



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

APR 14 1987

S/PV.2746
9 April 1987

UN COLLECTION

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 9 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. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. PABON GARCIA
Mr. MFULA

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 10.30 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, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with a decision taken at the 2740th meeting, I invite Mr. Gurirab to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Uganda, 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. Cesar (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Kibedi (Uganda) took the places reserved for them 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.

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

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): It has been said that repetition is the mother of all learning. If this be true, then by now the illegal régime in South Africa would certainly have been taught an unforgettable lesson on the necessity for hastening the freedom and independence of Namibia. Such, however, is the obduracy of Pretoria that the international community and, more particularly, this Council, is obliged to reiterate its well-known arguments in the hope - perhaps a vain one - that these latter-day colonialists would listen to the voice of reason and relinquish their savage rule of Namibia.

My delegation has not entirely lost faith in the art of verbal persuasion, Mr. President, and is therefore grateful to the members of the Council for allowing it to join in the general clamour for change in Namibia. It would be remiss of me, however, to do so before extending to you our warm congratulations and good wishes for your presidency during this month. I would also like to add a word of tribute to your immediate predecessor in office, Ambassador Delpech of Argentina.

In approaching this issue before us I must confess to a sense of discomfiture because of the insinuation I have heard that our deliberations are perhaps seen by some as being no more than an out-of-season General Assembly debate. It would be a pity if this were indeed so, since the fact of the matter is that these meetings have been long overdue and cannot be said to be a waste of the Council's time. The freedom of the Namibian people is an imperative which we, as responsible members of the international community, can neither ignore nor postpone. It is an aspiration which must, in fact, be satisfied quickly, since every passing day renders it more difficult to fulfil. The Council must therefore seize this occasion to advance the Namibian cause in whatever way it possibly can.

For delaying the independence of Namibia can only serve the selfish interests of the racist régime in South Africa, since it permits not only the further entrenchment of apartheid but also the continuing exploitation of the Territory's significant natural resources. Sooner or later, the Namibian nation will be

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

robbed of its rich legacy and left to inherit a virtually wasted land. The world cannot stand idly by and watch this pathetic degradation of an entire people by a despotic minority intent on preserving its own position of dominance and control. It must act swiftly to end this inequity and to assist Namibia to exercise the sovereignty to which it is fully entitled.

The Council for Namibia, as the legal custodian of the Territory, has made a very significant attempt to frustrate Pretoria's rapacious policies. With the enactment of Decree No. 1, it has asserted itself as the Authority responsible for the welfare of Namibia and ready to act on its behalf. The validity of that Decree, we are informed, will shortly be tested in the courts of some States Members of the United Nations. At least one Government that we know of - that of The Netherlands - has already accepted the competence of the Council to legislate in matters of concern to the people of Namibia. We welcome that positive declaration, which inspires confidence that international law will assuredly come down on the side of justice for the exploited.

At this stage it would be eminently useful, we feel, if the Security Council, in its final pronouncement on the question of Namibia, could give its blessing to this development and, indeed, to the provision by the United Nations body of financing for legal action of this kind. For, if successful, such a campaign could deal an effective blow to the forces of apartheid who use unscrupulous economic power to maintain their suzerainty over the Namibian people. It could, moreover, be aimed at compensating the dispossessed for the loss of the resources which are rightfully theirs and at discouraging, at least to some degree, the reckless plunder practised by some transnational companies operating in Namibia.

Legal procedures alone are not likely, however, to bring about the early independence of Namibia, and we must therefore be prepared to contemplate all other measures which seem capable of compelling the Botha régime to abandon the vicious

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

stranglehold which it maintains over the Territory. Certainly, among such instruments of persuasion comprehensive and mandatory sanctions are perhaps the most powerful at our disposal and should therefore be rapidly implemented. There can be no more talk, I venture to say, especially after the Council's consideration of the South African question last February, of a compromise on selective sanctions, since it would appear that even that limited form of pressure does not find general acceptance. My delegation therefore has no option but to support the demand for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions to be applied against the illegal South African régime. Admittedly, such a call may not be heeded by all States, but let the chips fall where they will.

In the face of mounting opposition, we find that Pretoria displays a most impudent defiance, employing unbelievable casuistry to justify a basically untenable position. It clings to the pretence, if one is to accept the asseveration of South Africa's spokesman in this forum, that Namibia would be granted independence once Cuban troops are removed from Angola. That facile declaration fools no one, since the régime knows full well that the linkage it has artificially created in its own mind does not exist in the minds of others. It must also know that the removal of those troops will simply provide carte blanche for launching further aggression against the front-line States from an occupied Namibia. We regret to say, therefore, that Pretoria's contention on this issue lacks credibility and cannot therefore be taken seriously. For even if the troops were to leave forthwith, it is highly possible that some other pretext would be conjured up to rationalize their presence in the Territory.

However, perhaps the most specious argument advanced by Pretoria is that it is actively promoting constitutional reform that would satisfy the requirements of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and guarantee the independence and welfare of the Namibian people. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as the

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

recognized representative of the people of Namibia, however, is obviously not impressed by these assurances and has made it clear that this political masquerade is totally unacceptable to it. There can, in fact, be only one path now to Namibia's independence, and this is already charted in resolution 435 (1978). Any manoeuvre to deviate from that route must therefore be rejected for what it is: another ploy by the South African régime to obstruct the purposes of the United Nations. This body must accordingly reinforce its earlier determination and go further to ensure that no obstacles are put in the way of Namibia's independence. In this connection my delegation is highly appreciative of the efforts of the Secretary-General to break the current impasse and would like to commend him in his pursuit of those efforts.

It is to be hoped that, on this occasion, the Security Council, to which has been entrusted the preservation of peace and security in the world, will take a unified stand against Pretoria's continuing abuse of power and endorse the draft resolution before it. Regrettably, in the past the veto of one or more members of the Council has effectively blocked concerted action against the régime. The people of Namibia cannot understand this division, for, traditionally, in the face of colonial domination, they have seen value only in unity.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

In the words of the battle song of the Hereros, one of the ancient Namibian tribes which were also in their time the victims of colonialism, we find this most stirring call for peace:

"Listen when the song of the frogs
Resounds from the marshes;
Listen to what they have to say.
It is good to come together;
It is good to reach agreement;
It is good to make the voices of many
The single voice of all."

It is a call to which this Council cannot turn a deaf ear, for if it does the battle for Namibia's independence will then be fully joined, and we cannot then pretend to speak of peace.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Guyana for the congratulations he addressed to me.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): Sir, I know your country and your diplomatic service well, so it gives me special pleasure to see such an accomplished diplomat as yourself occupying the high office of President of the Security Council. I know that you bring to your important task skill, wisdom and long experience. My delegation looks forward to co-operating with you in the work of the Council.

At the same time, I should like to thank and congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech of Argentina, for the skilful and professional manner in which he discharged his responsibilities as President of the Council last month.

This has been a long and serious debate, a debate in which every speaker has condemned the continued South African occupation of Namibia. The United Kingdom joins that unanimous condemnation. Namibia has been an acknowledged international

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

responsibility for over 60 years. Its future has been debated in one United Nations forum or another, virtually since the Organization's inception. It is now over eight years since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) endorsing a settlement plan for the Territory which includes the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration and the holding of free elections under the auspices of the United Nations. The implementation of that resolution is long overdue. The people of Namibia must be allowed to exercise their right of self-determination and to proceed to internationally recognized independence.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has not been implemented because of the delaying tactics of the South African Government. I very much hope that it will reconsider what its best interests are. As the admirable report presented to us by the Secretary-General makes clear, agreement has now been reached on all the main elements of the settlement plan. South Africa must understand that the introduction of new and extraneous issues, such as the so-called theory of linkage, is not acceptable to my Government, nor, I believe, to the great majority of the international community.

The British Government's objective is clear: we want Namibia to achieve internationally recognized independence at the earliest time and by the most peaceful means. We have repeatedly told the South African Government that it must implement resolution 435 (1978). We have recently stressed this view to them again. Any attempt to repudiate the settlement plan would be extremely serious. I wish to emphasize this point in view of the remarks made by Ambassador Manley at the conclusion of his speech which suggested that South Africa might seek some other course for Namibia.

