



# Security Council

UN LIBRARY

PROVISIONAL

NOV 1

S/PV.2758

30 October 1987

UN/EN COLLECTION

ENGLISH

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 30 October 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. BUCCI

(Italy)

Members: Argentina  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
France  
Germany, Federal Republic of  
Ghana  
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. TSVETKOV  
Mr. YU Mengjia  
Mr. ADOUKI  
Mr. BROCHAND  
Count YORK von WARTENBURG  
Mr. DUMEVI  
Mr. KIKUCHI  
Mr. BELONOGOV  
Mr. AL-SHAALI  
  
Mr. BLATHERWICK  
Mr. OKUN  
Mr. AGUILAR  
Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

#### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

#### THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

LETTER DATED 23 OCTOBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF MADAGASCAR TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19230)

LETTER DATED 27 OCTOBER 1987 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ZIMBABWE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/19235)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at previous meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. De Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Siddiky (Bangladesh), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Dah (Burkina Faso), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Svoboda (Canada), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Tadesse (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Ononaiye (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Ritter (Panama), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic), Mr. Majengo (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I invite the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Jacob, United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: 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: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus and Guyana in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity 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 accordance 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. Moushoutas (Cyprus) and Mr. Insanally (Guyana) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

Members of the Council have before them document S/19242, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia.

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

Mr. MAJENGO (United Republic of Tanzania): Allow me first of all, Sir, to express my delegation's warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. I am sure that your great experience and wisdom will prevail in guiding the deliberations of the Council to a successful conclusion.

Allow me also to extend my delegation's congratulations to your predecessor, Mr. James Victor Gbeho, the Permanent Representative of Ghana to the United Nations, on the able and efficient manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month of September.

(Mr. Majengo, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

The African Group and the Non-Aligned Movement have requested the convening of the Security Council because of the stalemate in the Namibian situation. In April this year, two permanent members obstructed action by the Council when they misused their right of veto. In August the Council, through its President, issued an appeal to South Africa to terminate its repression and detention of the Namibian people. The apartheid régime has not heeded the appeal, comforted by the support it had received from some Western members of the Council who cast a negative vote. This is an intolerable situation, and it cannot be allowed to go on.

It is now more than 20 years since the General Assembly in its resolution 2145 (XXI) unanimously terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in October 1966 and in its place established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its accession to independence. As a result of South Africa's continued refusal to comply with General Assembly resolutions, the International Court of Justice in June 1971 declared that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia was illegal and urged its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the Territory with a view to allowing the Namibian people to exercise their right to independence.

The action by the international community to terminate the South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was a reaffirmation of the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, in conformity with the United Nations Charter and in keeping with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The rights of the people of Namibia were given a big boost by the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which laid down the internationally accepted United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Majengo, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

It is regrettable, however, that since the adoption of resolution 435, (1978) the South African racist régime has employed one delaying tactic after another, all aimed at the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the denial of genuine independence to the Namibian people, the latest pretext being the infamous linkage pre-condition. We regard the linkage question as merely intended to impede the long-overdue independence for Namibia, whose people are still being exploited, oppressed and dehumanized. Like their brothers and sisters in South Africa the Namibian people are not only victims of the obnoxious policies of apartheid, which violate with impunity their basic human rights, but are also relegated to second-class citizenship in their own country.

The racist régime's atrocities are not restricted to Namibia and South Africa alone; they are committed in the whole of the southern African region. The destabilization policies are not only a threat to peace and security in the region, they also cause great loss of life and damage to property. The adventurous policies of the racist régime in southern Africa are designed to destabilize its neighbours through such methods as the arming, supporting and financing of armed bandits in Angola and Mozambique. These policies are, of course, tailored to perpetuate the hated, evil policies of apartheid in South Africa and the occupation of Namibia.

That the destabilization policies against the neighbouring States and the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime have persisted for such a long time is because of the support offered to the racist régime by external forces which have decided to turn the Namibian independence question into an East-West conflict. Tanzania has on many previous occasions rejected the policy of so-called constructive engagement being pursued by the United States Administration in

(Mr. Majengo, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

collaboration with the racist régime. We remain convinced that the policy is unhelpful and aggravates the already complicated situation in southern Africa. We request the concerned party to abandon this policy, which has been rejected by its people. Many of us in this Chamber had hoped that the unanimous adoption of resolution 435 (1978) would usher in an end to South African colonialism in Namibia. That optimism has been dashed, owing to the racist régime's failure to comply with resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. We have been frustrated by false promises, hypocritical statements of support and opposition to concerted international action by the misuse of vetoes.

The continued linkage of Namibian independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues is a matter of great concern to the whole international community. We are convinced that it is high time the Security Council, which is responsible for international peace and security, assumed its responsibility and compelled the racist régime to leave Namibia in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have come to the Council, as I stated at the outset, because all the relevant Security Council resolutions - especially resolution 435 (1978), which lays down the modalities leading to the implementation process of Namibian independence, such as the holding of free elections under United Nations supervision - have remained unimplemented. For that process to begin, it has been stipulated that the Security Council should set in motion the necessary conditions enabling the United Nations to establish in Namibia the machinery that is required for the people to organize free elections, through the assistance of the United Nations, through a cease-fire and the supervision of the elections.

(Mr. Majengo, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

In this regard my delegation condemns the imposition of the so-called interim government in Namibia, contrary to United Nations decisions and the wish of the Namibian people. We reject as null and void any plan born outside resolution 435 (1978). It is for this reason that we reaffirm our unqualified support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia, in their just struggle, including armed struggle, for the attainment of their right to freedom and independence. We are confident that the Security Council has the necessary power under the Charter to lessen the sufferings of the Namibian people by compelling the racist régime to leave Namibia immediately and without pre-conditions.

In conclusion, we reiterate our appeal to the Council to assume its responsibility and empower the Secretary-General to undertake, without delay, the implementation process of resolution 435 (1978) and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group towards the realization of independence for Namibia. That is the least the Security Council can do.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words addressed to me.



Count YORK von WARTENBURG (Federal Republic of Germany): Permit me, first, Sir, to congratulate you on assuming the high office of President of the Security Council for the month of October. As you are the representative of a country maintaining very friendly and cordial relations with my own, it gives me and my delegation great pleasure to see you presiding over the Council. There may be others more competent than I to speak about your experience and diplomatic skills. Let me just say that we feel the Council is in good hands under your presidency.

