



Security Council

LIBRARY

APR 8 1987

UN/CONF/CONF

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2740
6 April 1987

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
SEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 6 April 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. TSVETKOV

(Bulgaria)

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BLANC
Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. BUCCI
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. TIMERBAEV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council in the month of April, I should like on behalf of the members of the Council to pay tribute to His Excellency Mr. Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations, for his service as President of our Council last month. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Council in expressing to him our unreserved gratitude for the great diplomatic skill and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the business of the Council last month.

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): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Barbados, Canada, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kuwait, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe, 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. Dost (Afghanistan), Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Dame Nita Barrow (Barbados), Mr. Laberge (Canada), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Dasgupta (India), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Moya Palencia (Mexico), Miss Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter, dated 1 April 1987, from the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which reads as follows:

"On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I have the honour, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, to request an invitation to the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, headed by me, to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the President and delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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): I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter dated 1 April 1987 from the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which reads as follows:

"On behalf of the Special Committee, I have the honour to request, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to be invited to participate in the Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia."

On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of items on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Congo, Ghana and Zambia a letter, dated 1 April 1987, which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that during its meetings devoted to consideration of the item 'The situation in Namibia', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)."

(The President)

That letter has been distributed in Security Council document S/18772.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Gurirab in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

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

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 2 April 1987 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

"In my capacity as Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, I have the honour to request that the Security Council invite Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to the United Nations, to address the Council under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure on the matter currently before it for consideration."

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council (S/18779). If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council decides to extend an invitation to Mr. Ansay in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting today in response to requests contained in letters addressed to the President of the Security Council on 25 and 31 March 1987, respectively, by the Permanent Representative of Gabon to the United Nations (S/18765) and by the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations (S/18769). Members of the Council have before them document S/187867, which contains the text of a further report by the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia.

The first speaker is the representative of Ghana.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I have requested to speak today in my capacity as the current Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations in order to outline to the Security Council the anxiety and indignation felt by members of the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Group at the present deteriorating situation in Namibia. Before I do so, however, allow me, Sir, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. This is the second time that the Ghana delegation is privileged to be working under your presidency since our two delegations became members of the Council, and we are pleased to submit to your acclaimed leadership. Your wisdom, your gentle manners and your incisive knowledge of the traditions and procedures of this body make us confident that success will attend the Council's deliberations.

I wish also, if I may, to convey to Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina the deep appreciation of the Ghana delegation for the able and business-like way in which he conducted the affairs of the Council last month. His leadership, in both the Council's informal and formal consideration of issues concerning international peace and security, bore the unmistakable imprint of even-handedness and competence. We are proud to have worked with him.

My statement today is at the behest of the African Group, which has painfully observed the situation in the Territory of Namibia worsen since the Council last debated the question almost a year and a half ago. The request that the Security Council now give its serious and pressing attention to this issue therefore reflects the deep and serious concern that the African Member States of the United Nations have for Namibia.

In coming to the conclusion that the Territory has fared no better since 1985, the Group has taken into consideration the comprehensive and lucid report of the Secretary-General in document S/18767 of 31 March 1987. I wish to express to the Secretary General our appreciation for that report, particularly the conclusions, which are unambiguous and which set the tone for the present debate in the Council.

In that report the Secretary-General informs us that, following the mandate given him in 1985, he conducted extensive and intensive consultations with all

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

interested and relevant parties with a view to preparing the way for the implementation of the plan for Namibia's independence as set forth in resolution 435 (1978). He concludes that, while all conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have now been fulfilled, South Africa's continued linking of the independence of the Territory with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola constitutes a obstacle to the early conclusion of the matter. In sum, therefore, all arrangements have been in place since 1985, but Namibia has not progressed towards independence.

The States members of the African Group, therefore, are justifiably disappointed that no progress has been registered in the preparations needed to bring the Territory to early independence. It must be noted here that, while the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), on the one hand, continues to reaffirm its support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only viable means of bringing the Territory to full independence and has also been ready all along to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Council to that end, South Africa, on the other hand, has continued to raise the linkage precondition and has been busy compounding illegality in the Territory by helping the so-called transitional government there to further consolidate itself. Namibians continue to live under repression, torture and political domination, with no prospect for self-determination.

