilities for doing so since last we spoke in this forum in 1985, and to thank those which have relinquished those duties for their service in the interests of international peace and security.

Canada, as members of this body will be well aware, very carefully chooses the occasions - albeit we are not a member - upon which its representatives speak in debates of this Council. Canada is of the firm belief that the Security Council, in order to be able to act decisively, effectively and quickly when it must, should make every effort to focus its debates and, above all, avoid becoming an off-season General Assembly.

That said, there are occasions when, for reasons of national or international duty, statements in this forum are essential, going beyond the reservations I have just expressed. Canada is grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Council for this opportunity to participate in the deliberations today. Canada is, as is well known, a member of the Western contact group established pursuant to resolution 435 (1978) of the Council. Our appearance here on this occasion in some way completes

(Mr. Laberge, Canada)

a circuit, since the other four members of the group are present around this table with us for the first time since 1978.

I might also note that historical fact with a degree of sadness and, indeed, with a sense of frustration and even anger. That fact points to the disillusionment Canada feels that the question of Namibia is still before us, eight long years after the Council's adoption of resolution 435 (1978). Time and again we have stated our clear and categorical objection to all efforts to circumvent the only internationally accepted basis for a Namibian settlement. Nevertheless, the overriding fact is that South Africa has defied the international community by its inaction with respect to Namibia and its contempt for the principles upon which the United Nations is based. For its part, the Commonwealth, of which Canada is a member, has made it abundantly clear that it cannot ignore the challenge - nay, even the insult - thrown down by South Africa in its continued refusal to dismantle apartheid and to end the illegal occupation of Namibia and its repeated acts of aggression against its neighbours.

With other Commonwealth members, especially those of the front line, Canada has continued to press South Africa to dismantle apartheid and to end its illegal practices. We have taken strong and concrete actions to make it plain that intransigence on the part of Pretoria will be costly. We have stated clearly that unless South Africa genuinely gets on with ending apartheid in all its manifestations further measures will be taken. Canada's objective is to convince the Government of South Africa that it is in its own best interests to make those necessary changes now, before it is too late.

It would be too depressing to conclude that over the course of seven years of negotiations aimed at implementing resolution 435 (1978) no progress has been made. In fact, when we last spoke in the Council some 18 months ago, the only issue then formally outstanding was the setting of a date for the implementation of

(Mr. Laberge, Canada)

the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. Alas, as the Secretary-General so clearly set out in his excellent report of a few days ago, when South Africa did subsequently set a date, it was once again tied to extraneous and irrelevant conditions. Such delaying tactics are simply unacceptable and their real purpose is transparent, namely, the perpetuation of Pretoria's control over Namibia. We share the Secretary-General's regrets that events have not progressed as we would have liked, in spite of all his efforts to ensure that the remaining obstacles to Namibian independence have been removed.

South Africa has for many years now maintained that the United Nations has pursued sterile and confrontational tactics in working for Namibian independence. Quite the contrary: it is South Africa that has not only blocked progress but continually exacerbated the situation. Unprovoked armed attacks against one's neighbours are confrontational. Interminable delaying tactics and the establishment of a so-called interim administration designed to frustrate the will of the majority of the Namibian people truly reflect sterile and even hostile policies.

(Mr. Laberge, Canada)

Collectively we must make it clear to South Africa that such actions on its part only illustrate, yet again, its contempt for the United Nations and world opinion and gain nothing in return but condemnation and even firmer determination on the part of the international community that they will not be allowed to continue unchallenged.

If South Africa chooses, through some contorted logic, to point to foreign intervention as a major obstacle to peaceful change in southern Africa, we must remind the Pretoria Government that the principal example of foreign intervention in that part of the world is its own illegal occupation of Namibia, which has gone on far too long.

Namibia will be an important part of the future, and its long-overdue independence should be concrete proof of peaceful change in southern Africa. With all that has happened over the last seven years, Canada remains convinced that resolution 435 (1978) provides the only viable framework for the achievement of Namibian independence. We still believe that the contact group will have a role to play in any implementation of that plan, and we thus wish to remain part of it. But we cannot hide our disappointment at the lack of progress. Our regrets will, however, give scant comfort to those who have waited so long for the basic political and human rights that are their due. More so than ourselves, the people of Namibia have every right to be frustrated so long after an agreement was struck on the United Nations plan in 1978, because they remain faced, day by long day, with repression and intimidation by South Africa.

Given this situation, what can we do? It is not for us to present a new strategy to this Council. However, Canada for its part will continue to press South Africa to get on with real change in its society, to co-operate in the

(Mr. Laberge, Canada)

process of bringing full and legitimate independence to Namibia and to cease its unwarranted and aggressive practices against its neighbours.

In this context I recall that in October 1985 the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Brian Mulroney, stated in the General Assembly:

"... if there are not fundamental changes in South Africa we are prepared to invoke total sanctions against that country and its repressive régime. If there is no progress in the dismantling of apartheid, Canada's relations with South Africa may have to be severed absolutely." (A/40/PV.47, p. 26)

He reaffirmed that commitment to the front-line States during his visit to southern Africa only a few weeks ago, when our Prime Minister saw for himself the threat posed to fragile economies by the violence rooted in apartheid. He discussed with the leaders of Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana the concrete problems with South Africa now faced by those on the front line. Our Prime Minister pledged to make every effort to assist the States of the region in securing for themselves a peaceful and prosperous future. Indeed, he announced his determination to increase aid to the front-line States facing serious problems in the region. Moreover he announced a programme of humanitarian assistance for Mozambique.

It is our overriding objective in all this to persuade the South African Government to see reality. It is not our intention to bring about the crumbling of the South African economy. Without my over-simplifying the issues involved, those who have advocated sanctions are correct when they refer to them as tangible evidence for the Government of South Africa that the world finds its apartheid system repugnant. Sanctions tell the victims of apartheid that countries are prepared to act. It is our fervent hope that continued concerted pressure on South Africa will soon convince that country that it can no longer ignore realities.

(Mr. Laberge, Canada)

For now, in Canada's view, this Council should send an unequivocal and unambiguous message to the Government of South Africa that the patience of the international community is thoroughly exhausted and that it must take immediate steps to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and to enable the people of that beleaguered Territory to exercise their fundamental right to self-determination and independence with the assistance of the United Nations and without any pre-conditions or further obstructions.

The consequences of any further delay on the part of South Africa must be made abundantly clear. Let us hope that not another year will go by without Namibia's being truly on the path to independence as envisaged under the United Nations plan set and out in resolution 435 (1978).

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

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, since the beginning of this month we have seen how competent you are, and how well versed. We have seen your authority and the excellent manner in which you have been representing your country, Bulgaria. I am quite convinced that under your presidency the work of our Council will continue in the best possible atmosphere and that we shall have fruitful results.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity once again to extend to Mr. Delpech, the representative of Argentina, our deep gratitude, a sentiment I have already had the pleasure to express here, and to commend him for the great skill he demonstrated as President of the Council.

This new debate of the Security Council on the situation in Namibia shows the growing concern over the impasse that has continued on this issue for several years now.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The delay in Namibia's attainment of independence is a source of grave concern to my Government. The Namibian people, to which my Government would like to extend its sympathy and admiration, is still being deprived of its rights. It is enduring the harsh consequences of a situation that has been imposed on it, and is unable to have a say in its own future.

Recent events in Namibia and in the region, which have been marked especially by a series of armed conflicts, once again show the dangers to regional stability inherent in South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

No one in this body is unaware of the active part taken by France in the efforts of the international community to find a solution to the Namibian problem. My Government would like again to reiterate most vigorously its firm commitment to resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) of the Security Council. Those resolutions define the United Nations plan and remain the only acceptable basis for a final settlement of the Namibian question.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

France has often demonstrated its commitment to the speedy unconditional implementation of those resolutions, and it was in that spirit that the French Government denounced the South African authorities' establishment in June 1985 of an interim government in Namibia. France considers as null and void the result of that decision, which ran counter to the United Nations settlement plan.

Similarly, in June 1985, France took an active part in formulating Security Council resolution 566 (1985), with a view to participating once again in the international community's efforts to reach a settlement of the question. By voting in favour of that resolution, France wished also to demonstrate its commitment to measures to induce the South African Government to meet its obligations and agree to the implementation of United Nations resolutions.

I repeat that France is in favour of immediate implementation of the United Nations plan. The technical problems in the plan's implementation have been ironed out through difficult negotiations in which my country participated as a member of the contact group. The final obstacle was removed in November 1985, when South Africa announced its choice of an electoral system for the elections called for in resolution 435 (1978).

