



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

APR 9 1987

S/PV.2742
7 April 1987

UN/DA COLLECTION

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 7 April 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. TSVETKOV

(Bulgaria)

Members:

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. GAUSSOT
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. AOKI
Mr. TIMERBAEV
Mr. AL-KINDI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. OKUN
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 11.10 a.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, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados), Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), 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. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Midenge (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 letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Gabon, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tunisia and Viet Nam, in which they request 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 those representatives 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. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Biffot (Gabon), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdoun (Sudan), Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia) and Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter dated 6 April 1987 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, which reads as follows:

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

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

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

The first speaker on my list is the representative of Nicaragua. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Miss ASTORGA GADEA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Council presidency for the month of April. Your skill and experience are a guarantee of the success of our work. My congratulations go also to our Latin American colleague, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of the sister Republic of Argentina, who, with his characteristic wisdom, conducted the Council's proceedings last month.

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

All along the difficult path of civilization, mankind has shown its ability to survive by making major sacrifices. It has overcome various systems and tragic periods in its history. However, in South Africa and Namibia, the course of history seems to have stopped. Not only has civilization, justice, democracy and equality not penetrated that country, but South Africa has, in fact, become the last stronghold of what remains the most shameful period in the history of mankind. In South Africa and Namibia we find during the same period of history everything from slavery and feudalism to colonialism, fascism, neo-colonization, apartheid and, finally, imperialism. On the other hand, chapters featuring heroism, courage and resistance have also been written in the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to free themselves from injustice and to win back their inalienable rights.

The origins of South African policy towards Namibia go back to the military occupation in 1915 of what was then known as German South West Africa. The Versailles Conference of 1919 gave South Africa the Mandate over Namibia. Only two years later the then Prime Minister, General Smuts, said:

"The Mandate over South West Africa is nothing more than an annexation which gives us so much sovereignty that we need not ask for anything more."

In 1964, South Africa implemented the recommendations of the infamous Odendaal Commission and proceeded to the bantustanization of Namibia.

In 1970, in resolution 284 (1970), the Security Council declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal, and this was ratified by the International Court of Justice in 1971. Sixteen years later, despite resolution 435 (1978), South Africa and its powerful allies continued to usurp the legitimate rights of the Namibian people.

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

Throughout all that time, the struggle of the Namibian people and the international community, to liberate the Territory has been thwarted by the arrogant determination of South Africa and its allies to perpetuate colonialism. This intolerable situation must not be allowed to continue.

The consequences of South Africa's unlawful occupation of Namibia go far beyond the untold suffering that this brutal occupation has visited on the Namibian people. South Africa has made Namibia a keystone of its policy of regional destabilization which Botha has dubbed "total strategy".

Although Namibia has been a colonial Territory of South Africa for the last 70 years, and Pretoria has abandoned its original aspiration of annexing the Territory of Namibia as the fifth South African province, South Africa's present strategy is to make Namibia an integral part not of its national policy but of its regional policy. Occupied Namibia has been used by South Africa as a staging area for its attacks designed to destabilize the front-line States.

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

Since the end of the last decade, and more significantly since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), aware that a neo-colonial solution of the Rhodesian Smith-Muzorewa kind was no longer viable in Namibia, South Africa has created a military and economic structure designed not only to perpetuate the Territory's occupation but also to bring about future destabilization of an independent Namibia. South Africa also intends to bring about the regional destabilization of all of southern Africa - assuming, of course, that Namibian independence comes about prior to the elimination of the apartheid régime.

In 1980 South Africa created what was known as the South West Africa Territorial Force (SWATF) to project the image that in Namibia there was a "legitimate Namibian force" that would not be affected by resolution 435 (1978). That so-called Territorial Force, made up of Namibians recruited by force, was nothing but an occupying force. It was organized, trained, led, financed and equipped by the South African Defence Forces (SADF). South Africa claims that the members of that "Territorial Force" have become future Namibian contras.

Clear examples of similar processes are the mercenary forces of RENAMO in Mozambique and UNITA in Angola, which, guided by Pretoria and Washington, carry out terrorist activities against fraternal countries.

It is not by chance that Nicaragua is participating in this debate. It is a consequence of our principles and the history of our struggle. That historic process strengthens our bonds with the Namibian people and with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole legitimate representative.

South African manoeuvres to maintain its domination and exploitation of Namibia have affected all aspects of Namibian society. In that Territory the same laws of tribal and racial segregation applied by apartheid in South Africa have been used. Indeed, they are even worse in Namibia. In addition, although the

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

income and living standards of whites in South Africa are 10 times higher than those of blacks, in Namibia the ratio is twenty to one.

South Africa has also distorted the Namibian economy and adapted it to the needs of outside interests. Today the corporate affiliates of more than 200 American, South African and other Western firms are unlawfully and pitilessly exploiting Namibia's natural resources, reaping huge profits and usurping the wealth of its impoverished inhabitants.

Similarly, to perpetuate their control and exploitation of Namibia, in June 1985 South Africa set up a puppet government in the service of Pretoria that has earned condemnation and repudiation by the entire international community, as expressed in resolution 566 (1985) of this Council. In its most recent effort, South Africa has tried to give that "provisional government" alleged jurisdiction over internal security and foreign affairs.

Another manoeuvre to prolong injustice in Namibia is the repudiated doctrine of "linkage" - a product of the same minds that designed and initiated the policy of "constructive engagement".

As regards the linking of Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, may I bring to the attention of the Council the Secretary-General's report of 31 March 1987, which states:

"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. 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)

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

Exploitation and colonialism are evils with a common origin, and therefore the struggle for Namibian independence is indissolubly linked with the struggle for the elimination of apartheid.

We have not the slightest doubt that the Namibian people will throw off the colonial yoke imposed by Pretoria. As Eliaser Tuhadeleni, a Namibian labour leader, has said:

"The struggle with South Africa is a most unequal one. I have seen the power of the South Africans, but just as David killed Goliath because right was on his side, we Namibians will win out too, because right is on our side."

Through the Security Council, the international community has a duty to respond to the struggle of the oppressed people of Namibia by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to put an end to their matrydom and speedily bring about their total independence.

