



Security Council

UN LIBRARY
APR 10 1987
UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2744
8 April 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH MEETINGHeld at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 8 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
ZambiaMr. BEAUGE
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. DUMEVI
Mr. LAY
Mr. AOKI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-KINDI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. OKUN
Mr. PABON GARCIA
Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

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

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

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

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Mohiuddin (Bangladesh), Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados), Mr. Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Biffot (Gabon), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Insanally (Guyana), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), Mr. Bennouna Louridi (Morocco), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Miss Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Ononaiye (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka),

Mr. Abdoun (Sudan), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Mestiri (Tunisia), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia and the Syrian Arab Republic, 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. Maksimov (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Doljintseren (Mongolia) and Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic) 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 Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): It is indeed a pleasure for me to convey to you, Sir, my warm congratulations on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council. Your professional skills and your acknowledged wisdom are a sure guarantee of success in your important functions.

I should like also to express our appreciation to Ambassador Delpech of Argentina for the skill with which he discharged his duties last month.

This is the second time since the beginning of this year that Africa has turned to the Security Council with regard to the grave situation that persists in the southern part of the continent. Only recently we had to address the oppression of the South African people by the apartheid régime. Today we are focusing on the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and Pretoria's policy of systematically obstructing implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Faced with South Africa's power and the dangers it represents to peace and security, the international community must, through this Council, assume its collective responsibility.

All of the facts of the question of Namibia have long since been identified; therefore in its consideration the Security Council should concentrate simply upon recognizing the impasse, pronouncing a verdict and adopting and implementing the appropriate measures.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

More than 20 years ago the General Assembly revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. For its part, the Security Council nearly 10 years ago solemnly adopted the plan for the settlement of the Namibian question. The conditions for the implementation of that plan were met, thanks to the constant and persevering efforts of our Secretary-General, to whom a special tribute is due.

The non-implementation of that plan is South Africa's responsibility.

Need I recall that at the very time of its adoption the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia was the victim of an attempt to replace it with a neo-colonialist arrangement designed to perpetuate the illegal situation? From the very beginning, that manoeuvre was condemned and rejected by the Security Council. However, the punishment called for by that intransigence of Pretoria was deferred out of a need to pursue the dialogue. From that point on South Africa felt itself invested with impunity to bring about the defeat of the Geneva Conference on Namibia of 1981. The abuse of the right of veto has only strengthened the apartheid régime in its intransigence and on each occasion has encouraged it to bring forward further demands.

In insisting on its claim of linkage, South Africa's aim is merely to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The linkage argument has been rejected in this very Council. It represents an unacceptable distortion of the question of Namibia. It is an instance of interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign and independent State, a State that indeed is under attack by Pretoria. It is, finally, symptomatic of an attitude of open defiance of the authority of the Council.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

In fact, the pretext of "linkage" is mere camouflage for a vain attempt to co-opt the future of Namibia. Since 1978 that policy has developed through frantic activity to bring forth out of the void a so-called third force and gain outside recognition for it. It is perpetuated through time-worn manoeuvres to create a climate of civil war in Namibia. It is seen in attempts to partition the Territory: the manoeuvre to annex Walvis Bay and the offshore islands is now being renewed in the Caprivi Strip, which has been transformed into a South African base and earmarked as a future enclave from which to carry out regional threats and aggression.

A constant we cannot ignore is the fact that since 1919 South Africa has seen Namibia as an integral part of its hegemonic racist plans. If Namibia has been the object of annexationist designs and remains a case of thwarted decolonization, this is because the crime of apartheid has not met with the correct reaction demanded by respect for the fundamental principles of the United Nations. Similarly, because this defiant illegal occupation remains unpunished, Namibia has become a base for open aggression and subversion against neighbouring States; outlaw practices have become a permanent feature throughout the region.

In the face of South African oppression and repression, the Namibian people has amply demonstrated its unanimous loyalty to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole, authentic representative, and has affirmed its unswerving determination to recover its freedom. Its struggle is one of the noblest pages in the history of the peoples that have risen up against foreign domination. That glorious struggle demonstrates through sacrifice the determination of the Namibian people to bring about the restoration of its national rights.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The Namibian people shares its suffering with the South African people, which is engaged in courageous resistance to apartheid. Those two peoples are comrades in arms with other southern African peoples facing aggression, destabilization and pressure from the warlike Pretoria régime.

The international community has always proclaimed its solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people. It affirms that Namibia's independence must be brought about in conformity with resolution 435 (1978) and that the Territory's future must reflect solely the authentic will of its people. It affirms too that independence must come about with respect for Namibia's territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the offshore Namibian islands. It affirms finally that any so-called internal solution will be condemned and rejected out of hand.

In Namibia, duty - solidarity - requires active support for the right of peoples to self-determination and independence with a view to fulfilment of the international will. This lends urgency to the implementation of Security Council decisions, and by definition excludes any coming to terms with the apartheid régime. Suitable dialogue and repeated warnings have reached their limit, for this is a régime that has given every proof of its blindness.

The illegal occupation of Namibia must cease. South Africa has amply demonstrated its rejection of its responsibility under Article 25 of the Charter. Its position has exposed it to the sanctions envisaged in the Charter. In that regard the international community has charted the course, and has clearly indicated the action that must be taken.

First of all, we must act upon previous warnings of recourse to comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria to compel it immediately, completely and unconditionally to implement resolution 435 (1978). Secondly, we must support in every way the Namibian people's legitimate national liberation

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

struggle. Finally, we must strengthen international action in solidarity with the independent States of southern Africa, which are subject to South African aggression, destabilization and pressure.

