



Security Council

UN Doc S/PV.2747

MAY 7 1987

UN Doc S/PV.2747

PROVIS IONAL

S/PV.2747
9 April 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 9 April 1987, at 4 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. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

Mr. BIRCH
Mr. WALTERS
Mr. PABON GARCIA
Mr. 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 4.20 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 decisions taken by the Council at its previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the German Democratic Republic, Guyana, India, Jamaica, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Bulgaria.

Three major international events took place in 1986: the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna; the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare; and the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia.

(The President)

Those three events and the consideration of this item by the forty-first session of the General Assembly are striking testimony of the fact that the majority of States Members of the United Nations and the international community are determined to make every effort and to take all measures under the Charter to bring about the immediate granting of independence to Namibia. Those events and the present deliberations have shown the great responsibility of the Council to reach a final solution to this problem.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria believes that in our consideration of this question we should be guided by the Charter of the Organization, the decisions of the Security Council and the conclusions and recommendations formulated by the international community in those highly prestigious and representative forums to which I have referred. I will simply note that they share high hopes that the Security Council will discharge its obligations under Chapter VII of the Charter and that it will make a decisive contribution to the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

It is high time to act accordingly. Almost every year since 1966, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions on the independence of Namibia, condemning the policy of Pretoria. The Security Council, for its part, has adopted a number of resolutions in order to ensure the implementation of the decisions of our Organization. Of particular importance here are resolutions 385 (1976), and 435 (1978), which set forth a plan and specific ways for bringing about the independence of Namibia. There are also numerous resolutions adopted by the Organization for African Unity (OAU) and the Declarations of the Non-Aligned Movement calling for the immediate liberation of the country which has endured too much suffering. The political, legal and moral obligations emanating from these decisions are not questioned by any State Member of the United Nations.

(The President)

These resolutions and decisions which have emanated from the United Nations and the most prestigious and representative regional organizations as well as movements recognized by the whole world have, however, not been enough to make South Africa put an end to its colonial domination over Namibia, where the situation is getting worse all the time. True to form, Pretoria has been using military and police terror to stifle the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of that people, and thus perpetuate its domination. Furthermore the territory of Namibia is being used to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring front-line States.

The international community is therefore quite right to describe the policy of the racist régime as aggression not merely against the Namibian people but also against the whole of southern Africa, aggression that inevitably endangers international peace and security. That is another reason to bring to bear, in keeping with the United Nations Charter, the entire responsibility of the Security Council and to adopt urgent measures to curb aggression and to give independence to Namibia.

Here I wish to state that the people and the Government of Bulgaria entirely support the just struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation under the leadership of SWAPO. We will continue to give it our unreserved support so that it can achieve independence. We also support the struggle of the front-line States to repel South Africa's aggression. We welcome the statement made in the Council by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO as well as his thorough analysis of the current situation in Namibia.

The stark contrast between the existence of an internationally acceptable comprehensive legal and political basis for granting Namibia independence and the

(The President)

real situation in southern Africa is not due simply to racist Pretoria's refusal to give up its colonial possession. It is no secret that the assistance and support that Pretoria receives from its allies in the political, economic, military, nuclear and other fields are the main obstacles to Namibian independence and encourage racist South Africa's arrogant behaviour vis-à-vis the international community and the United Nations. The international corporations are plundering the human and material resources of Namibia. The marriage of convenience between the imperialist monopolies and the repressive authorities of South Africa enable it to continue to occupy Namibia to this day and terrorize southern Africa. That is nothing new; we are not the first or the only ones to say so. The majority of Member States of the United Nations recognize this.

The international community strongly rejects any so-called laws and proclamations, including constitutional and electoral plans, proclaimed by the illegal régime of occupation in Namibia to perpetuate South Africa's domination over that Territory. They are illegal acts that are null and void. We would have the same view of any attempt by South Africa to annex Walvis Bay and the islands that belong to Namibia.