At the same time, while imposing sanctions on Pretoria, the international community must as a matter of urgency expand bilateral economic co-operation, including the front-line countries, and increase co-operation with the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC). Similarly the international community must give full support to the recently created African Fund for Non-Aligned Countries, which is now being co-ordinated by Prime Minister Gandhi of India.

We should now like to quote what was stated in 1971 in the Manifesto of the Youth League of SWAPO, which expresses the spirit of the struggle of each Namibian and is still valid today:

"We are working for solidarity, freedom and justice. We have nothing to lose except our suffering."

We know it is just a matter of time. SWAPO will win out in the end. As our national hero, Sandino, said, "Our causes are just; therefore they will triumph".

(Miss Astorga Gadea, Nicaragua)

During a recent visit to Nicaragua by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, the Government of Nicaragua awarded him the Carlos Fonseca Order. It was a tribute by the Nicaraguan people to the just struggle of the Namibian people and the tireless efforts of Nujoma and SWAPO to achieve independence, self-determination and justice in that part of the world. It was also a token of our unshakable solidarity with the people of Namibia and with SWAPO, their sole, legitimate representative.

The entire world anxiously awaits the vote that is to take place in this Council. We wonder whether the Security Council will this time fulfil its obligations, or whether it will once again be bound by the veto of those are trying to perpetuate injustice.

All mankind wonders whether South Africa will continue to act with impunity, with the connivance of certain members of this Council. All mankind wonders whether in the end there will prevail the interests of the transnational corporations or those of millions of humble, simple human beings whose only demand is justice.

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

The next speaker is His Excellency Mr. Tesfaye Tadesse, Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24): On behalf of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for this opportunity to address the Security Council in connection with its consideration of the critical situation with which our Organization is confronted in respect of Namibia.

I should like also to say, Sir, how happy and gratified I am to see you presiding over the Council on this occasion. I am confident that with your well known diplomatic skills and your commitment to the cause of decolonization you will lead the Council's deliberations to a successful conclusion.

I wish also to convey the appreciation of the Special Committee to your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech of Argentina, for the effective manner in which he conducted the business before the Council during the month of March.

This series of meetings of the Security Council immediately following the Council's consideration in February of a closely related question reflects the mounting concern and deep sense of frustration shared by the international community at the protracted delay in taking effective measures to eliminate a situation which is seriously threatening international peace and security. As we meet here today to address ourselves to the question of Namibia, the prospect

(Mr. Tadesse, Special
Committee of 24)

of an acceptable solution appears to be as remote as ever, while the fundamental rights of millions of Africans in the region continue to be trampled upon with impunity.

The racist régime of South Africa, supported by its allies, defiantly continues to demonstrate both in its policies and in its deeds its open contempt for the United Nations and the goal of Namibian independence. All evidence indicates that the Pretoria régime has been deceitful all along while pretending to participate in negotiations in good faith. A sense of justice dictates that this must not be allowed to continue. It is therefore high time that the racist régime's open defiance of the true aspirations of the Namibian people and its blatant disregard for the will of the international community were brought to an end.

Guided by its mandate to ensure that the peoples of colonial Territories and countries are enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, the Special Committee of 24 has given high priority to the important question of the decolonization of Namibia. The position of the Special Committee on the question of Namibia is set out in no uncertain terms in a number of decisions it has adopted on this and other, related questions concerning the situation in southern Africa.

In brief, the Special Committee, first and foremost, holds the apartheid régime accountable for the creation of a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security. The Committee strongly condemns South Africa's persistent non-compliance with and violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions, its ruthless resort to acts of subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States, and its continued manoeuvres to subvert the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Tadesse, Special
Committee of 24)

The Special Committee categorically rejects and denounces all manoeuvres by South Africa to bring about a sham independence in Namibia through fraudulent schemes including the establishment of a so-called interim government which is designed to perpetuate South Africa's domination and exploitation. In this regard, the Special Committee condemns and rejects the policy of "linkage", which has clearly emboldened the apartheid régime to intensify further its repression of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa.

The Special Committee is convinced that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces, and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Committee calls for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without modification, qualification or pre-conditions.

We are well aware that the Security Council has been prevented from discharging its responsibilities effectively, owing to the negative votes cast by certain Western members. As recently as last February, when the Council met to condemn the policies of the apartheid régime in South Africa, the call for sanctions was similarly thwarted for the same reason. The Special Committee hopes that during its current series of meetings the Security Council will be able to respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community in that regard.

(Mr. Tadesse, Special
Committee of 24)

South Africa's continuing defiance of the will of the international community underscores the validity of the position of the Special Committee, which is based on its strong conviction that the United Nations is duty-bound to do everything possible to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Indeed, all that has happened since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) reveals a consistent and calculated policy of dissemblance and delay - in short, a policy of fraud. There has been no progress whatsoever in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), while on the other hand the minority régime of Pretoria has continued to consolidate its illegal presence in Namibia.

The repeated attempts to bring about an independent, stable, self-governing, democratic Namibia by exercise of reason, through negotiations at an international level, have been ignored and, worse yet, ridiculed by the racist régime, as amply demonstrated by that régime's repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. There cannot be, therefore, any ground for further equivocation on the part of anyone in the application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. At the same time, measures must be adopted without delay to extend all possible assistance to the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

On behalf of the members of the Special Committee, I wish to express the hope that the Council, at this sitting, will be able in unity to reiterate its irrevocable commitment and resolve to implement resolution 435 (1978) and to request the Secretary-General to proceed forthwith to take all measures necessary to give effect to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Tadesse, Special
Committee of 24)

Before concluding, I wish to express my deep appreciation to States members of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity for having taken the important initiative of calling for this series of Council meetings on the situation in Namibia.

I wish to express the hope that the decision adopted by the Council during this series of meetings will prove to be a decisive factor in restoring to the people of Namibia their long-denied human dignity and freedom.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): I wish on behalf of the delegation of Zambia to congratulate you most sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council. You represent a country which is firmly committed not only to the independence of Namibia but also to the total eradication of the evil system of apartheid and the abolition of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. We in the delegation of Zambia are confident that under your skilful stewardship our deliberations on this important subject will be brought to a successful conclusion.

