

APR 8 1987



Security Council

UN/SC COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2741
6 April 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 6 April 1987, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. TSVETKOV

(Bulgaria)

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. YU Mengjia
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. TIMERBAEV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. PABON GARCIA
Mr. ZUZE

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

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

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

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In accordance with a decision taken by the Council at its 2740th meeting, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Canada, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kuwait, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados), Mr. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), Miss Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. 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 Burkina Faso, Cuba, Jamaica, Morocco and Mozambique, 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. Faso Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Burnett (Jamaica), Mr. Bennouna (Morocco) and Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique) 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 on my list is the representative of Zimbabwe, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): At the outset, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. Bulgaria's commitment to peace, equality and the brotherhood of man is second to none, and your own commitment to those same values, as well as your acknowledged diplomatic skills, give us great confidence that the affairs of the Council will be well guided as we deal with the important matters before us.

I wish also to express my appreciation for the way in which His Excellency Ambassador Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina, so ably presided over the work of the Council during the month of March.

The international community has a special responsibility with regard to Namibia. Its duty towards the people of that Territory derives not only from the general responsibility of the United Nations to promote the self-determination and independence of peoples and countries. Its responsibility on the question of Namibia is very special: it emanates from the fact that it was the international community, through its mandate system, that in 1919 put Namibia under South African occupation in the first place. The international community therefore has a direct responsibility to end that occupation.

We are aware of and appreciate the ruling by the world Court in 1971 that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia was illegal. We are aware also of the decision of the United Nations in 1966 to terminate South Africa's Mandate. Furthermore, we continue to support the 1978 decision by the Security Council to put forward a plan for Namibia's independence. Those actions show that the international community acknowledges its responsibility towards Namibia, but sadly they have so far proved inadequate to bring about Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Namibia is still illegally occupied. Its people are not yet free. They continue to be oppressed and brutalized by the apartheid régime. This persists to this day, 21 years after the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, 16 years after the world Court handed down its historic ruling that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal, nine years after the Security Council voted in favour of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, and about two years after the Secretary-General announced to the world that all outstanding issues pertaining to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence had been resolved. We must therefore ask ourselves how such an intolerable situation has been allowed to continue for such a long time when no issues remain outstanding.

According to the Secretary-General, the only stumbling block in the way of proceeding immediately with the implementation of the Namibia independence plan is South Africa's insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In his report on the work of the Organization dated 9 September 1986, the Secretary-General stated that

"A concerted effort needs to be made to gain the co-operation of South Africa in the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan." (A/41/1, p. 10)

Our failure to heed that call by the Secretary-General is one of the reasons the Security Council is meeting today. We have failed to make "a concerted effort" to compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That is why Namibia's independence continues to elude us, like some will-o'-the-wisp.

It is true that the Botha régime now uses the issue of Cuban withdrawal from Angola as its pretext for not allowing Namibia to be free. But that should not fool anybody, for Botha himself is on record as saying that, to South Africa, the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

prior or parallel withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is not necessarily a sine qua non for granting independence to Namibia. What is crucial to Botha is the emergence and survival of an amenable puppet régime in Namibia so that Territory might continue to serve as a buffer State for apartheid South Africa. That is Botha's true prerequisite for Namibia's independence. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola is a convenient red herring which he uses to keep some Western countries enmeshed in his schemes. That interpretation of Botha's strategem emerged very clearly in a statement he made to the South African Parliament on 18 April 1985, in which he said,

"However, as I told Parliament on 27 April 1984, the people of South West Africa/Namibia, including SWAPO, cannot wait indefinitely for a breakthrough on the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola. Should it eventually become evident, after all avenues have been thoroughly explored, that there is no realistic prospect of attaining this goal, all the parties most intimately affected by the present negotiations will obviously have to reconsider how internationally acceptable independence may best be attained in the light of the prevailing circumstances."

Members of the Council will recall that this morning Pretoria's representative ended his statement by paraphrasing the very quotation I have just cited.

Botha has not waited "indefinitely", but has already installed a so-called interim government of his lackeys in Namibia. Those puppets have now produced a so-called constitution which they intend to submit to a national referendum. They have also decided to establish ministries of external affairs and internal security. These are unmistakable initial steps towards an illegal declaration of independence.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

To Botha, "linkage" is an expendable expedient to be used for the purpose of securing his major objective of creating a sustainable Muzorewa-like puppet régime in Namibia. Only such an entity, Botha reasons, can act as a shield or buffer for the apartheid State. He parrots the so-called importance of "linkage" merely to gain time to install his quislings in Namibia. Botha is fully aware that the Cubans are in Angola because he, Botha, invaded Angola and continues to occupy parts of it to this day.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

He knows that if he wants them out of Angola he must himself get out of Angola, move his troops back into South Africa, allow Namibia to become independent and stop supporting the UNITA bandits. But, of course, he does not want that. For the time being the defence of apartheid needs an ideological veil behind which to hide. That veil comes from skilfully equating the defence of apartheid with the defence of Western interests in southern Africa. It is that element that has enabled Botha to lure some Western leaders into thinking that they need his apartheid régime for the defence of their interests. The presence of Cubans in Angola has become an essential ingredient in the Botha scheme to create this illusion in Western eyes. As a result, these interests have become the armour behind which apartheid is protected, a kind of invisible Maginot Line behind which apartheid can resist Namibia's independence. Namibia is still colonized mainly because some key Western countries have become unwitting supporters of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

Linkage therefore is a convenient ideological cold-war mask used by the Pretoria régime to hide its true motives for delaying the granting of independence to Namibia behind East-West rivalry. That is why we must expose it for what it is. And it is for that reason too that we now appeal to those who invented it to defrock the apartheid régime by repudiating linkage. For whatever may have been the true motives behind the origin of linkage, today it has become a stumbling block to Namibia's independence by equating Western interests in southern Africa with the survival of the apartheid régime. Linkage forces the international community to keep addressing matters that are irrelevant and issues that are extraneous to Namibian independence. It diverts pressure and attention from the real cause of the delay - that is, South Africa's intransigence and desire to protect the apartheid State.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

According to a recent report entitled "A U.S. Policy toward South Africa: Report of the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on South Africa", linkage is an integral part of the policy, first formulated in 1980-1981, known as constructive engagement which - and I quote from page 33 of the report - "rested on four interrelated assumptions", one of which was

"that the Botha Government could be induced to agree to an internationally accepted settlement in Namibia if South African withdrawal from Namibia were linked to a withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola".

That is the origin of linkage. The Secretary-General's recent report also puts the genesis of linkage at 1982. Hence, before constructive engagement, linkage as a stumbling block to Namibian independence did not exist and was never used by the apartheid régime as a reason for delaying Namibia's independence. Linkage therefore is a transatlantic invention and obsession. Before the introduction of linkage by the present United States Administration, South Africa, in order to delay Namibia's independence, used excuses such as that concerning the "impartiality of the United Nations", which have long since been disposed of to everybody's satisfaction.

To Pretoria linkage is only a ploy to be used to win support for its policies in the region and to be discarded if and when it loses its appeal, especially across the Atlantic. We note that the report of the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee has concluded that the policy of constructive engagement has not succeeded and that therefore "a new [United States] policy is now urgently required" in regard to South Africa.

It is our hope that linkage, as part and parcel of the failed policy of constructive engagement, will now be abandoned. But the recent search for logistical facilities in the region for possible wider military involvement has caused much apprehension about the new directions United States policy might take

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

in the region. We hope that this does not portend any degeneration from constructive to destructive engagement. In this regard we are concerned by what appears to be efforts to force Angola and the Southern African Development Co-ordinating Conference to capitulate to UNITA blackmail over the reopening of the Banguela railway line. A move towards such a policy would be both misguided and doomed to failure. The UNITA bandits are South Africa's surrogates, needed to provide a buffer to the apartheid régime's occupation of Namibia. Support for UNITA ensures the existence of this buffer for apartheid's control of Namibia. And as long as the buffer exists, Pretoria will have little incentive to get out of Namibia. We therefore hope that the new United States policy towards southern Africa will not include continued collaboration with the apartheid régime in financing the UNITA buffer mechanism for the defence of apartheid and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

Those who stand in the way of Namibia's independence for any reason whatsoever bear a heavy moral responsibility. Whether they accept it or not, they are in fact accomplices in the brutalities committed by the apartheid régime against the people of Namibia - brutalities committed in order to make South Africa safe for apartheid.