At the same time, I wish to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador Victor Gbeho, for the efficient and friendly manner in which he presided over the Council's activities in September and for his untiring efforts.

During the last decade hardly any question has occupied the Security Council as often and as deeply as the question of Namibia, notwithstanding the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) as early as 1978. What sets this issue apart from all other regional problems is that in 1978 there was, as there is today, agreement on the settlement of the issue. All United Nations Member States are agreed that Namibia must be given its independence on the basis of resolution 435 (1978) as soon as possible. The Federal Government reminds the Council that South Africa itself agreed in 1978 to the settlement plan and that - as stated by the Secretary-General in his most recent report, of 27 October 1987 - the Head of State, Mr. P. W. Botha, committed himself again to this settlement plan by having made it clear to members of the so-called interim government that:

"constitutional steps, which might impair the Republic of South Africa's international interests and obligations, were not acceptable to the Republic of South Africa". (S/19234, para. 4)

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Here in the Security Council, but also elsewhere on other occasions, the Federal Government has declared time and again that it feels committed to resolution 435 (1978) in a particular way. Since the Federal Republic of Germany was vigorously in favour of Namibia's independence and the right to self-determination of the Namibian people, the Federal Republic, as a member of the Security Council in 1978, made an active contribution towards the elaboration and adoption of the resolution, and ever since then it has advocated its implementation.

My delegation regrets all the more that to this day the Namibian people have been denied their right to self-determination and independence. The implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is overdue and should be undertaken, as the Secretary-General stresses in his report, without further delay, independently of any other problem. As my delegation has already stated in the Council, in April this year, it is unacceptable that South Africa continues to occupy Namibia, in violation of international law. It is likewise unacceptable that the struggle for the liberation of Namibia continues to take such a toll in human life.

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

As on previous occasions, my delegation wishes to put on record today that the stance of the Federal Government on the question of Namibia has always been and will continue to be, clear and unequivocal. Resolution 435 (1978) is the indispensable basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia. Resolution 435 (1978) is and remains the only foundation for Namibia's achievement of its internationally recognized independence. In accordance with resolution 435 (1978),

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

the constitution of an independent Namibia is to be adopted by a constituent assembly elected in free and fair elections, under United Nations supervision, and by such an assembly only.

As the so-called interim government, instituted by South Africa, is fully incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), it has not been recognized by the Federal Government, which hence considers it null and void.

The Federal Government regrets that South Africa has taken an intransigent position on the question of Namibia. The Federal Government is convinced that South Africa, in its own interest, should not block the way envisaged by the international community for leading Namibia to its independence. The international community, on its part, is under an obligation to fulfil the commitments it has made in connection with the question of Namibia. Should South Africa continue to place obstacles in the way of implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and neglect exhortations to desist from its obstructive attitude, the international community has no choice but to put strong pressure on it.

The Federal Government relies on the influence and pressure of the international community of States and the international public at large upon South Africa. It is for this reason that the Federal Government actively contributed to the restrictive measures imposed by the member States of the European Community on South Africa, and the Federal Government will strictly apply those measures.

The Federal Government welcomes the fact that the authors of the draft resolution before us have chosen an approach enabling members of the Security Council and the Council as a whole to send the necessary unambiguous signal to the South African Government. Only if the international community acts in a strong and positive manner will the desired reaction of the South African Government be forthcoming.

(Count York von Wartenburg, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

As I have already pointed out, the Federal Republic of Germany, as a co-author of resolution 435 (1978), finds itself particularly committed to finding a solution to the question of Namibia. We commend the Secretary-General for his efforts and thank him for his report of 27 October. We appreciate the work done by his Special Representative, the front-line States and all others aiming at early independence for Namibia. The Federal Republic of Germany will make every effort to help to achieve this goal bilaterally, as a member of the Contact Group, and within the framework of the European Community. We will support the front-line States and the States members of the Southern African Co-ordination Development Conference (SADCC) to the best of our ability and will continue to support the United Nations Institute for Namibia; and we wish to continue the dialogue with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on the basis of mutual confidence.

Finally, my delegation appeals once more to the Government of South Africa - indeed, it earnestly exhorts it - to remove at long last the obstacles it has put in the way of Namibia's independence and to honour its own word.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his kind words addressed to me.

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

Mr. SIDDIKY (Bangladesh): The odious régime in South Africa is a cancer in the body politic of the world. Let us not treat it as though it were benign. The malignancy, unless totally removed, will lead to inexorable fatality.

But before I proceed further, let not the painful substance of my intervention preclude me from felicitating you, Mr. President, on the manner in which you have been conducting your onerous responsibilities. Under your inspiring leadership we hope to make some advance in the achievement of our objectives. Credit is also due to your predecessor, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, for his skilful guidance of the Council last month.

The Council has done much to preserve order in what would otherwise have been a very chaotic world. The Member States owe it a debt of gratitude.

Nowhere has tyranny manifested itself so nakedly as in Namibia. Nowhere has the expression of colonialism been so ruthless as in that unfortunate land. The sufferings of the Namibians have been severe. Pretoria has not only bound their limbs, stolen their resources and silenced their voices, but has also numbed their minds by trying to foist on them a vile theory that the basis of superiority is the colour of the skin. Such fallacious absurdities have led to disasters in the past. These lessons can easily be gleaned from history, but the bane of man is that some will never learn.

The Namibians have a right to self-determination and independence. The international community has a duty to ensure their speedy exercise. The racists of South Africa must not be allowed to thwart forever the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. They must not be permitted to ignore with impunity the voice of reason and of sanity. The opinion of a hundred million Bangladeshis on this subject has been unequivocally expressed time and time again.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

The way to conclude the tragedy would be to implement Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which are the only internationally accepted bases for the peaceful settlement of the question. The United Nations plan for Namibia is the only way out of this impasse. The fascists of Pretoria cannot be allowed to link this solution to extraneous and irrelevant issues. Nor can they be permitted to continue with their shameful depredations of precious Namibian resources in contemptuous defiance of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia. The installation of the puppet régime in Windhoek is an act of mockery, a comic element in that sordid drama.