But even though all outstanding questions have thus been resolved, the present situation continues to be deadlocked because of the linkage established by South Africa between the withdrawal of the Cuban troops stationed in Angola and the implementation of the settlement plan. That linkage is irrelevant, and France has supported Security Council resolutions rejecting it. As members know, it was in that context that my country had to suspend its participation in the contact group, whose mandate did not include that issue, which was extraneous to the implementation of the United Nations plan. The Secretary-General, whom my delegation commends for his efforts to complete the United Nations process, correctly assessed the problem in his further report:

(Mr. Blanc, France)

"The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a separate matter, to be dealt with by those directly concerned acting within their sovereign competence".

(S/18767, para. 32)

Proposals have been made to break the deadlock. In that connection, my delegation wishes to take the opportunity presented by this debate to appeal once again to the South African Government. Its stubborn delaying of Namibian independence can only make more difficult the solution of South Africa's serious internal problems. It should now finally agree truly to comply with its international obligations and to take the steps necessary to break the deadlock on the Namibian issue.

For its part, France remains very much concerned about this issue. The French Government has shown its determination by adopting measures vis-à-vis South Africa, including measure in compliance with resolution 566 (1985). It will continue to exert pressure on South Africa by taking all appropriate action. Finally, France remains prepared at the proper time to assist in completing the process leading to the internationally recognized independence of Namibia.

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

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Let me wish you success, Sir, in your work as President of the Security Council for this month. We are well aware of your diplomatic skill and your dedication, and are certain that you will guide our work to a fruitful conclusion. I assure you that you may count on the fullest co-operation of the Argentine delegation.

I wish also to take this opportunity to thank all representatives for their co-operation last month, and for the kind words they addressed to me concerning my term as Council President in March.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

The Security Council has been convened to consider the question of Namibia, for despite the time that has passed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) we have been unable to achieve the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia set forth in that resolution.

The United Nations has undertaken legal responsibility for the Territory of Namibia and created the United Nations Council for Namibia to act as its legal Administering Authority until its accession to independence. The Security Council framed a plan for the independence of Namibia through its resolution 435 (1978). That plan continues to be the only internationally agreed basis for the peaceful solution of the Namibian question.

South Africa, which continues its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, claims to be willing to co-operate in the implementation of the plan. But the facts - such as the establishment of an interim government at Windhoek, which resolution 566 (1985) declared illegal, null and void - prove the contrary.

All relevant conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan were resolved in November 1985, when the parties concerned reached agreement on the system of proportional representation for the Namibia elections, as the Secretary-General points out in his further report (S/18767) concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). The Secretary-General also reminds us of his proposal that the Government of South Africa set an early date for a cease-fire and for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. He tells us, in that connection, that South Africa's reply, because of the conditions it stated, did not constitute a valid basis for implementing the plan. Indeed, the racist régime's reply to that proposal insisted on imposing unacceptable pre-conditions extraneous to the United Nations plan, as the Security Council stated in resolution 539 (1983) and reiterated in resolution 566 (1985).

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

That position of the South African Government shows its intention to continue its illegal colonialist occupation of the Territory of Namibia, extending to it its hateful policy of apartheid, and to persecute the leaders of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by the General Assembly as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

Given that position of the Pretoria régime, it is logical that, together with other non-aligned countries we should have stated our frustration and called for concrete action by the Security Council. It is time South Africa adopted a truly constructive attitude and made a specific, formal commitment to compliance with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

An end to the tragedy of Namibia and the total and final eradication of the hateful system of apartheid are inescapable priorities for the international community. By adopting resolution 566 (1985), calling on Member States to adopt voluntary measures against South Africa, this Council warned South Africa that, if it did not co-operate, the Security Council would be obliged to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including those provided for in Chapter VII as a means of exerting additional pressure to make South Africa comply with this body's resolutions.

The Argentine Republic has repeatedly condemned in this forum Namibia's illegal occupation, whereby the South African Government is perpetuating an unacceptable colonial situation, which is a totally unjustifiable anachronism.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

We therefore feel that it is the inescapable responsibility of the Security Council to put an end to this South African policy and to make the South African Government change its attitude. That Government, far from complying with the United Nations decisions on this matter and on its policy of apartheid, is challenging the international community by increasing tensions in southern Africa and disturbing international peace and security.

The Security Council should, by virtue of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, demand the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We believe that, given South Africa's intransigence, the Council should adopt all the necessary measures, including those provided in Chapter VII of the Charter, to attain its aim. That will demonstrate the existence of the political will to ensure that Namibia will become independent. That is why my delegation has co-sponsored a draft resolution in which the Council would decide to apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. We hope that the other members of the Council will understand the aim of this initiative and will be able to go along with it.

My delegation firmly hopes that the Security Council will find a way of moving towards a solution to the Namibian question that takes account of the opinion of the majority of the international community. Such a solution must imply recognition of the Namibian people's right to exercise self-determination and independence, recognition of that people's national identity, respect for the country's territorial integrity and the exercise of its right to exploit its natural resources. The Council must spare no effort until a just, democratic, egalitarian society is established in an independent Namibia.

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

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): At the outset, permit me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of April. My delegation and I myself are convinced that thanks to your experience and your proven diplomatic skills the deliberations of the Security Council will be in good hands. At the same time, I should like to express to the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, my delegation's sincere appreciation of the efficient and friendly manner in which he presided over the work of the Security Council in the month of March.

Once more the Security Council is called upon to deal with the question of Namibia. My delegation regrets that this is still necessary. More than eight years ago the Federal Republic of Germany, as a then member of the Security Council, contributed to the preparation and adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and ever since has consistently endorsed the implementation of that resolution. The community of nations is agreed that this resolution constitutes the one and only basis on which Namibia can achieve its internationally recognized independence.

At the time, South Africa too gave its agreement to this settlement plan. As the Secretary-General points out in his report of 31 March, the last outstanding issue was resolved when in November 1985 agreement was reached on the system of proportional representation for the elections envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is therefore all the less justifiable that this resolution has not been implemented to date. Its implementation is now overdue. The right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence must be translated into reality without further delay. Independently of all extraneous issues, this right indeed must be realized without any further loss of time, as the Secretary-General underlines in his report.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

It is unacceptable that South Africa continues to occupy Namibia, in violation of international law. It is likewise unacceptable that the struggle for the liberation of Namibia continues to demand a toll of human lives.

The Federal Government also condemns the illegal raids by South African armed forces, operating from Namibia, into the territories of neighbouring States, in particular Angola. The Federal Government once again urges South Africa to refrain from such actions, which constitute an additional danger for the stability of the whole region.

The position of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has always been and will continue to be clear and unequivocal. Its position on the question of Namibia has been expressed time and again, on various occasions, in the Security Council as well. Permit me today to reiterate the essential keynotes.

For many years, and particularly after having been elected a member of the Security Council in 1976, the Federal Republic of Germany has pressed for an early transition of Namibia to national independence. In order to speed up this process, the Federal Republic of Germany joined in establishing the contact group. This group made a vital contribution to the preparation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We heard from the representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) that resolution 435 (1978) remains the basis of further efforts towards achieving Namibia's independence. That basis would, however, not exist were it not for the activities of the contact group. We therefore find it all the more disturbing and saddening that the representative of SWAPO has chosen to denounce the activities of contact-group members as having been undertaken in bad faith and as mere tactics to preserve the status quo. We categorically reject these untrue and unfortunate allegations.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

As a co-author of the United Nations settlement plan, the Federal Government continues to support all promising efforts proceeding on the basis of this settlement plan and aiming at its realization in order to establish the independence of Namibia. The Federal Government forcefully rejects all attempts and efforts at diluting or modifying the United Nations settlement plan embodied in resolution 435 (1978). In particular, the Federal Government does not recognize the interim government set up by South Africa in Namibia. Like others, we here in the Security Council declared the establishment of the interim government to be null and void. A declaration to the same effect was made also on our behalf during the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia in September 1986 by the member State of the European Community then exercising its presidency.

The request of the multi-party conference to participate in this series of meetings of the Security Council should be seen in that context. In principle we feel that whoever is able to supply the Council with relevant information on the subject under discussion should have the opportunity to do so. However, rule 39 applies only to persons and not to organizations. Moreover, the multi-party conference is closely linked to the transitional government in Namibia, which is considered null and void. This request therefore could not be acted upon.

The Federal Government calls for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia. The Federal Government rejects the use of force and human-rights violations, regardless of the quarter from which these may emanate.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In his statement the representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has addressed the policy of my Government in particular. I have already outlined our clear, unequivocal and unchanged position. I have nothing to add to this. The Federal Republic of Germany recognizes its historically grown responsibility for Namibia. Any insinuation, however, of a connection between unfortunate and regrettable historical events and the present policy of my Government can only be regarded as obviously unwarranted and indeed unjustified.

The Federal Government has maintained and furthered a dialogue with SWAPO and all other political forces in Namibia. The Federal Government calls upon all parties concerned to strive for mutual conciliation to achieve Namibia's independence so that Namibians will be able to live peacefully together.