At the same time we will continue to call for the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only valid basis for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia. Such a settlement is a decolonization issue, and has nothing to do with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. I should like to say here that we entirely share the view of the Secretary-General expressed in his report on the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) when he says he does not recognize the validity of this pre-condition and cannot accept it as a pretext to delay any further the independence of Namibia.

(The President)

Here it is appropriate to state that we indignantly reject the brutal threat hurled at the Security Council by the representative of South Africa in his statement. The failure of the three approaches to resolve the question of Namibia formerly applied by some countries and the trouble thus caused merely increase our conviction that there is no alternative to mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. I wish to state that at its session last year the General Assembly adopted a resolution stating, inter alia, that:

"... comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter are the most effective peaceful measures to ensure the compliance of ... South Africa with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia." (General Assembly resolution 41/39 B)

In that resolution of November 1986 the General Assembly appealed to the Security Council to adopt such sanctions.

The effectiveness of comprehensive mandatory sanctions should not be doubted by anyone. The recent colonial past in Africa has given us an example in which such a procedure produced positive results - in former Southern Rhodesia.

My country entirely shares the conviction that in the present situation the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions is the most direct way to Namibian independence. Such a solution would promote not only the triumph of a just cause but also the elimination of the danger to international peace and security.

For all those reasons the delegation of Bulgaria supports the draft resolution before the Council and will vote in favour of it.

I now resume my functions as President.

The representative of Cuba wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In his statement this morning, the representative of the United States, Mr. Walters, attempted once again to distort fact and reality with the obvious purpose of confusing the international community and world public opinion. His words should not go unanswered.

I wish to add as a parenthetical comment that, with respect to Cuba, it seems the representative of the United States, from his position as Ambassador, is trying to achieve what he was unable to achieve during his years as Assistant Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Walters' gross distortion of President Fidel Castro's statement in Harare can deceive no one. In his statement to the Eighth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries - which, it is worth recalling, was held in September, not December, as the representative of the United States said - President Fidel Castro said:

"Apartheid is a direct consequence of the colonial system, of the brutal way in which the peoples of Africa were forcibly plundered of their land and natural resources and their children enslaved and sold around the world. Apartheid has managed to maintain itself only through the support of the United States and the countries of NATO, which see South Africa as a strategic ally, as a source of raw materials, as a market for investments and the juicy profits of the transnational corporations, at the expense of the blood and sweat of millions of Africans."

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

Later in the same statement, President Fidel Castro said,

"Our solidarity with the African liberation movement and its heroic stand against colonialism, apartheid and racism is not merely verbal. In the struggle against Portuguese colonialism, Cuban revolutionaries fought alongside Amilcar Cabral and Agostinho Neto in Guinea Bissau and Angola; some gave their lives for that noble cause. When in 1975 South Africa invaded Angola, occupying more than half its territory, even though an ocean separates Cuba from Africa, Cuban internationalist fighters struggled together with their heroic Angolan brethren against the racist troops and drove them back more than 800 kilometres to the border of Namibia, thus showing the world that the soldiers of South Africa, like those of Hitler, are very far from being invincible.

"Despite the enormous effort this meant for our small country, a contingent of tens of thousands of Cuban internationalist fighters has stood guard for 10 years, together with the glorious Angolan armed forces, to ensure that the events of 1975 are not repeated.