The Council for Namibia deserves praise for what it has done so far. We are happy that Bangladesh has been able to contribute, however modestly, to its efforts. Last month the Council met for the first time at the level of Foreign Ministers. They urged the General Assembly to discharge its unique responsibility with regard to Namibia. Namibia may well become the litmus test of United Nations credibility to the nations of the world.

The silver lining in the dark cloud over southern Africa is the heroism of the people's struggle. Glory is justly due to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibians, for the leadership imparted. Time and time again, we have heard Mr. Theo Ben Gurirab's pleas for peace. Time and time again we have listened to his patient urgings for action. If we cannot respond, if his appeals go unheeded, the Council will have little to be proud of.

We welcome SWAPO's offer to sign the cease-fire at once. It is now time for the Secretary-General to proceed with arranging this and undertaking the necessary action for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). We therefore support the adoption of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

The poet John Keats said that there is a budding morrow in midnight. Surely there is a dawn at the end of the darkness of suffering that engulfs southern Africa today. Those of us who have viewed the film "Cry Freedom" have some perception of how excruciating the pains of that darkness can be. It is for us all to do the best we can to reduce this.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bangladesh for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. DAH (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): Permit me to convey to you, Sir, my heartfelt congratulations as well as those of the Burkina Faso delegation, on your assumption to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. We have no doubt that your talents as a skilled diplomat will ensure our success. I say this with full conviction since your country, Italy, and mine have excellent relations. I take this opportunity also to convey our satisfaction to our friend and brother Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, who so competently conducted the work of the Security Council last month.

I wish here formally and unequivocally to reiterate my country's commitment to the ideals and the Charter of the United Nations. Burkina Faso, led by the Popular Front, regrouping all Burkinabe democratic and patriotic forces is faithfully committed to the liberation struggles of peoples and to the noble cause of movements fighting for the advent of freedom and justice. On this basis I was mandated to come here to make Burkina Faso's contribution to the debates on Namibia.

South Africa is occupying Namibia. Racist South Africa would like to stop the wheels of history of the Namibian people which are turning inexorably towards freedom and regained dignity. In so doing it is resorting to all means. First, it

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

is resorting to wild and far-fetched theories to justify its presence on Namibian soil and, as a consequence, to deny the world Organization any involvement in the political development of that formerly mandated Territory. The 1966 decision of the International Court of Justice fortunately closed every possibility of the racist régime in Pretoria finding a legal solution to the problem, and the decision taken by the General Assembly the same year put an end to the South African mandate on Namibia. That augured well. Indeed, many were those who believed in good faith that those relevant decisions would bring the masters of the apartheid régime to reason.

Unfortunately, the racist South African State, far from bowing to the injunctions of the international community, led it down the perilous path with which we are familiar. Thus, the country of apartheid at each turn has refused to retreat; it distorts, it is obstinate, and all for the obvious purpose of gaining time to pursue its shameful exploitation of the immense and varied wealth of Namibia.



(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

In so doing, it must at all costs maintain that Territory under its domination.

Fortunately, the sham elections were boycotted by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, and were considered null and void by the United Nations.

What is more, the South African army is violating the borders of front-line States under the fallacious pretext of exercising its alleged right of hot pursuit. It has destroyed villages and killed indiscriminately men, women and children - all innocent victims and martyrs whose blood is being shed for having committed the "crime" of wishing to enjoy freedom and exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence.

Such action by South Africa is a denial of the human being. It is man's dignity that is being trampled. In such circumstances, South Africa's behaviour is no different from that of the Nazis against which at the time all the forces of the peace- and freedom-loving nations were united, despite their ideological differences.

South Africa's attitude is often described as one of defiance of the United Nations and of its organ entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security; but, as everyone agrees, that challenge is possible only because South Africa enjoys the support of strong accomplices.

Disregard for Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978), should give further food for thought to those who by means of the triple veto of 1974 prevented the ouster of South Africa from the world Organization. Hence those States still bear a major responsibility, especially when viewed in the light of the statement made by the Canadian Prime Minister in 1947:

"No association of nations can prosper without the support of the world's militarily and economically powerful."

This still remains valid today.

(Mr. Dah, Burkina Faso)

The international community as a whole has been inviting its powerful members to abandon the idea of constructive engagement with racist South Africa and instead support the cause of the majority - which, by the way, is one of the cornerstones of their own institutions.

The linkage pre-condition, which has been rejected by the members of this Council, is but a short-lived subterfuge.

Burkina Faso believes that States, whether members of the Council or not, are in duty-bound to enforce the United Nations plan of action for Namibia, namely, Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) which, inter alia, call for South Africa to put an end to its illegal administration and occupation of Namibia.

To this end, the Security Council must adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. That is the only effective means we have left to reach a genuine, speedy solution to the Namibian question.

Burkina Faso rejects outright any bogus government in the pay of South Africa. Burkina Faso rejects any elections that are not organized with the participation of SWAPO and held under United Nations supervision.

Lastly, my delegation urges the Security Council to adopt appropriate measures to compel South Africa to respect the resolutions of the world Organization, to which, from a legal standpoint, it still belongs. The suffering of the Namibian people has lasted far too long. Like all other peoples on our planet, that courageous people aspires to freedom, self-determination and independence. It is up to the Security Council to help that people realize its legitimate aspirations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Burkina Faso for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. BROCHAND (France) (interpretation from French): Allow me first of all to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. France is indeed gratified to see you

(Mr. Brochand, France)

guiding our work. The friendship uniting our two countries is so deep and long-standing that I have no need here to insist on it. As for your personal qualities of authority, competence and courtesy, I am certain that they guarantee a successful conclusion to our work.

Allow me also to express to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, my delegation's deep gratitude for the personal qualities and outstanding talent he once again so ably demonstrated as President of our Council last month.

Since our last meeting on the question of Namibia in April 1987, the situation in the Territory has continued to deteriorate without there being the slightest glimmer of a possibility for settlement. The Security Council expressed its concern over this continuing deterioration of the situation in Namibia in a statement made by its President on 21 August last.