May I also pay a deserving tribute to my brother and colleague Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina for the able manner in which he handled the work of the Council during the month of March. His personal commitment and that of his country to the liberation of Namibia is a great source of inspiration to my delegation. We cannot but commend him for his tireless efforts.

Our deep-rooted faith in the United Nations and in particular the Security Council, which the founding fathers of our Organization, in their wisdom, charged with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, has once again prompted us to seek justice and fair play from this body in regard to the long-delayed independence of Namibia. The Secretary for External Relations of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Ben Gurirab, in his important, inspiring and lucid statement before the Council expressed, inter alia, SWAPO's expectations from this series of meetings. They are expectations based on SWAPO's faith in the Security Council as the only arbiter on this vexing issue.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The issue of Namibia has been characterized over decades by words - too many words; by committees, appeals, judgements and frustrated decisions. I know of no parallel in history for the theft and rape of such a large portion of a continent. Nowhere will we find, since nations began to consult each other, anything to equal South Africa's snub to the world. There is no other, comparable rejection of any United Nations resolution. There has been no other, equal rejection of a decision by the International Court of Justice. And today, 21 years after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and ordered it to withdraw from Namibia, we are met to discuss the "Namibia question".

Is this not a most extraordinary state of affairs? We would be forgiven if we thought that, despite every civilized method and instruction and appeal, nothing had happened and that our deliberations and words in the Security Council were pointless. Perhaps we should all go home. We must ask ourselves seriously what it is that we are doing here. We can say more, we can write more. More resolutions, more discussions, more paper circulating: is that not truly an honest statement of the situation?

I apologize for being in a mood of despair. As a young man, I was impressed by a motto which I have tried to keep in the forefront of my mind: "There are no problems without solutions".

We all know the problem. But who among us today will stand up and offer a solution? And by "solution" I mean a state of affairs where South Africa is made to quit Namibia and the Namibian people inherit their God-given right to control the destiny of their land. Anything short of that is not a solution at all. It can be an idea, a recommendation, a thought worth pursuing, worth lobbying for.

Intransigency, bigotry, obstinacy, greed must be overcome. We cannot approach the twenty-first century still debating this issue. We must have within the near future - not only in our children's future - an end to this international farce.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

A sad chapter of the United Nations efforts to bring independence to Namibia relates to our failure to implement the universally accepted independence plan for Namibia embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Since 1978 that plan, which was initiated by five major Western countries - namely, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States - has not been implemented, thus shattering any lingering hope for an early settlement of the question of Namibia. It is inconceivable that those countries should have failed to live up to their solemn promise to deliver Namibia to freedom and independence. We hold them fully responsible for the misery and untold suffering the Namibians are enduring under the occupation of that inhuman and insensitive racist régime of South Africa. These countries have disappointed not only the people of Namibia but the entire international community. This is indeed a betrayal of the sacred trust of the people of Namibia and the United Nations.

I wish to reiterate that Namibia is a question of decolonization and should therefore not be looked at through the prism of East-West rivalry. The linkage issue introduced by the United States and still being insisted upon by both the United States and South Africa is a diversionary tactic and has been categorically rejected by the General Assembly.

A child born on the day that the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate is 21 years old this year. He could be maimed and a parent. To say this makes me angry. For during the growth of that child a hostile army has trampled its feet over nearly a million square kilometres of land which is not its to occupy.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Why, it may be asked, does this land rape continue? Throughout history occupying Powers have used various excuses for sequestering land that does not belong to them. Hitler claimed lebensraum, or living space. Napoleon claimed that he installed unity, peace and laws. The metropolitan Powers which built empires claimed that they civilized the occupied territories. What, it may be asked, is South Africa's justification for the illegal occupation of Namibia? I have yet to hear it.

But we all know the reason. Namibia is one of the richest countries in Africa. Yet most Namibians live in conditions of extreme poverty. South Africa and foreign economic interests have systematically exploited the country's rich natural resources with little benefit to Namibia itself.

As we know, Namibia's wealth is based on its rich deposits of diamonds, uranium ore and base metals, copper, lead, lithium, pyrite, tin, silver and zinc. The mining sector is owned by South Africa and Western transnational corporations and by combinations of South African State corporations with Western transnationals. We are talking about diamond mines owned by De Beers, which is part of the South African Anglo-American Corporation. We are also talking about Rossing Uranium, owned partly by the United Kingdom's Rio Tinto Zinc with other shareholdings held by French, West German, Canadian and South African corporations. We are talking about Tsumeb Corporations owned by Goldfield of South Africa, the United States firm Newmont Mining Corporation, the United Kingdom firms of Selection Trust, BP Minerals and South African companies. That is what we are talking about.

Minerals make up 85 per cent of Namibia's total exports, and virtually 100 per cent of mineral production leaves the country. However, in spite of the mining industry's crucial importance to the economy, the majority of poor Namibians get almost no benefit from this natural wealth. Most of the work force is not

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Namibian. The wages of Namibian workers and imported migrant blacks total about 10 per cent of the wealth produced. The differential of white to black wages is 5 to 1.

So we can dismiss any claim that might be made that development of the major industries brings benefit to the indigenous population. The sea off Namibia's coast contains a great variety of marine life, and in pre-occupation days fish provided a valuable source of protein for coastal communities. Now the inshore catch is exported mainly to South Africa, which ensures its own preferential access to the market. The fishing industry is managed by white businessmen and run by black crews. Six South African companies based principally at Walvis Bay own the initial processing industry and tinning, oil and meat extraction. The bulk of the offshore industry has been exploited and no benefit accrues to Namibia - certainly not to Namibians. Without its own national government, Namibia has not been able to secure an internationally accepted exclusive economic zone. So factory ships come and go at will. Inshore and offshore benefits go world-wide, but the poor Namibians gain nothing.

This situation repeats itself in the agricultural sector. Land appropriation has not only reduced black agriculture to today's low levels, but it has also forced thousands of impoverished blacks to work as labourers of white farmers.