"Our co-operation with Africa is not solely military. More than 15,000 young Africans are studying in our country free of charge, and thousands of Cuban physicians, teachers, technicians and workers are freely lending their services on that continent. More than 250,000 of our compatriots have carried out missions in Africa as fighters or civilians providing assistance. These efforts, carried out in solidarity and absolutely disinterestedly, disturb the sleep of the Yankee imperialists and the South African racists; they cannot imagine that countries that yesterday had been conquered, colonized and enslaved can now engage in such co-operation and raise such an impenetrable barrier against aggression.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

"Both the Yankee imperialists and the South African racists are doing everything in their power to bring about the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist troops from Angola, attempting to make the independence of Namibia conditional upon this. The Governments of Angola and Cuba have responded by common agreement: Implement resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia, cease threats of aggression against Angola, halt the dirty war and the support for mercenary bands, and the gradual, progressive withdrawal of 20,000 Cuban fighters who are defending strategic lines in southern Angola will begin. The remainder of the Cuban military personnel will be withdrawn, unconditionally, only when the sovereign Governments of Angola and Cuba see fit.

"The true key to the question is that so long as apartheid exists in South Africa, so long as that country is ruled by a racist fascist Government, there can be no security for Angola or for any other country of southern Africa, and the independence of Namibia can be no more than a fiction.

"Therefore, I can declare here categorically that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is based on principles; it is not motivated by any Cuban national interests or questions of prestige. When apartheid is ended, when the racist régime of South Africa ceases to exist, no country will feel threatened, Namibia will immediately become independent, and there will be no need for a single Cuban soldier and it will be possible to begin immediately the total withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Of course, Angola, whose sovereignty we have respected and will always respect with total loyalty, can decide at any time whether or not it requires our military personnel there. What I have just stated is our willingness to keep troops in Angola so long as apartheid exists in South Africa."

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

The manipulative and unforthcoming nature of the statement of the representative of the United States are thus obvious. Yet it is worth recalling that the Cuban troops went to Angola to fight against armed aggression by the apartheid régime at a time when United States support for that aggression through the Central Intelligence Agency - of which Mr. Walters was Assistant Director - was clear.

If it is true that, as the representative of the United States said, they want to see the end of apartheid, we might wonder why they continue to veto the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African racists. Why do they try to impede the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia with arguments that have been repeatedly rejected by everyone? Why do they continue collaborating with the Pretoria régime in the economic, political and military spheres, including the nuclear sphere, contrary to the wishes of the African peoples to ensure that their continent should be a denuclearized continent?

This morning's statement by Mr. Walters was intended to divert attention from the United States Administration's continuing support for the Pretoria racists in violation of the wishes and decisions of the United Nations. That is the behaviour of those who are seeking to block this Organization from carrying out effective work.

But the Namibian people, under the guidance of its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), has shown the world its determination to fight for its independence. That determination, and the ultimate victory, which is already in sight, cannot be denied by Yankee vetos in the Security Council. When a vigorous, virile people, such as the Namibian people, struggles with all its might for independence, the manipulations, distortions, lies and cynicism of infamous CIA agents are of no avail.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall call upon members of the Council wishing to make a statement before the vote.

Mr. BUCCI (Italy): Mr. President, it is a pleasure and an honour for my delegation to welcome you and your country, Bulgaria, to the leadership of the Council. In congratulating you I should like to recall here your long mission in my country, which left us with good memories of your talent and friendship. I am certain that the Security Council will derive great benefit from your expert guidance and from your outstanding personal capacities.

I should like to address a grateful thought to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech, colleague and friend, who directed our work during the month of March with great care, leadership and dedication.

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

The question of Namibia once again appears before the Security Council. This is happening just a few weeks after this same Council had a debate on apartheid. And it is apartheid which is the real problem, the problem at the very heart of the crisis which torments southern Africa.

The situation of Namibia is one of those which recur before both the General Assembly and the Security Council. And yet, in spite of the efforts of the Assembly and the Council, progress has not been made. On the contrary - and we saw this in regard to apartheid during our discussion in February - if there have been any changes, they have been, if anything, for the worse rather than for the better.

On Namibia we have received a new report from the Secretary-General. It is dated 31 March 1987 and is contained in document S/18767. It is not edifying to read this document. It shows the persistence of great obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). These obstacles maintain the deadlock in the process of independence more than 20 years after the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI) by the General Assembly at its twenty-first session, and almost 10 years after Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted.