In September 1986, the Federal Republic of Germany as a member of the European Community took restrictive measures against South Africa with the intent of directing an unequivocal signal to its Government. The Federal Government, though, does not regard general restrictions on economic and commercial relations as an appropriate means for influencing the South African Government in the desired direction. It is for this reason that the Federal Government does not view sanctions as conducive to speeding up Namibia's gaining its independence. This is why the Federal Government firmly held that the measures taken by the European Community on 16 September 1986 should not be detrimental to Namibia. The Federal Government believes that coercive measures would not promote the desired peaceful development, but would only foster increasing confrontation and hardening of positions on the question of Namibia.

For historical reasons the Federal Republic of Germany finds itself particularly committed to finding a solution to the question of Namibia. We commend the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his efforts and thank him

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

for his report of 31 March 1987. We appreciate the work undertaken by his Special Representative, by the front-line States, by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and by the other members of the contact group; jointly with them we shall continue to work for an early independence of Namibia. Both within the framework of the European Community as well as bilaterally, we shall continue to support the States members of the Southern African Co-ordination Development Conference (SADCC) and we shall continue to support the United Nations Institute for Namibia to the best of our ability. The settlement plan based on resolution 435 (1978) has created all the conditions for Namibia to embark upon its way to independence in conformity with the wishes of all of us. We appeal once more to the Government of South Africa to remove at long last the obstacles it has put in this way, to honour its own word and not to oppose any longer the manifest will of the community of nations.

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

Mr. LI Luye (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At the outset I wish to extend my warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am convinced that your acumen, talent and rich experience in diplomacy will certainly enable you to guide this Council to the successful accomplishment of its task for the month of April. I also take this opportunity to express my appreciation to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Delpech, for the remarkable skill with which he successfully conducted the business of the Council in March.

Till this very day, the Namibian people is still prevented from exercising its right to self-determination and Namibia is still denied its independence. The South African authorities should be held fully responsible for this. Ever since

(Mr. Li Luyue, China)

the founding of the United Nations both the General Assembly and the Security Council have made the independence of Namibia a priority item on their agenda for consideration. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has been universally accepted by the international community as the basis for a political settlement of the Namibian question. The early implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia as approved by this resolution is the common aspiration and urgent demand of the Namibian people and all peace-loving and justice-upholding countries in the world. The Security Council and the Secretary-General of the United Nations have made unremitting efforts to this end. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the front-line States have also rendered positive co-operation. However, the South African authorities have gone out of their way to block the implementation under various excuses. As is known to all, by the end of 1985, thanks to the efforts of various sides, the outstanding issues on implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were resolved and the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia should have been carried out at once. Yet the South African authorities have arbitrarily insisted on linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, thus blocking the solution to the Namibian question till this day.

The South African authorities' insistence on "linkage" was designed to place obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). As is clear to everyone, the realization of Namibian independence and the solution to the question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola are two totally different matters. To link these two unrelated issues will only make the question of Namibian independence even more complicated and delay its settlement. Both SWAPO and the Government of Angola are strongly opposed to this unjustified stand of South Africa. By the same

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

token, it has been categorically rejected by the Security Council in its resolutions. The Secretary-General has explicitly pointed out in his recent report contained in document S/18676 that he does not recognize the validity of the linkage pre-condition nor accept it as a pretext to delay any further the independence of Namibia.

The purpose of the South African authorities' stubborn insistence on such a linkage in defiance of Security Council resolutions and world opinion is to win time for strengthening their colonial and racist rule in Namibia. On the one hand, the Botha régime has stepped up its efforts to groom pro-South African forces in Namibia in an attempt to by-pass the United Nations with the so-called internal settlement. Following the collapse of the "ministers council" and "state council" knocked together in earlier days, it again set up in 1985 an interim government based on a "multi-party conference". Of late it has even talked of drawing up a "draft constitution".

On the other hand, the Botha régime has intensified its suppression of the Namibian people's struggle for independence. Not only has it sent troops in tens of thousands to crush the resistance of the Namibian people; it has also driven Namibians to fight Namibians by adopting legislation on conscription. It outlaws mass rallies, demonstrations and other activities; detains and murders patriots at will; and tries hard to wipe out or weaken the liberation forces led by SWAPO and to strangle the national liberation movement of the Namibian people.

At the same time it has frequently launched armed invasions into neighbouring countries that give support to the just struggle of the Namibian and South African peoples and constantly carried out political sabotage and economic blackmail against them. Using Namibia as a springboard, the South African occupation forces have often launched attacks against Angola. They are still occupying a part of Angolan territory in the south and wantonly interfering in its internal affairs.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

These criminal acts of the South African authorities are enough to show that they have no intention whatsoever of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but are bent on prolonging their illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

The perverse acts of the South African authorities have prolonged and deepened the sufferings of the Namibian people under the colonial and racist rule, undermined the peace and security of the entire southern African area and constituted a serious challenge to the international community. It is imperative that the Security Council, the principal organ of the United Nations charged with the responsibility of preserving the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, adopt necessary punitive measures against South Africa in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, so as to vanquish evil and uphold justice in defence of the fundamental interests of the small and the weak in the community of nations.

The international community is indignant over the crimes committed by the Botha régime in its obstinate pursuance of the barbarous policy of apartheid, continued illegal occupation of Namibia and brazen destabilization of the neighbouring countries. The Summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity, the Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly and the forty-first session of the General Assembly held last year have all called for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa by the Security Council. In recent years, quite a number of Western countries have, to varying degrees, adopted sanction measures against South Africa. This is a welcome move. However, we must also admit that, due to lack of effective measures and co-ordination, the pressure brought to bear on South Africa is far from adequate. The Chinese delegation is therefore of the view that the Security Council should act immediately to call urgently on the international community to increase moral and material support to the South African people, the Namibian people and the front-line States, and appeal to all countries, especially the major Western Powers that have influence on South Africa, to impose effective sanctions against it so as to compel it to implement the United Nations resolutions on southern Africa immediately and unconditionally.

(Mr. Li Luye, China)

Together with the African countries and peoples, the Chinese Government and people will, as always, give energetic support to the Namibian people's struggle for independence, the South African people's struggle against apartheid and the struggles of the other countries in southern Africa to safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity, and continue to provide them with assistance to the best of our capability. We are convinced that, with the vigorous support of the international community, the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, supporting each other and persisting in struggles of various forms, will certainly eliminate apartheid and win the final victory of liberation of the entire African continent.

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

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

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the functions of President of the Security Council for the month of April. I am confident that under your dedicated and able guidance the Security Council will be able to take decisive steps to bring about the freedom and independence of Namibia.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, for the competent and outstanding manner in which he guided the work of the Security Council during the month of March.

The realization of the independence of Namibia should be the major task and objective of our Organization this year. It is important that, even in the countries that continue to maintain relations with South Africa, there has in the past couple of years been heightened awareness that the solution of the problem of Namibia and the liquidation of the brutal concept of apartheid is the imperative for securing peace not only in southern Africa but also in the world at large.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Indeed, the question of Namibia is not only an African problem; it is also a global problem and it involves the basic principles on which international relations are based. It is a question of self-determination and independence, and not a question of bloc rivalry and the struggle for spheres of influence. Foreign domination and occupation in Namibia, just as anywhere else, are a direct threat to international peace and security.

The attitude towards the Namibian people's immediate accession to independence is also a real test of the proclaimed commitment of all the Members of this Organization to the realization of human rights all over the world.

Yugoslavia's position on the question of Namibia is well known. Proceeding from the principled support for the right of every people and country to self-determination, independence and freedom, Yugoslavia has always been in favour of a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia on the basis of the United Nations plan.

However, we consider that the purpose of these meetings is not to repeat in the debate the known positions of each individual country but to determine the ways and means for the immediate implementation of the existing decisions of the Security Council on the question of Namibia, primarily the United Nations plan for Namibia.

It is high time the United Nations undertook a resolute action in order to fulfil its direct responsibility for Namibia. The process of Namibia's accession to independence must no longer be delayed. The main role in starting it off must be played by the Security Council, which must see to it that its decisions are implemented.

The problem of Namibia is one such question on which there exists undivided agreement in the international community on all aspects of reaching a peaceful and just solution. With the agreement on the system of proportional representation for

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

the elections, the last outstanding issue relevant to the United Nations plan for Namibia has been resolved. All countries - bar the racist régime in Pretoria - continue to support the independence of Namibia as laid down in the United Nations plan. However, verbal support for the United Nations plan for Namibia is not enough; what we need is a firm resolve to carry out the plan and, as the first step in that direction, a strict timetable for its implementation.

We all know the reason that has thus far stood in the way of a solution of this question. This is clearly borne out by the Secretary-General's report in which it is stated that the linkage pre-condition now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. For those who sincerely want to see an early solution of the problem of Namibia, the linkage of this question with extraneous and irrelevant issues, such as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, is absolutely unacceptable.