The prevalence of such acts of inhumanity are matched only by their callousness. And these acts have been thoroughly documented and attested to by numerous church and human-rights organizations. They make most chilling reading indeed. Take, for example, the revelations made by Warrant Officer Nikodemus Nampala, a member of the Namibian police force for 13 years, when he gave evidence during the trial of some eight partisans of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in Windhoek recently. According to police officer Nampala, widespread use of violence on prisoners takes place in Namibian prisons. The police officer claimed that such use of violence is justifiable and necessary in

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

order to achieve certain results. "You thrash him until he cracks," said officer Nampala during a court hearing, "until he points out what has to be pointed out". Asked by the counsel for defence, a Mr. Brian O'Lyn, "where does [this thrashing] end?", Mr. Nampala was quite reassuring: "We don't beat them to death". Asked again if rules preventing abuse of prisoners do not apply to suspected SWAPO freedom fighters, Warrant Officer Nampala was again quite revealing. According to him it was all right to torture such prisoners "as long as we don't kill them".

When one of the eight accused, Comrade Andreas Heita, stripped to the waist to show scars on his chest and across his back, Warrant Officer Nampala, who had arrested him, testified that the prisoner had not had those scars when he arrested him nor indeed were they inflicted during the arrest; they were inflicted while the prisoner was in police custody.

Warrant Officer Nampala's attitude is by no means isolated. It is intrinsic to the apartheid system. Take, for example, the recent remarks by a Mr. Swanepoel, a parliamentary candidate in the present whites-only election and the former South African Chief Police Interrogator and commander during the 1976 Soweto massacres. According to Swanepoel, blacks are

"emotional people who easily go over to mob violence. The only way to stop them is to use as much force as is necessary. If you have to shoot one person or wound one person in the leg to stop him, you do so. But if it is necessary to shoot a hundred to get the situation under control, do it. There are no half measures when you deal with riots. Law and order must be restored at all costs".

According to Swanepoel, over 70 per cent of the South African police forces share his thinking.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It is therefore not surprising that these acts of brutality and inhumanity are being perpetrated in Namibia. Namibian prisoners are being thrashed until they crack, until they point out what has to be pointed out. Torture is commonplace; only murder is said to be avoided. This is the lot to which the Namibian people are condemned. This is the only way the racist occupying forces can keep Namibia under subjugation: by use of brute force. This is what linkage is legitimizing and perpetuating in Namibia: scars on the chest, scars on the back. And Pretoria's representative this morning boasted of how well his country has been looking after the Namibians. Some caring, indeed!

In the midst of all this, the pillaging of Namibia's natural resources continues unabated. We therefore welcome the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to enforce its Decree No. 1. We urge the Council for Namibia to remain firm and resolute in pursuing the legal battle against URENCO and others to its logical conclusion. The Council should not shirk its responsibilities. It must act without fear or favour to protect and preserve Namibia's natural resources. The judgement of history has never been kind to those who betray a role of trust. History will not forgive the Council for Namibia were it ever to give in to outside pressure in the execution of its sacred trust.

The question of Namibia poses an excruciating moral dilemma for the friends of South Africa. South Africa is in Namibia in defiance of international law. The Security Council has a plan agreed to by all, including South Africa, to bring Namibia to independence. There are no moral or legal reasons why South Africa should continue to occupy Namibia. Its only interest is to buy time for the perpetuation of the policy of apartheid in South Africa. How can any country represented here justify protecting such selfish and immoral ends?

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Let us hope that no member of the Council will find it necessary to protect the perpetuation of racism in South Africa and Namibia by casting a negative vote. Above all, nobody should insult us by asking the international community to wait for the outcome of the whites-only general elections in May before taking action against the Pretoria régime. This ploy is now thread-bare. It has been used a number of times before. For example, it was used in 1981 after Botha scuttled the Geneva pre-implementation talks and called for another whites-only election. We now know it for what it is: a device for inaction, a strategem to buy time for the continued occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa, a gimmick to allow the pillaging of Namibian resources, a justification for the continued torture and murder of Namibians. We therefore reject it out of hand even before it is proffered. We also cannot accept such excuses as that there are secret contacts which should not be disturbed. We have heard them a thousand times before. We know them to be hollow, and are therefore unimpressed by them.

South Africa does not need to be given more time to think about getting out of Namibia. It is there illegally, in defiance of Security Council decisions. It must be ordered out of Namibia - not tomorrow, but yesterday. The authority of the Security Council is being challenged. Has this Council the political will to uphold its authority? That is the challenge before this world body, and we shall know the Council's response to it by the way it votes. South Africa must be given the choice of either agreeing to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) now or of facing immediate imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. I trust no member of the Council will condone the defiance of international law and protect the apartheid occupation of Namibia by casting a negative vote on the draft resolution before the Council.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Finally, we salute the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic voice of the Namibian people, for its commitment and dedication to the liberation of its motherland. We applaud its leadership for the statesmanship and dignity it has demonstrated in its struggle for independence. We appeal to the international community to provide concrete material assistance to SWAPO in addition to the usual expressions of solidarity and diplomatic support. We thank the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to bring about Namibian independence. I want to assure him that in his arduous task he can always rely on our support and understanding. We welcome his latest report for being frank and forthright.

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

Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan): I welcome this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this Council for the month of April. I am confident that with your wisdom and broad diplomatic experience our deliberations will be conducted in a fruitful manner. Let me assure you, Sir, that my delegation is ready to extend its full co-operation as you carry out your important responsibilities.

I wish also to express our heartfelt gratitude to His Excellency Dr. Marcelo Delpech for the excellent manner in which he guided the work of this Council as its President during the month of March.

When the Security Council met last February to deliberate on the question of South Africa, I outlined the position of my Government on the abhorrent system of apartheid. In today's statement, therefore, I should like to confine my remarks to matters directly related to the present agenda item, namely, the situation in Namibia.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

At the outset I wish to note the report which the Secretary-General recently submitted concerning the implementation of its resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia. We have read the report with deep interest and wish to pay high tribute to the strenuous efforts that Secretary-General Pérez de Cuéllar has made to settle the Namibian question.

It is a matter of profound concern to the international community that two decades after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory the people of Namibia are still being denied their right to self-determination.

Since then, the international community has continued without respite its efforts to gain Namibia's independence. The Security Council and General Assembly have adopted a number of resolutions on the question of Namibia; the front-line States, the United Nations Secretary-General and other parties have made serious efforts to resolve the issue; and many countries, including my own, have been pressuring South Africa in various ways. However, South Africa, in defiance of international opinion, remains unmoved and continues its illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

Japan's position on this issue is firm and unequivocal: Namibia's independence must be achieved in accordance with the wishes of its inhabitants, as expressed through free elections to be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Japan steadfastly supports Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which embodies the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence.

Both the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have indicated their acceptance of the settlement plan endorsed by that resolution. But while professing its willingness to co-operate with the international community, South Africa has in fact been working to block the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Pretoria's conciliatory words are belied by its belligerent actions.

Its introduction of the linkage issue is a case in point. Last year South Africa proposed that the date of 1 August 1986 be set as a target date for commencing implementation of the settlement plan. This proposal first appeared to be a positive step forward, but it was not, as South Africa insisted upon the pre-condition regarding the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. In his report, which I mentioned earlier, the Secretary-General concluded:

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

He went on to say that he did not recognize the validity of the linkage pre-condition, nor could he accept it as a pretext to delay any further the independence of Namibia. Japan, too, maintains that efforts to resolve the Namibian question must not be obstructed by extraneous issues.