This is the reality: there has been no improvement in all these years; Namibia is not an independent State; the will of the United Nations, while repeatedly expressed, is disregarded; Namibian territory is used to conduct military operations. At the end of 1985 it seemed that an agreement was in sight on the principle of the elections foreseen by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). These elections should have been held under a proportional system. But then everything was up for discussion again. No agreement was possible on a cease-fire and therefore it was not possible to proceed to the other measures which

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

are necessary in order to implement resolution 435 (1978), including the setting up of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

I believe that the time has come to recognize that this picture casts a shadow upon the credibility of each of the organs of the United Nations. The current situation in Namibia constitutes a flagrant violation of a people's right to independence, and a flagrant violation of the principle of self-determination. It perpetuates a colonial situation in an era - the second half of this very century - whose major feature is precisely decolonization, a great process for which our Organization is the legitimate and the most representative forum.

The violation of human rights perpetrated through apartheid, in South Africa and in Namibia, inevitably paves the way to violence. We could even say that apartheid is an inherently violent policy, inside and outside South Africa. Indeed, the defence of the apartheid régime cannot be, and in fact is not, merely a passive fact. The pre-emption of the threats which hang over that régime leads to initiatives which turn into aggressive measures. South Africa itself suffers; Namibia suffers also, as the launching ground for operations which are said to be for defence - defence so active as to materialize in acts of aggression.

The mandate entrusted to the Secretary-General - as his report states - cannot be carried out, because of the question of the linkage objected to by the Government of South Africa. My delegation believes that a Member State should not be allowed to impede the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on the pretext of the presence of foreign troops in Angola. That fact, in our opinion, has nothing to do with that resolution, which has to be implemented regardless of any linkage with issues concerning third States.

Almost 10 years after resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, it is not possible to stage these debates repeatedly without turning them into a ritual which endangers

(Mr. Bucci, Italy)

the political credit of the Security Council and therefore of the United Nations as a whole. As with apartheid, so the case of Namibia - which is a consequence of apartheid - now requires a firmer attitude.

None the less, before we have recourse to a mechanism of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, which would represent a final option, we would have preferred that a further mandate be entrusted to the Secretary-General. Unlike what happened in the past, this time the mandate should have been accompanied by a specific deadline, at the expiration of which, if resolution 435 (1978) were not implemented, the sanctions would have become operational.

Indeed, the draft resolution presented to the Security Council does not give due attention to the very important role played, throughout the vicissitudes of the Namibia issue, by the Secretary-General. Furthermore, no appropriate acknowledgement is given of the fact that in his report the Secretary-General himself has called for a further effort to achieve the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. In our opinion, mandatory sanctions could come into consideration only in the frame of a more active diplomatic process.

For those reasons, the Italian delegation intends to abstain.

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

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): For reasons that my delegation has mentioned many times, France does not support the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. We prefer, because they are more effective, the gradual and limited measures which France has been implementing with its partners in the European Community and which, while exerting increasing and indeed major pressure on the Government of Pretoria, allow for dialogue, without which there can be no peaceful solution in South Africa.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

None the less, my delegation wishes to stress the very specific nature of the question of Namibia. Everyone knows that my country, which has been actively associated with the efforts to achieve the full independence of that Territory, suspended its participation in the contact group, which we felt had completed its work and should have set about implementing the settlement plan, without adding conditions extraneous to its mission.

Since it suspended participation in the contact group, my country, when it has not felt that it could vote in favour of texts concerning Namibia, has abstained - particularly during votes in the General Assembly. In accordance with the logic of that position - which seeks to preserve the possibility of my country's once again, in due course, playing its proper role in the process of Namibia's accession to independence - the French delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution now before the Council.

Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): Before I explain our position on the draft resolution before us, let me comment very briefly on certain allegations by the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid with regard to the implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa.