Yesterday, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO, His Excellency Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, reiterated with passion and sincerity his movement's readiness to co-operate in the search for a peaceful end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. The unanimous determination of the Security Council finally to ensure the triumph of the cause of the liberation of Namibia would be a just tribute to SWAPO's patience and sense of responsibility. To do this, the Council must gather all means available to it and exercise all its powers in the face of one of the gravest challenges to its authority and one of the last surviving instances of an anachronistic order of racial and colonial domination.

That is the hope of a people whose struggle teaches an essential lesson of our times. Also, it is the hope of an international community which desires the restoration of an order characterized by respect for international law.

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

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

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

I wish to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. I wish also to pay a tribute to the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Delpéch, for his diligent leadership of the Council during the month of March.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The question of the independence of Namibia represents a unique responsibility for the United Nations and particularly for the Security Council. The United Nations, through the Council for Namibia, has assumed responsibility for the legal administration of Namibia, for assisting the people of Namibia, and for preserving the Territory's national resources. As for the Security Council, there is no other issue in which it is so directly and substantially involved. In resolution 435 (1978), adopted in September 1978, the Council endorsed a detailed plan for the independence of Namibia, a plan which has been accepted by South Africa and is fully supported by the international community. All questions relating to the implementation of the Security Council resolution have been resolved, including the problem of the electoral system. There are therefore no impediments to the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), except the political will of the Government of South Africa. To influence that political will is the crux of the matter.

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

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

It is clear to us that so long as South Africa's intransigence continues and the peaceful evolution of Namibia into an independent State is blocked by South Africa, the Namibian people has no choice but to continue its determined struggle to dislodge the illegal régime from Namibia. Turkey has always expressed its solidarity with the Namibian people in their struggle for national independence under the leadership of South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which the General Assembly has recognized as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

In view of the tragic developments taking place in South Africa and the prospects of disastrous consequences if a dialogue for the elimination of apartheid cannot be initiated in the very near future, the problem of Namibia should be evaluated in its proper context. Namibia is without doubt a matter of decolonization and in that sense it is unconnected with the question of apartheid. However, the two questions are inevitably interrelated in the sense that they require similar actions by the international community. The emergence at this stage of an independent Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) will clearly show that peaceful means in southern Africa can be productive. Such a development will have a very positive impact and might be a factor encouraging a dialogue for the peaceful evolution of the South African régime towards racial equality and true democracy.

The Secretary-General's report of 31 March 1987 contained in document S/18767 throws light on the tortuous developments in the efforts undertaken to implement resolution 435 (1978). It is clearly brought out that all the front-line States, the Government of Angola and SWAPO have displayed remarkable flexibility and a constructive spirit. The Government of Angola, while insisting on the principle that there can be no linkage and pre-conditions for the implementation of the Security Council resolution, has referred to the package of concrete proposals

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

contained in the platform forwarded to the Secretary-General in November 1984 regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces. The President of SWAPO has reiterated SWAPO's readiness to proceed to a cease-fire with South Africa for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

In contrast, the South African Government has insisted that a firm and satisfactory agreement should be reached on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola before the beginning of the implementation of the settlement plan based on resolution 435 (1978). In the meantime, South Africa has continued to endanger the peace process by continuing cross-border attacks against Angola.

As the Secretary-General states in his report,

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

(S/18767, para. 32)

The linkage pre-condition is rejected by the international community, and the Security Council has endorsed the view that the independence of Namibia cannot be connected with irrelevant and extraneous issues. We believe that this decision of the Security Council should be henceforth reflected in the policies of all its members so that the South African Government can no longer misinterpret the position of the Council.

The time has certainly come to request the South African Government to accept unequivocally the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without any linkage or pre-condition, and we hope that the Security Council will be able to take a strong and resolute stand on this issue. It is also obvious that the South African Government will not change its policies until it is persuaded that its failure to comply with the requests of the Security Council will trigger the adoption of firm and effective measures, including measures envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. It is our earnest wish that the Security Council will be able this time to adopt a

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

stand which will induce the South African Government to co-operate with the United Nations in putting into effect without delay the plan endorsed for the independence of Namibia, on the basis of resolution 435 (1978).

In conclusion, I wish to express the appreciation of my Government for the tireless and skilful efforts that the Secretary-General has deployed in order to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). His report underlines that what is necessary now is for the Security Council to prove its determination and credibility.

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

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

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Comrade President, I should first like to say how very happy I am to welcome you to the lofty post of President of the Security Council. You represent a fraternal socialist country with which ours enjoys close and very warm relations. The friendship between our peoples has deep historical roots. We are very familiar with your great diplomatic and political skills and your experience, which doubtless will facilitate the work of the Council. I wish you every success in your endeavour.

I also express our delegation's gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations, Ambassador Delpech, for his skilful guidance of the work of the Council last month.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is grateful to members of the Security Council for giving us the opportunity to speak at this meeting.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Quite recently, in February, the Security Council considered one of the most acute problems facing the international community: the problem of apartheid, described by the United Nations as a crime against humanity. Today we are discussing the question of Namibia. The system of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia emanate from the very same scourge: the racist régime of South Africa.

The convening of this series of Security Council meetings shows that the immediate liberation of Namibia is the central, urgent task in the universal struggle for the elimination of the shameful vestiges of colonialism in our world. The statements made by the overwhelming majority of speakers are further convincing proof of the ever-growing international support for the just struggle of the valiant patriots of Namibia, led by their military vanguard, the South West Africa People's Organization, against the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and for the attainment by the Namibian people of genuine independence.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Twenty years ago the United Nations General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa. Since then, many resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly calling upon the racist colonialist régime Pretoria to terminate immediately its illegal occupation of Namibia. Among the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, I would refer in particular to resolution 385 (1975) and 435 (1978), which contain the only basis for a just and peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem that has achieved international recognition.