Indeed, concern for the Territory's future is also shared by other responsible Members of the international community. At last year's summit-level meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) that concern was unequivocally articulated. Subsequently, at a meeting of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Harare last year, the OAU position was further supported and the international community called upon to increase its efforts to bring the Territory to immediate independence. In spite of the universal concern and the long history

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

of the consideration of this issue in the Council, as well as in other international forums, the independence of Namibia is far from being realized.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It was the same concern, I might add, that led to the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of front-line States and those of the States members of the European Community held at Lusaka on 3 and 4 February 1986. It is worth noting that in their joint communiqué the Foreign Ministers again condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and reaffirmed the centrality and relevance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only valid basis for a peaceful solution of the question of the independence of Namibia.

In the circumstances, logic and political wisdom would lead to the conclusion that the time has come for this Council to take up the concerns of the overwhelming majority of the international community in order to reach a final and lasting solution. In other words, in the face of all the pieces of evidence pointing to a worsening situation in the Territory and in the southern African sub-region generally, and in view of the international community's position on the matter, what can the Council do to avert further bloodshed and also bring Namibia to independence?

Nine years ago the Security Council agreed upon a framework for Namibia's independence. That framework, embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was carefully negotiated with all the parties concerned. It set out all the modalities by which the people of Namibia would attain their independence through a fair and free election under the supervision of the United Nations. It is no credit to the Council or to the international community that resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented today.

It will be recalled also that in June 1985 the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985), which, inter alia, stated that the choice by South Africa of an electoral system to be used in selecting members of the constituent assembly of the Territory was the only outstanding condition that needed to be fulfilled in

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

order to pave the way for the adoption by the Council of a resolution setting in train the measures mentioned in resolution 435 (1978). The Council went even further to demand that South Africa co-operate with it and the Secretary-General in this regard lest the Council meet forthwith to consider action against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. In spite of the clear demands of that resolution South Africa has continued to drag its feet, presumably in the full knowledge that it has influential friends who will protect its interests.

It is against that background of apparent paralysis in the Council in the face of the serious challenge to the Council's credibility and authority as a result of the non-implementation of the settlement plan it has negotiated and accepted that Africa has requested the convening of the Security Council with a view to putting the question firmly back on the agenda of the international community and demanding immediate independence for the Territory.

Today's meeting, therefore, is yet another effort by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and its colleagues in the Non-Aligned Movement to reawaken the conscience of the international community, particularly that of the friends of South Africa, about the deep frustration and resentment of the people of Namibia. This meeting has been requested to remind the Security Council, as the United Nations organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, that in the face of such a serious threat to peace the negotiations and attempts to persuade South Africa have gone on far too long.

Secondly, the African Member States wish to emphasize that it has been established beyond reasonable doubt that the main obstacle to Namibian independence has been the refusal of South Africa, regrettably aided by the protagonists of the so-called constructive engagement policy, to implement the Council's resolutions, particularly resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Thirdly, we wish to state that Namibia remains the moral and political responsibility of the Security Council, which should now initiate decisive action that would ensure the independence of the people of the Territory without any further delay.

The African States Members of the United Nations are aware that South Africa will again raise the alarm over the presence of Cuban forces in sovereign Angola in the hope that this will stall progress towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). However, we maintain that such considerations are extraneous and alien to the independence of the Territory and that they should therefore be rejected out of hand in this particular debate. I shall refrain from rehashing the arguments in favour of such rejection because that might inadvertently lead some to conclude that linkage is still recognized as a legitimate precondition, which it no longer is.

Furthermore, because the Council itself, in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985), has left no doubt as to its position in the matter, it must resist the temptation today to reintroduce what it has already ruled as being irrelevant to the issue under consideration. In any case, South Africa needs to be reminded in no uncertain terms that in the present debate in the Security Council Angola is not on trial. Cuba is not on trial. What is at issue is South Africa's own betrayal of the trust reposed in it by the international community.