It is also recalled that in June 1985, South Africa set up what it calls an interim government in Namibia, in violation of the explicit provisions of Security

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

Council resolution 435 (1978). This is nothing but a ploy to frustrate the United Nations plan and further delay a peaceful settlement. Japan regards it as null and void.

Moreover, South Africa continues to mount armed attacks against neighbouring countries, destabilizing the situation throughout the region and making the possibility of settling the Namibian question even more remote. Japan particularly deplores the attacks against Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana in May last year, as well as the repeated armed incursions into Angolan territory. The latest of these attacks occurred this past January, as reported by Ambassador de Figueiredo of Angola in his letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 January 1987.

Japan has taken vigorous measures to pressure South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and abandon its racist policy of apartheid. In demonstrating its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Japan refrains from any action that would in effect acknowledge the present status of Namibia. For example, the Japanese Government does not extend grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind to South Africans in Namibia.

The Government of Japan also prohibits direct investment in South Africa and Namibia by Japanese nationals or corporations under its jurisdiction. It instituted this policy 20 years ago, long before this became a major issue in the Organization or in any other major industrialized country.

In accordance with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which was enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, no Japanese national or corporation under its jurisdiction maintains mining concessions in Namibia.

Most gravely affected by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory are, of course, the Namibian people themselves: and those who are suffering

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

directly under the yoke of their oppressors, as well as those who have been forced out of their native land as refugees. The neighbouring countries that have accepted the refugees are also experiencing serious difficulties.

Japan has long been extending assistance to the Namibian people through its contributions to the humanitarian and educational funds and programmes administered by the United Nations, including the United Nations Institute for Namibia. Japan is determined to extend such assistance as long as the need continues. As I have already stated, when the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) is in place, Japan will provide assistance in the forms of financial contributions and personnel. Once the independence of Namibia is achieved, Japan is ready to extend bilateral economic and technical co-operation for its nation-building efforts.

Lastly, allow me once again to quote Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, this time from the statement he made at the first meeting of the 1987 session of the United Nations Council for Namibia because my delegation fully concurs with his view:

"The intransigence of South Africa can by no means weaken our resolve. Namibia is a matter of very special importance to the United Nations and one in which the commitment of the international community is total and unequivocal. Even though two decades have passed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, South Africa must be made to realize that the just and legitimate aspirations of the people of the Territory cannot continue to be thwarted without serious detriment to South Africa's own long-term interests and, of course, to the peace and stability of the region as a whole."

As I said, my delegation fully concurs with his view. The Government of South Africa must realize that the international community is more firmly united than ever before in calling for the immediate independence of Namibia. It can no longer

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

tolerate Pretoria's prevarications, empty excuses, and an extraneous linkage. Japan demands once again that South Africa heed the voice of reason and grant Namibia its independence without further delay, as demanded by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

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

Mr. PABON GARCIA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. President, allow me to express my delegation's pleasure at seeing you in charge of our work this month and to express our sincere and fraternal appreciation to the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Argentina, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, for his wise conduct of the Council's proceedings last month.

Once again, the problem of southern Africa is before us for consideration. Only a few weeks ago the Council gave lengthy consideration to the situation of the South African black majority living under the odious apartheid régime. The violence and oppression characterizing the situation were found to be the cause of instability in the entire area and hence a threat to international peace and security. On that occasion as on earlier occasions, the hardly constructive attitude of a number of members of the Council left the door open to radicalization of the problem.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

Today, with the racist Government in Pretoria being the primary cause of debate, the question of Namibia is once again before us. Violence and oppression are also common features of the situation there. The only difference is that a foreign Government is exercising control over the people of Namibia - that of South Africa. The military occupation of the Territory and the imposition of the subaltern authority of colonial power in order to subvert the people's right to self-determination prove that the situation in Namibia is a political question governed by international law.

However, much as we are concerned by them, we are here to debate not political events inside Namibia, but the international legal situation: territorial occupation in flagrant contempt for international law.

We are discussing the application of the law enforcement machinery available to us. South Africa's defiance of international law and order can no longer be condoned. Any show of appeasement would only be tantamount to acceptance of a double standard: one standard for the international community, and another for South Africa.

The international community cannot continue to allow the minority South African régime to flout with impunity the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In his most recent report concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), in document S/18767 of 31 March 1987, the Secretary-General once again reports to this body that there has been no change in South Africa's position on the question of linkage, which he says has prevented the United Nations from implementing the plan for Namibia.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

Venezuela wishes to draw attention to another aspect of the situation now before us. Failure by the Council to take a stand would only foster increased violence in Namibia and entail further hatred and suffering. Reluctance to accept the implementation of binding general sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter would but prolong the suffering of the millions of victims of that régime and the bloodbath in Namibia, where South Africa is waging a typically colonial war based on the massive militarization of the country.

Any passivity or permissiveness on the part of the Council would only make it an accomplice to what is happening or might happen in that beleaguered land. That should give pause to those countries that presume to stand in the way of concerted action by the international community in its pursuit of a just and lasting solution to the Namibian problem.

In the light of events, Namibia's untold wealth is inextricably intertwined in the general situation obtaining in South Africa. The disproportionately huge profits of the transnational corporations operating there, which are made possible by inhuman exploitation, have in large measure helped finance the stability of the Pretoria Government and account for the very survival of the odious apartheid régime. As a result, Namibia's fate is in double jeopardy. To the extent that that is the case, the international community bears a double responsibility and therefore has a double debt: to the rule of law and to international peace and security.

Venezuela, as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, is disappointed to see how the long-suffering people of Namibia have been abandoned. That disappointment springs from the apparent ineffectiveness of our efforts. "Patience" is beginning to lose its real meaning. To the Namibian people, justice delayed is justice denied - which can only provoke greater violence.

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

Namibia, in spite of its many complex relations of interdependence with southern Africa, must be viewed as a case of colonization pure and simple. The self-determination of a people - a people fully entitled to expect other free peoples to be committed to the happy achievement of its cause - must be viewed within the universally accepted framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Ethically and politically, Venezuela is in solidarity with the cause of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). In an effort to promote freedom and justice and to preserve peace in Namibia, Venezuela would support any enforcement action provided for by the Charter to promote, foster and preserve the fundamental values that give meaning to the civilization and culture of mankind.

The adoption of general binding sanctions against South Africa has been demanded by the international community, by the opponents of apartheid, by its victims and by the front-line States. They are well aware that the economic difficulties that would flow from such sanctions would be a kind of contribution to the struggle of the peoples of that part of the world to overcome the inhuman apartheid system.

A few days ago Venezuela was pleased to receive SWAPO's President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, who had lengthy talks with a number of our officials, including an important dialogue with the President of the Republic, Mr. Jaime Lusinchi. His stay in the country provided an opportunity for an in-depth analysis of recent events in Namibia. The press communiqué issued at the conclusion of the visit states, inter alia, that

"the interest of both peoples in the strengthening of democratic institutions and in support of the front-line countries in their struggle against the repeated acts of aggression of the Government of South Africa remains intact. They reaffirm their support for those countries and their efforts to overcome

(Mr. Pabon Garcia, Venezuela)

their economic and social problems and to establish political independence and autonomy in the area."

For all those reasons Venezuela wishes once again to ask whether the time has not come for the Council, within the context of Article 50 of the Charter and as an exercise in prudent preventive diplomacy, to hear the views of the countries of the area on the adverse effects that a policy of sanctions against South Africa might have on their respective economies.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Venezuela for his kind words to me.

I now invite the representative of Peru to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, I should like cordially to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to express our gratitude for the skilful guidance of the Council by your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech of Argentina.