It is well known that the Federal Government instituted investigations as soon as it gained knowledge of the illegal supply of blueprints to South Africa. These investigations are still in progress. The result will be transmitted in due time to competent bodies of the United Nations. One point, however, is already clear: no illegal supply to South Africa was ever approved by the Federal Government, either in an explicit or in a tacit manner. Also, I should like to stress that the United States air traffic embargo is in no way undermined by us.

(Mr. Lautenschlager, Federal
Republic of Germany)

I should now like to explain our vote on the draft resolution before us. We share the political goal that was reaffirmed by virtually all speakers in the course of this debate in the Security Council: the independence of Namibia, based on the exercise of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, has to be realized without delay. The United Nations settlement plan and, in particular, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), are the universally recognized way for Namibia to gain independence. We are deeply disappointed by the delay which has occurred in implementing that resolution. But we continue to feel that comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa would not speed up the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). On the contrary, they could foster increased confrontation and hardening of positions on the question of Namibia. We therefore cannot support the draft resolution before us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The result of the voting is as follows: 9 in favour, 3 against and 3 abstentions. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council.

I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): If I have asked to speak at this unusual time it is in order to add a brief epilogue to this historic debate on behalf of the African Group of States at the United Nations.

The arguments against apartheid, the illegal occupation of Namibia and the unacceptable delay in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been presented as lucidly and as persuasively as we can present them, and we note with satisfaction that almost all delegations which spoke in the debate have supported us. The outcome of the vote the Council has just taken is, regrettably, such as to make impossible all the action contemplated in the matter. The unique veto mechanism of the Security Council has ironically ensured that South Africa's interests are protected and Namibians condemned yet again to life in bondage until those who see eye to eye with the racist Pretoria régime will Namibia's freedom.

The very large number of participants in the debate and the near unanimity in the condemnation of South Africa's role in delaying self-determination for Namibians, not to mention the keen support for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime, are eloquent and comforting testimony to the importance attached to the consideration of the issue by the Council.

On behalf of the African Group of countries at the United Nations I wish to place on record my thanks and appreciation for the effort of all those who spoke in favour of the interest of Namibians and against subjugation and political chicanery. As for those who voted against the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members, we can only hope that they will eventually accept the verdict of history. We expected their non-co-operative posture - indeed, we have come to associate them with that attitude. We saw similar postures struck in the past when the struggles for the independence of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau and many other colonial Territories were being waged. Today, they are unable to defend the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

past refusal actively to facilitate the independence of those erstwhile Territories. They merely added to the pain of millions of colonial peoples for reasons of profit and military solidarity.

While we acknowledge the legal validity of the use of the veto in the Council, will those permanent members who cast the negative votes blame us for concluding that the veto has been again deliberately called upon to prevent the Council from reaching the only conclusion possible, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? Will they take issue with us when we infer that they have put the interest of a few thousand of their kith and kin residing and operating in Namibia over those of the overwhelming majority of Namibians? Will they be sincerely surprised at our deduction that they have put the interests of DeBeers, Anglo-American Corporation, Rio Tinto Zinc and other greedy and callous transnational corporations above the sacred and inalienable rights of Namibians? We wonder what world or civilization this is that puts the greed for profit and job opportunities of the minority before the freedom and human rights of millions of fellow human beings. Again, history will be the judge.

When the founding fathers of our Organization endowed the Security Council with the veto mechanism they did so, inter alia, to ensure the strongest consensus for decisions on substantive questions. What has happened with the veto today, in our view, is a negation of the lofty hopes that gave birth to that unique decision-making mechanism. Today a few have employed the veto, knowingly or unknowingly, to prevent action in realizing the Charter objectives of freedom, of independence and of sovereignty. The veto has been used, perhaps inadvertently, to protect a mischievous State which all permanent members of the Council agree needs to be disciplined.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

I beg to recall that paragraph 1 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - or General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) - declares that:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation."