Another troubling aspect of the delay in bringing Namibia to independence is that time and conditions are being created for South Africa to continue to plunder the wealth and natural resources of Namibia. It is a matter of deep regret that a number of States Members of the United Nations that now profess opposition to the policies of South Africa in Namibia are among the major beneficiaries of the heartless and intensive exploitation of the Territory, especially by powerful transnational corporations based within the jurisdiction of those countries.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In its recent report, dated 9 June 1986, on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia set out in clear detail the extent of the exploitation of Namibia's wealth involving a network of international co-operation that has largely contributed to South Africa's hardened attitude on the issue of Namibia's independence. Paragraph 18 of that report, for instance, is instructive:

"The foreign economic interests operating in Namibia have neither reinvested part of their huge profits in the Territory for development purposes nor tried to integrate the different sectors of Namibia's economy. As a result, their illegal activities in Namibia have imposed a typical colonial economy on the Territory, totally unbalanced and distorted and dependent on foreign imports. Furthermore, such activities have not only continued to reinforce and perpetuate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, but have also encouraged the hardening of the apartheid régime's intransigence with regard to the liberation of Namibia." (A/AC.131/203, para. 18)

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We cannot talk of supporting the independence of Namibia while at the same time collaborating with South Africa in commercial ventures in a Territory in which the overwhelming votes of the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice have pronounced South Africa's presence illegal. The two positions are incompatible. Perhaps it is time once again to remind member States from whose jurisdiction these transnational corporations hail that continued failure to restrain their activities in Namibia seriously undermines the efforts of the Security Council and promotes illegality.

In face of the unequivocal call for the independence of Namibia, what action is the Security Council qualified to take? In the view of the African Member States, the Security Council should proceed to increase pressure on South Africa to end forthwith its illegal occupation of Namibia. Such pressure can be effected only in the form of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. Such action would not only isolate the racist régime but also force it to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). This is not a new concept; it has been already considered and threatened in paragraph 13 of resolution 566 (1985), in which the Council

"Strongly warns South Africa that failure to [implement this resolution] would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions".

The Council, in face of the evidence, should now give effect to its decision in order to assert its responsibility and authority in the matter.

It should be explained also that the use of sanctions as prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter will not end action under resolution 435 (1978). On the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

contrary, it is our strong belief that it will compel South Africa to lend support to the full and earliest implementation of the terms of that resolution.

The argument that sanctions would hurt Namibians too much can no longer be seriously considered by the Security Council, not only because it has been repeatedly rejected by Namibians but also because it is only an indirect means of buying time for the South Africans.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the African Group is pained that in spite of the Charter, in spite of the resolutions and decisions of the Council and the clear opinion of the International Court of Justice, Namibia continues to be in bondage. Indeed, Namibians have been waiting for independence since this Organization itself divested South Africa of its legal authority over the Territory. The Security Council, which is the ultimate hope of all peoples for justice, peace and security, must therefore act forthwith in favour of righteousness and against the forces of evil which apartheid represents. The future of Namibia has for too long been held hostage to cold-war considerations and rivalry, and Namibians must be given a chance not only to be themselves but also to be friends with all.

Furthermore, the African delegations would like to reiterate their clear preference for the United Nations as the forum for resolving the question of Namibia. The time spent in the past experimenting with other forums has regrettably yielded insignificant results and must no longer be expended that way. We beseech the Council therefore to assert its authority by imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, against the racist régime as a means of exerting pressure on South Africa to extend co-operation for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The African Group stands ready to give its fullest support to the Council in that course of action.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Peter Dingi Zuze, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on whom I now call.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I wish on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. I am confident that your well-known diplomatic skills and your knowledge of the question of Namibia will greatly contribute towards a successful outcome of this debate.

I wish also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Marcelo Delpech of Argentina, for the able manner in which he guided the work of the Security Council during the month of March. His country's agreement to act as host of a seminar on Namibia later this month in Buenos Aires attests to Argentina's firm commitment to the independence of Namibia.

May I, Mr. President, thank you and the other members of the Security Council for having acceded to our request to participate in this important debate.

We in the Council for Namibia commend the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his tireless efforts aimed at bringing about an end to South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia. We believe that in his difficult task he needs the unqualified support of all members of the Security Council and the rest of the United Nations. We commend him too for his report contained in document S/18767, which is before the Security Council. Security Council resolution 566 (1985) mandated the Secretary-General, inter alia, to resume immediate contacts with South Africa with a view to obtaining its choice of the

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations Council for Namibia)

electoral system to be used for elections in Namibia. The question which we must now seriously address is whether or not the Security Council is in a position to begin the process of implementing resolution 435 (1978). We must ask why the Security Council cannot do what it is expected to do.