In its 41 years of existence the United Nations has for more than 20 of these years been faced with a challenge to its political and moral authority owing to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

In the past six years alone the Security Council has been called upon to consider this question eight times. During that time five draft resolutions aimed at putting an end to South African colonial occupation and at beginning implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia were vetoed.

A vast world-wide coalition has supported and given impetus to this process designed to remedy this grave breach of the international juridical order. The cause of independence for Namibia has universal value: it has been embraced by an overwhelming number of States with varying systems and degrees of development; it has brought together the most varied political and social forces; and it has rallied the most diverse non-governmental organizations in a common effort to defend peace, freedom and the rights of peoples.

More recently this striving for freedom has been increasingly reflected in the quantity and quality of the sanctions adopted against South Africa, and today it is incumbent upon the Council to consolidate such action in an overall, mandatory and comprehensive mandate, in keeping with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter, to give further impetus to peaceful transition towards genuine independence for Namibia.

In this connection we welcome the efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at achieving progress in the search for agreement on the immediate implementation of

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

the United Nations plan, as well as the renewed pledge for peace made on this occasion by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which expressed its full readiness to discuss a cease-fire with a view to initiating the implementation of the plan on 1 August 1986.

The South African Government obstructed this process by insisting on invalid conditions extraneous to the problem - conditions already rejected by this Council - as well as the fiction of a so-called internal régime lacking any legitimacy or representativeness since it disregarded the elementary political principle of equality - which was also rejected by this Council.

The actions undertaken during 1987 to bring South Africa to renounce this obstructionist policy have so far been fruitless, and it is now up to the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, vigorously to reaffirm its commitment to the cause of freedom for Namibia.

Increasingly isolated interests are continuing to obstruct this appeal of the universal conscience and contributing, by their actions, to South Africa's illusory attempt to check the tide of history.

The veto policy aids and abets South Africa's defiance, thus undermining the United Nations and prolonging the subjugation and exploitation of Namibia. To the formal legal veto is added the material and tangible veto in the form of external support for South Africa by way of investments, loans from financial institutions, the sale of weapons and technology that increase its military capacity to wage a war of occupation against the people of Namibia, commit acts of aggression against neighbouring States and maintain apartheid.

The Government of Peru, in keeping with the requirements of internal social change, reaffirms its democratic and anti-imperialist position of solidarity with all the oppressed peoples of the world and on this occasion reiterates its active support for SWAPO's struggle.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

We are convinced that international solidarity with the Namibian people must acquire a more clearly defined political dimension. Hence last year Peru established diplomatic relations with SWAPO and has just received in Lima the official visit of President Sam Nujoma, a solemn occasion when President Alan Garcia reaffirmed to President Nujoma the militant commitment of Peru in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism and Peru's decision actively to participate in the international mobilization leading to the achievement of Namibia's genuine, final and total independence.

Today the overwhelming majority of States represented in this Organization - which reject the illegitimate use of force to subject a people, pillage a nation or colonize a State - once again urge the Council to assume its responsibility and put an end to the veto policy that impedes the adoption of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa as called for in the draft resolutions of the non-aligned countries and as consistently advocated by Peru within and outside the Council.

When the Council adopts these measures, we shall have taken an irreversible step towards ending the illegal occupation of Namibia and the international system will have swept aside one of the main focal points of tension and danger.

On the other hand, if the veto policy once again impedes the application of the measures provided for in the Charter to maintain peace and the rule of law, we shall have yet again shown what are the motives and reasons impeding freedom for Namibia and the scope will have been more clearly defined, revealing those that are and those that are not part of this vast coalition of States in favour of freedom and justice.

For Latin American countries there is no dilemma, and the path laid out for us by our liberators is clear, identified as we have been since our birth with life in

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

independence, with the struggle in solidarity against colonial domination and in support for the common defence of racial equality, human dignity and the freedom of peoples - something which constitutes an irreversible historical process.

For an analysis of history confirms our conviction that colonialism cannot endure and that no veto can stand in the way of the struggle of the people of Namibia, SWAPO's leadership and the solidarity of the peoples of the world with the cause of Namibia's genuine freedom and independence.

Peru is fully identified with this cause, and today we renew our firm and broad support for it.

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

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

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me pleasure, Sir, at the outset to convey to you our congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to express to you our full confidence that your great diplomatic abilities and rich political experience will enable you fully to discharge your responsibilities. I should also like to take this opportunity to convey our gratitude and appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Delpech, for the ability and wisdom with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

The independence of Namibia has been one of the subjects most studied by the major organs of the United Nations since the Organization's first session in 1946, when General Assembly resolution 65 (I) was adopted. Ever since then, this question has been before the Assembly and the Security Council. Many resolutions have been adopted by both organs, including a resolution on the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, and another on the United Nations assumption of direct responsibility for the Territory's administration, resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967, which also established the United Nations Council for Namibia to act as the organ through which the international Organization would discharge its responsibilities to the Territory and its people until the attainment of independence.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represents the culmination of the position arrived at by the international community with regard to this question. That resolution contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which is rightly considered the only internationally accepted basis for the achievement of a peaceful settlement of the question. Subsequent resolutions have affirmed that the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) cannot be linked to any extraneous factors or considerations. That has been the position of the entire international community; yet, South Africa persist in its policy of prevarication

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

and procrastination and in fabricating obstacles to the implementation of Security Council resolutions, including those South Africa itself has accepted.

For many years the reports submitted by the United Nations Secretary-General on his consultations with the Government of South Africa concerning the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence have affirmed that, despite the achievement of agreement on all matters pertaining to the plan's implementation, no progress has yet been made in that regard because of the racist régime's insistence on linking its withdrawal from the Territory to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That linkage is extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, as such, has been condemned by the international Organization in all its resolutions on the subject. However, the racist régime in Pretoria, not content to defy the international community and to disregard United Nations resolutions, has continued to plunder and pillage the natural resources of Namibia and to exploit the Territory's human resources, in collaboration with foreign economic interests, which have disregarded the right of present and future generations of Namibians to the riches of their country, concentrating only on reaping enormous profits in as short a time as possible.

The occupation authorities have also transformed the Territory into a base for terrorism, aggression and blackmail against fraternal sovereign States. That has not only weakened the ability of those States to face the challenges of development and progress, but also exacerbated instability and insecurity; it has also led to an increase in threats to peace in the region. In its practice of State terrorism the racist South African régime is opening the door to international conflicts on the African continent, which has thus far managed to avoid them. It is only wise and logical that international efforts to spare Africa from the scourge of major-Power rivalry be intensified.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

That has been the United Nations historical responsibility for Namibia and its people. South Africa's practices are in flagrant defiance of the international Organization and its resolutions. Therefore, as the supreme international organ entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must today consider how those resolutions can be fully and immediately implemented.

Because, we believe, South Africa will not leave Namibia and its vast riches voluntarily, there is no alternative but to compel it to comply with the international will. Over the years, the international community has experimented with various degrees of selective sanctions against South Africa; yet, as has become abundantly clear, those measures have failed to bring Namibia to independence and to enable its people to exercise its legitimate right to self-determination. We consider that the Security Council must today take an indispensable step if it wishes to uphold its international prestige and to reaffirm its major global role: The Council must accept the challenge thrown down before it by the Pretoria Government; it must discharge its obligations and duties under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter with regard to a régime that alone is responsible for the obstruction of Namibian independence as envisaged in the plan adopted by the Council nine years ago.

If the Council has failed in the past to guarantee the necessary respect for its resolutions on Namibia, its meeting today might furnish a favourable opportunity for it to correct the situation and to consider this matter with the necessary seriousness and attention. We believe that the item before the Council today will to a great extent affect the Security Council and its role in the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter. The Council must achieve South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia, terminate South Africa's

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

illegal occupation of that Territory and enable the people of Namibia to exercise its legitimate right to self-determination in accordance with the rules of international law and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

Egypt has supported and will continue to support the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of their hopes and ambitions. That position stems from Egypt's understanding of the lessons of the history of the African continent - that African security is an integrated whole and that independence is an objective shared by all its peoples. That position also reflects Egypt's belief in the common destiny, history and future of the peoples of our continent.