In fact, the impasse remains total, and the suffering of the Namibian people is deepening and the danger of regional destabilization is growing. This impasse has been brought about because of the intransigence of the South African Government, which refuses to carry out the process of independence for Namibia, despite the repeated urgent appeals of the international community.

This is basically a simple question. A settlement plan exists - and, as the Council is aware, France played an active role in its preparation. That plan, which is now nine years old, forms the basis for an internationally recognized settlement. It has been accepted by all, including by the parties most directly involved - South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Its implementation has been blocked by South Africa's demand for linkage of the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That South African condition, which is extraneous to the problem of Namibia, was recalled here yesterday by the Permanent Representative of South Africa.

(Mr. Brochand, France)

I should like to state once again that France totally rejects that linkage, and that is why the French Government in 1983 decided to end its participation in the so-called contact group, whose mandate does not extend to this question which is extraneous to the implementation of the United Nations plan.

This impasse has not prevented the United Nations Secretary-General from pursuing his efforts and continuing his contacts with the parties. In his further report of 27 October he reported to us on his most recent initiatives. My delegation wishes to renew its full support for the Secretary-General's activities last summer, including a new mission to southern Africa by his Special Representative for Namibia, Mr. Ahtisaari.

The African Group has now proposed to the Security Council that it should authorize the Secretary-General to undertake new initiatives to achieve a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

The French delegation cannot but support this initiative. We hope that this new mission entrusted to the Secretary-General will finally bring about the conditions allowing for Namibia's accession to independence.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of France for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker on my list 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): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to express our appreciation and pleasure at your presidency of the Security Council for the month of October; indeed your Government has often shown its enlightened position on various issues important to Africa. For this we thank you and request that, on the issue before us, one of the most important to face Africa in general and southern Africa in particular, you and your Government continue to display your support as in the past.

When history judges the events leading to the independence of Namibia - and we have no doubt that it will be independent - and judges in particular those who played a major role, its most merciless indictment will be reserved for those who actively impeded the dawning of Namibian independence, either by their intransigence, as in the case of racist South Africa, or by their vetoes, as in the case of certain Western permanent members of the Council, or by their negative votes, as in the case of certain past and present members of the Council, or by their silence, which is in itself assent, if not consent, to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the apartheid South African régime and its refusal to allow Namibia to be free.

As a number of speakers have pointed out, statements made recently during the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) all categorically and definitively called for Namibian independence and placed the blame for the present sorry state of affairs in apartheid South Africa, where it belongs, and unanimously asked for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

As the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO pointed out in his statement to this Council, SWAPO agreed a long time ago to the one identified unresolved issue - that of electoral systems - and restated its readiness to sign a cease-fire immediately. He firmly rejected the validity of "linkage" introduced as a spurious, extraneous and unacceptable element late in the proceedings, as have a number of speakers in this Chamber, ever since its introduction in 1981.

Even the Council itself rejected the word "linkage" in resolutions adopted in 1983 and 1985. The Government of the People's Republic of Angola has also firmly and consistently rejected the attempt to tie a non-Namibian issue to independence for Namibia. Nevertheless, in an attempt to move forward to a comprehensive solution to various important problems facing southern Africa today, my Government presented a platform in late 1984, which, if accepted, could bring about peace in southern Africa and conditions which could lead to Namibian independence. Since our proposals were made there has been no response either from racist Pretoria or from its ally and partner. Recently our President, Comrade José Eduardo Dos Santos, President of the MPLA Workers Party and of the People's Republic of Angola, made additional constructive proposals, in response to which again there has been nothing but silence.

This has been indeed the cat-and-mouse game of the racist régime and its allies: either silence, or the presentation of demands which would be laughable if they were not so contemptuous of African sovereignty and dangerous to African freedom.

I should like to ask certain permanent and non-permanent members of the Council one question: Do the views of the overwhelming majority of the world's sovereign States carry no weight, no importance? Does the communiqué issued by the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia in early October mean

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

not a jot? Do the resolutions of this Council itself, which, according to the Charter, are mandatory for the States Members of the United Nations, carry no validity? Does this unique case, that is, direct United Nations responsibility for Namibia, not impose on these particular Members both the obligation to do everything possible for the independence of Namibia and to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa? Do they not realize that the very reputation and effectiveness of the United Nations is at stake? Are they not aware of the fact that a weakened United Nations, one that is thus perceived, is harmful to the entire world, indeed to its security? Do they not understand that it is a betrayal of the Charter?

And, if those Members of the Council do realize all these factors, then what makes them veto and cast negative votes again and again on an issue that is unequivocal. Namibia must be free.

The historical perspective and structural manifestations of racism are responsible for apartheid in South Africa and Namibia; they are responsible for Pretoria's illegal occupation of Namibia; they are responsible for the continued aggression by racist armed forces against the People's Republic of Angola and their illegal occupation, since 1981, of parts of southern Angola; they are responsible for sabotage attempts against all the sovereign southern African States; they are responsible for the creation and control of bandit groups in many southern African States, UNITA and RENAMO, which terrorize and kill the peaceful populations of those countries and destroy or damage the attempts for socio-economic infrastructure and reconstruction being undertaken by these independent African States.

The statement yesterday by the representative of the racist South African régime is astounding in its audacity, laughable in its pathetic attempts to obfuscate the truth and depressing in its outright lie.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

The racist representative of the Pretoria régime is perhaps under the illusion that this Council is meeting on the question of South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, which, indeed, remains on the agenda of the Council, and on which the Council has met innumerable times. Perhaps the Pretoria representative can be apprised of the fact that the Council is meeting on the issue of independence for Namibia. Secondly, if the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) depended on the People's Republic of Angola, I assure the Council and the world that Namibia would have long since been free, since 1978 to be exact. Who is impeding implementation of this resolution is a matter of public and official record. Thirdly, and most important, perhaps the Council can ask the representative of the racist Pretoria régime, how come no such "obstacle", as he now specifies, existed during negotiations on resolution 435 (1978) and its subsequent adoption, although nothing has changed in southern Africa? Fourthly, the racist régime's appeals, if they can by any stretch of the imagination be called that, are for concurrence with apartheid, with racist imperialist hegemony and with a return to colonialism.