I have just mentioned land appropriation. I read a quote recently by a Namibian which went as follows:

"When we lost our land, we lost our rights, our family way of life, our independence and our culture."

Both the colonial authorities and the Germans prior to 1915 and South Africa wanted Namibia for minerals and for white settler farmers. More than one-third of the country's total land surface is desert, and the majority of this barren land has been allocated to what are called homelands, a repetition of what exists in South Africa proper.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

And so in matters of land, wealth and labour the Namibian misses out. And what has this rape of a nation produced for Namibians in social services, in care for individuals, the very essence of good government? In education, illiteracy among black adults is about 60 per cent. Education for black children is not compulsory, as it is for white children. The ratio of expenditure between white and black is 5 to 1.

In health the mortality rate for black infants in Namibia is the highest in Africa. A black baby is seven times more likely to die in infancy than a white baby. Do we need to know or say more? Apartheid in health provisions, in hospitals, in clinics, in staff and in funds is everywhere apparent. Namibia is permanently occupied and claims about Namibia's being used as a base for the invasion of Angola are uncontested. In my delegation's view, the continued occupation of Namibia demonstrates a systematic theft of the birthright of the Namibian people. The foreign mining companies have just celebrated their fiftieth anniversary, but the toiling, sweating, oppressed Namibians have remained with nothing to celebrate. They have been deprived and discriminated against for too long. These have been 50 years of exploitation by over-mining and by oppression of the Namibian people.

In God's name, how long is this to go on? The United Nations and the Security Council have a sacred duty to end this wickedness at the earliest possible date, and my country, with yours, is committed to that noble task.

But how then shall we proceed? We have seen South Africa's opinion of the United Nations and its resolutions. Dialogue or the so-called constructive dialogue has made no change to apartheid. On the contrary, dialogue has entrenched South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. What is now left? What options remain? Is there any Member of the United Nations which can now say no to sanctions because they will ruin the chance for dialogue? And if there is, what,

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

I ask on behalf of my country, is the real value of United Nations solidarity? Are we speaking with one united voice? Can we all coexist when one or more Members refuse to accept the fact of an evil that will not simply go away by hoping to persuade South Africa to leave Namibia?

We are sometimes told that sanctions will be ineffective. But if so, if that be the case, why has South Africa tried to persuade its friends to oppose them? The truth is that sanctions half-heartedly applied will not work. We now know that sanctions against the Smith régime worked only partially because the then Southern Rhodesia had South Africa upon which to lean. Indeed, South Africa has successfully applied sanctions against its neighbours with whose Governments it did not agree.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

Again we are told that sanctions will harm the very people we are trying to help. That, as we know, is a patronizing and arrogant approach. The body of African opinion - except, perhaps, characters like Mangosuthu Buthelezi - has continued to call for sanctions. The argument that sanctions will harm the front-line States is again arrogant. The front-line States have already suffered an estimated \$8 billion in economic damage. The undeclared war has already cost 100,000 lives and probably resulted in 100,000 refugees. The idea in the Western world that sanctions will cause unemployment is grossly exaggerated. Figures have been bandied about but academic and research institutes have challenged these figures, and we know that the figures advanced in this argument are submitted mostly by industrialists who are also investors in South Africa.

One could go on destroying these arguments. Similarly, we are told that sanctions will drive white Afrikaners into the laager. That is not necessarily so. The Gleneagles agreement provided changes in their approach to non-racial sports, however superficial. The limited action taken by United States banks has produced a flurry of activity. That cannot be the reaction of a Government retreating into the laager. No Government wants to commit suicide - even the racist régime of South Africa. When the right pressure is applied, South Africa will succumb. It will come to the negotiating table.

Finally, we have been continually bombarded by propaganda that sanctions will increase violence. On the contrary, it has been the failure of the international community to intervene effectively on the side of freedom and justice that has led liberation movements to embark on the armed struggle. And so when we ask the Security Council to give its unanimous support to the draft resolution on comprehensive mandatory sanctions, we are convinced that only this course of action will produce results in a peaceful way.

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

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

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, your experience, discretion, diplomatic skill and political wisdom guarantee that this month the work of the Security Council will be successfully carried out in an atmosphere of calm and efficiency. Those are simple words, but they express our confidence in you, and my delegation is happy to see you presiding over these meetings of the Security Council - which are once again devoted to southern Africa - all the more so in view of your country's considerable contribution to the cause of peace and the liberation of peoples. I extend our warm congratulations to you and I wish to pay a sincere tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, for the discreet but very skilful and effective way in which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

I express my gratitude to you and the other members of the Council for having kindly allowed me to participate in the discussion on this question, the solution of which will undoubtedly show how devoted our Organization is to the cause of decolonization.

The question of Namibia is a particular aspect of the dangerous and explosive situation developing in southern Africa owing to the policy of apartheid, which seriously threatens the peace of the entire region and places world security in jeopardy.

Members of the Council are all too aware of the situation for me to have to describe it any further. Allow me simply to recall some facts.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

First, there is no need to demonstrate anew that a colonial situation exists in Namibia. Dispossessed of its lands and deprived of its political rights the people of Namibia has for 70 years been subjected to systematic discrimination in the fields of education, health care, social services and employment, as well as in all other aspects of its existence. Its natural resources are ruthlessly plundered by foreign economic interests, and harassment and persecution is its daily lot.

Pretoria has transformed the country into a vast military camp in order for its army of occupation and its police not only to smash the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people but also to commit acts of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring independent States. Hence all the necessary conditions for the establishment of a Fascist régime and State terrorism are present in Namibia.

That such a situation of tension and conflict should be allowed to go on endlessly is intolerable to all those who cherish peace, justice and human dignity.

South Africa's occupation of Namibia thus poses a challenge to all the principles to which civilized peoples are devoted and which they seek to defend: self-determination, racial equality and social justice - all noble principles on which our Organization is based. By perpetuating this odious and scandalous situation the leaders of South Africa have through their actions shown that they completely disregard morality and law.

Speaking in July 1986 at the International Conference for the Independence of Namibia, in Vienna, Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar stated:

"It is impossible not to understand that the Namibian people should feel deep frustration, resentment and impatience as they see the political evolution of their Territory."