The Secretary-General's report is but further proof that South Africa does not want a solution to the problem of Namibia. What the racists in Pretoria do want is the continuation of the colonial occupation and domination of Namibia. To further their goals, they have increased the terror and exploitation of the Namibian people, intensified the policy of apartheid and racial discrimination and carried out aggression against, and the subversion of, independent African States, particularly Angola, with the aim of destabilizing the whole region.

That is precisely the second element on which the Security Council must take a very firm stand, on the basis of the Charter, against South Africa. Yet the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia, has on many occasions confirmed its willingness to achieve a political solution and its readiness to participate in all negotiations and mediation efforts aimed at implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia. To this effect SWAPO has voiced its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa and to abide by it.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

This bears eloquent witness to where the problem is and who is obstructing the efforts and negotiations to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia. The Security Council should therefore move more resolutely and step up the pressure on South Africa to accept unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and thus bring about the solution of this problem. The United Nations Charter provides appropriate measures to be taken against countries that defy the will of the international community and this body. Yugoslavia considers that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is the only remaining peaceful means to force South Africa to accept the decisions of the Security Council.

However, those countries that continue to maintain relations and to co-operate with the régime in Pretoria must have understood by now that it is only through firm and united international action that it is possible to force that régime to renounce apartheid and to discontinue its occupation of Namibia. The cutting of all links and co-operation with the racist régime would make a vital contribution to the strengthening of over-all international pressure on South Africa. It would also deliver a clear message to the régime in Pretoria that the international community is united, not only in words, but also in its resolve to bring freedom to Namibia and to do away with apartheid.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, whose efforts so far we highly value, has a very important role to play in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. His mediation efforts deserve the full support of the Security Council and of all the members of our Organization. We are all duty bound to support and participate in the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, over a number of years, has initiated many actions aimed at assisting the people of Namibia in their just struggle to attain independence.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

For its part, Yugoslavia will continue to give every possible support to international action aimed at achieving this goal, and it remains prepared to contribute to the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to secure the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

In conclusion, I should like to quote from the special appeal for the immediate independence of Namibia adopted at the Eighth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Harare, Zimbabwe, last year:

"The time for Namibian independence is long past. To delay it any longer is immoral. We therefore appeal to all men and women of goodwill firmly to oppose any delay, for any reason and under any circumstances, of Namibian independence." (S/18392, p. 156)

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

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

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): I should like, first, to thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, to express to the members of the Council my deep gratitude for allowing me to take part in its deliberations on a question that is of the greatest concern to the international community.

The future of this world will hardly be bright, nor will the role of the United Nations be fully appreciated, as long as the international community has not eradicated one of the last vestiges of colonialism, as long as the spirit of tolerance and dialogue, which must govern co-operation, has not prevailed over policies of domination and terror. In short, as long as peoples are not reconciled with themselves and man with himself, it will be very difficult to achieve peace.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

The case of Namibia, like that of apartheid, to which it is closely linked, is indeed a most instructive example of an attempt to perpetuate, against the tide of history, a colonial heritage that is today a thing of the past.

This serves to demonstrate the delicacy of your current duties, Mr. President. No one has any doubt that, throughout this month and particularly during the course of this debate, you will be inspired by the constant commitment your country, Bulgaria, has always demonstrated for just causes at the side of peoples struggling for dignity, freedom and independence. We wish you full success always.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the worthy representative of the third world, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, whom we Senegalese hold in high esteem because of his presence amongst us for several years. He deserves our tribute and admiration for the clarity, efficiency and competence with which he led this body during the past month.

Once again the question of Namibia is on the Council's agenda. Critics, motivated by often obscure sentiments, will be quick to accuse the initiators of this debate of abusing the Council's sense of duty, convened as it is in mini-Assembly to discuss an item whose urgency and gravity might not be apparent at first glance. We feel that such comments are made on the basis of malicious political logic and, obviously, they do not contribute either to the vitality or to the effectiveness of the United Nations, which, since its conception, has been attempting to topple one of the most solid and impermeable of contemporary colonial bastions.

Indeed, since 1946 the question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the United Nations, and throughout all those 40 years no issue has given rise to so much

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

hope or mobilized so much energy. Yet never has any issue experienced so many missed opportunities or given rise to so much passion, frustration and indignation.

Whether it be the repeated injunctions of the General Assembly, the Security Council's plan for a settlement or the exhortations and appeals made by many international meetings and conferences - none of which need be dwelt on here - South Africa has continued imperturbably to turn a deaf ear and has stubbornly continued with its occupation of Namibian territory, which has long been declared illegal, even by this body.

If all that energy and all the efforts made in various international bodies testify to the evident interest and constant concern of the international community over the fate of Namibia, the repeated failures and the present deadlock nevertheless illustrate the lack of political will on the part of those States with a special mission vis-à-vis Namibia and highlight our differences with regard to the stand to be adopted to compel the South African régime to see reason. Indeed, 20 years after the United Nations decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and eight years after the Council's unanimous adoption of a settlement plan for Namibia, it is inadmissible that the Pretoria régime should continue to defy the authority of the Organization and the unanimous will of the community of nations that make it up by stubbornly continuing to thwart the people's liberation movement and by illegally persisting in its occupation and exploitation of Namibia. The challenge is great, and with each passing day we have additional proof of the deliberate choice made by the Pretoria authorities to stand aloof from international society's evolution towards greater harmony and solidarity.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

So it is that, in line with the delaying tactics of which it has become a past master, South Africa has been deliberately delaying Namibia's accession to independence by continuing, first, to put this problem of decolonization within the context of East-West relations, which is totally irrelevant, and, secondly, to attempt to link Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from which the Angolan Government, in full sovereignty and legality, has requested assistance in accordance with a bilateral agreement and international law.

As we all know, the United Nations General Assembly, the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement have categorically rejected the inclusion of any extraneous element in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

This Council has stated unambiguously in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985) that the independence of Namibia cannot be subject to the settlement of problems extraneous to resolution 435 (1978).

Need we once again recall that in its very essence and fundamentally the Namibian question is purely one of decolonization, which must be settled peacefully in the spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)?

Nevertheless, not satisfied with posing totally unacceptable conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and in full awareness of the pointlessness of its efforts to set up a so-called interim government to administer the Territory, the South African régime has been arrogant enough to use Namibian territory as a base from which to perpetuate repeated acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line countries, thereby deliberately violating their sovereignty the territorial integrity.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

By the same token, with its annexationist designs, South Africa continues to make every effort to perpetuate its racist and military domination and to extend to Namibian territory the appalling system of apartheid through a far-fetched arsenal of repressive and oppressive laws, creating there an explosive situation that without a doubt presents a serious threat to international peace and security.

Hence the racist Pretoria régime is violating and flouting the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the most basic principles of international morality and peaceful coexistence among peoples and nations.

In putting an end to South Africa's mandate over Namibia in 1966, the General Assembly decided to take direct responsibility for the management and administration of the Territory of Namibia until it acceded to independence, thereby giving this issue a special international character.

Since the taking of that historic decision, which marked a turning-point in the process of decolonization in Namibia, the Namibian people has been awaiting its opportunity to realize its legitimate aspiration and enter the concert of free and independent nations.

The United Nations Council for Namibia - the legal Administering Authority for the Territory of Namibia, of which my country, Senegal, is honoured and privileged to be a member - has not failed at every available opportunity to draw attention to the urgent need to implement immediately the negotiated plan contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The United Nations Secretary-General himself, invested by this Council with a specific mandate for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), has in his contacts come up against the intransigence of South Africa, which has been responsible for the failure of negotiations to implement the United Nations plan.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

Indeed, in spite of the repeated appeals of the international community, the continued efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General, and the open-mindedness and willingness of the leaders of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to engage in dialogue, and in spite of the repeated warnings of the Security Council, South Africa still obstinately refuses to co-operate to bring about the implementation of the negotiated United Nations plan. Thus it continues illegally to occupy Namibian territory in defiance of the world Organization, which, need we state again, put an end to its Mandate over Namibia 20 years ago.

I should like once again to reiterate our most vigorous and unequivocal condemnation of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia, its stubborn pursuit of racist military domination over that Territory through the heinous, inhuman system of apartheid, a crime against mankind, and the forced conscription of young Namibians into South Africa's forces of oppression and repression.

My country will spare no effort to participate in any action that might hasten the unconditional implementation, without distortion, of resolution 435 (1978) so as to enable the Namibian people, which has been so sorely tried, finally to enjoy its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

Implementation of resolution 435 (1978) requires more determination and more political will on the part of the entire international community, and in particular the permanent members of this Council, which the Charter of our Organization has given major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The latter must increase their pressure on the racist Pretoria régime so as to force it to grant immediate and unconditional independence to Namibia within the framework of the United Nations plan in resolution 435 (1978), which for Senegal remains the only basis for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

In this connection my delegation welcomes the statements just made by the representatives of Canada, France and the Federal Republic of Germany, that they will do their utmost to bring about implementation of resolution 435 (1978), because those countries, need we repeat, have done a great deal to bring about its adoption. My country also welcomes the statement just made by the representative of China, a Permanent Member of the Security Council.