SWAPO has been one of the national liberation movements of Africa to which Egypt has unfailingly provided moral and material assistance. Egypt has opened its heart to the leaders of SWAPO and has provided in its capital a home for the organization's liaison office in order that SWAPO may lead its people and wage political campaigns in support of its just struggle. Egypt is proud of the fact that the first foreign liaison office of SWAPO, from which that organization began its intensified political struggle in support of the massive resistance struggle in the Territory of Namibia, was established in Cairo. Egypt's support for other African liberation movements having achieved its purpose of enabling our brethren to regain their freedom and independence and to exercise sovereignty over their own territories and riches, we are confident that similar victory will crown the struggle of the Namibian people, who, for more than a century, have been steadfastly pursuing their freedom and independence.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

We have absolute faith in the inevitable victory of the popular will. But victory is the product of a people's sacrifices and of adherence to its purposes and principles. We join in the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, convinced that such measures would expedite restoration of equity and justice, help put an end to the tragic situation in Namibia and eliminate the racism and occupation under which its people suffer.

Egypt reiterates its continued support for and assistance to the Namibian people, through SWAPO, until its hopes for independence and sovereignty have been realized. We call upon the Security Council to overcome the obstacles which have in the past prevented it from discharging its responsibilities under the Charter, and to adopt a decisive position in the face of Pretoria's stubborn refusal to comply with the international will, United Nations resolutions and the provisions and rules of international law.

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

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

Dame Nita BARROW (Barbados): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April, the month we have come to associate with new beginnings.

I should like also to compliment the delegation of Argentina, and particularly Ambassador Delpech, for its excellent execution of the presidency during the month of March.

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

I cannot do other than take note of the appointment of a new Permanent Representative to the United Nations from the Government of South Africa. Courtesy requires me to acknowledge his presence. Optimism, and perhaps the time of year, tempted me to hope that this envoy would have brought with him a new attitude, a refreshing change, to this grievous issue with which we are faced. Realism tempered my optimism, however, and reminded me that nothing in the events of the past 20 years justifies any expectation that the régime at Pretoria would alter or review its policy on Namibia.

In a few months' time, the Government and the people of Barbados will celebrate the twenty-first anniversary of independence. Barbadians know well the aspirations of subject peoples; we know the unease that comes from being controlled by a foreign Power; and we have known for 21 years the pride and civic energy that are released when people are left free to manage and to chart their national destiny.

While it is the wicked system of apartheid which motivates and sustains the enslavement of Namibia, it is the politics of greed which have permitted Pretoria to defy this Organization and to continue unchecked its exploitation of Namibians. But the greed is not restricted to Pretoria, for without the complicity of its vast network of accomplices the South African Government would not have attempted, and could not have succeeded in, its primitive determination to defy the course of history.

Namibians have long sought to find a peaceful solution to this problem, indicating to all their wish to have the wealth of their land enjoyed by all who hold just entitlement to that wealth. Pretoria, on the other hand, emboldened by a phalanx of international monied interests, has responded with consistent contempt

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

and armed suppression. In the end, the Namibians have had to resort to arms in order to defend their interests and to rescue their children from the clutches of apartheid and transnational greed.

The problem of Namibia is not difficult to define. It is the systematic and effective application of international finance to the suppression of a people. The solution to the problem must be seen in like terms. International finance must be employed in the service of Namibians.

The two largest banking organizations in South Africa and Namibia are affiliates of transnational corporations. There are, we are informed, some 1,000 transnational corporations active in South Africa and Namibia. Those corporations provide the life-blood which flows from the industrial centres of the world to the organism at Pretoria. Transnational banks are the creditors for the more than \$20 billion South Africa carries in foreign debt. Three of South Africa's four oil refineries are owned by transnational corporations, which also own all but one fifth of South Africa's retail petroleum outlets. Transnationals supply more than half of South Africa's electronic imports and control South Africa's automobile industry. In Namibia, three transnational corporations hold 90 per cent of the country's mining assets in base metals, uranium and diamonds. Those industries account for half of Namibia's gross domestic product and three quarters of its exports.

That is only half the picture. While transnational finance is the life-blood of the system which enslaves Namibia, the armaments industry provides the muscle to ensure Namibia remains suppressed. The armaments industry bears a transnational character which finds easy accommodation in the laws of Pretoria.

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

Under South Africa's Key Points Act, a company in South Africa or Namibia can be required to maintain an armed security force far larger than that required for its protection. Those forces can be called upon by the Government as required. South Africa makes no secret of its military capability or of its faith in those who furnish its matériel and help train its troops.

None are more aware than the rulers at Pretoria that their policies in Namibia are an aberration of history. This we know because paranoia has become evident in their execution of those policies - a paranoia which it was my dubious lot to see face to face.

The leaders at Pretoria have chosen to reduce Namibia to a strategic resource in order to furnish for themselves and their allies a plausible reason for armed occupation. Not content with suppressing the aspirations of the Namibian people, Pretoria's rulers have embarked on a systematic programme of combined military and economic aggression against the neighbouring States of Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Angola. South Africa's objectives of devastation and destabilization can readily be discerned.

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

What is also evident is that Namibia can no longer be viewed in isolation but must be seen as a symbol and a symptom of a menacing problem. What we debate here today is not only the question of Namibia but the question of the integrity of African people. It is a problem most vividly expressed in the objectionable and transparent policy of homeland settlements through which that primitive arrogance that inspires Pretoria would usurp the goals of subject peoples and render all southern Africa the colony of apartheid.

This web of oppression which Pretoria would weave must be dismantled. This return of Africans to a life of enslavement sends a clear signal to us in the Caribbean, whose memories and history find common cause with Africa. We recognize a specific responsibility in taking firm initiatives to discourage the Government of South Africa from implementing regressive schemes against Namibians and the people of South Africa.

The Government of Barbados reiterates its commitment to solidarity with the people of Namibia and commends the Movement of Non-Aligned Nations for bringing this matter to the attention of the Security Council. Barbados stands ready to extend its resources, meagre as they are, to all those menaced by apartheid. This commitment has already been demonstrated through the offer of scholarships and other grants to young Namibians to enable them to study at institutions in Barbados. These have been taken up.

Barbados wishes also to commend the Non-Aligned Movement for its call to protect the front-line States of southern Africa from the declared intention of Pretoria to undermine their economies. Twelve days ago the Government of Barbados announced its pledge of the sum of 100,000 Barbados dollars to the Solidarity Fund for Southern Africa. The pledge, the first by a Caribbean State, is significant for a country of Barbados' size, representing 40 cents for each citizen. That

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

underscores in tangible terms the seriousness with which Barbados views the situation in southern Africa.

In its blatant and repeated assaults against its neighbours, Pretoria has permitted us to see in its true form the problem that confronts the Security Council and the people of Namibia. We believe that the initiatives taken by the Non-Aligned Movement, if adequately supported, can bring a solution to that problem.

Much has been said against Pretoria's policy in Namibia and southern Africa. We challenge those with the capability to do so to put their resources behind their words.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Barbados for the congratulations she extended to me.

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

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I am happy to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We have full confidence in your abilities and wish you all success in your task.

I take this opportunity also to express my delegation's appreciation to your predecessor as President of the Council, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, for the excellent way in which he conducted the Council's work last month.

The Security Council is meeting today to consider an item which it has repeatedly considered in the past, with the aim of achieving a solution to the question of Namibia that is acceptable to the whole world. The solution it advocates, however, remains unimplemented - not because of a lack of effort on the part of the United Nations, but because of South Africa's intransigence and its continued refusal to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, despite all

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

the United Nations efforts to prevail upon that country to respect the international community's will and international legitimacy.