(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

How can the representative of the hated minority régime speak of peaceful resolution when every act of the apartheid régime is one of violence? When the racist régime denies the inhabitants of South Africa their most fundamental rights, when it has wrested those rights away from the inhabitants of Namibia, when it violates the rights of the independent citizens of neighbouring States, is that not violence at its most extreme and its most cynical? When it attacks and illegally occupies territories belonging to Member States of the United Nations, is that not violence at its most dangerous? When it kills children, is that not violence at its most inhuman? When it seeks to place ridiculous arguments before the international community, is that not violence at its most ridiculous - what a modern philosopher has called "the banality of evil"? And when Pretoria imposes a state of emergency on its own inhabitants in order to control them more completely, is it not a constitutionalization of violence: is it not violence at its most unnecessary?

With such organized, legislated, constitutionalized violence and racism and racial discrimination as the ramparts and foundations of the minority régime and its rule of privilege and power, the racist representative has the gall to express concern over a situation for which his régime is responsible - the largest-scale State terrorism which is official Pretoria policy in southern Africa and the attempts at destabilization of sovereign legal Governments, as well as the sabotage of national reconstruction efforts.

Pretoria's contribution to Namibia is well known, except that instead of the picture painted by the racist representative all of us here are fully aware of the true situation: the brutal exploitation of Namibia by Pretoria, the enslavement of its human resources, the plundering of its natural resources, the denial of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people, the murder of its children and the

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

turning of Namibia into a slave camp for the benefit of parasitic Pretoria. In fact, if there is going to be any talk of contributions the Council should record what Namibia has contributed to the Pretoria régime's prosperity and development. The false comparison that the racist representative seeks to make between the people of Namibia and Angola would be better served if he had categorically compared the condition of the handful of minority white rulers of Namibia to the conditions of the vast majority of the suffering Namibians and South Africans.

When the racist representative speaks of the responsibility Pretoria has assumed towards Namibians it bears analogy with the wolf safeguarding sheep for a leisurely meal. In Pretoria's lexicon, "responsibility" is equated with illegal occupation and a just and internationally recognized fight for freedom is interpreted as "terrorism".

It was no accident of history or aberration of judgement that got the Pretoria régime suspended from the United Nations General Assembly; it was indeed just - though not sufficient - punishment for the shameful acts of a founding Member of the United Nations. Justice would demand the expulsion of racist South Africa from membership of the United Nations.

My delegation calls for a strong condemnation of the Pretoria régime for its acts of violence and terrorism inside and outside South Africa, for its refusal to allow Namibian independence, for its refusal to end its illegal occupation of parts of southern Angola, for its contravention of the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council and for its refusal to observe the principles of the United Nations Charter. It is only just and right that, since it is the Charter that is being violated, it should be the Charter that is used to punish the violator; and there is no more just and correct punishment than the application of measures envisaged under the Charter's Chapter VII - full, comprehensive and mandatory sanctions.

(Mr. De Figueiredo, Angola)

My delegation fully supports the draft resolution before the Council, in particular its request to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to proceed immediately to arrange a cease-fire between SWAPO and Pretoria and the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

I should like to take this opportunity to express once again our complete solidarity with the Namibian people and its liberation movement SWAPO and our complete and total opposition to and abhorrence of the apartheid régime. May we Angolans, with a deep knowledge of racism and apartheid, offer a warning to the international community that unless apartheid is swiftly and completely stamped out and dismantled inside South Africa there will be no peace in southern Africa.

As long as the Pretoria régime continues to be a threat to peace in southern Africa and a threat to the safety and well-being of the majority of South Africa's inhabitants, internationalist comrades like our Cuban friends will continue to be needed. And if after the dismantling of internal colonialism South Africa needs doctors, engineers, technicians and teachers, perhaps our internationalist friends could oblige.

Until the genuine liberation of Namibia, until the complete destruction of apartheid, until the cessation of Pretoria's State terrorism, a luta continua; a vitoria e certa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Angola for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, Sir, allow me to welcome you in the post of President of the Security Council. Now that the month of October has almost drawn to its close, we have all the more reason to express our satisfaction at your skilled guidance of the work of the Council, which is promoted by your great diplomatic experience and

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

your sincere aspiration to see to it that the activities of this most important body of the United Nations are successful and fruitful.

We are grateful also to Mr. Victor Gbeho of Ghana for his outstanding work in presiding over the Council in the month of September.

The question of the exercise by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination, independence and the territorial integrity of its country have been discussed in the United Nations from practically the day of its founding. Can such a situation be considered as worthy of our Organization, of the entire international community? The blame for the fact that the people of Namibia has up till now been under the colonial yoke of South Africa should be on the consciences of those who deliberately, continually and stubbornly block the application against the racists, the occupiers of Namibia, of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and resort to the use of the veto in the Security Council on the question of adopting against the Pretoria régime comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The whole world knows full well that Namibia's accession to independence has been delayed for such a shamefully long time only because of the clear connivance of a few Western States.

Those who have spoken before me, the representatives of the front-line African countries, of other States of Africa and of countries of other continents have drawn attention to the extremely alarming situation in and around Namibia. A theme of almost all the statements has been indignation and profound concern over the artificially created helplessness of the United Nations to implement its own decisions providing for the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to independence.

The Security Council's attention has once again been drawn to the brutality of the racist régime of Pretoria to the people of Namibia and the increase in its acts of violence against the civilian population of that Territory. The South African occupying forces are destroying Namibian villages, burning harvests in the fields, acting inhumanly against the indigenous population, including children, old people, women, and church and public officials, and arresting and gaoling black workers without trial or investigation.

Taking advantage of the support and connivance of their Western protectors, the racists of Pretoria keep Namibia in their grip and use its territory to carry out acts of aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring independent African States, including Angola, Mozambique and Zambia. According to existing data, in Angola alone, the undeclared war unleashed against the Republic by the Pretoria régime and its puppets, represented by UNITA, have already cost the lives of tens of thousands of Angolan citizens. Thousands of children have become orphans and the country has suffered material damage assessed at billions of dollars.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Recently, the South African régime has again stepped up its military activity in the south and south-east of Angola and South African troops have been concentrated in the north of Namibia. Is this not evidence of South African preparations to expand the scale of its invasion in the south of Angola?