Faced with a wanton régime that continually tramples underfoot the elementary rules of international law and systematically violates the fundamental principles of freedom and human dignity, a régime that has disdained resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, whose authority it has denied, the international community must take this opportunity to promote concrete measures likely to compel the Pretoria authorities to put an end to their illegal occupation of Namibia.

In this connection the adoption and implementation of joint comprehensive mandatory sanctions in pursuance of the United Nations Charter, especially its Chapter VII, is the only possible peaceful response to the arrogance and warmongering of the racist Pretoria régime.

The diverse members of the international community - at an international conference on Namibia held in Vienna in July 1986; at a special session of the General Assembly held last year; at the Eighth Summit of Non-Aligned Countries held in Herare last year; at the Summit of the Organization of the Islamic Conference held last January in Kuwait; at the last meeting, in July 1986, of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity - have all come out in favour of the implementation of such sanctions.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

Much has been said on the question of sanctions, including that sanctions against South Africa would do more harm to blacks than to whites. To refute such arguments we need only recall the statement made at the fortieth session of the General Assembly by His Excellency President Abdou Diouf in his capacity as Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. He stated, after having traveled through the front-line States, that Heads of State of those States as well as southern African liberation movements unanimously realized that whatever suffering comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions might bring, they were the only way to end apartheid and the colonial status of Namibia.

It is now for the Security Council to act on the unanimous will of the community of nations to end the unspeakable suffering of the Namibian people and the plunder of its resources.

For its part, Senegal, in co-operation with all countries and peoples that believe in freedom, dignity, human values and human rights, is determined to commit itself to action that will enable the martyr people of Namibia to regain its independence and dignity.

To conclude, I wish on behalf of His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, solemnly to renew here my country's support for and active solidarity with the leaders of SWAPO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, in their heroic and legitimate struggle, and to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his constant co-operation and for his sustained action on behalf of the Namibian people.

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

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

Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, it is a special pleasure for my delegation to see you guiding the work of the Security Council. Mexico hails the great value placed by Bulgaria on our Organization's efforts to attain peace and its work for the cause of the speedy independence of Namibia.

I wish also to take this opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina for his work as President of the Council during the month of March.

Similarly, my delegation thanks the members of the Council for permitting it to participate in the discussion of the question of Namibia; Mexico attaches high importance to the cause of the Namibian people.

Although 20 years have passed since we began dealing with this item and since the United Nations assumed responsibility for Namibia, the question has origins dating back to the creation of the Organization. Yet we have not achieved a complete solution.

Many efforts have been made to find a solution to the question of Namibia and to bring about the immediate independence of that country. None the less, those efforts are as nothing compared to the suffering the Namibian people has endured in its quest for independence.

The United Nations Council for Namibia has done much praiseworthy work to advance the cause of the people of Namibia. Our support for the Council for Namibia is total, and as in the past we shall focus our efforts on assisting Namibia to achieve immediate independence.

Moreover, the activities of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, deserve the respect and constant support of the international community.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

Yet we may wonder what results have been achieved, and how far we have come in advancing the cause of Namibia. The historical record is unimpressive in that regard, and world public opinion wonders, sometimes quite rightly, about the powerlessness of the Security Council to reach an agreement. But the Security Council is extremely important, and once again it is facing a historic challenge. On previous occasions Mexico has made proposals for the imposition not only of economic and political sanctions against South Africa, but also of an arms and oil embargo against that country. We have repeatedly condemned South Africa's abhorrent apartheid régime and its consistent non-compliance with resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Again today we are obliged to come before the Council to demand that this responsibility be fully met. At present, the unconditional liberation of the Namibian people is a priority for our Organization, the credibility of which has been continuously undermined by the intransigent and defiant attitude of South Africa.

Once again, South Africa is the focus of the international community's attention because of the crimes it constantly commits both inside the country and in the Territory of Namibia; the Security Council cannot again turn its back on the international outcry for rapid and unequivocal change in the situation endured by Namibia and its people.

In the past, the Security Council has been paralysed - unable to take a decision on the question of Namibia because of the repeated vetos of some of its permanent members. If the Council had on those occasions decided to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, both Namibia and the South African people itself would be nearing the end of a long struggle that has caused them such suffering.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

The Security Council thus missed a historic opportunity and we wonder whether it will miss another one. World public opinion is making itself heard ever more forcefully, and many countries previously unwilling to adopt bold national measures are now supporting a cause that can no longer be denied such support.

Last year the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia was held at Vienna, Austria, and the General Assembly met in special session on the question of Namibia. Both gatherings condemned South Africa's policies in southern Africa, and both called for closer international co-operation in an effort to prevent that country from continuing its abhorrent apartheid régime and its oppression of the Namibian people.

Mexico has always condemned any pretext for weakening the struggle of the Namibian people for immediate independence. The immediate and unconditional implementation of United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), is the only possible basis for the peaceful achievement of independence by Namibia.

Mexico reaffirms its full support for those resolutions and considers that their immediate implementation is an inescapable obligation of this Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

Therefore, my Government categorically rejects the linkage or subordination of the application of the United Nations plan for Namibia, contained in the foregoing resolutions, to any other question, particularly that relating to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from the territory of Angola.

Mexico has also joined in the universal rejection of the policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa, and we call for the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that country, in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter of this Organization, since we believe that this is the only way to implement the United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

South Africa is not an ordinary problem and extraordinary measures are therefore required. We are convinced that South Africa's intransigent attitude is sustained by the Security Council's paralysis and the political, economic and even military support that some countries continue to give it. In that context, we deeply regret the misuse of the right of veto by some of the permanent members of the Council, for that is what has so far prevented the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. So long as those countries impede the implementation of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia will be maintained under the responsibility of the United Nations as a whole and of those countries in particular.

The independence of Namibia cannot and should not be the subject of extraneous geopolitical considerations; nor should it provide a stage for East-West confrontation. Mexico has invariably maintained that the cause of decolonization admits of no conditions.

We recognize that the imposition of selective voluntary sanctions against the South African régime reflects the international community's concern and underscores the emergence of a consensus in favour of the Namibian cause. My Government

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

maintains, however, that sanctions against that régime should be comprehensive and mandatory.

Moreover, the exploitation of Namibia's human and natural resources cannot be a valid obstacle to that Territory's immediate independence, and any economic enterprise that maintains the opposite to be true should be categorically condemned by the international community.

The protection of Namibia's resources is also a primary responsibility of the United Nations, which, through the Council for Namibia, constitutes the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its independence. Mexico is an active member of the Council for Namibia, and today we renew our commitment to the fundamental interests of the Namibians, and we pledge to continue our efforts to ensure that that Council can fully exercise its mandate.

The heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), deserves the unanimous support of our Organization and the active solidarity of each one of our countries. Mexico reasserts its unswerving commitment to the cause of the people of Namibia.

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

The next speaker is Major General Joseph N. Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. GARBA (Nigeria), Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid: May I first offer you, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your country, Bulgaria, along with the other socialist countries, has traditionally been in the

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

forefront of the struggle against apartheid, and for this the Special Committee and African countries will for ever remain grateful. We are happy that you are presiding over the Council's affairs when the most tragic issue of the twentieth century is placed before this prestigious body. I trust that your wisdom and vast diplomatic experience will guide the Council into taking a courageous and bold decision on the tragedy in southern Africa.

Let me also pay a tribute to your predecessor, my very good friend Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, for the amiable but businesslike manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Security Council in the month of March.

The Security Council is meeting today for the second time this year to consider the very serious situation in southern Africa, having met in February at a critical stage of the struggle for liberation in South Africa. As the oppressed people of South Africa intensify their struggle for freedom and justice, the racist régime continues to resort increasingly to its violent methods to quell opposition to its inhuman policies and practices of apartheid. Although the South African Government's policy of brutal repression in the country, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring African countries is widely condemned, the Security Council was one more time prevented from taking appropriate and decisive action on the matter owing to the negative votes of two permanent members of the Council.

The Security Council today has another opportunity to reconsider developments in the volatile and tormented region of southern Africa as it takes up the agenda item before it. The Council is invited to take, in the discharge of its obligations, immediate action to fulfil its mandate and reaffirm its credibility,

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in regard to the maintenance of international peace and security in the region.

In 1948 the Pretoria régime argued that the dissolution of the League of Nations meant the expiration of its Mandate over Namibia and that henceforth South Africa occupied Namibia by its own right to do so. Consequently, the racist régime took a series of measures to incorporate Namibia into South Africa on a piecemeal basis. The General Assembly reacted to these developments by adopting its resolution 2145 (XXI) of October 1966, in which South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was revoked and terminated. In 1967, following the United Nations action, the Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, was established under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967.