The long delay in bringing about the independence of the Territory has distressed our friends in Africa. It has caused no less distress to us and we

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

sympathize with the frustration felt by many speakers, as so eloquently expressed by the representative of Zambia. The United Kingdom joined with other members of the Contact Group - three of which are represented at this table today - in elaborating the United Nations settlement plan. I was, therefore, particularly sad to hear the representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) suggest that this exercise was

"a carefully contrived strategem ... to stop ... [the] radicalization of the situation in southern Africa". (S/PV.2740, p. 38)

Nothing could be further from the truth. The Contact Group conducted long and complex negotiations aimed only at bringing independence to Namibia. It does no service to the people of Namibia, nor to their cause, to distort that record. Like the other authors of the settlement plan, the United Kingdom has repudiated any attempt to circumvent resolution 435 (1978) through an internal settlement. That resolution remains the only internationally accepted basis for a Namibia settlement, and as such it is something that this Council should be careful to preserve. South Africa must accept that there is no future in a policy of clinging to the Territory or of delaying implementation of the settlement plan. South Africa must also accept that it is in its own best interests, as well as those of the people of Namibia, to co-operate in bringing Namibia to independence as once.

Unfortunately, South African support for the so-called Transitional Government of National Unity has continued. For our part, we cannot endorse any attempt to accord recognition or status to this body. We do not and shall not recognize it. We remain firmly committed to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have noted the request made by the Multi-Party Conference of Namibia that it, and/or the individual parties making the request, should be permitted to participate in the Council's discussion. We have consistently maintained, and shall continue to

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

maintain, that the Security Council should be impartial in providing opportunities to address it to all those individuals who may contest the elections to be held in Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), elections which we should all like to see take place as soon as possible. However, rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure states that only "members of the Secretariat or other persons whom it considers competent for the purpose" can be invited to address it. This means that organizations, such as the Multi-Party Conference, should nominate individuals to speak for them. The Multi-Party Conference has not done so, and it is not possible for us to support their request.

A further most disturbing development is that South African armed attacks on neighbouring States, particularly Angola, have continued. These activities must cease forthwith. It is a matter of very considerable regret to my delegation that the Council's repeated calls upon South Africa completely to withdraw its forces from Angola and to respect that country's sovereignty have gone unheeded, as have our warnings that acts of force cannot but undermine the prospects for peace and stability in southern Africa. We recently expressed to the South African Government our concern at continued South African violation of Angolan territory and urged it to respect Angola's territorial integrity. At the same time we also expressed our disquiet at recent evidence which has emerged from the current trial of SWAPO members in Windhoek of human rights abuses by the security forces in Namibia. During our debate on South Africa in February, the South African representative said that his Government was striving to put an end to violence. I hope that his Government will give practical effect to that declaration of peaceful intent not only in South Africa and Namibia but throughout the region. We utterly condemn violence from whatever quarter.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

Listening to this debate I have been struck by its similarity in many ways to the debate we had about South Africa in February. The two situations are, of course, different: South Africa, however much one may condemn its Government's policies, is an independent State. Namibia is the responsibility of the international community. In both cases, however, we are completely agreed on our objective. Where we do not see eye to eye is on the means to achieve it. On 19 February we emphasized the need for the Council to think carefully about how best it can contribute to solving the difficult and complex problems that exist in South Africa. The same arguments apply with even greater force to the question of Namibia. We should avoid sterile political exchanges which will only give comfort to those who oppose a Namibia settlement.

But if we are to be effective we must act unanimously. The United Nations has a special responsibility in respect of Namibia and, as we said in the Council on 15 November 1985, the British Government would have been prepared to vote for a resolution which included a considerable list of non-mandatory economic measures designed to exert pressure on South Africa to withdraw immediately from the Territory. My Government cannot, however, vote for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Measures of this sort would be counter-productive, giving South Africa the excuse to remain intransigent. The sponsors of the draft resolution have sadly missed an opportunity to arm the Secretary-General with the weight of the Council's unanimous concern in continuing his mission of good offices.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Francis Meli, a member of the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and editor-in-chief of Sechaba, the official organ of the ANC, to whom the Council

(The President)

extended an invitation under article 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2745th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MELI: In the year of advance to people's power, the year of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the African National Congress (ANC), our leadership, general membership, the entire oppressed and struggling people of South Africa, and our delegation here, salute all the members of the Council and extend a special salute to the heroic and fraternal people of Namibia and their sole, authentic representative, our sister national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Mr. President, your country's distinguished tradition of active dedication to the ideals of freedom, peace and progress speaks eloquently for itself. The fact that you represent such a tradition, coupled with your vast experience and proved diplomatic skills, more than assures our delegation that the important work of the Security Council, under your able and dedicated stewardship, cannot but move forward.

We are, of course, most indebted and would like to convey our admiration, appreciation and gratitude to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech for the exemplary effectiveness with which he led the work of the Council during the month of March.

Literally every resolution of the United Nations has drawn attention to the fact that there was a mounting crisis in southern Africa and that the grave situation in that region was rapidly deteriorating as a result of the policy and practices of apartheid and the Pretoria racist régime's continued illegal occupation of Namibia. For the people of Namibia and South Africa and the peoples of the front-line and other neighbouring independent African States, that mounting crisis, that deteriorating situation, is already smouldering into flames, if not

(Mr. Meli)

already exploding. From the distance of outer space it is possible to continue referring to apartheid as a threat to international peace and security. For the people of southern Africa, for men and women of conscience everywhere, apartheid means death, destruction and war on an ever-expanding scale. How else can we interpret apartheid's domestic reign of violent State terror, its acts of wanton aggression, economic blackmail, sabotage and political subversion and destabilization of independent neighbouring States, and its conversion of Namibia into a vast military barracks cum concentration camp for the purpose of raping and plundering the natural wealth of the country and keeping its people captive? How else can we interpret the fact that this inhuman and criminal enterprise counts among its victims and casualties not only hundreds of thousands of men and women but also a rapidly increasing number of infants and children?

The chronic unworkability of apartheid, and the ungovernability of South Africa, as a result of the mass united actions of our people in the relentless advance of our struggle led by the ANC and its allies, is paralleled by the all-round escalation of the struggle of the Namibian people led by SWAPO. Both have forced the Pretoria racist régime to shed even its pretence of democracy and to resort, like all repressive régimes beset with irreversible crisis, to the use of outright military might in order to perpetuate itself. Yet the militarization of apartheid and its escalating war against the people of South Africa, Namibia and southern Africa has failed to reverse the advance of our struggle. It has inadvertently succeeded in further steeling our determination to free ourselves by all necessary means as soon as possible. The problem is not whether or not we can rid ourselves of apartheid. The question is: when will it happen and at what cost in terms of human lives needlessly lost and property senselessly destroyed?

(Mr. Meli)

We are most indebted to the majority of previous speakers who contributed to both the necessary facts and relevant analysis. We are particularly grateful for the Secretary-General's report on his selfless and relentless efforts to seek the co-operation of all interested parties in the quest for implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), with a view to achieving the decolonization of Namibia without further delay. It is also our good fortune to have had the opportunity of listening to the urgent, incisive and realistic interventions by Ambassador Gbeho, speaking on behalf of the African Group, Ambassador Dingi Zuze, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and Comrade Theo Ben Guirarab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO. They have all individually and collectively helped blaze the trail in terms of where the problem lies and of necessary actions which alone can break the impasse in which the struggle for Namibian independence seems to be trapped.

(Mr. Meli)

The problem is clear enough, despite the Pretoria racist régime's endless attempts to confuse the issue. The people of Namibia, like all other people, have an inalienable right to freedom and self-determination. The issue of Namibian freedom must be treated as primary, and not as an adjunct to other issues such as linkage, which must be rejected because they are by definition extraneous and irrelevant. It must also be reaffirmed that the presence of Cuban internationalist troops in the People's Republic of Angola at the invitation of the legitimate Government of that country falls perfectly and most comfortably with the sovereign competence of the People's Republic of Angola. It is apartheid which is the antithesis of the natural rights of the people. It is apartheid which continuously violates the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of independent countries. It is apartheid which is violating international norms and continues illegally to occupy Namibia as well as parts of southern Angola. That is the culprit that needs to be dealt with.

Apartheid is now 39 years old. During that time apartheid has proved - by violating international law and fundamental human values or by ignoring international opinion - that it is indeed synonymous with criminal inhumanity, unrepentance and defiant intransigence, all of which are oblivious and impervious to reason and benign persuasion. As apartheid's murderously criminal career proceeds apace, spreading and intensifying its deadly embrace, it becomes more and more obviously urgent to eradicate this crime against humanity.