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Operative paragraph 5 of the same Declaration requires that:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire...". (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV))

It is these principles, considered together with the principles in the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is the attainment of these inalienable rights of Namibians that the negative votes of permanent members have today frustrated, and we make a distinction on this occasion between a negative vote and an abstention. For while the latter - an abstention - was unable to support our proposed sanctions as a means of putting pressure on South Africa, those who cast a negative vote must have known that this would counteract the unambiguous will of the overwhelming majority in the Council and in the international community.

In our view, therefore, the negative votes today have served only the purpose of making Pretoria proud of its friends, because it is after all a cardinal policy objective of the racist Pretoria régime to preserve the United States-United Kingdom veto in the Security Council against economic sanctions.

It is a matter of distress to the African States Members of the Organization to have had one more hope in the Security Council destroyed. The proposals presented have been rejected without so much as a dialogue with the authors on their demerits, if any. It was as if it had been the wish that the proposals would not fail to provide the excuse to trigger the veto. We ask: how long will this go on and how much suffering by Namibians will finally make the heart bleed for them? Is it nothing to you that Namibian men, women and children are dying from

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

exploitation and brutality? Do the voices of the overwhelming millions all round the world, calling in unison for sanctions against an international condemned régime not turn your hearts? Are you the same States that called for sanctions because people were imprisoned somewhere in eastern Europe? Again, history will be the judge.

For the moment, allow me, on behalf of the African Group, to renew again our unflinching solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of Namibians. SWAPO may have been unsuccessful this round, but it has certainly not lost the struggle. The fight must continue, and victory is certain because its cause is just and the international community, save a few, is morally and politically committed to supporting the independence of Namibia.

The African Group is more than grateful to all the other delegations which participated in the debate in order to make the voice of justice heard. To the members of the Council who by their votes underscored the importance of the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), we remain eternally grateful. Africa will again call on your understanding and support in the hope of setting Namibia free.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): The Cuban representative's tasteless personal attacks on me do not warrant more than categorical rejection, and I reject them. They add nothing to our debate except the artificial injection of unfounded, untruthful and unacceptable allegations.

We are proud of our role in elaborating resolution 435 (1978). We believe the search for a peaceful solution is the true vocation of this institution. We shall continue to seek a peaceful and just solution to the problem of Namibia.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): The representative of Ghana, on behalf of the African Group of States, has just made a number of charges against the motives of my country in voting against this draft resolution, charges that are totally incorrect. I should like to emphasize that we share, with all delegations which have spoken in this debate, the same concern, the same objective towards Namibia, which is that resolution 435 (1978) should be implemented. We have the same concern for the people of Namibia. Where we differ is over the means of achieving it, and this is a perfectly legitimate difference of opinion.

This has been a long debate, and I do not propose to go over those arguments again, but I should like to commend the representative of Ghana, and any others who have misunderstood our position, to look again at the statement that I made this morning.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2740th meeting, wishes to make a further statement. With the consent of the Council, I now call on him.

Mr. GURIRAB: I have already said in my substantive statement of 6 April all I had set out to say in the debate. I do not intend to cover that ground again. Suffice it to say here that I heard nothing new, I witnessed nothing in terms of progress in the position, collectively or severally, taken by the Western members of the Council about whom I said quite a lot in my statement. Therefore, I will not retract a word of that statement.

The hour of decision came and we have got the predictable results. Once again the same countries elected to stand in isolation in defence of apartheid, notwithstanding their passionate claims to the contrary, and in opposition to Namibia's independence. Their vetoes can for now, and perhaps for many years to

(Mr. Gurirab)

come, obstruct the will of the majority in the Council. But vetoes cannot suppress the will and determination of our people to free themselves.