In March 1969 the Security Council declared the South African occupation of Namibia illegal, called on the racist régime to withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory and endorsed the call for the international diplomatic and economic isolation of South Africa whenever it acted on behalf of Namibia. South Africa's reaction was to treat these measures with deep contempt.

Today, 20 years later, the situation remains almost unchanged, except that the racist régime is increasing its criminal repression of the people of Namibia and its brutal aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The Security Council is therefore once again faced with an unprecedented challenge; it is called upon to respond promptly and in an appropriate manner, consistent with its primary responsibilities to restore peace and security in southern Africa and to pave the way for the total eradication of apartheid and the immediate independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

It is not by accident that the United Nations has kept South Africa's racist policies and practices under constant review. The uniquely inhuman and institutionalized character of apartheid is rightly condemned as a total negation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, a gross violation of human rights and a crime against humanity.

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

Apartheid is unique because it is a system of institutionalized racial discrimination accompanied by State terrorism under which the indigenous majority in South Africa and Namibia is oppressed, exploited and dispossessed by a racist minority which monopolizes political and economic power. Let us not deceive ourselves: the root of the Namibian problem is the philosophy and practice of apartheid, which the Security Council has thoroughly condemned. Any genuine solution to the Namibian problem must therefore address the core issue of apartheid.

Numerous efforts have been made in this chamber to resolve through pressure, including moral suasion, the southern African problem. The failure of moral suasion in four decades of United Nations action forces us to call for the imposition of sanctions which the General Assembly and even the Security Council have separately adopted in principle and some Member States are implementing in practice. However, we note with great sadness the reluctance of some Member States to resolve the problem of apartheid through the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions. The views of these Governments are that sanctions never work, that sanctions would penalize the black majority and neighbouring States in southern Africa. We have even read that the commendable sanctions imposed by the United States Congress are not achieving their objectives. Then, as a new twist to the anti-sanctions argument, we are informed that, once they are imposed, a certain powerful member of this Council may veto its lifting once it has achieved its purpose. And so, in order to pre-empt this supposed action, the resolution calling for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa could not be adopted at the last meeting of the Security Council on the question of South Africa. This is a very spurious argument.

It is painful for me to refer to the actions of the leading Members of our Organization who continue to export arms to South Africa in violation of the 1977

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

arms embargo decision of the Security Council. According to the recently published State Department report to Congress, Israel, France, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, among others, have been reported to be either exporting or conniving at the export of arms to the racist régime in South Africa. Two months ago it came to light that a West German-owned company sold submarine blueprints to the racist Government in South Africa with the tacit approval of the Government of the Federal Republic. The Director of the World Campaign testified before the Committee established by the Security Council under resolution 421 (1977) on this matter, and the Special Committee against Apartheid made numerous representations to the West German Government urging it to penalize the company involved. The Government, instead of discharging its responsibility and dealing with this company severely, decided to treat it merely as an administrative matter. Moreover, in direct contravention of United States congressional sanctions, the national airline of West Germany, Lufthansa, is actively collaborating with South African authorities to frustrate the ban imposed on South African Airways flights to the United States. We now know that South African Airways has dramatically increased the number of its flights to Frankfurt, while Lufthansa has concomitantly increased its flights to the United States. The implication of these actions is very obvious.

Equally saddening is the role of the United States Administration, which in its support of the linkage of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola continues to provide moral succour to the racist régime in Pretoria in its illegal occupation of Namibia and naked aggression against the Republic of Angola. Let us not forget that it was South Africa's invasion of Angola in the autumn of 1975 in its quest to install the quisling traitor Savimbi and the UNITA rebels in power in Luanda that prompted the MPLA Government of Angola to ask for assistance from States it regarded as friendly. No one can see any

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

threat to United States interests in Namibia to warrant the introduction of an extraneous issue that has delayed the freedom of Namibia all these years. The sum effect of prevarication and opposition to freedom for Namibia by some Western States is the endorsement of South Africa's policy of racism and aggression. Emboldened by the tacit support of Western States, the racist régime, in defiance of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), has not only imposed a puppet government but is currently expanding that bogus institution in preparation for a unilateral "declaration of independence" with the aim of depriving the Namibian people of genuine national independence and self-determination.

In the face of the continuously deteriorating situation in South Africa and Namibia caused by the policies and practices of apartheid, by the intransigence and neglect of the racist régime to abide by international law and by its acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring independent countries, one cannot but call on all States to refrain from any collaboration with South Africa that might encourage it to continue on its murderous course. The Special Committee against Apartheid calls on the Security Council once again immediately to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and appeals to the United States and United Kingdom, permanent members of the Council, to reconsider their position in the light of the grave situation in southern Africa and the accumulated evidence of the past 20 years which irrefutably shows that those sanctions are the most effective peaceful means of forcing South Africa to terminate apartheid as well as the illegal occupation of Namibia.

The Special Committee against Apartheid wishes to take this opportunity to commend the people of South Africa and Namibia, led by their liberation movements, the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for their heroic struggle against the repression and oppression of the apartheid régime and

(Mr. Garba, Chairman, Special
Committee against Apartheid)

reaffirms its support for their fight for self-determination and liberation and for their right to use all available means, including armed struggle, in pursuance of their noble aspirations. The call of the liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia for the establishment of united democratic and non-racial societies in South Africa and Namibia where all the people, irrespective of race, colour or ethnic origin, may enjoy equal rights is further proof of the universal and noble aims of their struggle.

We are at a great historical conjuncture, one that offers a challenge and an opportunity: a challenge to strike out for freedom, to let justice reign in southern Africa, an opportunity to prevent a racial cataclysm and to build racial harmony. Let it not be said that we allowed our feeble and myopic interests to block us from taking up the challenge and utilizing this opportunity. Let us here unanimously decide to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the pariah régime in Pretoria. Let us all resolve to adhere to the sanctions, and let us all pledge and honour our commitment speedily and peacefully to end the rule of apartheid.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

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

Mr. ABDOUN (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to convey my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am fully confident that your diplomatic skills amply qualify you to preside with wisdom and skill over these meetings. Also, I cannot fail to express special appreciation to your colleague, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, who presided over the Council's deliberations last month and provided wise leadership throughout his mandate.

Once again the Council has met to consider the question of the Territory of Namibia, following upon several series of meetings in this Chamber over the past two decades. This is a cause that can be clearly characterized by a call to independence and the right to self-determination of a people that has been struggling against a racist colonial rule for too many long years, notwithstanding the numerous resolutions adopted by several international forums and international and regional organizations.

The justness of this cause is rooted in the right to self-determination of the Namibian people which, like any other people that at one time was at the mercy of foreign rule, must exercise that right - its right to rule over its own affairs, its right to create its own independent political entity in accordance with the principles enshrined in international instruments and norms. All peoples that cherish freedom, justice and equality call for the application of these principles.

My delegation therefore cannot see any logic that could allow any party to hinder the achievement of these legitimate rights, unless, of course, that party did not uphold the values and morals of our modern civilization that are based on justice, equality and majority rule.

While the international community as a whole recognizes these legitimate rights of the militant people of Namibia, while the international community fully recognizes that people's right to immediate independence, as expressed in General

(Mr. Abdoun, Sudan)

Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and Security Council resolution 435 (1978), as well as in other resolutions adopted by international forums, we find that the racist Pretoria Government persists in ignoring this international Organization and its resolutions. That régime continues to procrastinate; it invokes arguments which, at best, are spurious and weak, if not simply false.

The Pretoria régime continues to practise its policy of racial segregation, or apartheid, against the Africans and other citizens in Namibia in the fields of education, health and social security. That régime continues to perpetrate acts of violation of human rights through arrests and assassinations of the nationalist and political leaders of the Territory; it also deprives all citizens of their civil, political, economic and social rights.

By flouting the resolutions of the international community and regional organizations this racist State seeks to create elements of instability; it threatens international peace and security by its repeated acts of aggression against the front-line African States. All these actions are designed to destabilize the security of these States and to sabotage their development plans.

The Pretoria régime continues to ignore the political will of the international community; it continues to occupy the Territory of Namibia; it refuses to recognize Namibia's right to self-determination; and it practises a policy totally rejected by international public opinion. All that would have been impossible were it not for the moral support and material assistance provided to the régime by some States Members of this international Organization. That support and assistance comes in various forms - in the military, economic and trade areas.

My country deeply regrets such collaboration between the Government in Pretoria and some Western States, particularly those which throughout their history have taught the principles of the right of peoples to their own self-determination, majority rule and the need for mankind to live in peace.

(Mr. Abdoun, Sudan)

We believe that that support and assistance is South Africa's lifeline. This is what allows the Government of South Africa to defy the international will calling for the immediate independence of Namibia. This lifeline is the main stumbling-block that prevents the Territory from enjoying its legitimate right to self-determination.