The chief obstacle in this direction proceeds from the unspoken and inhuman but nevertheless very real assumption that Namibia as well as South Africa ought to be kept as the economic cornucopia of the Western democracies, notwithstanding the fact that this translates into the prolongation of the oppression and exploitation of the people of those countries. It is this criminal assumption which is the

(Mr. Meli)

basis of the policy of "constructive engagement" as well as the policies of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's and Chancellor Kohl's Governments towards Namibia and South Africa.

What we wish to point out is that the policies of these Western Governments towards Namibia and South Africa are extremely short-sighted, hinged as they are on the false hope that apartheid will go on for ever. They amount literally to an investment in bad faith because without failure they solicit the anger of the people of Namibia and South Africa - people with a memory, people to whom the future of those countries belongs. It is only natural to expect that we will remember those who treated us as nothing but fuel for the engines of their economic greed. It is equally important that we say that we would rather the entire international community acted in concert and honestly in the quest for a just and lasting solution to the problem of apartheid and its illegal occupation of Namibia. In this respect the path lies in the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria racist régime.

We will be told again that sanctions will hurt the very people we are trying to help. The fact, however, is that nothing can hurt us more than apartheid and its prolongation. Nothing hurts us more than the non-implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). Besides, no real freedom, not even American freedom, was won without sacrifice.

We will also be told that sanctions will destroy the South African economy. The fact, however, is that the life blood of apartheid is its economy and that therefore to take action against apartheid must inevitably mean taking action against its economy. The Pretoria racist régime knows this, and that is why it has declared advocacy of sanctions a crime almost tantamount to treason.

(Mr. Meli)

The people of Namibia and South Africa continue to ask for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, fully aware that this will entail some, perhaps extra, hardships. We also know that sanctions will dissipate the strength of apartheid even more and, for us, extra suffering will simply be the necessary price of bringing our oppression and exploitation to an early end. Those who honestly want to help us will heed our call and act accordingly.

We wish to thank the Secretary-General for the time and energy and resources he continues unremittingly to devote to the quest for the decolonization of Namibia. We also wish to thank the United Nations Council for Namibia, and especially its dynamic President, His Excellency Dingi Zuze, for their continuing efforts to mobilize ever increasing international support for the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

We also thank all those countries which individually or multilaterally have adopted packages of sanctions against the Pretoria racist régime. Our ardent hope, which is also our appeal, is that in the interest of enhanced effectiveness they will lend their unequivocal support for comprehensive mandatory sanctions at these meetings of the Security Council.

It is with deep feeling that we also wish to reaffirm our principled and unflinching solidarity with the struggle of the heroic people of Namibia and their great national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

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

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I wish to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Tsvetkov, on his assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. I am certain that under

(Mr. Walters, United States)

his fair and efficient guidance the Council will conduct its business with equity and dispatch.

I also wish to pay tribute to the President of the Security Council for March, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Delpach, under whose able leadership this Council performed its work.

The United States welcomes this debate on Namibia. Nearly a year and a half have elapsed since the Council last met on this issue. Nearly 10 years have passed since the passage of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), on which we have all pinned so many hopes. In that time we have advanced to the point where the implementation of 435 (1978) would appear to be within our grasp. All that is needed is the will on both sides to make this happen.

The problem we are debating in this Chamber stems from the fact that South Africa has no right to be in Namibia, no right to control the domestic and foreign policies of a land whose people aspire to independence, and no right to use it as a platform from which to violate the borders of neighbouring States. My Government has repeatedly and clearly made known its views on this matter.

The United States remains engaged in efforts to bring independence to Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The South African announcement of 1 August 1986 as a date to commence implementation of resolution 435 (1978) - provided prior agreement could be reached on Cuban troop withdrawal - offered a critical opportunity to achieve Namibian independence. We regret that, as yet, Angola has not responded to this opportunity. For our part, we have consistently reiterated that we are prepared to resume substantive discussions with Luanda on how to achieve a settlement based on resolution 435 (1978). We take note of recent indications that the Angolans themselves see the wisdom of returning to the

(Mr. Walters, United States)

negotiating table, which offers them their only serious hope for lasting peace. We are pleased that after a 15-month hiatus the Angolan Government has shown a readiness to resume talks on how to achieve a settlement.

As a practical matter, both Angolan and South African security concerns centring on Namibia must be dealt with to obtain an overall settlement. These concerns exist. They must be confronted if we are to achieve the results we seek under resolution 435 (1978). In the plataforma proposal contained in their November 1984 letter to the United Nations Secretary-General, the Angolans themselves accepted the reality that Namibian independence could be achieved only in the context of a Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

The United States continues to believe that until Angola and South Africa can agree on a schedule for the phased withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola in connection with South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia, it is wishful thinking to expect South Africa to commence implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Concern over the role of Namibia in terms of Angola's and South Africa's security, as the United States has often stated in the past, is not an artificial concept imposed from outside. Namibia's security is inextricably linked to both Angola and South Africa. The mutual security of these States involves the presence of tens of thousands of foreign troops in that region.

This reality ineluctably ties events in Angola to the situation in Namibia. In this regard, the United States deeply regrets the fact that Mr. Castro, at the Harare non-aligned summit last December, attempted to tie events to a still broader context. He manufactured a new form of linkage that cannot have been welcomed by either Angolans or Namibians when he asserted that Cuban troops would remain in Angola until apartheid was extinguished in South Africa.

We want apartheid ended now and will lead the international chorus of approval when that happens. But statements such as Mr. Castro's simply bolster the South Africa assertion that Cuban forces in Angola are a threat to South Africa's security and, thereby, underscore the practical requirement that they be removed in order to persuade Pretoria to grant Namibians the secure independence they seek. Moreover, one wonders whether the Havana Government is not simply seeking fresh justification for a distant overseas military adventure that is far from popular in Africa or at home.

In short, the endless debate over the "inadmissibility" of relating events in Namibia and Angola is fruitless and should be recognized as such.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions as well as Non-Aligned Movement declarations relating to Namibia have proved unhelpful to achieving the peaceful implementation of resolution 435 (1978). They have condemned linkage despite the Angolan proposal referred to above. They have declared SWAPO the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people", an assertion disputed by many other Namibians and one that flies in the face of democratic principles. They have criticized the United States by name, despite the fact that singling out particular countries for adverse criticism in resolutions is contrary to the established custom in the United Nations and contrary to the expressed wishes of all for a negotiated resolution of the problems besetting the southern African region.

I should include a practice that my Government finds especially inadmissible and heinous: making threats to those States that have seen fit to break away from the pack and that refuse to go along with the gratuitous name-calling. That these States subsequently be subjected to pressures of one sort or another for following the dictates of their own principles is outrageous, and my Government assures all States that may find themselves in such a position of its full support.

In the same spirit, we reject any efforts to legitimate the armed struggle by means of United Nations resolutions or by any appeals or support to so-called armed struggle, as a perilous call to arms in a volatile region.

I also wish to note the request made by the Multi-Party Conference of Namibia to the President of the Security Council that they be permitted to participate in our deliberations under rule 39 of this body's provisional rules of procedure. A request to address the Council by a person who might have information to supply, regardless of his political affiliation, should be granted sympathetic consideration. It is important that this Council be, and be seen to be, capable of impartiality in order for all concerned to be able to rely upon it. This is

(Mr. Walters, United States)

central to resolution 435 (1978). The United States believes it is important for the Security Council to have direct access to all the viewpoints from Namibia. The request presented to the President and several other members of the Council is, however, defective because it was sent by and on behalf of the secretariat of the Multi-Party Conference, an entity that comprises the so-called Transitional Government of National Unity. In this case, and with no prejudice to the Council hearing persons otherwise competent, the United States believes the Council is not obliged to consider favourably the request of the Multi-Party Conference as such to speak before us. Were it not for the procedural defects of the request of the Multi-Party Conference, the United States would be inclined to recommend it be accorded favourable consideration.