As is well known, the Security Council, as a result of constant efforts, adopted resolution 435 (1978), which contained an acceptable formula for guaranteeing the Namibian people's independence. Since the adoption of that resolution, efforts have been made to ensure its implementation. But no progress towards that end has been made. The objective is to end South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to achieve Namibian independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory.

It is also well known that both the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted several resolutions calling for free elections in Namibia, for South Africa to cease its domination of Namibia, and for Namibia, like its neighbouring sister African countries, to achieve independence. The major obstacle to the implementation of those resolutions and the achievement of Namibian independence has been South Africa's intransigence and its refusal to comply with the international community's will. South Africa has sought to circumvent the will of the international community by means of various ploys, including the installation of a puppet Government to mask its real intention - that is, to plunder the wealth and resources of the people of Namibia.

We must refer here to the efforts made last year to solve the question of Namibia. Among those efforts was the International Conference, for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna from 7 to 11 July 1986, and the special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia, held in September 1986 - in which my country had the honour to participate.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

The Conference to which I have referred was a clear, strong expression of the will of the countries of the world to put an end to South Africa's persistent refusal to withdraw from Namibia and grant that Territory its independence, to put an end to South Africa's obstruction of efforts by the United Nations - the only legitimate authority in the Territory since the Mandate was terminated in 1966 - to assume its responsibilities.

The fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, constituted a platform for representatives of countries to deplore the intransigence of the Government of South Africa and its evil intentions, evidenced by its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its plundering of that country's wealth, as well as by its bolstering of its military presence in Namibia.

The implicit support of the South African régime reflected in the fact that the Security Council has been prevented from adopting a resolution calling for the imposition of sanctions against that régime encourages it to persist in its denial of the will of the international community.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

At a time when international public opinion is intensifying efforts to pressure the racist régime in South Africa to grant independence to Namibia, we have new information on co-operation between the two racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv. The latest is included in the United States State Department's report to Congress on 2 April affirming, inter alia, the following: that co-operation between South Africa and Israel was between their Governments and that the Government of Tel Aviv was fully aware of the military exchanges with South Africa. Last year the Israeli arms industry garnered profits ranging from \$400 million to \$800 million through its trade with South Africa.

We have noted the further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia. In that report the Secretary-General told of his efforts and the resumption of contacts with South Africa to implement the provisions of these two resolutions, in particular, its choice of an electoral system. However, it seems that the more the Secretary-General tries to eliminate difficulties, the more new obstacles South Africa throws up, the latest being the unacceptable pre-conditions to any agreement on implementation of the United Nations resolutions. Those pre-conditions now constitute the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

In his concluding remarks, the Secretary-General does not recognize the validity of those pre-conditions and is of the view that the Government of South Africa should urgently reconsider its position, and we totally support him in this. My delegation thanks the Secretary-General's tireless efforts to implement the Security Council's requests and to reach a peaceful solution. However, it is certain that those efforts will not bear fruit unless the Security Council discharges its responsibility by adopting the measures enshrined in the Charter against those not complying with resolutions of the Security Council.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

In conclusion, on behalf of my country I should like to pay tribute to the heroic people of Namibia for their heroic struggle, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

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

The next speaker is His Excellency Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to the United Nations, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ANSAY: Please accept, Sir, the congratulations of the Organization of the Islamic Conference on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month.

At the same time I should like to pay tribute to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Delpech of Argentina, for the efficient manner in which he presided over the work of the Council last month.

Once again we are discussing the perennial question of Namibia, which has become one of the most important and serious issues facing the United Nations in the field of decolonization.

The United Nations has been seized of the question of Namibia for the past 40 years. Volumes of resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council, as well as by the General Assembly, with the aim of putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist minority régime of South Africa in defiance of the will of the international community.

A few weeks ago I stated before this Council that my Organization had always kept a close watch on developments in Africa, since 24 of its members belonged to that great continent. We consider both the question of Namibia and the question of

(Mr. Ansay)

South Africa as important and vital as the question of Palestine and the Middle East. As members are aware, the Fifth Islamic Summit, held in Kuwait from 26 to 29 January 1987, decided to establish a ministerial committee chaired by His Excellency Mr. Pirzada, Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), on the pattern of the OIC Committee on Palestine, in order to co-ordinate action by the Islamic States against the racist régime in Pretoria.

The illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and is a belligerent challenge to the authority of the United Nations. This situation constitutes a permanent threat to regional and international peace and security.

We believe that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the only acceptable basis for a final and lasting settlement of this question. I should say that there is universal consensus on this, with the sole exception of the party that continues to defy both resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

South Africa cannot and must not be allowed to continue to hold the implementation of these resolutions hostage to some irrelevant issues.

The Fifth Islamic Summit reaffirmed, inter alia, its condemnation and rejection of the racist Pretoria régime's insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the independence of Namibia and expressed satisfaction with the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions rejecting such linkage. In this regard His Excellency Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar has our firm and full support for his determined position categorically rejecting such linkage, as pronounced in the concluding remarks of his important recent report contained in document S/18767 of 31 March 1987.

(Mr. Ansay)

I should also like to bring to the attention of this Council that the Fifth Islamic Summit also appealed to all countries that have diplomatic relations with South Africa to exert immediate and unrestricted diplomatic pressure and implement real economic sanctions against the racist South African régime in order to hasten implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978); urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive and effective sanctions against South Africa in conformity with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; called upon the United Nations Security Council to explore all ways and means that are available to it to accelerate the independence of Namibia; and expressed support for the struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to achieve the national independence of a united Namibia.

It is indeed unfortunate that a number of States have encouraged the Pretoria régime in persisting in its illegal and aggressive designs by their political, military, economic and other forms of assistance and support. The Zionist entity, as is well known, has been especially generous in its support for the racist régime of Pretoria. We condemn the collusion, especially in the nuclear field, between these two régimes aimed at exercising hegemony over the African and Arab peoples and hindering their economic and social development.

(Mr. Ansay)

We consider that the racist ideology of the South African apartheid régime, its illegal and brutal occupation of Namibia, its exploitation of the natural resources of that country and its repeated aggression against the front-line States and neighbouring countries are similar to the practices of the Zionist entity in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories. We have no faith whatsoever in the validity of Israel's recent claims that it would reconsider its military and cultural co-operation with South Africa, since these two régimes are organically linked, both in practice and objective.

At this juncture, suffice it to refer to last Friday's edition of The New York Times, which stated that the latest report submitted to the Congress by the United States Department of State unequivocally asserts that Israel has provided military aid to South Africa in violation of the existing United Nations sponsored international embargo against the racist régime in Pretoria.

In the light of these recent developments, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which has actively participated in the efforts exerted by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and a number of other international organizations to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime, calls upon the international community to translate its support into practical measures, including the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions with a view to compelling nations and transnational corporations really to sever all their ongoing ties with racist South Africa, to expediting the termination of the subjugation of the Namibian people, and to effecting the complete freedom and independence of the valiant people of Namibia.

We demand that the Security Council exercise the powers entrusted to it under its Charter to impose mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. We hope that this Council will not once

(Mr. Ansay)

again find itself powerless to act in the face of this expansionist and obnoxious racist policy.

We call upon the Security Council to explore all ways and use all means that are available to it to accelerate the independence of Namibia.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference will continue to take all necessary measures in tandem with the international community towards the achievement of this objective.

The question of Namibia will continue to be on the agenda of the Islamic Conference until the day when the heroic people of Namibia have liberated their land and regained their legitimate rights.

As the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference declared in Harare before the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and reiterated before the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia:

"The members of the Islamic Conference will continue to exert all efforts to support the people of Namibia and Azania to gain their just and inalienable national rights to self-determination, independence and majority rule."

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Ansay for the congratulations he addressed to me.