The Soviet Union shares Angola's concern, as expressed in the statement of the Ministry of External Relations of the People's Republic of Angola of 16 October, in connection with the stepping up of South Africa's aggressive actions. By its aggressive policy and military actions, the apartheid régime is creating a threat to international peace and security. We cannot fail to point out that an escalation of tension in the south of the continent is fraught with serious consequences not only for the black but also for the white population of South Africa. This, too, should not be forgotten inter alia by those that are protecting the racist régime of South Africa.

The Soviet Union vigorously rejects the policy of delaying the granting of independence to Namibia and linking it with extraneous issues. We oppose with equal vigour the attempts of South Africa to resolve the Namibian problem, side-stepping the United Nations, through the so-called internal settlement and the creation of a puppet government. The time has long been ripe to shift from a policy of linkage to a policy of solutions, to practical steps aimed at cutting the Namibian knot, to defusing the explosive situation in the south of the African continent. The Soviet Union believes that a just settlement in southern Africa can and must be achieved by political means.

In the interest of ensuring the speedy independence of Namibia, it is extremely important to expand without any delay the role of the United Nations, in particular that of the Security Council and the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in the settlement of the Namibian problem, so that through

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

intensified pressure on Pretoria and its Western protectors South Africa will be forced to take into account the will of the people of Namibia and of the overwhelming majority of States of the world, as expressed in the relevant decisions of the Security Council, the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

In that connection, the Security Council should consider a renewal of the work of its sub-committee on Namibia, which could, on a regular basis, follow the development of the situation in the Territory, report on it to the Security Council and deal with the search for ways and means to ensure speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We believe that the United Nations and the Security Council bear the major responsibility for the rapid decolonization of Namibia. We are firmly convinced that the United Nations is in a position to carry out this role, acting in accordance with the Charter. The defusing of the conflict situation in the southern part of Africa would contribute to the establishment of the bases for a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Peace and security are needed by all peoples, including the peoples of southern Africa. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized in his article entitled "The reality and guarantees of a secure World",

"the world cannot be considered secure if human rights are violated in it ... if a large part of this world has no elementary conditions for a life worthy of man."

The Soviet Union once again states that it does not support the thesis according to which the worse it is, the better it is, inasmuch as that would mean new suffering for people and new victims, and in the future the possibility of an explosion with consequences difficult to predict.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Our country is ready to talk with all who, not in words but in deeds, aspire to a just and honest political settlement in Namibia and in southern Africa as a whole. However, the problem lies in the fact that, judging by all the signs, South Africa and the forces that support it are apparently not ready for such talks. Pretoria continues to rely on force as far as its own people are concerned, on force in its relations with occupied Namibia and on force in its relations with neighbouring front-line States.



(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

It is perfectly natural that, in such conditions, the national liberation movements represented by the African National Congress (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have no choice other than to counter the military might and terror of the Pretoria racists with their own struggle - a struggle of the multi-million population of South Africa and Namibia for the elimination of apartheid, the establishment of a free, multi-racial, democratic State and the proclamation of Namibia's independence.

It is clear to any unbiased person that it is precisely the terror practised in Namibia by the racists that is forcing the Namibians to take up arms, to leave their motherland and to seek shelter in neighbouring countries.

The Soviet Union firmly supports the decisions of the United Nations and other international forums on the question of the speedy granting of independence to Namibia and the elimination of the system of apartheid. We support their decisions and appeals for comprehensive material and moral support and assistance to the anti-colonial, anti-racist struggle of oppressed peoples. In accordance with the decisions of the United Nations and other forums, the Soviet Union will continue to render full support to the just struggle of the Namibian people for its national self-determination and independence - a struggle it is waging under the leadership of SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

Based on that position of principle, the Soviet Union will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted to the Security Council by the non-aligned countries. We hope that the adoption of the draft resolution will be a practical step towards strengthening the role of the United Nations, including the Security Council, and the Secretary-General of the Organization in the settlement of the

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Namibian problem, and that it will open the way to the application of concrete measures to implement the United Nations plan on Namibia, contained in resolution 435 (1978).

I should like to end by quoting the following passage from the article, to which I have already referred, written by Mikhail Gorbachev in connection with the opening of the forty-second session of the General Assembly:

"The United Nations Charter gives extensive powers to the Security Council. But joint efforts are required to ensure that it can use them effectively".

That is precisely what the Soviet Union would wish to see done.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): The African Group, on behalf of which the Permanent Representative of Madagascar, supported by the Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, submitted his request, is infinitely grateful to you, Mr. President, for having convened the present series of Security Council meetings.

For the delegation of the Congo, as an African country and as a member of the Security Council, this is the outstanding public opportunity to pay a tribute to you, Mr. President. Therefore, it is my great pleasure, because of the links of friendship between your country, Italy, and mine, the Congo, to congratulate you and to assure you again of my delegation's co-operation.

To your predecessor, last month's President of the Security Council, my brother and friend Ambassador Victor Gbeho, I would say that the exercise of his mandate was very worthy of his great qualities and his experience as an

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

accomplished diplomat. Ambassador Gbeho well deserves the gratitude of the Security Council; Ghana, his country; and Africa as a whole. I therefore congratulate him once again.

While the month of October this year marks the eleventh commemoration of the Week of Solidarity with the Namibian People and its Liberation Movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Security Council, for its part, has resumed the never-ending debate on the question of Namibia.

At the present stage, all the elements, all the components of this political puzzle which for almost 21 years now has been a cancer of international life, are well known and identified. The situation of the Territory of Namibia remains resolutely colonial. That Territory, with the support of the international community, must exercise without any further delay its right to self-determination and independence.

The Secretary-General's reports - whether the one dated 31 March 1987 or the further one dated 27 October 1987 and issued as document S/19234 - make it clear that there is no major question that should delay the process of the decolonization of Namibia decided upon by the Security Council.

In that respect, resolutions 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978, and 439 (1978), of 13 November 1978, are decisive in terms of their effects on the objective - namely, the immediate independence of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO. Unfortunately, the arrogance of South Africa, which is aware that it has large Western support, has imposed and continues to impose an unusual approach to Namibia - an approach which is of no use to Africa and the free peoples of the world. The theory and practice of linkage, under which extraneous considerations - the Cuban troops in Angola - are regarded as a factor in the settlement of the

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Namibian question are totally unacceptable and stupid. The allies of South Africa must be aware of that - those allies which contribute to giving South Africa this means of evasion and in fact are opposing Namibia's independence, thereby seriously undermining the Security Council's credibility.