The views of the United States towards mandatory sanctions against South Africa, whether in the context of apartheid or Namibia, are well known. We remain flatly opposed for the same reasons we have outlined so often in detail, most recently on 20 February 1987 during the Security Council debate on mandatory limited sanctions. The United States believes each Member nation should remain free to enact or to alter the policies it deems most appropriate, including sanctions, as we all pursue our common goal of bringing independence to Namibia as rapidly and peacefully as possible. In this connection, the United States has applied the full range of sanctions enacted by the Congress last year not only to South Africa but to Namibia as well. Nevertheless, we remain convinced that mandatory sanctions imposed by this body would seriously limit the initiative of nations, such as the United States, that seek to bring about South Africa's implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Mandatory sanctions would complicate and frustrate the achievement of this goal. The United States does not accept the right of others in this Council to determine for us how best we can contribute to Namibia's early independence.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

No country has worked harder than my own to bring independence to Namibia. We shall continue to strive to this end, and we shall not accept that our hands be tied in the attempt.

There are, in fact, elements in the international community who have a vested interest in ensuring a perpetuation of the Namibia problem, as well as the continuation of the tragic conflict in Angola. There are those who, like the United States, seek a rapid and peaceful resolution to the problem on terms acceptable to the international community at large, to the involved parties and, most important, to the Namibian people themselves.

Therefore, before closing, I should like to convey my country's gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts regarding Namibian independence. We support those efforts fully. We also urge that all other involved States support them. The Secretary-General's good offices remain a key factor in the search for bringing Namibia to independence in a rapid and peaceful manner.

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

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

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. My delegation is convinced that thanks to your political ability and considerable experience you will be successfully guide the Council's deliberations. We are further convinced that your country, which supports liberation movements world-wide, sets a fine example in its support for the oppressed people of Namibia led by its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

On this occasion I should like to express our appreciation to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, for the skilful manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

Given the current situation in which our brothers in Namibia find themselves in the grip of untold suffering, it is high time for the Council to take account of the concerns of the overwhelming majority of the international community and act to reach a final and lasting solution to the problem.

Since everything leads one to believe that the situation in the Territory and in southern Africa as a whole continues to deteriorate, and in view of the international community's positive attitude, one is entitled to wonder what the Council could do in order to avoid further bloodshed and to contribute to Namibia's independence.

Nine years ago the members of the Security Council agreed on a framework for the achievement of Namibia's independence and adopted resolution 435 (1978), containing all the arrangements to enable the Namibian people to achieve independence through the holding of free and fair elections under the auspices and supervision of the United Nations.

We still wonder how certain parties could have prevented the realization of that international unanimity. We express our thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General for the honest and frank statement contained in his report (S/18767), dated 31 March 1987, especially the concluding remarks, which are quite unequivocal and which have led to consideration of the item on the agenda.

My delegation strongly condemns the pre-condition of linkage between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola, all the more so since this is a matter totally unrelated to Security Council

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted unanimously, and since that pre-condition has been rejected outright by the international community. Namibia's independence remains a political and moral responsibility for the Security Council, which must adopt decisive measures to assure the Namibian people's independence without further delay and without pre-conditions.

The United Nations Council for Namibia has made quite clear the extent of the plundering of Namibia's resources by transnational corporations, which have made a significant contribution to the strengthening of Pretoria's racist position with respect to the question of Namibia's independence. That contribution has made it possible for Pretoria to play for time and to empty the Territory of its natural resources, leaving it a fleshless skeleton.

A large number of States Members of the United Nations - especially some permanent members of the Security Council with special responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter - have benefited considerably from this plundering and brutal exploitation of the Territory's resources, thanks to the operations of the transnational corporations under their jurisdiction.

The arrogance with which the Pretoria representative addressed the Council shows that nothing has changed in Pretoria's fraudulent policy of defying the international community, owing to the support received from a certain number of its Western friends. He reminds us of his colleague and brother, the representative of the nazi, racist and Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, who also enjoys support and assistance from his Western friends. Although the representative of that entity has repeatedly denied the existence of collaboration between his country and Pretoria, the report submitted at the beginning of this month by the United States State Department to the United States Congress contradicts that assertion. The

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

report indicates that the sale of armaments between the two Governments amounts to between \$400 million to \$800 million a year.

There is only one way the Security Council can bring about independence for Namibia peacefully; it is through the imposition by the international community of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against the apartheid régime, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to compel it to grant independence to Namibia and to restore to its people its right to self-determination. Thus, Namibia will know who its true friends and enemies are; it will know who are those undermining its freedom and compromising its development, those who wish to make it a colony and to interfere in its internal affairs through a handful of agents turned into the leadership of the country by force of imperialist arms.

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

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Comrade President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the high post of President of the Security Council for the month of April. The Soviet delegation is sure that your multifaceted political and diplomatic experience will allow you effectively to carry out your duties as President. I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Delpech, who successfully carried out the functions of President of the Security Council during the month of March.

In 1986 - which was declared by the United Nations as the International Year of Peace - two major international forums met under the aegis of the United Nation: the International Conference on the Immediate Independence of Namibia, in Vienna, and the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, in Paris. The question of independence for Namibia was the subject of careful

(Mr. Belogonov, USSR)

consideration at the fourteenth special and forty-first regular sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and also at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and at the session of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

All those forums insistently called on the Security Council to make urgent use of its powers under the United Nations Charter and to take decisive action to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolutions and other United Nations decisions concerning the independence of Namibia. They demanded that the Security Council, in view of the serious threat to international peace and security created by the racist régime, impose on that régime the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

Unfortunately, 1986 - despite those efforts by the international community - did not bring peace and independence to the long-suffering people of Namibia. That people continues to remain in the grip of the colonialism of racist South Africa. Now, yet again, the Security Council is considering the question of the situation in Namibia.

The overwhelming majority of the members of the international community are unanimous in considering that a decision to the Namibian problem brooks no further delay. The Security Council must finally make use of the responsibilities given it and must take effective measures to ensure the implementation by South Africa of all the United Nations decisions, including those of the Council, relating to Namibia. The time has long been ripe for washing away that shameful stain on mankind's conscience: the long-standing, stubborn refusal by the South African racists to grant the Namibian people its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence.

The question of the immediate liberation of Namibia from racist tyranny is one of the central and most pressing problems facing the entire international community, and in particular the United Nations and the Security Council. So far, however, because of the position of some of its permanent members - the United

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

States and the United Kingdom - the Security Council has not been able to adopt and apply effective binding measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against the racist Pretoria régime, in order to ensure implementation of the Council's decisions on Namibia. The Council's inability to take the necessary decision, because of these kinds of obstructionist actions, helps the South African racists to maintain Namibia under their colonial control. The strength of the racist South African régime does not lie within itself. In South Africa, the earth is burning under the feet of the racists. The racists are able openly to challenge the United Nations and the world community only because they feel that they have behind them the concrete political and material support of the United States and the United Kingdom. Today, judging by everything, Pretoria continues to bank on the support of its allies.

It is precisely under the umbrella of such support that the Pretoria racists sent an army of 100,000 men in an attempt to crush the resistance of the Namibian people to the occupiers. Under that same umbrella of good will, the South African régime, sidestepping the United Nations arms embargo, is receiving modern weapons and is continuing to make use of the credits from a number of Western countries and their banks, which help to preserve the system of colonial domination in Namibia. Finally, under that same umbrella of support, Pretoria continues to prop up in Namibia, which it occupies, the so-called territorial army and the puppet interim government.

This foreign policy of certain Western countries in regard to South Africa not only has pulled the Namibian knot still tighter but has also led to a further destabilization of the situation throughout southern Africa and to a stepping up of aggression on the part of the South African régime. That régime is carrying out acts of direct aggression and subversion from the territory of Namibia against

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Angola. It is carrying out acts of aggression against Mozambique and other independent African States. In fact, those States are the victims of an undeclared war waged against them by the Pretoria racists and their mercenaries. All this creates a serious threat to international peace and security.

While condemning in words individual actions by Pretoria, the United States and some of its allies in fact take the racists under their protection, blocking the implementation of decisive international measures against the South African régime. They in fact encourage that régime to expand its acts of violence within the country, to maintain the colonial system in Namibia and to escalate the policy of State terrorism carried out by South Africa.

The statements made today in the Security Council by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom are extremely disappointing. They reaffirm the lack of any real shifts in the positions of the Governments of those two States, which so far have been obstructing any successful exercise by the Security Council of its responsibilities and duties in regard to Namibia. Verbal condemnation of the South African régime is insufficient. Words do not mean very much if they are not backed by concrete actions; and words mean nothing if deeds are in direct contradiction with them. The question of mandatory sanctions has for a long time now been a litmus test of the genuine attitude of one or another Member State of the United Nations towards the racist South African régime.