The Secretary-General has reported to this Council that

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

As far as the United Nations is concerned, there are no outstanding issues standing - or even sitting - in the way of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We in the Council for Namibia, therefore, expect that this body will take the necessary steps to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa. We believe that the Security Council, in fulfilment of its responsibility under the Charter, must demand of South Africa nothing less than full compliance with all its resolutions and decisions relating to Namibia.

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

Too much time has been wasted in creating irrelevant and extraneous artificial barriers such as linkage. Linkage has been condemned as a non-issue by the United Nations. It is inconceivable that members of the Security Council should be seen as flouting resolutions of this important organ in the name of economic and ideological necessity. Indeed, the reputation of this Council remains questionable as long as its resolutions are respected only in the breach. It makes a mockery of the Secretary-General's efforts to bring about the independence of Namibia and to some extent erodes the confidence the people of Namibia have so rightly reposed in the United Nations. The Security Council has a graver responsibility to the people of Namibia, and its members should not permit self-centred interests to thwart the collective efforts of the international community.

The inability of the Security Council to act decisively has encouraged the racist régime of South Africa in its intransigence. For a long time now South Africa has persistently sought ways to circumvent resolution 435 (1978). Various puppet groups subservient to South Africa's interests have been used to arrange "internal political settlements", which have failed to gain both local and international recognition. These puppets have not only failed in their desperate attempts to secure respectability, but the Namibian people are aware that these South African surrogates have neither the vision nor the mandate to govern the Territory.

There is no question about South Africa's intention to defend apartheid and the status quo in Namibia, as evidenced by its continued maintenance of an occupation army of more than 100,000 troops. All indications in Namibia point to the fact that South Africa is not interested in any action to bring about the independence of Namibia. Dialogue and friendly persuasion have failed to impress upon the Boers in Pretoria the need to heed the voice of reason. On the contrary,

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

the régime has resorted to violent means in order to entrench itself in Namibia. Not only does South Africa maintain a large military presence in Namibia, but it also deploys its field force in southern parts of Angola.

South Africa's arrogant attitude towards the United Nations is frustrating and should not be tolerated. The United Nations has intervened before in a military role in Korea, in the Middle East, in Nigeria and in what was then Katanga. What prevents the United Nations from removing the defiant thieves from Namibia?

We know the answer - perhaps we do. The public relations machine has without any blemish of a blush told the world that South Africa is in Namibia because it is mandated to care for it; that its stewardship prevents factional disorder; that the world needs the precious minerals only South Africa and the multinational corporations have the capacity and technology to produce; that it is providing a communist-free zone, and so on.

And this public relations success has not only gained admission that in illegal occupation and continued theft South Africa is entitled to demand the linkage condition; but in the absence of an equally successful public relations exercise its case is somehow believed.

Here then is an international scandal excused in the cause of profit and the forces of supply and demand; here is theft on a monumental scale; here is a nation illegally occupied; here is a people denied advancement and justice; here is a pawn in the southern African game of chess - all at the expense of the underprivileged and unrepresented people of Namibia.

Until the world knows of the greatest piracy of the twentieth century, resolution 435 (1978) is likely to be a joke and South Africa will, and perhaps on behalf of sympathetic nations, continue to win the game of negotiations.

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

The Security Council has the power to intervene in situations where international peace and security are threatened. Provisions exist in the Charter for such action.

The Security Council can, for example, invoke Chapter VII of the Charter against any country whose disregard of international law and norms constitutes a threat to international peace and security. We demand that this provision be invoked and enforced by this Council through the adoption of a resolution calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist South African régime in order to compel it to abandon its illegal occupation of Namibia. I ask members of this Council to die a little for peace and security in the world and the independence of Namibia. Reasons of kith and kin, economic considerations and racial prejudice have a limited shelf life and should be prevented from distorting the major goal of peace and security.

We in the United Nations Council for Namibia commend the United States Congress for imposing selective sanctions against racist South Africa. But we are dismayed to learn that a State Member of the United Nations is participating in flouting these measures. It is our understanding that South Africa Airways has since increased the frequency of its flights from three to four to one of the member States of the Security Council. The same member State is understood to be involved in the sale of blueprints for submarines to South Africa in violation of the existing arms embargo. These actions demonstrate a lack of will to implement even those decisions on which there is total agreement. We condemn this hypocrisy.