The outstanding assessment of the situation in Namibia made by Mr. Ben Gurirab, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO, in his statement to the Security Council deserves our consideration and respect. It opens up serious prospects for enabling the Council to extricate itself from the present impasse. This statement by SWAPO serves to strengthen the efforts by the Secretary-General, which are reflected in his recent reports on the question of Namibia and which my country wishes to encourage.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

That is why, although it is in opposition to the decisions, which it supported, of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the summit meeting of non-aligned countries, which unanimously call for the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, my country has put its name to the draft resolution now before the Council for consideration. It must be understood by its action Congo is in no way endorsing Pretoria's apartheid policy or its policy of aggression against the front-line States. My country condemns those policies and resolutely supports liberation movements in South Africa and the struggle of the South African people.

The international community and the Security Council cannot continue indefinitely to cope with South Africa's challenge. It is more than time, nine years after the adoption of the United Nations peace plan for Namibia, at last to begin the real process that will lead the Territory to independence.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Congo for the kind words he addressed to me.

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

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): I congratulate you most sincerely, Sir, on your presidency of the Council for the month of October. The same sentiments go in like measure to your predecessor, my friend the Ambassador of Ghana, who guided the work of the Council last month.

That Namibia remains illegally occupied by South Africa almost 10 long years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is unquestionably a scandal of historic proportions. This is even more true when account is taken of the tens of hundreds of innocent lives that have been wasted in Namibia over these years; and of the tens of hundreds, if not thousands, more in the neighbouring

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

States, for which Namibia, because of South Africa's presence there, has become a source of endless aggression and death.

The question which the people of Namibia and of the region of southern Africa as a whole have every right to ask the Council is very simple: what use is to be derived from resolution 435 (1978) if it cannot be implemented, if it cannot serve the purpose for which it was adopted by the Council nearly 10 years ago?

We have, however, asked for this meeting not to determine the fate of resolution 435 (1978), but to see if there is at long last a willingness on the part of the Security Council to implement the resolution to pre-empt its death by neglect. We are here to plead seriously for action, to remind the Council that it still owes the people of Namibia a debt of honour which is far too long overdue.

The people of Namibia do not have the patience of an elephant. They have to get on with their war of liberation without being distracted by dishonest promises of peaceful evolution to freedom and independence through the instrumentality of an independence plan which the Council has shown an embarrassing reluctance to implement. They are sick and tired of waiting for old promises to be fulfilled.

There is no question about the commitment of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the front-line States to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We have spared no effort to demand its implementation. For us, the resolution should have been implemented nine years ago, in 1978, after it was adopted by the Security Council. Every one of those nine years has been too costly for our region in every conceivable sense. They have been years of death and misery, not only for the people of Namibia but for the region as a whole. We want all this to come to an end.

But are South Africa and the Security Council as committed as we are to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? Indeed, we are surprised that the Security Council has thus far failed to agitate for the implementation of

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

resolution 435 (1978), despite the settlement of all the so-called outstanding issues, including in particular the issue of the electoral system to be employed in the conduct of the elections in Namibia. Has the Council been recruited to the linkage bandwagon? Why the deference to Pretoria's sensibilities on an issue - an irrelevant issue - which has been rejected by the Council? Has the Security Council now resigned itself to cohabiting in peace and harmony with the impertinent linking of Namibia's independence to the presence of Cuban troops in the neighbouring independent and sovereign State of Angola? We have every right to ask those questions.

South Africa's refusal to implement resolution 435 (1978) is a known fact, but what about the Security Council? Why the deafening silence, despite the fact that no reason exists any more to justify the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? The people of Namibia deserve answers to these questions, and we are here to get those answers.

What about the Western Five, the famous - or infamous - contact group, the godfathers of the United Nations plan for Namibia? Where are they? Have they come to suspect that because resolution 435 (1978) would have produced a truly free and independent Namibia, its implementation is consequently not in their interest? We are not accusing them of bad faith, yet we deem it our right to suspect the original motive of their initiative back in 1977 which gave birth to resolution 435 (1978). Why have they not insisted on the implementation of a plan they laboured so hard to bring to life? Why? Why the silence, the indifference, the hibernation?

The Security Council must redeem its honour. It must not allow South Africa and its friends to ruin its image. It must not force the people of Namibia and the world at large to lose faith in it. It must not allow a tiny minority of its

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

members to transform it, the Council, into the worthless paper factory it has often been accused of having degenerated into.

I said earlier that we have come here not to determine the fate of resolution 435 (1978) but to see if the Security Council, nearly 10 years after the adoption of that resolution, is at long last ready to proceed, without any prevarication or excuses, with the implementation of the resolution. The parties to the Namibian issue, South Africa and SWAPO - South Africa, of course, with bad faith - have now agreed on the electoral system to be used in the elections to be conducted and controlled by the United Nations. All the other so-called outstanding issues were settled in August 1982, settled between SWAPO, the front-line States and the contact group, before it went into hibernation.



(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

It was agreed then that, on agreement being reached by the parties on the electoral system to be used in the elections, the Secretary-General would be informed and the President of the Security Council would be called upon to convene a meeting of the Council for the purpose of adopting a resolution by which the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would be triggered off. This is what we are here for - to implore the Council, on our knees, to live up to its responsibilities to the long-suffering people of Namibia, by implementing a plan which has the potential of saving them from the traumas of a protracted war of liberation.

Our region is in no need of pious ideological posturings by outsiders. We want freedom and peace for Namibia, South Africa and the region as a whole, not hegemonistic squabbles by outsiders over spheres of influence over us. We reject with contempt any suggestion that southern Africa is a pliable and mindless candidate for external ideological influence-peddling and proselytizing. We want to be free of all foreign influences which complicate our lives. What we want is freedom for our people, peace and stability, not foreign influences antagonistic to our own way of life.