The United States representative made an artificial attempt to introduce into the discussion of the Namibian problem the question of Angolan-Cuban relations. Obviously, the aim was to distract attention from the unsavory position of the United States itself regarding the racist South African régime. The notorious linkage of the question of Namibia with the defensive measures taken by Angola has rightly been rejected by the United Nations, including the Security Council, and by

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

the international community. As has been emphasized by many preceding speakers in the Council Chamber, this linkage can only be regarded as a cynical ruse by the Pretoria racists and their Western protectors. It reflects their desire in fact to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to impose a different, neo-colonialist solution to the Namibian problem and other problems of southern Africa. I am sure that if this artificial linkage were not invoked, another excuse would be thought up to oppose the application of mandatory sanctions on South Africa.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which defined the fundamental lines of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, put special stress on the basic elements required for an improvement in the international situation. Among them were unconditional international respect for the sovereign right of each people to choose its own form of development, the just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts, and the total eradication of genocide, apartheid and all forms of racial, national or religious intolerance.

As has been emphasized on numerous occasions in its statements, the Soviet Union believes it to be its international duty to support the anti-colonialist and anti-racist struggles of all peoples. Solidarity with struggling peoples is an integral part of efforts aimed at building a reliable system of comprehensive security. It is only on the basis of unconditional respect for each people's right to freedom and independence that conflict situations can be defused and the situation in the various trouble-areas of our planet - among them, southern Africa - be stabilized.

The Soviet Union favours an immediate political solution to the problem of Namibia through the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other fundamental Council and General Assembly decisions in that connection. We are prepared to contribute towards achieving that goal. Moreover, the Soviet Union believes in the necessity for the Namibian people's speedy access to its inalienable right to self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. In spite of the brutal acts of oppression and the neocolonialist manoeuvrings of the South African racists, the selfless liberation struggle being waged by the peoples of South Africa and Namibia continues to grow.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Speaking in the Security Council, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Theo-Ben Gurirab, along with representatives of African and many other States, have compellingly evoked the determination of the people of Namibia and other African peoples to achieve genuine freedom and independence for Namibia. We have no doubt that that objective will be achieved, regardless of the ploys of the Pretoria racists and their supporters.

We reiterate that the sympathies of the Soviet people are fully on the side of the people of Namibia, who are waging a heroic liberation struggle for freedom and independence under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The Soviet Union will continue to give full support to the just and all-out struggle being waged by the Namibian people in accordance with relevant United Nations decisions.

The Soviet Union actively supports the African countries and the international community as a whole, which are unanimously in favour of the adoption of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. At the present time, that is the only path towards a settlement of the problem of Namibia. The delegation of the Soviet Union will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution now before the Council.

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

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

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia): Allow me first of all to express my congratulations to you, Sir, on assuming the post of President of the Security Council for the month of April. Your professional skills, your sense of objectivity

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

and your responsibility are a guarantee of the successful work of this extraordinarily important body. I am glad to be able to express my satisfaction that on this occasion the Security Council is presided over by a representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, with which my country is linked by the fraternal bonds of socialist co-operation.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express appreciation for the work of Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, who carried out the responsibilities of President of the Security Council in the month of March. At the same time, I should like to thank members of the Council for making it possible for our delegation to make a statement on the issue under discussion.

The question of Namibia that is being discussed today in the Security Council represents one of the central and pressing tasks the United Nations is called upon to perform in its struggle against the policies of aggression and violence, colonialism and neocolonialism, racism and apartheid on our planet. We have been dealing with the situation in South West Africa for almost 40 years. Throughout that period the international community, and particularly the United Nations, has exerted considerable effort towards terminating the colonial domination of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria and towards ensuring the legitimate interests of the Namibian people, as well as their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence.

In spite of those efforts, Namibia continues to be a victim of colonial repression. During his recent visit to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Sam Nujoma, Chairman of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), stated, inter alia, that the political and military situation in and around Namibia was very critical. That was so because of the increasing acts of repression by the

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

racist white minority of South Africa against the people of both Namibia and South Africa. The racists have more than 100,000 colonialist troops in Namibia, who are massacring the people of Namibia every day, endangering their lives and occupying their country. The racist régime is relying to an increasing extent on foreign mercenaries. Its own soldiers are becoming unreliable and demoralized. The racists are also conscripting the black population to serve in their armed forces.

There is ample evidence in support of that assessment. It is a demonstration of how much the people of Namibia are suffering from the most brutal colonialist policy. At the same time, however, Namibia has become a symbol of the heroism of a nation longing for freedom. The participation of broad strata of the population in demonstrations against the occupation régime is increasing. Combat operations of the Namibians, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), are being activated. Nothing can stop them, despite the growing aggressiveness of the régime and its acts of repression.

The national liberation struggle being waged by the Namibian people, using all available means, including armed conflict, is just and legitimate, and it deserves support from the United Nations, which bears direct responsibility for ensuring Namibia's speedy accession to independence. The policies of hatred and the inhuman practices of the apartheid régime and the increasing aggressiveness of the Pretoria racists directed against neighbouring sovereign States are the main sources of mounting tensions in the region and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security that extends beyond regional boundaries.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Of an extremely dangerous nature is the abuse of the territory of Namibia by the régime of South Africa as a platform for perpetrating acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. How is it possible for Pretoria cynically to deride the authority of the United Nations? How can it dare ignore the views of the overwhelming majority of mankind?

The answer is very simple: it is still free to do so thanks to the greedy interests of transnational corporations in the riches of Namibia; thanks to the strategic interests and global ambitions of imperialism which coincide with the interests of the South African rulers. It is enabled to act in such a way because of the deliberate circumvention by some United Nations Member States of the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council against South Africa. This is why the tragedy of the Namibian people goes on. These are also the reasons why the Security Council is not able to complement the decolonization efforts of the Namibian people and of the international community with effective sanctions according to the United Nations Charter. The lesson of these 20 years of rejection of sanctions should invariably have resulted in a fundamental change in the positions of those who, in the case of Cuba and Nicaragua, would be ready without hesitation to declare sanctions against them within a few hours but who, in the case of Pretoria, seek hypocritically any kind of pretext to render such sanctions impossible, or at least reduce them to a minimum.

The United Nations - and the Security Council in the first place - bears direct responsibility for ensuring implementation of the decisions already taken on Namibia, as well as for the achievement of a just solution of the question of Namibia as soon as possible. We resolutely support the just demand of the international community that comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the régime of South Africa be adopted by the Security Council in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Our delegation condemns in principle the policy of "linkage" and of "constructive co-operation" with the Pretoria régime, which, in reality, invites the racists to perpetrate violence and terror against the African populations of South Africa and Namibia, to escalate aggression against the front-line States, to be adamant in the question of Namibia and to sabotage the resolutions and decisions on Namibia adopted by the United Nations.

We advocate the complete and final eradication of colonialism and racism in all their forms and manifestations; we therefore take a resolute stance in favour of the undelayed and unconditional exercise by the people of Namibia of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence in a unified, territorially integral Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, and of the immediate and complete withdrawal of all troops and administrative institutions of South Africa from the territory of Namibia. We voice our full support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole, legitimate representative of the people of Namibia.

In conclusion I should like to emphasize once again that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will continue to take an active part in all effective steps of the United Nations leading to the independence of Namibia.

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

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

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the post of President of the Security Council for the month of April. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is most

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

gratified that a representative of a fraternal socialist country is discharging that duty during the discussion of so important a question as the situation in Namibia. Your country has always taken a principled and firm position in the struggle for the self-determination of peoples against colonialism, racism and apartheid. We express our confidence that, under your leadership and thanks to your diplomatic experience and skill, the work of the Security Council will be successful and fruitful.

In the struggle for the speedy, complete and final eradication of the vestiges of colonialism from our planet, the question of the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, which is occupied by the racist régime of South Africa, is doubtless one of the most pressing and one that requires immediate solution. The direct responsibility of the United Nations for the fate of Namibia and elementary justice for its indigenous population, which has for many decades now been under a foreign, colonial and racist yoke, requires that the international community at last undertake appropriate measures to protect the interests of the Namibian people and to ensure its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence. The persistent need for an active and purposeful search for ways to achieve a just political solution to the Namibian problem is also dictated by the growing aspiration of all peace-loving forces on the planet to improve the general international situation.