Finally, we appeal, to those members of the Security Council opposed to the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions seriously to reconsider their position, for this is the only peaceful and effective way of bringing about a positive change in South Africa and Namibia. This Council must take the necessary

(Mr. Zuze, President, United Nations
Council for Namibia)

measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to avert imminent catastrophe in Namibia and South Africa, and we believe that the time to do it is now.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is His Excellency 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. I call on him.

Mr. GURIRAB: It gives me great pleasure, Sir, on behalf of the Central Committee and the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia, to join speakers who preceded me in extending warm congratulations and best wishes to you on your assumption of the post of President of the Security Council for the month of April.

We all know of your great qualities and accomplishments as an outstanding diplomat. Your great country, Bulgaria, and its fraternal people are counted among our friends and supporters. We therefore draw inspiration from this knowledge in the expectation that you will provide wise and effective leadership towards achieving a successful outcome in the debate that we all can share.

(Mr. Gurirab)

With your indulgence, Mr. President, I should also like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Marcelo Delpech, Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations, for having presided over the current urgent business of the Council last month with a firm hand and great political skill.

So far this year the Security Council has, as part of its urgent business, considered two amongst the most burning areas of tension in southern Africa. In February the Council debated the explosive and tragic situation in apartheid South Africa. The debate, like many others in the past, concentrated on the crimes of the evil apartheid system and the endless suffering caused by it; the people's resistance, on the one hand, and the world's solidarity with them, on the other; the renewed call for the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners, and the demand for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the defiant, pariah State ruled by the ex-Nazi collaborators and perpetrators of the current vicious policies of war, death, destruction and darkness in our region.

It was clearly established during the debate that the political will and resolve of the majority in the Security Council had been in favour of the adoption of a strong and appropriate resolution against Pretoria. The outcome, regrettably, was once again disappointing. The United States and the United Kingdom cast another round of vetoes, thus frustrating the will of the majority in the Council and instead opted to stand in isolation in defence of apartheid. The Federal Republic of Germany, which rejoined the Security Council this year, also elected to cast a negative, solidarity vote in that debate. I intend to come back to this point later.

Suffice it to say at this stage that the citizens themselves of these very countries are demonstrating these days in the streets in concert with the mounting

(Mr. Gurirab)

worldwide campaign for sanctions against apartheid South Africa and demanding that their governments desist from giving any support and encouragement to the vicious Botha régime. They, no less than the rest of us, strongly deplore the actions taken and the spurious arguments being put forward by these recalcitrant States. They and not their governments are the true friends of the victims of apartheid and Botha's destructive war and political violence throughout southern Africa.

The African Group of States at the United Nations, acting through its Chairman for the month of March, Mr. Laurent Marie Biffot, Permanent Representative of Gabon to the United Nations, requested the convening of this important meeting to consider the question of Namibia. A similar letter was addressed to the President of the Council, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, by Mr. Midence, Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations. This debate therefore deals with the second of the two burning issues relating to southern Africa discussed in the Council so far this year.

In this connection, I am greatly indebted to the speakers who preceded me for the eloquent and serious manner in which they all have introduced the subject and elaborated on it. In particular, I should like to commend the Chairman of the Group of African States for this month, Mr. Victor Gbeho, Permanent Representative of Ghana to the United Nations, for the able and characteristically thorough presentation of the case before the Council. Similarly, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Peter Zuze of Zambia, was convincing in reiterating the commitment of his Council towards redoubling its efforts aimed at speeding up Namibia's independence, while at the same time expressing that Council's strong indignation at the continued sabotaging of our freedom and the plundering of Namibia's natural resources by certain Western States and their transnational corporations. I join them in urging the Security Council right at

(Mr. Gurirab)

the beginning of the debate to assume its responsibilities fully, in accordance with the Charter, and especially on the basis of its own resolutions, including in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

I should be remiss if I did not at this juncture place on record my personal gratitude to the delegations of the Congo, Ghana and Zambia for facilitating SWAPO's participation in the debate. I thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for inviting me, at their joint request, to make my statement.

Why is this item inscribed for the umpteenth time on the agenda of the Council? In other words, why are we here once again discussing the same question of Namibia in the year 1987?

The obvious answer is: we are here because Namibia is not free. The country for which the United Nations assumed direct responsibility more than 20 years ago still remains occupied illegally by the Pretoria régime, which has been relying on massive military force and violent repression to perpetuate its colonial domination in the country.