In this context, statistics show that four major Western States share 43 per cent of all exports to South Africa, while they absorb 35 per cent of South Africa's exports. We must also take into account that foreign trade makes up more than 63 per cent of the racist State's gross national product.

What is even more dangerous is the recently confirmed - indeed admitted by the State of Israel - frightening degree of close collaboration in the military field between that State and the racist minority Government which is basically aimed at oppressing the African peoples inside South Africa and in neighbouring African States.

On the other hand, my delegation fully appreciates the emerging movement among the masses in the Western world and the general awareness of the rights of the Namibian people, especially its right to break the chains of racist Pretoria's rule. Hence the Sudan would in this forum pay tribute to the American people, represented in the United States Congress, for the resolution calling for partial sanctions against South Africa, despite the gaping loopholes in it. Furthermore, we fully appreciate the latest positive phenomenon represented in the contents of a report of the consultative committee to the United States Secretary of State and the report of the United States State Department on military co-operation with South Africa by some States.

For all those reasons my delegation believes that the Security Council bears a special responsibility to adopt a new, more positive approach against the racist Pretoria régime so as to force it to heed the will of the international community

(Mr. Abdoun, Sudan)

and implement those two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 and by the Security Council in 1978. We believe that this could be achieved by the imposition of mandatory comprehensive sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

While we call for the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions by all States Members of the Organization. We believe that all arguments advanced by those that now provide support and assistance to South Africa are transparent and without foundation.

Firstly, the appeal not to impose economic sanctions in order to spare the black populations from hardship has no basis. Those peoples have been suffering since the very beginning of the racist occupation; they have been deprived of their legitimate rights. Furthermore, the States of the region are experiencing instability which was created by South Africa in the first place.

Secondly, the argument that the imposition of sanctions would merely delay a peaceful settlement of the problem and widen the vicious circle of violence and terrorism is an exercise in procrastination. The main reason for violence is the racist oppression of the Namibian people. An end to that oppression would mean an end to violence and would open the way for peace.

(Mr. Abdoun, Sudan)

Thirdly, procrastination in granting self-determination to the Namibian people because of the presence of Cuban forces in Angola is simply unacceptable. There is no connection between the two issues. The former is an issue of granting independence to the people of Namibia; the second is an issue of foreign forces in another, fully independent and sovereign State. The Cuban forces are present in Angola at the wish and invitation of an independent Government. They came to Angola many years after the racist occupation of Namibia. Such a pretext is tantamount to the blackmail of the Western States by Pretoria, which is raising the spectre of international struggle against the East and of the spread of communism, particularly since that racist State has been unable to advance any acceptable and logical reason for remaining on Namibian territory.

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the international community has adopted more than enough resolutions calling for the immediate independence of Namibia. We believe that the independence of the oppressed people of Namibia is now directly linked with the strength of the international will and the ability of the international community to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria to force it to heed international public opinion and join the mainstream of human civilization in the twentieth century.

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

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): Allow me first of all to express my sincere thanks to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Security Council for providing me with this opportunity to address the Council and to participate in its deliberations on the question of Namibia, which remains a matter of grave concern to the international community. Permit me also to extend to you my warm

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. We feel confident that in deliberating this important issue the Security Council will have the benefit of wise guidance and skilled leadership under your presidency.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the excellent manner in which Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, presided over the proceedings of the Council last month and for the success with which he guided its deliberations.

My delegation participated in a similar debate some two years ago, but it is sad to recall that the Security Council could not be persuaded at that time to adopt a common stand and that another opportunity for effective action was lost. During these two years we have witnessed a progressive deterioration of the situation in Namibia - as, indeed, in the whole of southern Africa, where the oppressed black people continue to suffer the indignity of Pretoria's racist rule and the painful burden of its colonial yoke. South Africa's stubborn denial of human rights in Namibia and its unrepentant violations of the legitimate rights of the Namibian people are matched by its policies of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring front-line States, which result in the aggravation of tension and conflict and which further delay a negotiated settlement.

In his last report of 31 March 1987 (S/18767) the Secretary-General elaborated the actions he has taken for the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia. The Secretary-General's actions have our whole-hearted support. South Africa's continuing obduracy in linking the issue of a negotiated settlement in Namibia with extraneous issues is a pretext to further put off the day of Namibian independence. We would do well to recall the Secretary-General's statement before the United Nations Council for Namibia on 9 January this year, when he emphatically

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

stated that South Africa must be made to realize that the just and legitimate aspirations of the people of the Territory cannot continue to be thwarted without serious detriment to South Africa's own long-term interests and, of course, to the peace and stability of the region as a whole.

The delay in the resolution of the Namibian question is not caused by the nature of the problem. The delay is caused by the tactics employed by the South African régime to inject East-West considerations into the issue. In defiance of the wishes of the international community as repeatedly expressed in resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly the racist régime persists in its denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Namibia. With conscience unstirred by the appalling consequences of its oppressive and inhuman policies of apartheid at home, Pretoria moves to impose, unashamedly, the same policies in Namibia, oblivious of the punishment the nemesis of history has in store for it.

Twenty-one years ago the United Nations, in a bold assertion of the will of the international community, terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory. The following year it established the Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority, amidst hopes that the Council would receive the co-operation of all the interlocutors for a purposeful dialogue leading to the exercise of the right of self-determination by the Namibian people and to their long-awaited independence. Developments since then have belied those hopes. On one pretext or another, South Africa has attempted to maintain its stranglehold over Namibia through such brutal repressive measures as the imposition of martial law, dusk-to-dawn curfews and the intimidating presence of 100,000 South African forces. Added to that is the threat of an interim government propped up by South African bayonets and ready to declare independence unilaterally. Moves are also afoot to incorporate the strategically

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

important Walvis Bay into South Africa, in flagrant violation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

Inside Namibia the population continues to be subjected to intolerable degradations. Torture, killings and terror are rampant, but the spirit of the people of Namibia remains unbroken and their will to freedom unshaken. It is to the credit of the Namibian people and their representative organization, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), that, despite the sufferings and outrages to which they are subjected, they have explored with patience, courage and forbearance every opportunity to arrive at a peaceful and negotiated settlement.

Following the agreement reached on the electoral system in November 1985, all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations Plan have been resolved. In February last year President Sam Nujoma asked the United Nations Secretary-General to initiate contacts with South Africa to press for a cease-fire and for the over-all implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay. South Africa's conditioned reflex was to raise the irrelevant issue of the Cuban presence in Angola, which was firmly rejected by the Secretary-General. In his report of 31 March 1987, the Secretary-General says:

"This linkage pre-condition, which dates back to 1982, now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. 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." (S/18767, para. 32)

We are gathered here not to be content with debating an issue which has seen endless debates, nor merely to seek satisfaction from an exchange of views on a problem which has been overwhelmed by exchanges. We are gathered to ensure that the Security Council fulfils its primary responsibility for the maintenance of

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

international peace and security and prevents the situation from deteriorating further. The Security Council is expected to take whatever measures are necessary to compel South Africa to abide by the wishes of the international community.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The Security Council has been convened to consider the question of Namibia, in response to the call made by the United Nations General Assembly at its fourteenth special session and the earlier call of the Eighth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare urging the United Nations to redress the intolerable and unacceptable situation which continues to persist in Namibia. It can do so by adopting the draft resolution before it, which in its essence demands full respect for the principles and precepts enshrined in the United Nations Charter and compliance with the pronouncements, declarations and resolutions of our Organization, including those of the Security Council itself, in dealing with the question of Namibia.

The draft resolution calls upon the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; it calls upon all States to assist effectively in the implementation of this draft resolution and other Security Council resolutions relating to Namibia in conformity with Article 25 of the Charter. It also calls upon the specialized agencies to ensure the effective implementation of the present draft resolution and all other relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on Namibia.

It is our earnest hope that, in voting on the draft resolution in document S/18785, now before the Council, members of the Council will be guided solely by their commitment to the cause of freedom for the people of Namibia and adopt it unanimously.

Pakistan has always advocated the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions in order to ensure peaceful change in southern Africa and has suggested that a deadline be set for Namibia's independence. Pakistan salutes the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia and remains committed to supporting unreservedly their right of self-determination. The courage, sagacity and patience with which

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

President Sam Nujoma has steered the struggle of the Namibian people deserve our respect and tribute.

We are particularly happy to have among us Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the South West African People's Organization, whose statement before the Council was most instructive. My delegation would request him to convey to the people of Namibia and their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the unfailing and resolute support of the Government and people of Pakistan in their just struggle for self-determination and independence.