Real ways and means to ensure such a settlement of the Namibian problem have been fully and clearly defined for a long time and reaffirmed on many occasions in numerous United Nations decisions on all aspects of this matter and have been universally recognized. These decisions, and first and foremost Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), laid down a political basis for a just solution to the problem and for ensuring Namibia's transition to independent and self-sufficient development.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

Unfortunately, the aforementioned decisions have still not been implemented because the racist régime of South Africa cynically continues to ignore the clearly expressed will of the international community.

As is well known, the colonizers of South Africa, besides doggedly persisting in trying to preserve their illegal presence in Namibia, are also making various types of efforts designed to perpetuate the enslavement of its people. In order to achieve their objectives the Pretoria racists are continuing to intensify mass terror and violence against the indigenous African population and are ever more rapidly building up the military potential of the occupying régime in Namibia through the recruitment of foreign mercenaries and the forced military conscription of Namibians.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

They are carrying out deceitful manoeuvres with the creation of the so-called system of self-government of the occupied Territory. The South African régime's practice of using the Territory of Namibia as a beachhead for unceasing acts of armed aggression and subversive actions against neighbouring independent African States is becoming extremely dangerous. The hateful policy and growing aggression of the Pretoria apartheid régime is the major source of tension in southern Africa and represents a serious threat to international peace and security on the continent and beyond.

It has been well known for a long time now that the South African racists would be unable to behave in so defiant a manner were it not for the direct and indirect economic, military, political and other forms of support given by certain Western Powers, first and foremost by the United States. Moreover, in justification of this pernicious alliance, the parties to it continue to distort the nature of the Namibian problem by all possible means and to link its just solution to irrelevant questions. Without any basis, and unsuccessfully, such an attempt was made today by the representative of the United States. At the same time, there has been a build-up of overt pressure on African countries in order to exacerbate the situation in southern Africa, to move the question of Namibia out of the framework of the United Nations and to resolve it on a neo-colonial basis.

The Byelorussian SSR believes that in the face of such manoeuvres and subterfuges of the united forces of racism and international reaction, which are so dangerous for the fate of Namibia and independent African States, there must be a relentless, continuous, insistent and ever-growing pressure both on South Africa and its protectors, in order to force them fully to implement the Security Council decisions on Namibia and to take into account the will of the majority of the States of the world.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

The Byelorussian SSR firmly and consistently advocates the immediate and unconditional implementation by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and national independence in a unified and territorially integrated Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands; the immediate and full withdrawal from its Territory of all troops and the South African administration; and support of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which is recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole, genuine, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The time has long been ripe for the Security Council to use its full authority to ensure effective and constant control over Namibia's achievement of genuine independence. The Byelorussian SSR supports the unswerving, growing demand of the international community that the Security Council impose comprehensive and binding sanctions against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

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

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

Mr. KIBEDI (Uganda): Allow me, Sir, from the outset, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the important duties of President of the Security Council for the month of April. Given your diplomatic skills and wealth of experience, we are confident that you will successfully discharge the onerous duties entrusted to you. Your personal commitment and the well-known principled stand of your country regarding the liberation struggle in southern Africa make it fitting that the item be discussed under your presidency.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

I wish also to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech of Argentina, who provided inspiring leadership to the Council for the month of March.

Through you, Sir, I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in this debate.

The Council is meeting once again to consider the question of Namibia, in the light of the continued intransigent refusal by the racist South African régime to implement various Security Council resolutions and its contemptuous disregard of the Council's injunctions and directives. The culpability of South Africa in this respect is not in dispute. The task of the Council, therefore, is to consider what measures under the Charter are appropriate in the face of racist South Africa's challenge to the Security Council's authority, and the continuing gross violations of the provisions of the Charter.

A century has now passed since the infamous Berlin Conference of 1884, when the imperial Powers of the time assembled to partition Africa among themselves. In that period, many of our countries, with the assistance of the United Nations, have been able to shake off the yoke of colonialism, regaining their human dignity, and taking their rightful place in the comity of nations.

For the Namibians, on the other hand, it has been a century in which they have been subjected to all manner of injustice and oppression, first under the heel of German colonialism and then under the pernicious South African racist régimes. At a time when colonialism is regarded as anachronistic even by its original proponents, the racist régime is leaving no stone unturned to frustrate the emergence of Namibia as a free and independent country.

This fact is disturbing because Namibia has been and remains a unique responsibility and sacred trust of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the history

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

of Namibia is one of a continued betrayal of trust and of failure of the powerful nations of the international community to act decisively to assist Namibians to end foreign domination and restore their legitimate rights. In our view, it should be with a sense of shame and embarrassment that those who in the past obstructed the Security Council's efforts to bring South Africa to book and instead reposed their trust in the so-called good faith of the racist régime should in 1987 countenance and calmly tolerate its continued intransigence, aggression against neighbouring countries, and breach of international law and morality. One would have expected them to be in the forefront of proponents of enforcement measures that would make South Africa comply with its international obligations, but sadly this is not the case.

Last year we marked the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. After years of appealing to South Africa, the General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations under the League of Nations Mandate, terminated its Mandate and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. A year later, in resolution 2248 (S-V), the General Assembly established the Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence. Twenty years after the termination of the Mandate the independence of Namibia continues to elude us. The Council for Namibia, which is the legal Administering Authority of the Territory, is an Administration in exile as South Africa continues to entrench its illegal occupation and to defy United Nations resolutions.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

It is important to recall that this position was confirmed by the International Court of Justice some 16 years ago. In an advisory opinion requested by the Security Council, the International Court of Justice held:

"(1) that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory;

"(2) that States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration;

"(3) that it is incumbent upon States which are not Members of the United Nations to give assistance, within the scope of subparagraph (2) above, in the action which has been taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia." (International Court of Justice, Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971, p. 58)

The Security Council, in resolution 301 (1971) of 20 October 1971, endorsed the ruling of the International Court of Justice and declared that any further refusal of South Africa to withdraw from Namibia would create conditions detrimental to international peace and security in the region. That resolution called on all Member States, inter alia, first, to abstain from entering into treaty relations with South Africa in all cases in which the South African Government purported to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia; secondly, to abstain from invoking or applying those treaties or provisions of treaties concluded by South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which involved active intergovernmental co-operation; thirdly, to review their bilateral treaties with

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

South Africa in order to ensure that they were not inconsistent with the Court's advisory opinion; fourthly, to abstain from entering into economic and other forms of relationship or dealing with South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which might entrench its authority over the Territory.

In view of this unambiguous determination of the International Court of Justice as regards the illegality of the occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa and the obligations of Member States in that regard, the international community rightly expected the Security Council to move decisively against racist South Africa. In the face of racist South Africa's intransigence and unwillingness to respond positively to the appeals of the United Nations, we in Africa, and indeed the overwhelming majority of members of the international community, had no illusion about South Africa's intentions and no doubts as to what were the appropriate measures to take in the circumstances. We believed from the outset that the imposition of mandatory sanctions was the only peaceful way of putting meaningful pressure on racist South Africa. Unfortunately our calls for actions to this effect were always resisted by those permanent members of the Security Council friendly to racist South Africa. They have always urged us to be patient, as according to them there were other ways of making racist South Africa comply with its obligations.

Indeed the hopes of the international community were raised when, at the initiative of the Western contact group - namely the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Canada - the Security Council passed resolution 435 (1978) and adopted the United Nations plan for settling the Namibian question peacefully. In spite of the misgivings about certain aspects of these proposals, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) accepted in

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

good faith the plan and the undertakings given by the Contact Five. The Western Contact Five undertook to exert pressure on South Africa to comply with the United Nations plan.

At that time each and every one of the Foreign Ministers of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany appeared before this Council in person and gave dire warnings as to what the consequences for South Africa would be if the racist régime did not comply with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan for Namibia.

These serious warnings were given by the Contact Group at the highest level in 1978 when the Security Council debated and adopted resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan. We had every reason to expect that, given the legal position regarding obligations of all Member States as spelled out by the International Court of Justice, their economic leverage on South Africa and the moral imperative of their undertakings, members of the contact group would prevail upon South Africa to comply with resolution 435 (1978) or alternatively make good their threats of isolating South Africa and imposing appropriate sanctions. Alas, this was not to be.