Throughout those years, however, racist South Africa has obstinately continued to sabotage implementation of those resolutions and persisted in its illegal occupation of Namibia, attempting by force of arms to break the will of the Namibian people for freedom, independence and national self-determination. The racist régime and transnational corporations have ruthlessly exploited Namibia's natural and human resources. There can be no doubt that one of the main reasons the racist régime of South Africa continues to refuse to grant complete independence to Namibia is the wealth to be found there. It is a Territory rich in diamonds, copper, uranium and other strategic minerals. The scale of the exploitation of Namibia's resources by foreign economic interests can be gauged by the data set forth in a document prepared by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which states that more than 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product is appropriated as pre-tax income by corporations. A significant portion of the remaining 40 per cent is used by foreign interests in Namibia for operational expenses.

From time to time Pretoria revives its Namibia propaganda campaign. It issues hollow statements about its intention to "grant" independence to the Namibian people. Under close scrutiny, however, those statements are but patently deceitful attempts to maintain South Africa's neocolonialist interests in Namibia by the

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

illegal establishment of a puppet "interim government" there. The granting of independence is hedged about with artificial and extraneous demands and conditions. This is clearly evidenced by Pretoria's much-touted intention to grant independence to Namibia by 1 August 1986. As the Secretary-General quite rightly states in his report, South Africa's pre-condition is "the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia" (S/18767, para. 32). The entire international community, apart from the immediate henchmen and protectors of the racist régime in Pretoria, is in agreement with the Secretary-General's opinion that South Africa's precondition related to so-called linkage is invalid and cannot justify the postponement or delaying of Namibian independence.

The General Assembly in its resolutions - inter alia resolution 40/97 - has stated that the continuing illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia by South Africa constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a serious threat to international peace and security.

The African countries, the countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement, the United Nations General Assembly and various other international forums, as well as the broad majority of world public opinion, support the noble struggle of the Namibian people and have on many occasions called upon the Security Council to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. It is quite clear that the longer the delay in imposing such sanctions, the less likely will be any peaceful and non-violent solution to the problem of Namibia.

However, the obstructionist position adopted in this matter by some Western countries remains unchanged. As preceding speakers have stated here, the most recent evidence of this was provided on 20 February of this year, when a draft resolution submitted to the Security Council calling for the imposition of partial

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Republic of Germany. The error of such justifications and the invalid nature of talk of the harmfulness of sanctions has been amply exposed, most recently in the course of the Council's present deliberations.

However, the explanation for such an attitude lies elsewhere. According to information furnished by the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid in its report to the forty-first session of the General Assembly, direct foreign capital investment in South Africa totals some \$25 billion, more than 40 per cent of which is furnished by United Kingdom corporations and banks. The second major investors in South Africa are corporations of the Federal Republic of Germany, which account for 20 per cent of all capital investments. The United States of America accounts for 17 per cent of capital investments. According to the same data, out of the 1,068 transnational corporations operating in South Africa, 206 are American, 364 are British and 142 are West German.

Can we be surprised, therefore, that the limited sanctions introduced in the United States and the United Kingdom in response to pressure from the international community and world public opinion, affect only secondary areas of trade in South Africa and have no real effect? It is also clear that the widely touted "withdrawal" from South Africa by a number of American companies, primarily for commercial reasons, will have no effect at all on the South African economy. In fact, such purely selfish actions by international monopolies, under the ongoing policies of "constructive" and other types of "engagement" with South Africa being practised by a number of Western countries, primarily the United States, encourage the racist régime of Pretoria to disregard the international community, undermine efforts to eliminate the system of apartheid and allow it to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia. I stress that mere moral condemnation of the racists

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

through futile diplomatic calls for an end to apartheid is not enough: it is high time that concrete, effective measures were adopted. Indeed, the situation in southern Africa is so critical that such measures are now an urgent necessity.

The Ukrainian SSR believes it necessary immediately to ensure the decolonization of Namibia and the attainment by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity in a unified State, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, as well as the transfer of all power to the people of Namibia as represented by their sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO.

The Ukrainian SSR firmly supports the appeal to the Security Council launched by African and other non-aligned countries to introduce comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in order to compel Pretoria to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without any extraneous considerations.

Guided by its position of principle, the Ukrainian SSR will continue to support the struggle of the valiant people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, for their liberation.

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

(The President)

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

Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): I extend to you with pleasure, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your well-deserved assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. I should like to take this opportunity also to express our appreciation for the able manner in which your immediate predecessor, Ambassador, Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, conducted the affairs of the Security Council last month.

Mr. President, we take due cognizance of the difficult task that you have to perform. We are none the less certain that the vast experience and immense diplomatic skill and wisdom that you bring to the presidency will guarantee general support for your leadership role. We pledge our unflinching support for your guidance of the Council in dealing with the important issue before us.

I wish to place on record my Government's deepest appreciation of the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in the matter before the Council. Indeed, we recall the profuse expressions of support for the Secretary-General at the time of his recent election. We were unable to identify one delegation that did not express support. If it is necessary, we should like to remind all concerned to recall their support for the Secretary-General and to complement his efforts in the Namibian question. His most recent report is self-explanatory and we commend it to those who have not seen it.

We are here today with a rather heavy heart and a sense of disappointment. We hope that that disappointment and despair will turn to optimism and satisfaction by the time the Security Council winds up its deliberations on the agenda item. The Council's apparent inability to live up to the intentions of the founding fathers of the United Nations and to the expectations of the international community in the South African crisis because of the selfish arrogance of power of some of the

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

permanent members remains a blight on the authority of the Organization. It is our hope that this meeting will not be turned into yet another occasion for dashing the legitimate aspirations of the struggling people of Namibia in preference for economic gain and parochial interests.