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

Mr. De FIGUEIREDO (Angola): On behalf of my delegation may I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. It gives me great pleasure to see the representative of a fraternal country hold this post during the debate on an issue on which his

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

Government's stand is unequivocally on the side of self-determination and genuine independence for an oppressed, illegally occupied nation, and against racism, apartheid, colonialism and imperialism. May I also take this opportunity to congratulate your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Argentina, who so ably conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

My Government would also like to commend the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and its leadership for their courage, wisdom and diplomacy in their unceasing struggle to be the instrument of their own liberation. They have shown patience and restraint not often seen in a similar situation.

It is an irony that the issue of Namibian independence is one regarding which few Articles of the United Nations Charter have been left unviolated.

It is an irony that all these violations of the Charter have been undertaken by a founding Member of the United Nations - the apartheid régime in South Africa.

It is an irony that this Council, set up to safeguard international peace and security, has allowed itself to be held hostage by this renegade Member of the United Nations, mainly through that Member's close allies and supporters.

It is an irony that the Council has been unable, since the United Nations in 1967 declared illegal South Africa's occupation of Namibia and the United Nations Council for Namibia became the administering Power, to achieve the withdrawal of South African troops from the Territory of Namibia.

It is an irony that the Council is, as it were, in default of its own obligations and its mandates under the terms of its constitution, the Charter.

It is an irony that all the necessary ingredients for Namibian independence are already there; in fact they have been in existence since 1978. They are embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was freely and willingly negotiated by all parties, and only the setting of a cease-fire and emplacement of

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) remained. I should have said "almost all the necessary ingredients", because one of the key ingredients was, and still is, missing: The honest intention on the part of South Africa to allow resolution 435 (1978) to be implemented, and thus give up its lucrative military and economic hold on Namibia.

It is an irony that the apartheid régime - the criminal in this case - is allowed to get away with its flagrant flouting of the Charter, through a variety of tactics, including the introduction since 1978 of issues extraneous and non-related to Namibian independence.

For example, what happens inside the borders of Angola with our officially invited Cuban internationalist forces has nothing to do with Namibian independence. And just to set the record straight, South African troops first launched a full-scale armed invasion of Angola in 1975, months prior to the arrival of a single internationalist comrade in Angola. And may I state here that the presence of our Cuban internationalist forces in Angola acts as a sort of peace brigade, whose presence is in some ways a deterrent to even more intensive aggression by racist troops in all of southern Africa. In addition, may I point out that Article 51 of the Charter gives each and every country the right to appeal for assistance in the face of vicious and massive external assault and aggression.

I have heard with amazement and disbelief the statement delivered this morning by the representative of South Africa. It would be difficult to find more untruths, terminological inexactitudes and distortions than those contained in his statement. The record of negotiations clearly shows that the blame for the non-implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can only be laid at Pretoria's door.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

In 1978, when resolution 435 (1978) was ready for implementation, our Cuban internationalist friends had already been in Angola for two and a half years, at our specific request, to help us in the task of national reconstruction and to help stave off racist imperialist aggression against our newly independent State. How come their presence was not an issue during late 1976, 1977, 1978 and subsequently until Pretoria, desperately looking around for excuses, settled for this one?

The representative of the racist régime is right when he asks how it is conceivable that free elections can be held in Namibia in the shadow of a menacing presence - except that he has deliberately misidentified the menace. The menace is the huge armed machinery of the racist régime, which is in military occupation of Namibia, of parts of southern Angola and indeed of South Africa itself.

The Council should not shed crocodile tears over the South African claim that it will "simply not abandon its obligations to the inhabitants" of Namibia. We know full well what those obligations are: to plunder Namibia; to strip it of its finite resources; to subsidize the apartheid activities in South Africa and its military aggressions in the sovereign States of southern Africa; to impose racism inside Namibia, as it has done inside South Africa; and to violate every conceivable human, economic, political and social right of the inhabitants of Namibia - except, of course, for the small white minority.

What the South Africa representative refers to as an initiative was nothing more than an insult to the United Nations and to the Security Council. As such it was simply ignored by the international community and consigned to well-deserved oblivion. Attempts by South Africa to demonstrate good faith are met in the only manner possible: by asking Pretoria for concrete action and not more words. And all this is accompanied by realistic cynicism, for Pretoria is merely continuing to fool the international community.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

On our part, the Angolan Government has always displayed its readiness to talk to racists and their supporters in an effort to find ways of solving the problems of Namibian independence and related issues and the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola. We have never received a specific response to our platform of November 1984.

The South Africa representative has issued a warning to the African continent that sanctions will not end at the frontiers of Namibia or South Africa. All of us are aware of the arrangements being made by the racist régime to attack, destabilize and terrorize southern Africa in order to keep itself in power. And despite those warnings, we, the States of southern Africa, are willing and ready to bear the consequences of comprehensive sanctions. Their consequences will be borne with dignity and pride in so far as they help to liberate our Namibian comrades and our South African friends.

I have simply one specific question to put to the Pretoria régime via the good offices of the Security Council; it requires a one-word answer: Is the racist junta in Pretoria willing immediately to set the implementation date for resolution 435 (1978), as agreed in 1978, without preconditions? The answer will be as vague and as worthless as South Africa's duplicitous promises and deceptions.

Since 1975 South Africa has invaded Angolan territory, then sought to use withdrawal as a bargaining chip, only to renege on its various agreements and promises.

However, in order to strengthen our support for the heroic Namibian struggle led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Angolan President José Eduardo dos Santos in November 1984 presented a fair platform, with a number of offers and propositions designed to address the major issues in southern Africa, including, of course, the independence of Namibia. While the

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

international community has categorically rejected any linkage, my Government has since 1984 been prepared to agree to a phased withdrawal of all Cuban forces from the south parallel and the complete withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia. The racist régime has attempted a remarkable re-contouring of the geography of southern Africa. It has artificially created a border between Angola and South Africa by bringing its troops to our own borders via Namibia.

However, the racist régime and its main supporter, the present Administration in Washington, in effect neglected to undertake any negotiations or actions based on the platform. In fact, the racist régime has rejected resolution 435 (1978) by establishing the so-called interim Government in Windhoek and has shown its disregard for solutions to any of the problems facing southern Africa by its support for the bandit renegade group of UNITA in Angola and RENAMO in Mozambique.

At this point it may be opportune to mention that the United States Administration is now seeking to obtain new bases in Africa to enable the transfer of UNITA terrorist acts to areas further away from Namibia, thus attempting to create the false impression that the UNITA puppets have broken their links with their racist Pretoria protectors. In this manner both the United States Administration and the Botha régime, and the UNITA renegades themselves, hope to weaken the cohesion and unified action of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) on the issues of the total liberation of the African continent, respect for the independence and sovereignty of States and the policy of destabilization of front-line States. The Pretoria régime meanwhile continues to enlarge and arm its sophisticated military base in the Caprivi Strip, the better to carry out its terrorism in southern Africa.

The supreme irony is that, while from time to time the issue of Namibian independence is debated in some international forum or the other, the oppression of

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

the Namibian people continues; their land continues to be occupied by South African troops; the murder and incarceration of Namibian patriots continue; and Namibian resources continue to be plundered and used to maintain South Africa's illegal occupation, to maintain the apartheid system and structure inside South Africa and to subsidize South Africa's illegal military occupation of parts of southern Angola since 1981 and to subsidize South Africa's invasions of all the other States in southern Africa as well.

Behind all these ironies of the situation lie many tragedies: the senseless killing of patriots and freedom fighters in Namibia; the brutal murder of women and children; the denial of fundamental human rights; the denial of basic civil, economic, political and social rights; the daily humiliation of being a prisoner in your own land; the pain of watching a new generation grow up in the same apartheid conditions as their parents.

There are other tragedies too: that of virtual inaction by the international community on the issue of actual genuine independence for Namibia; the virtual failure of the Council to either adopt or enforce resolutions which would or could force the racist régime to withdraw from Namibia; the virtual powerlessness of the United Nations to do anything concrete in the face of racist Pretoria's intransigence.