It is now almost a decade since the United Nations plan was adopted. The racist Pretoria régimes have groped from one pretext to another in order to frustrate the setting in motion of the implementation process for Namibia's independence. We all recall very vividly the debacle in Geneva in 1981, when the Pretoria régime scuttled the so-called pre-implementation talks on very flimsy excuses. The overwhelming majority of the international community was indignant and demanded the imposition of comprehensive sanctions to bring racist South Africa to book. The draft resolutions which would have put into effect the near-universal demand for comprehensive mandatory sanctions were regrettably vetoed in April 1981 by three permanent members of this Council who are also members of the Western

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

contact group. They urged SWAPO and the front-line States to be patient and to give them more time to engage South Africa in yet more rounds of negotiations.

Since then we have gone through the motions of these negotiations. It should by now be abundantly clear to all that racist South Africa has no intention whatsoever of co-operating in good faith with the United Nations in implementing the letter and spirit of the United Nations plan. Whenever one obstacle is surmounted, racist South Africa builds another to block any progress. In his report before this Council, the Secretary-General has stated that all the conditions for the United Nations plan laid down by the Security Council have been met. Yet South Africa refuses to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan, and now comes up with the spurious excuse of Cuban troops in Angola.

They now talk of linkage between the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and the independence of Namibia. We regard linkage, reciprocity, or whatever euphemism is used to disguise it, as a deliberate design intended to prevent the genuine independence of Namibia. It is to us a matter of regret that the United States, which was at the time presumed to be an honest broker in the negotiations, prompted the racist régime to introduce this notion with a view to achieving its own strategic objectives. It is unacceptable to barter a people's freedom for strategic objectives which are of unilateral benefit and interest. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola is an irrelevant and extraneous issue. Their presence in Angola is a bilateral matter between Cuba and the People's Republic of Angola. Cuban troops were in Angola well before the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), which incidentally made no mention of them. It is therefore unacceptable that anybody should use this as a pretext to obstruct the United Nations plan. We call upon the United States to prompt South Africa to relinquish linkage.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

The racist régime has used the negotiation process as a device to divert attention from what is going on in Namibia and southern Africa in general. It has strengthened its oppressive machinery within Namibia and intensified its destabilization of the front-line States. South Africa is aware that SWAPO would win any fair elections and is determined to forestall SWAPO's victory. Thus, through delaying tactics, it is trying to free itself from the decisions of the United Nations and is intent on imposing an internal solution which the international community has rejected. The assembling of yet another group of puppets, the so-called interim government, is part of this design. South Africa's singular intransigence clearly shows its unwillingness to give genuine independence to Namibia.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

Why has South Africa remained defiant and intransigent? In our view, this is due largely to the collusion of those who have given it a protective shield from censure in this Council. South Africa is further emboldened when it sees individual States or transnational corporations joining it in criminal enterprises contravening the Council for Namibia's Decree No. 1 or the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. The racist régime regards such actions as seals of approval.

Those actions are in contravention of the ruling of the International Court of Justice, which states that

"The member States of the United Nations are, for the reasons given in paragraph 115 above, under obligation to recognize the illegality and invalidity of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. They are also under obligation to refrain from lending any support or any form of assistance to South Africa with reference to its occupation of Namibia ... "

(International Court of Justice, Advisory Opinion of 21 June 1971, para. 119)

Uganda believes the United Nations must, as a matter of right and necessity, be at the centre of the negotiations concerning Namibia. Attempts to bypass the United Nations in the search for a solution have unfortunately been used to hold the independence of Namibia hostage to extraneous and unacceptable demands. The United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, should take up its responsibilities and put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa.

As we have stated before, South Africa's occupation of Namibia is not a case of ordinary illegality. It is a case of a threat to international peace and security and an act of aggression falling within the purview of Article 39 of the Charter. Uganda maintains that the logical consequence of such breaches is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

In an attempt to prevent the imposition of sanctions, the apologists have advanced a number of self-serving arguments. It is claimed that sanctions should not be imposed because they would hurt the oppressed people. That patronizing argument persists even though the oppressed people themselves have indicated that they wish sanctions to be imposed. Again, it is argued that sanctions are ineffective and therefore should not be imposed. It is noteworthy that those arguments are advanced by countries which have in the past unilaterally imposed sanctions in other situations - and in cases where there was not the near international unanimity that exists in respect of southern Africa today. It has also been suggested by some - as echoed by the representative of racist South Africa - that sanctions would make the situation in southern Africa worse.

In that connection, the Security Council should take into account the findings and conclusions of the Commonwealth mission of eminent persons to South Africa, which stated, inter alia, that

"The question in front of Heads of Government is in our view clear. It is not whether such measures [sanctions] will compel change; it is already the case that their absence and Pretoria's belief that they need not be feared defer change. Is the Commonwealth to stand by and allow the cycle of violence to spiral? Or will it take concerted action of an effective kind? Such action may offer the last opportunity to avert what could be the worst bloodbath since the Second World War."

It is imperative that South Africa's powerful friends reassess their position and act decisively in concert with the international community in order to secure the independence of Namibia. It is necessary to take action that decisively rises the stakes in the campaign to force South Africa to comply with the United Nations plan. So far, we have exhorted, pleaded, condemned and threatened, but none of

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

this has so far redeemed our pledge to the people of Namibia. The only peaceful avenue left for the Council is to act in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Countries sympathetic to racist South Africa because of economic factors or considerations of kith and kin may feel that African countries are being unrealistic and impatient in their calls for action against racist South Africa, and that it is a waste of this Council's time to bring the issue of Namibia before it year after year. To them I would say that the concern of African countries, and indeed of all reasonable people the world over, about the situation in Namibia and in southern Africa in general is deep and genuine. We act as we do because we are responding to an illegal, immoral and inhuman situation. We are striking out against an abominable and horrendous state of affairs which denies the people of Namibia not only their fundamental human rights but their very humanity as well.

The challenge to those who offer succour and comfort to the racist régime in South Africa is stark and simple: if they take away the illegality, immorality and inhumanity of the present political and economic situation in Namibia, they will hear no more from us. Short of that, they can be sure they will continue to hear a lot more debates in this Council about Namibia. In the same way they will continue to hear of the valiant and heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, spearheaded by SWAPO, whose victory is certain because its cause is just.

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

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): It is a great pleasure for me, speaking on behalf of the delegation of the Congo, to see you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council during the month of April. We are glad to be able to draw upon your great experience and diplomatic skill as the Council again

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

considers, at the request of the African group, the question of Namibia, a Territory which has so wrongfully excluded from the vast historic process of total decolonization of Africa as a result of absurd opposition by the Pretoria régime.

Congo has embraced the new dimensions of the world resulting from the broadening of its political and diplomatic horizons and from the imperative of peace, and we have relations of trust with Bulgaria. Our two delegations to the United Nations have always co-operated in promoting the essential principles of relations between States. I am therefore certain that the future of the Security Council is in excellent hands.

My delegation is grateful, Sir, to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, for the great courtesy and ability he demonstrated as President of the Council for the month of March. Ambassador Delpech helped our deliberations reach a more positive outcome, and we thank him sincerely.

In the same vein, I extend a warm welcome to my colleague - and neighbour at the Council table - His Excellency Ambassador Pierre-Louis Blanc, Permanent Representative of France.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

His country and mine have long been linked by an accident of history; they now enjoy excellent co-operation which has expanded from its original context to take on today the democratic dimensions of free and independent men and peoples. Hence I should like to renew to the representative of France assurances of friendship and co-operation from the delegation of the Congo within the Security Council.

As a major question in the political debate in the United Nations owing to its universal implications, the question of Namibia will continue to be of greatest concern to the international community as to the future of the Territory.

There is general agreement that Namibia is not free, despite the convulsions which in Asia and Africa have affected the links between the metropolitan countries and their colonies, leading to a profound mutation of the right of peoples to self-determination. Namibia is not free, 20 years after the United Nations agreed to assume direct responsibility over the Territory.

Namibia is none the freer, notwithstanding the United Nations plan for the independence of the Territory, which eight years ago the Security Council enshrined in its resolution 435 (1978).