The history and nature of the Namibian question have been sufficiently documented, and I shall not repeat the details at this time. It is, indeed, a shame that, 20 years after the termination of apartheid South Africa's Mandate over the Trust Territory, the racist régime has blatantly defied the United Nations and the will of the world community by refusing to surrender its pernicious control over the Territory. Nearly 10 years ago the Security Council, which our Charter vested with the authority to deal with breaches of peace, adopted a United Nations plan for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian crisis in the form of resolution 435 (1978). That action was hailed by the international community and endorsed by all parties involved in the Namibian crisis, including the apartheid régime. The United Nations plan, however, remains unimplemented to this day because of the prevarications of racist South Africa, encouraged by its friends and allies. Issues extraneous and irrelevant to the plan contained in resolution 435 (1978), issues which predate the adoption of the resolution and which were not raised at the time of negotiations on the United Nations plan for Namibia, are now being flaunted as red herrings to block implementation of the plan. In any event, the legitimate quest of the Namibian people for self-determination, freedom and independence has been frustrated. It is a betrayal.

It is our view that the pariah South African entity could not have had the effrontery to challenge and defy world opinion, as expressed in numerous resolutions of the United Nations, including those of the Security Council, were it not for the support and deliberate encouragement it receives from some powerful Members of the United Nations and the Security Council. It is the greatest irony

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

of history, and perhaps a reflection of the contempt in which some Members hold our Organization that countries which voluntarily and actively participated in fashioning the United Nations plan for Namibian independence are now engaged in subverting implementation of the same plan.

We are forced to search for the motive for this unusual situation. We recognize that all Member States support the principle of self-determination and independence. We note that all Member States renewed support for the United Nations at the recent fortieth anniversary celebrations. We have been unable to identify any support for the system of apartheid. The foregoing analysis leads us to conclude that there is a racial dimension to the policies that certain powerful countries are pursuing with regard to the Namibian and, indeed, the entire South African issue. It is clear and indisputable that racism is the main consideration in the official policies of apartheid South Africa. It is beginning to appear that racism also informs the official policies of certain friends and supporters of racist South Africa.

My delegation is nevertheless hopeful that the predominant feeling of sympathy for and understanding of the Namibian cause expressed by the good people of those countries will soon be reflected in the policies of their Governments. We pay tribute to the citizens of all countries who, through mass action, have distanced themselves from the myopic policies that their Governments have been pursuing in Namibia and South Africa.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

We salute their courage and determination to live up to the true traditions of their own history and their enlightened beliefs in the principles of self-determination, freedom and justice. The struggle of the Namibian people is in the true tradition of the quest for freedom and self-determination by oppressed people throughout the annals of history.

The co-operation and collaboration with racist South Africa in its continued stranglehold over Namibia by certain Western countries have recently taken a new turn in the form of the increased militarization of the Trust Territory and, indeed, the entire southern African region. It has been widely reported in certain Western European newspapers that secret arms shipments to racist South Africa have resumed again. The international Territory of Namibia is being used in this nefarious plan to arm the apartheid South African régime, in contravention of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) imposing a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. It is being claimed that the arms are destined for the UNITA armed bandits of Angola. We know, however, that UNITA is but a proxy of the pariah Pretoria régime. The independent African States in the southern African region are being threatened with possible military reprisals because of their support for the legitimate struggle for freedom in Namibia and South Africa. The Territory of Namibia is being used by the South African-sponsored UNITA armed bandits to launch military incursions into the independent and sovereign nation of Angola, portions of whose territory have been under South Africa's occupation for some years now.

It is a matter for regret that in spite of the world-wide rejection and condemnation of the South African-established "interim government" in the international Trust Territory of Namibia, in spite of the unequivocal rejection of that non-government by the United Nations, certain governments have started to deal with the puppets of that entity who masquerade as ministers. The motive for this

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

sinister collaboration is now coming to light - a move to deplete the enormous natural resources of Namibia, in contravention of relevant United Nations resolutions and Decree No. I, promulgated by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974 to protect Namibia's natural resources. Once again, the lure of economic gains is being given priority and precedence over human suffering and misery in Namibia.

As the report of the Secretary-General, contained in document S/18767 of 31 March 1987 vividly shows, the implementation of the Council's plan for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question has consistently been delayed because of racist South Africa's insistence on pre-conditions extraneous to the plan contained in resolution 435 (1978). The Angolan Government, in order to get the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) going, has since 1984 committed itself to a phased withdrawal of the Cuban international forces under the Mindelo Act it entered into with the Government of the United States. This undertaking was reached despite the sovereign right of the Angolan Government, under international law, to choose whom to invite into its borders. The demonstration of good faith on the part of the Angolan authorities is, however, not sufficient for the racist Pretoria régime, which continues to insist on complete withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola before the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

The international community has repeatedly rejected this "linkage" theory. The Final Communiqué of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which took place in Harare in September 1986, and the Action Programme adopted by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which took place in Vienna in 1986, rejected and condemned the doctrine of "linkage". The people of Namibia have suffered enough. For how long must Namibians be denied their just rights on the altar of apparent filial kinship with the apartheid rulers of South Africa? The international community must urgently

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

address the genocide that is being perpetrated by the minority régime of Afrikaners in southern Africa. During the Second World War black and African people in the colonies were conscripted to fight against Hitler's fascism and genocide. Africa is now asking the Western Powers to live up to their oft-repeated respect for democracy and freedom by persuading apartheid South Africa to quit the international Territory of Namibia - and to do so now.

We believe that the Charter has enough provisions for dealing with aggressor nations which breach international peace and security. Having tried negotiations and mediation, regrettably without success, we are now calling on the international community to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter against South Africa. This is the only alternative peaceful course of action left to the international community. It is for this reason that we support and recommend the draft resolution before the Council.