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

At the first 1987 session of the United Nations Council for Namibia the Secretary-General went on to say:

"South Africa's intransigence cannot in any way be allowed to weaken our determination: Namibia is an especially important question for the United Nations, to which the international community is fully and unequivocally committed. It has been two decades since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, and South Africa must realize that the just and legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people cannot continue to be flouted without seriously damaging the longer-term interests of South Africa itself, as well as peace and stability in the whole region."

The growing interest of the international community in the decolonization of Namibia can be seen in the large number of meetings throughout the world confirming that the international consensus favourable to the cause of Namibia is consolidating.

Following upon those meetings, this current series of meetings of the Security Council comes at a time when the situation in Namibia shows no sign of positive evolution. And yet, in keeping with General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), Namibia is under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and through the United Nations Council for Namibia the Organization exercises legal administrative authority over the Territory until its independence.

In spite of the overwhelming majority supporting the General Assembly's decision and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, South Africa refused to co-operate with the Organization.

Nevertheless, the Security Council was able to adopt resolution 435 (1978) as the basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia by way of a carefully negotiated plan that laid down the modalities whereby the people of Namibia could decide on its own future through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

By what cruel quirk of fate has the Namibian people's legitimate desire for independence not yet been adequately met by the international community, despite the intensive efforts of the United Nations to implement General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which laid down the United Nations plan for Namibian independence?

By what miracle of history has the South African racist régime managed to continue with impunity its illegal occupation of this international Territory, notwithstanding the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and despite the powerful mobilization of international public opinion by the United Nations Council for Namibia for the independence of that Territory?

Pretoria's arrogance, intransigence and duplicity, its obvious desire to perpetuate apartheid and to continue to occupy Namibia illegally, as well as the criminal indulgence shown by some Powers, are perfect proof of all this. Neither the lessons of colonial history nor the human values recognized by all so-called civilized societies, nor the world-wide support for the Namibian cause seems to have inspired any change in the colonial policies of the apartheid régime. On the contrary, Pretoria keeps conjuring up new tricks and stratagems to prevent or delay as long as possible Namibia's independence, to continue the massive plunder of its resources and to thwart the international pressure for Namibia's decolonization.

The constant call for "linkage" by South Africa proceeds from a grave historical mistake to pass off the situation in Namibia, and generally in southern Africa, as a matter of East-West relations. We categorically reject all machinations to divert international public opinion from the main issue, the implementation of the Namibian people's aspirations to freedom, self-determination and national independence.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

The irrelevance of "linkage" has escaped neither the international community nor the Security Council. The South African minority régime believed it could weaken our vigilance by showing a supposed desire for negotiation by establishing an "interim government" in Namibia. The Council also adopted resolution 566 (1985), which confirmed its rejection of "linkage" and condemned South Africa because it established the so-called interim government and declared this action to be null and void.

It is important to note that by that resolution the Security Council, having declared that South Africa's installation of an "interim government" in Namibia was a direct affront to the Council and a challenge to its resolutions, in particular resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), and again warned South Africa that its refusal to co-operate in implementing resolution 435 (1978) would oblige the Council to meet immediately to consider the adoption of appropriate steps under the Charter, including the provisions of Chapter VII, in order to induce it to abide by United Nations resolutions.

We must say, however, that since the adoption of resolution 566 (1985), the South African minority régime has thrown caution to the winds and shown the international community that it intends to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia. The increased repression and militarization of the Territory, the plundering of its resources, and the acts of aggression against neighbouring countries continue to be the basis of a colonial policy which disregards the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, international pressure to implement comprehensive, binding sanctions, and the latest warnings of the Security Council.

Furthermore, by informing the Secretary-General of its refusal to change its position with regard to the electoral system and the "linkage" between Namibian

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops, Pretoria has clearly shown that it was not prepared to negotiate with the United Nations.

What greater proof do we need than the warnings issued by the Security Council in resolution 566 (1985), which have had no effect upon the intransigence, arrogance and colonialist appetite of the South African racist régime? What further evidence is needed in order to demonstrate that South Africa will continue its obdurate defiance of the United Nations as long as it enjoys the indulgence, complicity, and economic and military co-operation of certain Powers, and as long as some members of the Council thwart the imposition of binding, comprehensive sanctions against Pretoria under Chapter VII of the Charter?

For 20 years now, despite our professions of anti-colonialist faith and our firm denunciations and condemnations of South Africa's abject colonial policy, the Pretoria racist régime has continued with impunity its illegal occupation of Namibia. Certainly the selective sanctions adopted against South Africa by some Powers show a determination to exert pressure on that country in order to clear the way for the decolonization process in Namibia. However, the impact of those sanctions is not strong enough to weaken Pretoria's intransigence.

In my delegation's view, comprehensive, binding sanctions are now the best way to force South Africa to pay a high price for having occupied Namibia and to force it finally to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The argument that binding, comprehensive sanctions against South Africa would be politically ineffective and economically and socially harmful to the people of the region proceeds from the defence of the powerful economic and financial interests of the accomplices of Pretoria, which want to preserve their own development prospects in southern Africa. How can we comprehend the argument that sanctions are ineffective and harmful, when their supposed victims favour them?

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

There is no doubt that binding sanctions would isolate South Africa and therefore force the apartheid régime to abide by relevant United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia. Hence the Security Council must shoulder its responsibilities: it must impose sanctions and provide compensation for the possible economic and social sacrifices to be borne by the people of the region.

It is not enough to condemn the South African régime's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its policies and practices of apartheid, and other flagrant human rights violations or to demand an immediate end to these policies; it is not enough to denounce the detention and imprisonment of Namibians by the minority régime and to demand the unconditional release of all political prisoners in Namibia. It is not enough to denounce South Africa's massive militarization of the Territory, the establishment of compulsory military service for Namibians, the recruitment and forced training of Namibians in order to form tribal armies, and the recruitment of mercenaries and other foreign agents to carry out their repressive policies and external aggression.