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

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

Mr. DASGUPTA (India): Mr. President, you have begun your tenure as President of the Security Council with an issue whose length and frequency of debate in this forum have not made it less topical or less painful. The distinction of your personal qualities and the depth of your diplomatic experience are known to all of us. We look towards you for guidance in the efforts of this Council to address the problem before it. I should like to express my personal appreciation to you for giving me the opportunity to speak this evening.

May I also pay tribute to His Excellency Ambassador Delpech of Argentina for the leadership with which he provided the Council last month.

I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to our Secretary-General for the report he has presented in document S/18767 of 31 March. The Secretary-General has shared with us the characteristically intensive and purposeful manner in which he has tried to make possible the implementation of

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) through discussions with parties concerned. We share the Secretary-General's regret that South Africa's proposals in regard to Namibia run counter to relevant Security Council decisions and that what now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia is a separate matter to be dealt with by those directly concerned acting within their sovereign competence.

I should also like to refer to the notable work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which will this year mark the twentieth anniversary of its establishment as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence. Under the presidency of my friend and colleague Ambassador Zuzo of Zambia, the Council and its secretariat have done their utmost to arouse the international conscience and give the people of Namibia access to their right to be free and to independence with dignity and honour.

The United Nations was founded on a determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Aggression, brutality and conflict continue in Namibia. Its occupied territory is used as a base for war within and war without. Can this Council remain passive?

The United Nations was founded on a determination to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person. A society crafted on colour is allowed to perpetuate itself in Namibia, and false promises are offered to a subjugated people to prolong their captivity. Can this Council remain passive?

The United Nations was founded on a determination to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained. A member State of this body

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

continues to mock and to destroy every tenet of human decency, which it is expected to uphold by virtue of its adherence to the Charter. Can this Council remain passive?

The United Nations was founded on a determination to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. When a nation wilfully depletes the resources and the economy of another to impoverish its people and its future, to cripple the very worth of national life, can this Council remain passive?

We could have seen all this only too clearly too long ago. In November 1946, Field Marshal Smuts told the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly that

"the integration of South West Africa with the Union of South Africa would be mainly a formal recognition of a unity that already existed. The wishes of the European population had been expressed through the normal democratic channel. The wishes of the natives have been ascertained in an equally democratic but rather different form, with due regard to their differing tribal organizations and customs."

Smuts may well have got away with this arrogant falsehood, but he was challenged by the delegation of a people that had already broken trade relations with South Africa and who had just established a national Government in preparation for their own independence. India has consistently argued that it is only the complete isolation of the racist régime in South Africa that will bring home to it the will of the international community. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions are the means to this isolation. We hope that at this meeting the Security Council will take adequate action in the form of an effective resolution.

Sixteen months have passed since Namibia was last discussed here. On that occasion we failed to adopt a resolution. Five months before that, resolution 566 (1985) had been adopted. Allow me to recall operative paragraph 13 of that resolution, which was formulated after considerable discussion among

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

members of the Council, of which India was one, and in conformity with the spirit of consensus which the non-aligned members of the Council had hoped would drive our point home to Pretoria. The Security Council strongly warned South Africa that failure to co-operate fully with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolution 566 (1985) would compel the Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including under Chapter VII. Resolution 566 (1985) demanded that the racist régime of South Africa immediately rescind its illegal and unilateral action of installing a so-called interim government in Namibia. South Africa has not done so. The Security Council had mandated itself to meet and consider the very measures it had warned South Africa it would consider adopting. This meeting has not come a day too soon. What is left is to see how good is the faith which resolution 566 (1985) was thought to collectively represent.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

On 1 April the so-called interim government established its own national intelligence service. The puppet régime has already announced plans to set up ministries of international co-operation and development and a ministry of security. The legitimacy of this interim government has been negated not only by international resolutions but by the people of Namibia themselves. A year ago, a group of political parties, religious leaders and other public organizations in the Territory issued the Ai Gams declaration, rejecting the so-called transitional government as unelected, unmandated and preserved in power only by the sheer brute force of the occupiers of Namibia. The chaos within that so-called government itself is evident from the threat by members of the National Party within it to take it to court if any plans to desegregate schools in Namibia in the current year were implemented.

Even as the puppet régime continues to flounder in Windhoek, South Africa is reported to have decided earlier this year to create a regional service council in Walvis Bay within its Cape Province. It is expected to become operational in July. Pretoria's plans for the dismemberment of Namibia continue.

Reports testify not only to the savagery of the occupying régime in Namibia but to its utterly callous disregard for human life. The Namibian Women's Voice has made the specific allegation that black Namibian women of all child-bearing ages are being injected with a particular birth control substance which, medical reports have shown, causes liver and brain tumours in infants. This drug, studies have shown, also has been found to cause cancer in several instances. The Namibian Women's Voice has pointed out that this drug is not administered in segregated health facilities for white women. It has been described as a silent war to kill and curb the growth of the African population, and quite simply as genocide.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

We have also seen reports in the Namibian press itself about the banned locust poison used by South Africa in Namibia, with four tons having been sprayed over a principal centre of meat production, infecting the produce.

The anguish of the people of Namibia has been mirrored in numerous documents and in much testimony. A few months ago, in an open letter to the self-styled Minister of Justice, the Namibia Committee of Parents charged:

"We see the actions of the police and provocators as the denial of basic rights of the Namibians. For the past 100 years, the status of the life of a Namibian has not changed one iota."

Allow me to corroborate this with an analysis which comes not from a Namibian organization but from a publication in South Africa itself, the Financial Mail:

"For most black Namibians, daily life is still a struggle for survival. A recent survey put the unemployed above 50 per cent of the labour force in urban areas, with 60 per cent of those employed earning far below the poverty line.

"Schools are hopelessly overcrowded and the housing shortage is severe. Medical services are inadequate and more than half the population has been displaced by the war in the north where normal social life has been disrupted by the dusk-to-dawn curfew.

"The transitional government of national unity, which was installed by South Africa in June 1985, has suffered from a pronounced lack of political legitimacy since its inception. The six parties forming the TGNU have not been able to agree on any policy which can solve the multiple crises affecting this country."

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

But it is not as if these truths had only suddenly become self-evident. They have been before the international community since the very inception of this international Organization, had we but had the courage to recognize them. For too long have we sought to substitute the leisure of quiet diplomacy for the concert of united action. Private assurances are no compensation for public inaction. There is the apocryphal story of a business firm which continued to export traffic lights to South Africa on the premise that it was sending signals to the Pretoria régime. Let the Security Council not be placed in a similar position of ineffectiveness, inadequacy and indecision.

Rarely has so much professed concern yielded so little purpose. There is talk of preparing for independence a nation whose history, culture and determination could well match those of many nations that are free today and that have enjoyed their freedom with wisdom and maturity, and without the grace of a preparation time sanctioned from outside. SWAPO has stated that imperialism is what is rotten at the heart of the problem. The people of Namibia, led by their sole authentic representative, will stem that rot - with their blood if need be. This Council can do so with its endorsement of one piece of paper.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi once recalled how when returning to India from England in 1941 her ship was diverted to Durban. In the week she was there, General Smuts made his single telling remark, that the colour of a person's skin was his passport. The latitude we have shown Smuts and his successors has given South Africa another passport: a passport to commit aggression, a passport to occupy, a passport to plunder and a passport to this institution, where the chasm between word and action, between fact and intention, is revealed. This Council concurred in resolution 435 (1978); it could not be seen to oppose its principle.

(Mr. Dasgupta, India)

Our Secretary-General has told us time and time again that every issue relating to resolution 435 (1978) is in place. Will this Council now shy away from its responsibility to ensure that issues irrelevant to resolution 435 (1978) not be allowed to defer its implementation, to ensure that parties who by their own profession have a commitment to resolution 435 (1978) not be allowed to circumvent it for their own interests, and to ensure that the international community speak in the language that the outlaw of the twentieth century will understand?

The outlaw's intentions are clear: they require no reading between the lines, for the lines themselves are sinister and coloured in the arrogance and hate which the people of South Africa and Namibia have long been accustomed to but which this Council has yet to resolve to confront directly. It is clear that South Africa intends its ventriloquist's dummy in Namibia to manoeuvre its way into a unilateral declaration of independence. That would be a declaration bereft of legitimacy of popular sanction, a declaration drafted under the direct tutelage of Pretoria, and a unilateral declaration of independence from the bar of the world's conscience and from the repository of that conscience, the United Nations.

In their statements before this Council, the representatives of Angola and SWAPO reaffirmed their readiness for direct negotiations with Pretoria. Why is this offer not accepted? Is it only because Pretoria has nothing to say which will stand the scrutiny of detailed discussion, or is it because Pretoria has learned through history that a domestically dispensable régime can survive if it proves itself indispensable to some people abroad?

In the address of the Secretary of External Relations of SWAPO, the eloquent voice of the people of Namibia was heard. It is a voice we must heed, for it is we who, as the Charter reminds us, are determined "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security".

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

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 8 April 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.