It is time that all in this Chamber, in particular those whose presence here is permanent, examined our own words in this history of silent shame and realized the extent of our participation in modern slavery.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

It is time also for all to note that the only real solution that will work towards Namibian independence is mandatory comprehensive sanctions under Chapter VII, unless the South African racist régime immediately agrees to the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as it stands.

The Council has for too long been paralysed by the veto action of those who appear to be blind and deaf to the realities of the situation, and their explanations for the veto is pathetic - like telling an enslaved man that the abolition of slavery would be injurious to his health. The putative injuries are mainly financial and strategic, and they certainly do not affect the people of Namibia. The arguments of the veto users are patently spurious and self-serving.

While laudable efforts have been under way since last year to improve the efficiency and structuring of the United Nations, the Organization's most abysmal failure in international law and peace-keeping has been conveniently ignored, perhaps even encouraged, by some of those who are in the forefront of reform.

I will refrain from cataloguing the military, political, economic and social violations being perpetrated by the racist régime with impunity and with immunity from prosecution and retribution granted by its friends. I would like to confine myself to a few points of international law, since that is the very matrix of the United Nations and the code to which all countries that join the United Nations pay at least lip-service.

The racist régime's defiance of the Security Council and the General Assembly is all the more scandalous because Pretoria is guilty of some of the most serious crimes, characterized as such by the International Law Commission: aggression against the territorial integrity of another country, in this case Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and others; denial of a people's right to self-determination, in Namibia and inside South Africa; and enforcement of apartheid, also in Namibia and inside South Africa.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

And yet no effective measures have been taken by the United Nations, which has thus unwittingly contributed to a breach of international peace and security and seriously undermined the authority and rule of international law all over the world.

What greatly disturbs my Government is that legal dimensions and illegal violations are considered either unimportant or less important. And while the international community and especially its power brokers failed to take any effective action despite all the legal rights and rulings in favour of Namibia, the racist régime misused and abused the system of law illegally to give itself "rights" over Namibia.

The situation worsened in the 1970s after initial attempts and some movement on the part of the international community in the 1960s.

In 1950, when the International Court of Justice determined that the supervisory functions concerning the administration of the Mandate were to be exercised by the General Assembly, Pretoria refused to accept this.

In 1955 and 1956 the International Court of Justice further determined that South Africa had a legal obligation to accept United Nations jurisdiction over the Mandate. South Africa refused.

In 1960 proceedings were instituted in the International Court of Justice against South Africa on the above.

In 1962 the International Court of Justice decided over South Africa's objections that the Court did not have jurisdiction over the case.

In 1966 the General Assembly reassessed its policy on Namibia and terminated the Mandate.

In 1967 the United Nations Council for Namibia was created, but South Africa refused it entry into Namibia.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

In 1967 South Africa applied the Terrorism Act - and what an irony - to the Territory of Namibia, on a retroactive and repressive basis and held a trial of 37 SWAPO patriots.

Between 1969 and 1971 the Security Council adopted several important resolutions on Namibia, all of which had no effect on South Africa.

What cannot be emphasized enough at this point is that in 1971 the International Court of Justice confirmed that these resolutions were binding, that Pretoria was under obligation to withdraw from Namibia and that all States had a duty to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence there.

In October 1971 this very Council endorsed the operative paragraphs of the Court's determination and that all States had individual responsibilities towards the people of Namibia and that in the discharge of those responsibilities they must abstain from all relations with South Africa which could entrench the latter's authority over Namibia.

In 1972 the Security Council began direct negotiations with the racist régime without success, and these were terminated in December 1973. Simultaneously the racist régime began to organize and sponsor local minority puppet groups.

In 1974 the General Assembly endorsed Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which prohibits the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources without the consent of the Council. Not only South Africa, but a number of other States as well have continued to violate this Decree with impunity.

In 1974 the Security Council adopted its first strongly worded resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and warning that in the event of non-compliance it would consider taking "appropriate measures". South Africa refused to comply.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

At this stage, as a matter of lasting shame, three permanent members of the Council - France, the United Kingdom and the United States - cast a veto on a draft resolution calling for the first time on mandatory sanctions.

These vetoes, which have continued mutatis mutandis until now, gave South Africa the courage, encouragement and protection it needed to continue to defy the United Nations, a position it has expanded and intensified.

In 1976 the Council adopted the critical resolution 385 (1976). Yet again South Africa refused. And once again a draft resolution calling for mandatory sanctions could not be adopted owing to the three vetoes.

In 1978 the General Assembly, responding to the paralysis of the Council, adopted an important declaration on Namibia, which stated that, if the vetoes prevented the United Nations from taking effective measures against South Africa, the General Assembly would take the necessary action to end the illegal occupation.

But while this change was being considered, these three permanent members, together with two other Council members, began a process which culminated in the famous resolution 435 (1978).

Sadly and inevitably, while resolution 435 (1978) is an excellent framework for Namibian independence, the entire process in 1978 and since 1978 has done nothing but give South Africa time to entrench itself further in Namibia, increase repression at home, invade neighbouring sovereign States, attempt to destabilize sovereign Governments and sabotage all efforts by these Governments to develop independent economic infrastructures and thus decrease the region's colonially structured dependence on South Africa.

I will not take up any more of the Council's valuable time by listing the sorry state of affairs since 1978: the duplicities by South Africa, the betrayals by others and the vetoes when mandatory Council resolutions could have changed events. The flexibility shown by SWAPO, and in particular by my own Government,

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

the proximity talks, the desperate attempts at buying time and creating patently false "linkages", the abysmal and hopeless and doomed constructive engagement policy - all these are too well known for me to repeat here. What emerges fairly clearly is that, already as long ago as 1974, self-serving policies of some permanent members of the Council played an obstructionist role, one that is still in operation, no matter in what pseudo-humanitarian or political guise it is presented.

And, throughout, South Africa has managed to deceive and cuckold the international community. And, throughout, especially since 1974 - except for a brief period in 1978 - the Security Council too has been powerless, through the vetoes, to fulfil its own role and enforce international law and punish the violations and the violators of those laws.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

Those who oppose mandatory sanctions solely because of huge investments - despite the disinvestment of 1986 - should be made aware that there are other reasons for them. They do not have to support the illegal and inhuman structure of apartheid. The funds withdrawn can be invested anywhere in southern Africa - in the countries of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), for example.

It is time now for new signals to be given to Namibia and to the rest of southern Africa that the international community will no longer allow itself to be fobbed off with pathetic excuses and weak explanations from one quarter and with deceit and lies from another. It is time for the Council to be more committed to repairing the damage to the standing, stature and credibility of international law. It is time for the General Assembly once again to use the means at its disposal to push for mandatory sanctions if the Council fails once more.

It is time for several nations members of the international community to stop treating South Africa like a naughty child that has been guilty of a number of misdemeanors, none of which are considered serious enough to warrant the child's expulsion from the family but only, perhaps, from one or two rooms. We had all better face up to the fact that this child is, instead, a cunning, evil, hopelessly and pathologically twisted and distorted freak whose capacity to destroy the lives of those in its environment is enormous and exceeded only by the inevitability of its own destruction when its internal and external contradictions can no longer sustain either its body or its life-support system.

It is not simply that the time has come to do all that should and must be done. I am afraid that soon the time will be gone when anything can be done - anything within these walls. It will then be out of our hands, and historical forces will pangenetically erupt with their own solutions.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

I do not wish to sound dramatic, but the drama that has been unfolding with steady, and now increasing, violence in southern Africa will neither end nor change simply because the Council or some group wishes it to do so. No: that drama is the unfolding, developing history of that region, and it is inexorably choosing its own options.

Before the inevitable happens, perhaps all of us have this one last chance. It must not be allowed to lapse because of the short-sighted policies of a few, whose sense of history and knowledge of Africa is lacking, even in fundamentals. A luta continua! A vitoria e certa!

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

In view of the lateness of the hour, I propose to adjourn the meeting now. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on its agenda will be held, with the consent of members, tomorrow morning, 7 April 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.