Because it is defending a just cause under the responsible guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Namibian people is more determined than ever before to continue its struggle for national liberation. In order to achieve their legitimate aspirations to independence, the Namibians are ready not only to shed blood to defend themselves against their cruel adversary but also to cease their armed struggle if the South African racist régime is willing to end its violence and to engage in dialogue. Indeed, SWAPO has already declared its readiness to sign a cease-fire with Pretoria in order to launch the process of the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

The many demonstrations organized last year by SWAPO, despite the savage, orchestrated repression by the Pretorian troops, are the best possible proof of the unshakeable will of the anti-colonial resistance of the Namibian people. But as long as some members of the Security Council prevent the use of the only peaceful way to break Pretoria's intransigence, Namibia will continue to be a hotbed of tension, bloody confrontation and the source of conflagration in the region.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Persistent opposition to the imposition of binding sanctions against South Africa plays into the hands of the apartheid régime. On the one hand, that régime bends to its own account, in the form of political and economic blackmail, the argument that such action is ineffective, untimely and harmful. On the other hand, the régime takes comfort in the false conviction that the adoption of binding sanctions against it would be suicidal for the economy of its principal trading partners.

For that reason, my country believes that the rejection of sanctions is a dangerously complicitous attitude, a false dilemma and a dereliction of responsibility on the part of some members of the international community. That is also why, on behalf of the Government of Togo, I urgently appeal to the Security Council, and in particular to its permanent members, to vote in favour of the imposition of comprehensive, binding economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

For more than 20 years the racist régime of South Africa has sent to the international community the clear message that it does not intend to abide by the relevant decisions and resolutions of the United Nations. It is now time for it to be given a strong, responsible and logical response. Such a response must once and for all remind the racist régime of South Africa of the need for strict and unconditional compliance with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. To be properly understood, such a response must include the imposition of comprehensive, binding economic sanctions.

If we truly want to serve the cause of peace, we must make sure that the Namibian people are not forced to spill more blood in the achievement of an aspiration that is, for us and for them, beyond price.

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

(The President)

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

Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I should like at the outset, Sir, to extend warm congratulations to you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. Your country, Bulgaria, is well known for its devotion to the principles of the Charter. Thus we have high hopes that under your wise guidance the Council's deliberations on the important issue of Namibia will promote the cause of justice and peace in southern Africa.

I should also like to extend our congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, for the effectiveness and competence with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

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

In 1960, with the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the international community sought to put an end to the colonial era. Fifteen years earlier, the authors of the San Francisco Charter had proclaimed the need for the equality of nations and for the right of each people to self-determination. They entrusted the world Organization with a vanguard role in the decolonization process. Today, in spite of some success, the Organization has not completed the task it assumed. In some circumstances, and Namibia is a case in point, the Organization has demonstrated a strange lack of authority. This is all the more unfortunate, in that Namibia is a Territory for which the United Nations has assumed a special responsibility. Indeed, no other question taken up by our Organization has commanded so clear a consensus or been given such precise guidelines.

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

The question of Namibia is therefore a main priority, since the Organization has been especially responsible for it since 1966, when it decided to assume supervision over the Territory. With regard to Namibia, the consensus is clear. It was unanimously decided by Council members and it provides opportunities for a peaceful and just change, as set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Nine years after its adoption, resolution 435 (1978), the fruit of so many efforts, has not yet even begun to be implemented. Yet, and quite rightly, its adoption raised the hopes for a negotiated, just and peaceful solution to the problem. Those hopes, however, barely kept alive, have gradually faded owing to the obstinate arrogance of the Government of South Africa.

Nine years have passed during which the South African régime has increased its delaying tactics to thwart the United Nations plan and perpetuate its illegal occupation. Today, the hopes aroused by resolution 435 (1978) have faded and Namibia's accession to independence in serenity and peace seems to be seriously in jeopardy. In order to undermine the United Nations plan, the Government of South Africa has continually attempted to portray this question of pure and simple decolonization as an East-West conflict and to create a linkage, by a ploy as blatant as it is unacceptable, between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

In the meantime, the long list of South Africa's crimes has grown even longer. Thus, the Pretoria régime has endeavoured to step up its acts of massive repression and violence in a desperate attempt to put down the Namibian people's growing resistance to its domination. Rejecting a just, peaceful and negotiated settlement with the genuine representatives of the Namibian people, it has decreed a state of emergency and has used force and violence to detain thousands of militants in the struggle against apartheid and colonial domination.

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

Furthermore, the Pretoria régime has increased its acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring independent African countries. It is also trying to sow internal division, to plunder Namibia's natural and human resources and to use the Territory as a base for launching attacks against neighbouring countries.

Since 1976 the racist régime of South Africa has on many occasions attempted to impose a so-called government upon Namibia, a government lacking any representation but responding to its own interests and ideology. The latest political ploy was to establish in Namibia on 17 June 1985 a so-called interim government through a so-called multi-party conference. The establishment of that bogus government in Windhoek, a plan in direct contravention of the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), has been widely condemned by the international community.

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

Indeed, on 19 June 1985 the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), declaring, inter alia, that that action, taken even while the Security Council was in session, constituted a direct affront to the Council and clear defiance of its resolutions, particularly resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). The Council declared that action by South Africa to be illegal and null and void and stated that no recognition would be accorded to it by either the United Nations or any Member State or by any representative or organ established in pursuance thereof. It also demanded that South Africa immediately rescind that illegal and unilateral action.

At the time, the Secretary-General said that the establishment of an "interim government" in Namibia aroused grave doubts about the true intentions of the Government of South Africa to seek a solution to the problem of Namibia by implementing resolution 435 (1978) of the Council, which it had accepted.

Clearly, South Africa has no intention to abide by international law and withdraw from Namibia in the near future.

The Security Council and all Member States are obliged to react vigorously in the face of this challenge. We certainly realize the moral and political difficulty of having recourse to sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, but in this situation there seems to be no alternative.

South Africa's systematic refusal to adopt a reasonable position leaves us no other choice. We would refer here to what was said by the Group of Eminent Persons of the Commonwealth on the problem of apartheid:

"The weapon of economic sanctions alone can help us avoid the toll of human lives, which could run into the millions; in fact it could be the biggest blood-bath since the Second World War."