At the same time, we will not be deterred in our efforts continuously to hold the Security Council responsible to its solemn undertaking for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), without any further delay or prevarication. The statement made the other day by the Boer spokesman of apartheid South Africa, apart from being the usual diatribe, was essentially a sinister and cynical play to the gallery and the all-white so-called democratic elections to be held next month in Fascist South Africa. We dismiss it with the contempt it deserves. I should like, however, to caution the Council not to treat lightly but to heed the threat contained in the conclusion of his statement about an imminent unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia.

(Mr. Gurirab)

The Council should prepare itself to be able to respond in a prompt and effective manner in such an eventuality.

With regard to the statements made and explanations of vote proffered by the veto wielders and their collaborators in the Council, I can only say to them that more than 15 years of my tour of duty at the United Nations as SWAPO's chief representative made me realize that the only noteworthy change in their positions is in the transiency of their delegates rather than in the substance of the policies of their Governments.

They invoke lofty ideals in defence of their good faith and sincerity, but their actions repeated time and again belie their words. Again I witnessed in this debate mere excuses and hypocrisy. The continuing senseless killing, suffering and impoverishment of our people instruct us to continue to point out this truth.

For a moment I thought the Permanent Representative of the United States was a spokesman for the Botha régime. The theory and practice of linkage was given a new twist with the repeated emphasis on the concept of so-called mutual security and Pretoria's alleged "legitimate security concerns". The case was presented in a way that purports to make us, the victims, and our Angolan brothers and sisters as being responsible for our own suffering and the devastation caused by Pretoria's acts of destabilization and support for the armed bandits of UNITA that are now receiving military and financial assistance from the United States.

The United States representative and others condemned the armed struggle but decided to mention nothing whatsoever about Pretoria's huge occupation army and the destruction it continues to perpetrate in Namibia - let alone mention the root causes of the colonial conflict in Namibia.

There is a time-tested tradition among African delegations in the United Nations in terms of the sponsorship of the representatives of the national liberation movements to appear before the Security Council. As in the present case,

(Mr. Gurirab)

it is the African delegations on the Council that request a hearing for the spokesmen of the authentic organizations. This has always been the practice. The fact that non-African delegations on the Council are promoting the case of the puppet MPC group should be instructive to all as to whose interests they represent. This group has no separate existence of its own. It is composed of Pretoria's quislings, installed on 17 June 1985 in Namibia as a so-called interim government, which was rejected by the Council in its resolution 566 (1985) as null and void.

We are satisfied about the progress made in the debate. The calibre of the participants and the quality of their statements were overwhelming and reassuring to our people, who are waging a just and legitimate struggle for the total liberation of our own country. We are grateful to them all for reaffirming the political goal for the debate - namely Namibia's independence through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We will now return to our respective zones of combat to continue intensifying that struggle, including, in particular, the armed struggle for the achievement of genuine independence.

May I express our heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution - namely the delegations of Argentina, the Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia. We are greatly indebted to them and to all the other delegations that voted in favour of it. I trust that, in the future, those States which this time abstained in the voting will be able to join the majority. We welcome as significant the position taken by France, Italy and Japan to abstain in the voting rather than cast a negative vote.

We and some of our friends have started reflecting on various ways in which the General Assembly, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, may assume extraordinary powers with a view to expediting the implementation of the United

(Mr. Gurirab)

Nations plan on Namibia, as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). We shall return to this august Chamber to ask once again for action. But if the obstruction of the will of the majority continues to prevail, then we believe the other competent organs of the United Nations must assume their responsibilities fully. We have come to believe that Namibia's problem is that important in the United Nations.

When the Secretary-General of the United Nations is in a position to inform SWAPO that Pretoria is ready to sign a cease-fire, we should be happy to reaffirm to him our own readiness to reciprocate. We wish him well in his tireless efforts to this end, and we renew our commitment to resolution 435 (1978).

In conclusion, I thank you once again, Mr. President, for your understanding and co-operation and for having presided over the affairs of the Council in a skilful and effective manner.

1987: Year of Rededication to the Struggle.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.