The Security Council must realize that too much is at stake in southern Africa. The continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa must not be taken lightly, even by those whose sympathies may lie with that racist country. The Council must understand clearly that without a solution to the Namibian question a solution to the question of apartheid would become a pipe dream. That is why the Pretoria régime would not allow implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It knows that apartheid South Africa will become the sole focus of international attention and pressure once resolution 435 (1978) is implemented and Namibia is allowed to

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

proceed to independence. The Council must not allow the régime to continue to use Namibia as a protective shield for the perpetuation of the intolerable status quo in South Africa.

Our agitation for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is thus inspired by more than a mere yearning on our part for a speedy end to bloodshed and suffering in Namibia: it is inspired, most importantly, by our belief that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia carries in it the seeds of a more catastrophic situation in southern Africa, the consequences of which the world has yet to experience. This is no empty bluster. The Council must not make the grave mistake of thinking that the countries of southern Africa, whose brutalization by the South African régime most of the Western world has greeted with pious pledges of sympathy and understanding, will allow themselves to die without trying, as they must, to survive. I say to representatives: "Some of you may detest the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, but you haven't seen anything yet, if by your action or inaction you are going to continue to be so permissive towards South Africa's brutal rape of the People's Republic of Angola, or of anybody else in the region." Angola must survive - and it will - with the assistance, if need be, of anyone it chooses in the exercise of its sovereignty. We all must survive in the region - and survive we will - with the assistance, if need be of even the devil himself.

Those who side with the enemies of the people of Angola cannot claim to have the interests of Angola or of our region at heart. It is all rudimentary common sense. Those who fuel the conflict in Angola are enemies of peace in our region, especially as they combine their destabilization of Angola with the unconscionable denial of independence to Namibia.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Namibia's freedom is long overdue. Angola's peace and stability and the enjoyment by its people of their hard-won independence has for too long been denied. The region as a whole has long been bereft of the tranquillity it so much deserves if it is to get down to the task of nation-building and the pursuit of happiness and prosperity for all its peoples.

And so we ask the Council to rise to the occasion, to respond constructively and with a determined sense of purpose and mission to the cries of the people of Namibia for freedom, for so long denied them. We call for the implementation - the speedy implementation - of resolution 435 (1978). Anything less would be a tragedy, not only for Namibia and southern Africa, but for the Council's utility and efficacy. Do not allow this premier organ of the United Nations to become a laughing-stock to both its supporters and its detractors.

The Council has the potential to act decisively to seize the golden opportunity which resolution 435 (1978) has presented all these years - the opportunity to decolonize Namibia without further bloodshed. The permanent members in particular have shown that they can act together. The impressive solidarity of intent and purpose they have recently displayed on the Iran-Iraq issue would not be out of order on the question of Namibia. Imagine the cathartic effect of the symbolism of an appearance on television by the permanent members of the Council, with the Secretary-General standing in their midst, agitating for implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and threatening dire consequences if South Africa blocked such implementation. Imagine how much that could do for the morale of the people of Namibia. They would very much appreciate such a display of solidarity with them. Their morale would receive a needed boost.

Yet all we shall soon hear from some members of the Council, which we have not heard, of course, on the question of the Gulf, is that threatening South Africa with dire consequences for refusing to implement resolution 435 (1978) is a

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

negative tactic, that we have to be temperate in our demands, that South Africa's so-called security concerns must be addressed before anything can be done about resolution 435 (1978), as if only South Africa in our region had security concerns that must be addressed. We shall be treated to a staple diet of diversions, diversions from concentrating on the question of Namibia to discussing the internal affairs of Angola.

The selective morality practised here is unbelievable. Deadlines issued by the Council are the order of the day in the case of the Gulf conflict, while in the case of South Africa's arrogant defiance of the Council's injunctions the veto is readily invoked - with indecent haste, I must add - to block even a modicum of action by the Council. There is even a campaign in certain quarters that the apartheid cow must be fattened first in order to encourage South Africa to be amenable to reason. What logic!

And is it not utterly incredible and unconscionable that the representative of a Government which has under merciless subjugation 28 million people in South Africa should appear in the Council and piously pontificate about mercy and compassion for "the plight of the people of Angola" (S/PV.2757,p.22)? What does South Africa know about mercy and compassion for the black man? What about the daily suffering of the people of South Africa, whose only crime is to strive peacefully to be free in their own land?

Is it not also true that whatever sorry plight the people of Angola are enduring has resulted in large measure from Pretoria's repeated invasion and destabilization of Angola?

(Mr. Legwaile, Botswana)

The representative of South Africa has also excoriated the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for perpetrating what he calls terrorism in Namibia citing as an example the exploding anti-personnel mine incident on 23 October in Owambo, which killed three children. Please let us be honest: will the Council ever know the number of the children of southern Africa as a whole - not only of South Africa - whose young, innocent lives have been brutally snuffed out by the South African police and nocturnal commandos? Will we ever know the exact number of those children who have been murdered in cold blood by South African commandos coming into the front-line States under cover of darkness? Among the innocent victims of Pretoria's brutal raid on the capital of my own country in 1985 was a six-year-old child who did not even know what the initials "ANC" stood for. He was murdered on the suspicion that he was a leading member of the African National Congress (ANC) plotting subversion and terrorism from the capital of my country! How merciful and compassionate was that heinous act of State terrorism, we ask?

South Africa is at war. I see that in his statement the representative of South Africa said that South Africa was not at war, not even with SWAPO. South Africa is at war. That is a fact. South Africa is at war not only with its own people in South Africa, where people are being mowed down every day, but with the people of Namibia, Angola and everybody else in southern Africa, and we want the blood-letting to stop. As a start let us have a cease-fire in Namibia. Let us allow the people of Namibia to proceed to independence without delay. Everything will then follow. It is true that international attention and pressure will then be focused on the racist régime itself. We do not want to leave anybody in any doubt that the independence of Namibia would relieve the régime in South Africa of the pressure for change, meaningful change, not reforms. If we allow Namibia to

(Mr. Legwaile, Botswana)

proceed to independence as a start, South Africa will also have to change. Only then will our region, the region of southern Africa, at long last begin to go about fulfilling the callings of all its peoples, white and black, in peace, freedom and stability.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Botswana for the kind words he addressed to me.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will take place at 3 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.