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

Tunisia would like once again to reaffirm that resolution 435 (1978) is the only acceptable basis for a peaceful negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. We urgently appeal to all those that have shown a certain indulgence towards South Africa to let their deeds match their words and convictions.

Those who have prevented the exertion of appropriate pressure on the South African Government to change the course of events certainly run the risk of bearing a very heavy responsibility before history: prolongation of the suffering of the Namibians and the South Africans, and further destabilization throughout southern Africa, which endangers the entire continent and ultimately world peace and security.

Tunisia is in total solidarity with the Namibian people and its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We are convinced that concerted international action to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa is the only way to bring about a peaceful change in that country's policy.

Given these circumstances, comprehensive mandatory sanctions are the only solution available to the United Nations, the only way to make matters clear, the only way to assert the authority of the United Nations and effectively and forcefully implement the provisions of the Charter.

Over the years SWAPO has always lived up to its historic mission despite the massive repression the Pretoria régime has exerted against its militants and its people. Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, defined the role and historic mission of that organization as follows:

"When, one day, a people writes the history of a free and independent Namibia, it will be said that SWAPO was firm where others hesitated and that it sacrificed itself to the sacred cause of liberation, where others made compromises."

(Mr. Mestiri, Tunisia)

Let us not be among those who make compromises and procrastinate when the aspects of this situation are so clear.

The African countries fully appreciate the correct attitudes of Council members, their willingness and their strong statements. But the time has come for strong action and determination. The Security Council and the permanent members will, we are convinced, live up to their responsibilities under the Charter and not shirk their obligations and run the risk of disappointing the hopes of the Namibian people and African peoples or of all those who believe in the freedom of peoples and the brotherhood of man.

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

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

Mr. Dos SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, first of all may I take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude for the privilege accorded me to address this important Council. I am sure that under your able leadership our discussion will be very fruitful. Bulgaria and Mozambique entertain the best of relations.

Allow me also to express my sincere appreciation to your predecessor for the way in which he presided over the Council during the month of March.

The convening of the Security Council on the question of Namibia is highly significant. It is the culmination of a series of international conferences convened last year on the question of Namibia, among them the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, the Eighth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations General Assembly special session on Namibia. A cursory examination indicates that those conferences achieved very important results which reflect the will and determination of the international community

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

to take immediate actions aimed at the eradication of apartheid and the attainment of independence by Namibia.

The importance of these meetings of the Council is emphasized by the grave development unfolding in southern Africa as a result of the South African racist régime's persistence in its policy and practices of apartheid, its illegal occupation of Namibia and the perpetration of repeated acts of aggression against the front-line States.

We meet once again in the Security Council to consider the critical question of Namibia. The Namibian question has been with us for more than four decades, covering the entire span of this Organization's life, and yet there is no hopeful sign of any change in Pretoria's intransigent arrogance.

Two decades ago the United Nations determined that racist South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal and terminated its mandate over that Territory. That decision led to the establishment of the Council for Namibia as the only legitimate authority to administer the Territory.

For its part, the International Court of Justice has declared that the continued occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa is illegal and constitutes a violation of international law.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Admittedly, the Council has been unable to carry out its mandate. The responsibility lies with the intransigence and arrogance of the racist Pretoria régime and the support it enjoys from certain Western countries.

When the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) following intensive consultations with all the parties concerned, including the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Namibia's sole, legitimate representative, and the South African régime, hopes ran high that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations would be held for the whole of Namibia and that this would culminate in Namibia's independence. Such expectations are still to be fulfilled.

Through dilatory manoeuvres, racist South Africa has persistently stalled Namibia's independence process. The minority régime's insistence on linking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is nothing more than a vain effort to introduce extraneous issues in order to retain control over Namibia and to continue to enjoy economic and strategic benefits from the occupation of that Territory.

Namibia's independence and the presence of foreign troops in Angola - at the invitation of the legitimate Government of that country - are two unrelated issues, and linking them cannot be used to delay even further Namibian independence. Cuban troops are in Angola at the invitation of the Government of Angola to help, defend the country against racist South Africa's invasions, as envisaged in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. On the other hand, the independence of Namibia is organically linked to decolonization and must be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Namibia must be decolonized and its people given their birthright of mastery over their own destiny.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Lately the situation within Namibia has dramatically worsened. The racist South African régime has turned the country into a huge concentration camp. Arbitrary arrests, torture, the wanton killing of defenceless civilians and the assassination of patriots are everyday occurrences in the lives of the Namibian people. The militarization of society is another reality in Namibia. To hold down a population of 1.5 million, the racist régime has deployed more than 100,000 troops in the Territory. Racist South Africa has stationed in Namibia some of the most sophisticated weapons to be found in the entire African continent. The racist régime has been using the Territory as a laboratory to test its new weapons.

The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime has been costly to the Namibian people in terms of the persistent plunder and depletion of the Territory's natural resources. That exploitation persists unabated despite the enactment in September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

Despite strong opposition by the international community, the racist régime continues its attempts to impose a so-called internal solution through the establishment of what it calls an interim government. Such attempts are aimed at excluding the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO, from the process of self-determination, and at imposing a puppet régime which would ensure racist South Africa's colonial domination of Namibia and the unhampered exploitation of Namibia's natural resources in the future.

Namibia has been systematically used by the racist South African régime as a launching pad for its aggression against and subversion of neighbouring States, particularly Angola.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

It has been stressed again and again that racist South Africa could not act so arrogantly were it not for the massive political, economic, military and diplomatic assistance it receives from some Western countries. The unwise and unwarranted use of the veto by certain members of the Security Council whenever concrete and effective measures aimed at resolving the question of Namibia are proposed has been interpreted in Pretoria as a green light for the continuation of its colonial policies in that Territory, of apartheid and of its aggressive policy against neighbouring countries.