Even the involvement of all the major protagonists of the question of Namibia and of international life, as well as the significant involvement of the international community itself, have failed to overcome the murky forces of resistance that could in no way be legitimized and that continue to oppose any democratic development of the Territory.

This woeful state of affairs has prompted the Secretary-General - whose significant effort at achieving Namibia's independence my delegation commends - to go beyond his traditional prudence and state, in his recent report of 31 March 1987 (S/18767), that he rejects the linkage pre-condition invoked by South Africa and that he can no longer accept this pre-condition being used as a pretext further to delay Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

How, then, can justice be done for the struggling Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and make it possible for them to exercise their inalienable rights?

What - if not mandatory sanctions - can force racist South Africa to desist from its persistent refusal to comply with the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council? And the view of the International Court of Justice leaves no doubt that those decisions are binding.

Finally, how can we at one and the same time contribute to restoring and enhancing the considerably diminished prestige of the United Nations if not through finally re-establishing harmony between the independence that is today sought by the Namibian people and the international community and the legality, based on the Charter, of the relevant decisions of our Organization?

This level of concern with respect to the question of Namibia takes fully into account the imperative need of the very idea of seeing to it that this Territory accedes to independence and international sovereignty, all the more so since for the international community this necessity is no longer at issue and needs no justification.

In once again bringing the question before the Security Council, the Group of African States had no other purpose but to contribute to an act of justice in keeping with the inalienable rights of the Namibian people.

Subject to colonial writ since the last century, Namibia continues to suffer all the facets and horrors of oppression: from genocide, slavery and the plundering of its resources to the most subtle forms of contempt for human beings flowing from segregation and total denial of rights, nothing has been left out.

As if to worsen the lot of the Namibian people and assist South Africa to carry out its murky designs, the systematic exploitation of Namibia's resources continues apace and is being extended in an uncommon frenzy, in violation of

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

international law as laid down in Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

In this "fling", which bears all the hallmarks of the civilizing enterprises pursued by one version of the West, it is illuminating to observe the leading role played by the transnational corporations of certain members of the Council. Driven by their voracious appetite for cheap profit, they take a demonstrably short-term view of events, and give no consideration to the decisive issue of the Territory's future. These companies, and the Governments which egg them on, are going to have to pay the price, and sooner than they expect.

Hence it is outrageous that even now the Namibian people should still be at the "negotiating" stage for its inalienable rights, to haggle for the freedom the racist Pretoria régime and its powerful protectors may one day condescend to grant it.

SWAPO, the organized conscience of the Namibian people, has shown a sense of political responsibility that has confounded many of those who wish to criticize it for intransigence or political immaturity. Thus, despite the danger to it of choosing negotiation instead of armed struggle, it has engaged in good faith in talks that led to the adoption of resolution 435 (1978).

Given the obvious bad faith of South Africa, backed as it is by the active support of major and powerful allies, the international community today finds itself in a paradoxical situation in which the entry into force of an agreement freely arrived at by the parties involved is submitted to extra-contractual conditions that have absolutely nothing to do with the talks nor with their timing.

In these conditions, we must fear for the fate of international peace and security in Africa. We must exclude any "strategic" considerations having nothing to do with Africa, as well as any designs alien to the realities and the true aspirations of that part of the world.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Thus, for almost six years now an odd approach to the Namibian question has been imposed on the international community, an approach marked by the theory and practice of linkage, under which considerations irrelevant to the problem become sine qua non conditions for its settlement. Hence, the internal situation in Angola has been artificially tied to the autonomous process of Namibia's accession to independence.

Such combinations can only result in the obfuscation of a totally clear situation in order to promote all kinds of anti-Namibian and anti-African manoeuvres. The de facto allies of South Africa are aware of that - those allies who engage in all kinds of nit-picking in an effort to sidestep and hide the various strikes and other acts of aggression of which the Pretoria régime has made itself the exclusive agent, sowing terror and desolation as a means to strengthen and expand its obsolete values.

The most grievous element of this situation is not the unpredictable behaviour of the South African régime, about which it is natural to have misgivings in view of the intrinsic nature of that régime; rather, it is the slow but sure drift of the policy of the major Western Powers towards an ever-more-refined type of collaboration that is all the more beneficial to colonialist and racist South Africa since that country is the subject of an arms embargo laid down by Security Council resolution 418 (1977). The revelations in this respect made by the United States Congress are a striking indictment of the countries concerned, and one can no longer be surprised that, a priori, they are hypocritically reticent about any idea of sanctions against South Africa.

At present, as is known, the clearest efforts made by many of those countries that are members of the contact group consist not in exerting positive pressure on

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

the apartheid régime but, on the contrary, in sending supplies to it in secret, in sending prohibited military equipment or in issuing licences for the production of matériel supposed to be banned from export to South Africa.

On the other hand, as my delegation sees it, during the Twentieth Summit Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Africa took several decisions aimed at strengthening the determination of the liberation movements and the front-line countries to cope with the needs flowing from the struggle against the racist colonialist enemy. The pursuit and implications of that struggle are now the subject of a more systematic assessment under the authority of an ad hoc committee of Heads of State; apartheid and colonialism are now experiencing the blows of a counter-campaign designed to show them in their true light and also to justify increased international solidarity; there is a resurgence of interest in assistance to the liberation movements and the front-line States, particularly through the establishment by the non-aligned countries - on the initiative of His Excellency Mr. Denis Sassou-Nguesso, President of the People's Republic of the Congo and current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) - of the Africa Fund for this purpose. The creation of that Fund must be viewed within the framework of this general impetus, a previous example of which was the organization of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC).

The Organization of African Unity has adopted a perfectly clear position regarding the measures that the international community must take vis-à-vis South Africa, whose policy of apartheid, illegal and prolonged occupation of Namibia and acts of aggression against its neighbours poses a serious threat to international peace and security. The OAU therefore calls on the United Nations Security Council to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

This logical position also takes into account the many warnings addressed to Pretoria in the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on this subject. Finally, this OAU position draws the appropriate conclusions from an absurd situation deliberately perpetrated and maintained by South Africa as a challenge.

My delegation cannot see any approach other than this African position which could adequately respond to South Africa's arrogance and defiance and which could spare the Namibian people further suffering.

My delegation also believes that the members of the Security Council can only endorse that position, if the Council is to be consistent, particularly with regard to its resolution 566 (1985).

It is up to the Security Council to strengthen and enhance the prestige of the international Organization by ensuring that it settles a problem in which its credibility is most clearly at stake. Indeed, what non-permanent member - and, even more, what permanent member - of our Council can forget that South Africa's Mandate over Namibia ended in 1966 and that this Mandate was entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which alone has legal authority over the Territory? Nevertheless, the United Nations continued to negotiate with South Africa for the adoption of resolution 435 (1978). What a lesson in humility for the United Nations! But it is to be hoped that the Security Council will be able to control such a sign of peace and of the will to appeasement.

Thus, the outcome of the present discussion normally should be a unanimous agreement designed to implement the settlement plan, since South Africa has already shown its agreement to the system of proportional representation for voting in the election of the constituent assembly of Namibia.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

As for the manoeuvres concocted by the South African régime to give credit to the idea of an internal solution as an alternative to the United Nations settlement plan, such manoeuvres can and should be considered with the contempt they deserve.

In fact, no one should be fooled by any attempt to transform Namibia into a branch of racist South Africa, with its plan for a rigorously compartmentalized society, its militaristic designs and its determination to annex Walvis Bay and some islands and other areas belonging to Namibia. Respect for the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and other relevant United Nations resolutions admits of no ambiguity in this connection.

So the time has come for the United Nations to take stock - to take stock on all issues. Certain members of the Security Council, including some of the most influential members, have recently - in other spheres, to be sure - become ardent champions of the credibility of the United Nations. My delegation would like to see all of us, together, during this reconsideration of the Namibian question, work for the advancement of that credibility through the strengthening of the ability of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to act - and here we would say that the recent report placed before us by the Secretary-General demonstrates once again by its clarity and objectivity where the obstacles to the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan really lie.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Our Organization will gain greatly when, once and for all and soon, it is freed from the shackles of the Namibian question. Having thereby recovered their freedom, the people of Namibia will then be able to enjoy a most well-deserved peace, free from the continuous and accepted plunder to which they are unfortunately being subjected today.

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

Owing to the lateness of the hour, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to adjourn the meeting now. If I hear no objection, the next meeting of the Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will take place this afternoon at 4 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.