It is an indictment of the authority of the Council that a minority Afrikaner régime, representing less than 5 million white South Africans, should defy its decisions regarding Namibia. This becomes ridiculous when it is realized that some members of the Council are regrettably encouraging the racist régime's acts of defiance. Racist South Africa's colonialism in the Trust Territory of Namibia must be brought to an end. The Pretoria régime must be forced to discharge its obligations under international law in the context of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Council must facilitate that process by enforcing its authority in Namibia: by calling on all State Members of our Organization, as well as non-members, immediately to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime until it relinquishes its illegal and nefarious hold over Namibia. Let us unite to act now.

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

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

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to express my congratulations to you, Sir, the worthy representative of Bulgaria, on your assumption of the presidency of this important organ for this month of April, and we are confident that the work of the Security Council will benefit from your wise and experienced leadership.

At the same time, we wish to express our appreciation to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, who so ably and zealously guided the business of the Council during the past month of March.

In 1985 the Security Council considered the situation in Namibia, as well as the arrogant and treacherous behaviour of the Pretoria racists, who continued to thwart the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978. On that occasion the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), in which it was established that there only remained to determine the electoral system to be used for the election, under United Nations supervisions, for the Constituent Assembly, so that resolution 435 (1978) could be implemented and Namibia accede to its longed-for independence.

Throughout all these years the international community in a variety of international forums, such as the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations itself, has affirmed that Namibia has the right to be independent and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the appropriate framework for the attainment of that cherished and inalienable aspiration of the Namibian people. The only obstacle impeding the independence of Namibia has proved to be the arrogant and intransigent position of racist South Africa in perpetuating

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

its colonial domination in Namibia and, in this, it is clear that it has enjoyed the encouragement and support of those in Washington who concocted the so-called constructive engagement and linkage, subterfuges and theories totally alien to the spirit and letter of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

It was necessary to create genuine conditions for human dignity, proclaimed in resolution 435 (1978, to be guaranteed, in order that it could become a concrete and objective fact. In reading today the excellent report of Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar - for which we express our appreciation - we see the following:

"As members of the Security Council are aware, in November 1985 agreement was reached with the parties concerned on the system of proportional representation for the elections envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). With this agreement, the last outstanding issue relevant to the United Nations plan was resolved." (S/18767, para. 31)

It is clear to everyone that with the agreement referred to by the Secretary-General in his report the only pending issue to implement resolution 435 (1978) was resolved. In insisting, with the support of its Washington allies, upon pre-conditions under so-called linkage - which has already been rejected on more than one occasion by the international community - South Africa continues to stall the process aimed at Namibia's independence.

In view of the foregoing, all that remains to be done without further delay is to implement the above-mentioned, and now historic, resolution 435 (1978) and to react urgently to the earnest appeal made by the Secretary-General to all the parties concerned, as well as to the international community as a whole, to make a determined effort to emplace the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia in 1987.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

The day before yesterday the Permanent Representative of South Africa in this Council made a cynical statement reflecting everything the South African authorities are doing to guarantee what he termed the well-being of the Namibian people - in the fields of health and education. What we heard was the same as what we had already heard on many other occasions from other colonial Powers. For the representative of South Africa the most valuable thing is their spurious well-being, whereas for the peoples themselves what is most valuable is freedom and independence. And, as always, in a demonstration of his frustrated belligerence, the representative of Pretoria in concluding his statement threatened to apply fanciful reforms in Namibia - in other words, unilateral arrangements. How can South Africa, which has so often challenged the international community, now come before the Security Council to proffer new threats?

"Linkage" was quite simply concocted to hold hostage the independence of Namibia, and we wonder how many new "linkages" will be created by the Pretoria racists in continuing to flout the appeal of the world's conscience and to violate the decision of the International Court of Justice, which declared South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal. How many new "linkages" will be created to continue thwarting Namibia's independence? Are we perhaps forgetting the other delaying manoeuvres and obstacles? The following are examples of such tactics: the holding of elections in Namibia in December 1978, despite the United Nations plan; the problems of the demilitarized zone; the question of the numerical size of the United Nations forces; and the impartiality of this very Organization.

We should not be surprised to see new "linkages" in future, until the final suggestion would be to attempt to eliminate the South West Africa People's Organization from the process towards Namibian independence.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Clearly, that South African arrogance is being manifested owing to the fact that to date two permanent members of the Security Council - the United States and the United Kingdom - have used the veto to prevent the application of sanctions.

South Africa's habitual intransigence in refusing to comply with the Council's decisions only lead us to think, after so many years, that there remains no other alternative but to apply the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter to compel the racists to bow to the appeals for reason and to history, for it is an anomaly that Pretoria's obduracy should be allowed to give rise to a focus of tension threatening international peace and security in that part of southern Africa.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

This is no time to handle the Pretoria racists with kid-gloves. In addition to occupying Namibia, they have violated the sovereignty of Angola by maintaining in its southern part a number of military units whose sole purpose is to assist in the detabilizing activities of the mercenary bands of UNITA.

We are once again seeing the already threadbare manoeuvres of South Africa designed to distract attention and to delay the entire process. In this case South Africa dares to tell us that the framework of resolution 435 (1978) has already been left behind by events. It would be wise for us to pause here, meditate upon this point and draw the appropriate lessons, because South Africa is thus subtly attempting to draw us into a new labyrinth that will lead us away from the clear, definite, well lit and well paved road provided by resolution 435 (1978). I believe we have seen too much trickery from the South African racists to be deceived once again by the same siren songs.