Moreover, this assistance has enabled racist South Africa to build a huge, modern but repressive apparatus which it uses not only to suppress the suffering people of Namibia and South Africa but also to carry out its crusade of terrorism against its neighbours. Due to the violation by certain countries of the arms embargo imposed against racist South Africa, that country has become a significant producer and exporter of weapons of war. It is believed that with the help of certain Western countries racist South Africa has been able to acquire significant technical know-how and is now capable of producing nuclear weapons. There is no need to mention the danger that poses, for the record of racist South Africa's behaviour - or, I should say, misbehaviour - speaks for itself.

The economic assistance given South Africa not only enables it to sustain the criminal policy of apartheid but also finances South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its war of aggression against neighbouring States.

How much longer must the Namibian people suffer and make sacrifices for their freedom? Patience has worn thin. The international community must now, more than ever before, adopt all available measures in a more concerted and resolute manner finally to ensure freedom for the Namibian people.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Peoples from all around the world are openly manifesting their deep-rooted indignation against apartheid, the illegal occupation of Namibia and armed aggression against and subversion of neighbouring countries. The tide of time favours freedom, justice and democracy for both Namibia and South Africa.

This Council was not convened in order to repeat what has been said several times. The struggling people of Namibia look to these meeting of the Council for something different, something that will reassure them that the international community as a whole is with them. Messages of solidarity are not enough. Something new must be done. Now is the time for deeds, not mere words. A country that defies the will of the whole international community must not remain unpunished. It has already been recognized that racist South Africa is not a peace-loving country and that its apartheid policies constitute a threat to international peace and security. There can be no doubt that the South African régime is and will remain a constant source of injustice and violence in the southern African region.

The United Nations Charter contains explicit provisions, not made use of thus far, on the measures to which the world Organization can resort if world peace and security are threatened or violated or if constant aggression occurs. Let the Security Council send a clear and unambiguous message.

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

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

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): Permit me at the very outset to congratulate you wholeheartedly, Comrade Boris Tsvetkov, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We are confident that, as a representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which is closely and fraternally allied with the German Democratic Republic, you will use all your rich experience and great diplomatic skills to guide this body in the interest of a just settlement of the question of Namibia, and we wish you success in the discharge of your responsible office, to the benefit of the cause of the oppressed Namibian people. We respect you as an outstanding representative of your country who, with all the vigour at his command, has always stood for the national and social liberation of the peoples.

Our appreciation goes also to the representative of Argentina, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, for leading the Council last month.

My delegation would like to thank you, Comrade President, and the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to explain the position of the German Democratic Republic on the situation in Namibia.

We regard this series of meetings, convened on the request of the Group of African States and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as indeed urgent and timely. And we make our voice heard here because we are deeply concerned, as is the majority of States, over the aggravation of the situation in southern Africa. The policy of State terrorism in South Africa itself and against neighbouring States, the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia and the escalation of the murderous campaign against the Namibian people constitute more than ever before a threat to peace and international security.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, has impressively analysed the situation in Namibia and, with many shocking facts, has demonstrated the criminal policy of Pretoria. The apartheid régime is able to pursue such a policy only because it knows that the most reactionary and aggressive circles of imperialism are at its side. And there still exist forces that, against all better judgement, insist - with their so-called constructive engagement - on so-called linkage, which has been condemned and disqualified throughout the world. They are supported practically by those who help to prevent the taking of decisive measures against South Africa, be it here at the United Nations or in other international organizations.

Those are the obstacles which bar the road to the granting of independence to Namibia on the basis of United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), because they encourage the obstructionist attitude of Pretoria. No solemn affirmations or half-hearted measures can hide that fact. What the Namibian people needs is not a policy of double standard, not vetoes or negative votes in the Security Council, but clear-cut decisions conducive to a just solution of the question of Namibia.

South Africa's undeclared war of aggression against the Namibian people claims innocent victims every day. The militarization of the Territory has assumed extreme dimensions. The racists have an army of 100,000 men in Namibia. In addition, there are hired mercenaries. Every day more than 10 civilians are killed by the occupants, not to speak of the untold suffering, which weighs heavily on the oppressed population, caused by the continued acts of terror and the application of the apartheid legislation; and not to speak of the systematic and immensely profitable exploitation of the country's riches by the racists and their allies. Is it just a coincidence that the respective transnational corporations come from

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

those Western countries which have so far prevented the taking of any effective steps to end the illegal occupation? What we have in Namibia today is nothing else than typical colonialism, condemned in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - colonialism with all its inherent disastrous consequences and aggravated to the extreme by the peace-threatening and inhuman nature of apartheid. From Namibia the torch of war is carried into the neighbouring People's Republic of Angola and other front-line States.

For the second time this year, the Security Council is dealing in a broad debate with questions of southern Africa, and the apartheid régime is in the pillory.

In 1986 three important international conferences were devoted to this problem, two of them specifically to the question of Namibia. One is justified to ask: how long will such activities continue unabated until success is achieved at last? After all, it is generally agreed that there can be neither peace nor stability or security in southern Africa as long as there is apartheid. Ways for solving this conflict have repeatedly been advocated and approved by the overwhelming majority of States. With regard to Namibia this means the resolute rejection of all manoeuvres to prevent the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). This includes so-called internal settlements as well as the maintenance of so-called linkage. The rejection of the linkage pre-condition is contained in a clear form in the report of the Secretary-General in document S/18767 on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). My delegation fully shares the position expressed in that report.

However, one thing has long since become clear. The time for appeals is over. What is required is the co-ordination of united international actions by the Security Council.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

The German Democratic Republic supports the demand of the non-aligned countries for increased international pressure on South Africa, including the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions are indeed an efficient means to force the racists to respect the norms of international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions and thus the will of the international community. In my statement before this body on 18 February I explained my country's position on this question in detail.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

So long as this goal has not been reached, so long as the Security Council has not vigorously implemented its resolutions on the question of Namibia, there is but one choice for the Namibian people: it will continue on all fronts its hard, bitter and heroic struggle to implement its right to self-determination and gain independence for its country. Its sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), has left us in no doubt about that.

My delegation would like also to take this opportunity to assure SWAPO and the entire Namibian people in their just struggle of the unreserved solidarity of the people and Government of the German Democratic Republic in the future.

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

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 this afternoon at 3.30 sharp. I would urge members of the Council to be here on time so that we can start our meeting promptly.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.