My statement could be quite lengthy if I were to attempt to list each and every one of the cases of South African aggression against the front-line countries. It is well known that Namibia is being used for the continuous acts of aggression against Angola, a sovereign country and a Member of this Organization. And in this regard let us not forget the genocidal policy applied by the apartheid régime against the black people of South Africa themselves. It suffices simply to read the New York daily press to learn the number of victims whose blood is daily paving the road to freedom in South Africa to realize once and for all that, like a cancer or a case of political AIDS, that régime is gnawing away peace and stability in southern Africa.

We are firmly convinced that it is not rhetoric that will resolve this bitter and sad reality. Therefore we appeal to the Council, which our Organization's Charter endows with the responsibility of protecting international peace and

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

security, to apply without delay the measures prescribed for cases such as that before us today, so that the people of Namibia, under the guidance of its sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), may speedily accede to independence and, confident in its future, come and sit among us here as an independent and sovereign country working for peace and development.

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

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

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish at the very outset to convey to you, Sir, our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that your expertise and diplomatic experience will help us achieve the results we hope for. Your representation of the friendly country of Bulgaria is truly of benefit to the righteous and the just in the galling Namibian question, which is high on the list of thorny international problems. We have come here to discuss that problem and to take the actions necessary to secure a realistic response to it in our civilized world - namely the granting to the Namibians of their inalienable right to self-determination.

On this occasion I cannot fail to pay tribute to my friend and colleague the Permanent Representative of Argentina, Ambassador Delpech, for his success in presiding over the Council last month.

My delegation is participating in these deliberations in order to join the majority of the international community in demanding the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's occupation of the Namibian people's territories, which continues 20 years after the General Assembly's adoption of its resolution ending South Africa's Mandate over the Territory.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Our participation is inspired by Kuwait's principled and firmly established commitment to the cause of preserving the rights and legitimate interests of peoples and supporting the sanctity of mankind and its liberties and basic needs, regardless of colour, religion or race. It proceeds from our firm commitment to the endeavour to protect the rights of peoples and all they hold sacred, and to prevent injustice.

I should also like to remind those present in this Council of the call made two months ago by leaders of the Islamic countries during their Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, in Kuwait, at which those leaders appealed to all Member States to extend the utmost possible assistance to the people of Namibia in their struggle, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to liberate themselves from the yoke of racist occupation and colonization and to put an end to the plundering of their wealth now being carried out in broad daylight.

My country, Kuwait, has consistently urged the international community firmly to support the justness and legitimacy of this liberation struggle for national independence and self-determination.

Kuwait believes that the solution is implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, to which there is no obstacle except the intransigence and procrastination of the Pretoria racist régime. There must also be firm rejection of any and all attempts to link Namibia's independence to irrelevant issues that do not relate to or stem from international law and to defy the will of the majority of the membership of our world Organization as reflected in many resolutions, notably Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which represents the only valid basis for the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

We have repeatedly debated the irrationality implicit in efforts to make such a linkage, and all have concurred on the illegality of that demand, which has been forcibly introduced into the Namibian question for purposes totally extraneous to it and for the sake of procrastination and prevarication.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Kuwait condemns all attempts by the racist Pretoria régime to establish puppet bodies and administrations in Namibia and to lend them a false legitimacy running counter to the clear will of the people, which will accept no alternative to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the leader of its liberation struggle. We continue to demand that the racist Pretoria régime and its invading forces that occupy Namibia immediately release the heroic political prisoners now held in Namibia and desist from terrorism against the legitimate national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO. Kuwait considers the so-called interim administration in Windhoek to be illegal, null and void; all countries must refrain from providing it with assistance of any kind, for it is but another tool for perpetuating the colonial domination of Namibia.

The present debate reminds us that this year marks the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We should pay a deserved tribute to the role of our world Organization, its Secretary-General, its Council for Namibia and other relevant bodies, and to their sincere, diligent efforts to bring about peacefully the independence of Namibia in spite of the difficulties and frustrations created by the racist régime of South Africa, especially through its policy of escalating aggression whenever messengers of peace take action and whenever the front-line States embark on initiatives towards a settlement.

We consider that the Secretary-General was speaking on behalf of us all when some weeks ago he stated before the Special Committee on decolonization that the decolonization process will remain incomplete so long as millions in Namibia and elsewhere continue to be deprived of independence and stripped of the right of self-determination. The Secretary-General sparked optimism when he said that whatever the racist Pretoria régime may do to ignore the rights of the Namibian

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

people and to defy the international community, we shall not be diverted from the search for a just settlement to the question of Namibia.

The fifth Islamic Summit Conference, held at Kuwait last January, adopted a resolution on support for the liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, which, inter alia, called for

"requesting the Security Council to explore all avenues and employ all available means to expedite the attainment of Namibia's independence".

The conference also supported the struggle waged by SWAPO, including armed struggle, for independence in a united Namibian nation.

I wish to stress once more that history will have no mercy upon those who condone what is being done to the colonized people of Namibia, especially those who are motivated by narrow selfishness at the expense of the millions of oppressed and dispossessed people. Thus, all influential economic Powers and all other States Members of the world Organization must impose a comprehensive economic and military embargo against South Africa until the minority régime in Pretoria demonstrates respect for mankind by guaranteeing fundamental human rights, and until it abides by the resolutions of the international majority, particularly those calling for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

My country's unswerving commitment to supporting efforts to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa was highlighted with Kuwait's election to the vice-chairmanship of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, established in conformity with General Assembly resolution 41/35 F, which called for the imposition of an oil embargo against South Africa. My country will do its utmost to help attain that lofty purpose and will participate in all endeavours to that end.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Morality overcame narrow interests when, last year, the United States Congress adopted economic sanctions against South Africa, even though the sanctions were largely without palpable effect owing to their narrowness and their total lack of congruence with the position taken by the United States Administration in the Security Council.

In that connection, I consider that we owe the Swedish Government our appreciation for its pledge to impose a trade embargo against South Africa beginning on 1 July next. The world has come to the conclusion that international pressure provides the last chance for a non-violent settlement in Namibia.

A draft resolution sponsored by a number of Council members is before the Security Council. My delegation believes that a number of operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, particularly those concerning application of the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, truly reflect the official and popular demands of the international community on this vital issue, as stated both within the United Nations and outside it.

It goes without saying that the Security Council must be the instrument of the hopes of peoples aspiring to a life of freedom and dignity in keeping with the principles of the Charter. That Charter entrusts the members of the Security Council with a special responsibility to defend its principles and ensure its application. Thus, the international community expects the Council to support and adopt the draft resolution before it.

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

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

Mr. MOHIUDDIN (Bangladesh): I speak to add my voice to a growing demand for action on a matter that has been pending far too long. Ours is a call whose echoes resound around the globe. Perhaps many here recall how the observant saw the winds of change blow across Africa in the 1960s; today those winds have been transformed into a gathering gale of gigantic proportions. Our world must take heed or run the risk that the foundations of our civilization will be obliterated by its force.

Namibia is that important.

But before proceeding, Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you upon your assumption of your high office. I have not the slightest doubt that you will bring to bear the prodigious qualities of your head, your heart, and your intellect upon the deliberations of the Council and ably guide them to a fruitful conclusion.

May I also place on record our deep appreciation for the skilful manner in which your predecessor, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, conducted the affairs of this Council last month.

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

The sorrows of Namibia continue to distress us all deeply. Our relentless efforts, spanning four decades, appear to be verging on futility.

A single odious régime, abhorred by an overwhelming majority of its people and condemned by most of the world, has succeeded in spurning with impunity both global public opinion and specific resolutions of the United Nations. I refer to the racist régime of Pretoria, whose despicable policies constitute perhaps the greatest blot on our present times. The arrogance of South Africa makes a mockery of our demands. Its Government does not simply perpetrate a hateful system at home: even beyond the frontiers of the State it continues its evil machinations to keep the entire nation suppressed and subjugated. With the jackboot of oppression, it tramples beneath its heavy heels the plaintive appeals of the Namibians for freedom.

Pretoria represents an evil that can never be rationally engaged. For reason and rationality are not the values, justice and humanity are not the virtues, to which it can lay claim. The Government of South Africa is an international pariah as a result of its own misdeeds. It has chosen to treat global public opinion with ridicule and disdain. It must be denied all external sources of strength; it must be deprived of all external sources of power.

The responsibility of Namibia weighs heavily on the shoulders and on the conscience of this Council. But to date the Council and the United Nations have not been able to fulfil the commitments to the Namibians. Today the Namibians have taken upon themselves the task of determining their own destiny. Theirs is a valiant struggle. We salute them, as we salute the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). I have no doubt it will lead its people to success and glory.

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

There are many around the world who have accorded their support and sympathy to this glorious cause. To them I give my thanks. The front-line African States have displayed unmatched resilience, fortitude and determination. I offer them my congratulations. The Secretary-General and his colleagues have approached this issue with edifying dedication. I extend them my sincere appreciation.

For the people of my country, Namibia is a cause dear to their hearts, just as it is for all those who have experienced foreign domination. That is why Bangladesh attaches the greatest, the highest, significance to the membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

It is our firm conviction that the racist régime of South Africa will not relent unless its hand is forced. That will require concerted international action. South Africa's attempts at hoodwinking the world by the so-called reforms at home and by the installation of a puppet régime in Windhoek have rightly earned it global derision. These actions have fooled no one. South Africa, to the utter anguish and dismay of most of the world, continues its shameful depredations of precious Namibian resources, in total defiance of Decree No. 1. Pretoria has not only stolen the lands of the Namibian people: it has also stolen their limbs - for forced labour is a corollary of South Africa's illegal occupation.

Must we not make all efforts to compel Pretoria to withdraw from territories to which it has no right? Must we not force South Africa to conform to the norms of accepted civilized State behaviour? Must we allow reason and logic to disappear so easily without protest? We all know the answers to those queries. Why can we not, then, muster enough courage and determination to let ourselves be guided by the dictates of our conscience?

South Africa must be responded to in a language and idiom that it understands. We must isolate it politically, economically and militarily.

(Mr. Mohiuddin, Bangladesh)

The only peaceful method left open now is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. My delegation therefore supports the adoption of the draft resolution before the Council. We may not achieve our aim by this action alone. But imposing it will have a symbolism that will be striking, and by doing so we shall have vindicated ourselves before the judgement of posterity.

The only path to Namibian independence lies through the application of the United Nations plan. That is the only manner through which our aim can be achieved peacefully. The plan contains the principles embodied in the relevant United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The plan is the verdict of the global community. It must be implemented without any modification. All attempts by the racist Pretoria régime to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues must be thwarted. South Africa today stands exposed. That is evidenced in the sentiments and opinions expressed in every relevant forum of the world.

The litany of South Africa's misdeeds is inordinately long, and it will continue to grow unless we act. A simple, hard-hitting resolution, endorsed by all, will help.

If there is a voice in Namibia that does not cry out in anguish, it is only because it has been forcefully muted. If there is a voice in Namibia that does not protest, it is only because it has been silenced and not converted.

Let it not be said in the years to come that we denied an entire people justice by needlessly delaying it or by showing our unconcern.

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

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

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation is grateful for this important opportunity to participate in the Security Council's debate on the situation in Namibia, which is taking place at the urgent request of the member States of the African Group.

At the outset, I should like to extend our sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as President of the Security Council for the month of April. To your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, we express our deep appreciation for the manner in which he presided over the Security Council's affairs in the month of March.

It has not escaped our attention that the Security Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia is taking place at the same time as the ongoing struggle of the peoples of South Africa against the inhumane and evil system of apartheid.

Is there no sense of shame? Can the permanent members of the Security Council in all good conscience continue to play out this charade? Is it possible to avoid the weary cynicism that the debates on Namibia in the Security Council seem inevitably to bring out? The answer to all three - not-so-rhetorical - questions is "No". There is no shame. There is no good conscience. And weary cynicism will not be avoided.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

The powerful have taken a stand. The weak must wait and splutter in anger, in frustration and in resignation.

It is not as if the issues about which we debate in circles are not well known; it is not as if the justice of the cause of the Namibian people is not almost universally acknowledged; it is not as if the item is new; it is not as if Namibia were not a United Nations responsibility by decision of the United Nations itself.

Some nine years have elapsed since the Security Council, by resolution 435 (1978), adopted the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia. It remains unimplemented and has been undermined and frustrated by South Africa's duplicity and intransigence.

Jamaica is especially mindful of the uniqueness of the Namibian problem arising out of the fact that the Territory is legally under the direct control and supervision of the United Nations. It is also the only decolonization issue in which the United Nations, by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), has established a precise framework, unanimously agreed by the parties concerned, outlining the modalities for the implementation of the independence plans for the Territory.

The recent report by the Secretary-General (S/18767) concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) clearly sets out the painstaking efforts and initiatives he has undertaken with a view to securing the immediate implementation of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia's independence. Not surprisingly, it candidly reveals that the sole responsibility for the delay in Namibia's independence lies with the Government of South Africa, especially as a result of its insistence on linking Namibia's independence with the extraneous issue of the removal of Cuban forces from Angola. South Africa is not alone in that view.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

Thus, with all the outstanding procedural issues having been settled, the stalemate in the immediate implementation of the United Nations settlement plan remains unbroken. Accordingly, the Secretary-General has been forced to conclude:

"Regrettably, South Africa's proposal that 1 August 1986 be set as the date for the implementation of the United Nations plan ran counter to relevant Security Council decisions, since it reaffirmed that prior agreement must be reached on the total withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola before implementation. The proposal as a whole could therefore not be sustained as a valid basis for proceeding with the implementation of the United Nations plan. This linkage pre-condition, which dates back to 1982, now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. I do not recognize the validity of the linkage pre-condition, nor can I accept it as a pretext to delay any further the independence of Namibia. The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a separate matter, to be dealt with by those directly concerned acting within their sovereign competence." (S/18767, para. 32)

Jamaica fully endorses and concurs with the very pertinent concluding remarks and observations of the Secretary-General. We totally reject the notion of linkage. For far too long the international community has acquiesced and equivocated in its response to Pretoria's stonewalling tactics and its unscrupulous manoeuvres in attempting to transform the Namibian problem into an issue of East-West conflict. Such despicable manoeuvres, which form part of Pretoria's grand regional design to perpetuate the discredited apartheid system and to annex formally and place under its exclusive control the Territory of Namibia, should be firmly confronted and resisted.

Whatever the rationalizations proffered and excuses made, the delay is a betrayal of trust and confidence; it is the undermining of the prestige and

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

credibility of the United Nations and a questioning of the authority of the Security Council. Meanwhile people die, miseries continue, freedom is smothered; but profits are made and exploitation continues.

As was emphasized by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Jamaica, the Right Honourable Hugh Shearer, in his statement at the fourteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Namibia, Jamaica fully supports the Secretary-General's position that a more concerted effort needs to be made to secure the co-operation of South Africa in the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan. He also underscored Jamaica's view that delay can only increase instability and violence in the region and unnecessarily prolong the suffering of Namibia's inhabitants.

It is also the view of the Government of Jamaica that the efforts by the international community to secure Namibia's independence should be complemented by more concerned efforts to assist the United Nations Council for Namibia in protecting and preserving the natural resources and economic wealth of Namibia so that resources will be available for the development of Namibia for the benefit of the Namibian people on the attainment of their independence. We strongly deplore the continued wanton exploitation of Namibia's resources, particularly its marine and mineral resources, by South African and other foreign economic interests. Those illegal actions are inimical to Namibia's future; they have served to keep the Territory in a state of neo-colonial dependence and have facilitated the apartheid régime's illegal occupation of the Territory.

Ideally, the Security Council's resumed consideration of the situation in Namibia should at least lead to some worthy conclusion. But we, the underprivileged, will hope in vain. The battered policy of constructive engagement limps along, with nowhere to go and no suitable haven to find refuge. In such circumstances, there can be no justifiable excuse for the Security Council to delay

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

in taking bold and decisive action to redress the grave injustice which has been wrought on the Namibian people.

The permanent members of the Security Council have special obligations under the Charter for the preservation and maintenance of international peace and security.

Jamaica maintains the view that the application of mandatory comprehensive sanctions is the only peaceful option the Security Council has within its means to mount a credible response to South Africa's aggressive designs. This particular course of action has been viewed as unpalatable to a few influential members of the Council who wield considerable influence over the Pretoria régime. It is our considered view, however, that such opposition as exists to mandatory sanctions is held more out of misguided and short-sighted consideration than because of genuine concern for the suffering people of Namibia and South Africa.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

Such narrow economic and strategic self-interest should not stand in the way of this quest for international justice and morality and for the defence of the fundamental human rights, dignity, equality and self-worth of the oppressed people of Namibia.

Finally, I wish to reaffirm Jamaica's unstinting support and solidarity with the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, legitimate representative.

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

I propose to adjourn the meeting now. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place this afternoon at 3.30.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.