We are here because more than eight years ago the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which was heralded as the resolution to end all resolutions on Namibia once and for all.

That much-talked about Western-sponsored resolution appeared to hold out a promise then - that is, in 1978 - and, in our view, still continues to hold out that promise today for a democratic and peaceful settlement of the Namibia problem. It provides for the holding of free and fair elections, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in Namibia, beginning with a ceasefire to be signed between SWAPO and South Africa, along with the arrival of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to take charge of the transition.

(Mr. Gurirab)

Where else could we have gone, except to come here? If not this Council, which other organ in the United Nations can see to it that resolution 435 (1978), embodying as it does the spirit and intent of international consensus on Namibia, is implemented forthwith and unconditionally? The hour is already late. That is the reason why we are here to repeat this sad story, which represents an open challenge to the authority of the Security Council itself - for that resolution remains unimplemented.

Pretoria has repeatedly demonstrated its unwillingness to proceed with the implementation process. We have for many years now become accustomed to Pretoria's intransigent, arrogant and defiant behaviour towards the United Nations, and this in total disregard of the legitimate aspirations of our people to be free and to take charge of their own destiny. This has been the sordid record of the successive racist régimes in Pretoria in their dealings with this world body since 1946, when the usurpers initially sought to annex Namibia.

Pretoria's uncanny political manoeuvring and false pretenses alleging its readiness and good faith in the matter should not fool anyone at this stage. The record is clear and indefensible. But Pretoria is not acting alone in this obnoxious manner. There are others whose complicity and bad faith must also be exposed and condemned.

What is most reprehensible and what is causing much suffering to our people today - on top of all of racist South Africa's crimes and sinister machinations in Namibia - is the introduction into the question of Namibia of a type of machiavellian politics of duplicity that have now resulted in the eternal postponement of our freedom.

We charge those unrepenting Western States which, in pursuit of their notorious policies aimed at perpetuating world dominance and control of access to raw materials and strategic minerals, are still bent on practising the discredited

(Mr. Gurirab)

imperialist doctrine of manifest destiny in Africa. Some of their leaders' thinking has been so enfeebled by their own racist history and memories of the heinous crimes committed over the centuries against the African people, and also by what is essentially an irrational fear of the spread of communism in southern Africa, that they react to political conflicts strictly on the basis of this distorted view of the world as consisting only of the good guys and the bad guys. They do not care to try to understand the fact that the oppressed and dispossessed peoples everywhere are fighting and sacrificing for their birthright to rule themselves in their own countries.

We are very sorry indeed to note that Namibia is, among other things, being viewed by the oppressors and exploiters mostly in the context of being part of what is said to be an enormous treasure-house of strategic minerals in southern Africa. That is obviously part of our problem. Where there is treasure, one always finds the capitalist exploiters greedily seeking fame and fortune. This pernicious view is further compounded by the equally misguided ideological calculations which are not given to enabling the die-hard leadership in some of the Western countries towards making meaningful contributions to end apartheid and to bring about Namibia's independence. Instead, the prevailing Western credo is, in our view, the intensification of all sinister attempts aimed at decapitating the national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia, the undisputed agents for change, in favour of perpetuating the status quo.

It is the same old story all over again, which puts higher consideration on mineral rights and accumulation of profit above political emancipation and human progress. This is the kind of duplicity and bad faith we have no hesitation in exposing and condemning at all times.

Some may consider my language as being not quite according to the accepted diplomatic decorum or my words as being too strong. If so, it was not without

(Mr. Gurirab)

intention on my part. Which is worse? My verbal protest about the unceasing politics of duplicity and eternal postponement of our freedom, resulting in the senseless killing of innocent Namibian men, women and children, or the despicable and repeated actions being taken by some Western permanent members and other supporters of racist South Africa in this Council? If I sounded otherwise, I would be unworthy of the awesome responsibility I bear as the spokesman of the struggling masses I represent here. This will continue to be our attitude until and unless our people are able to have an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination. Without this, and in the face of the persistent negative role being played in the question of Namibia by the Western supporters of the Pretoria régime, our voice will remain loud and clear in protest and we will continue to mention the names of the culprits.

In 1977 - just about this time of year, in early spring - the widely publicized Western diplomatic initiative on Namibia was launched by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada. They called themselves a contact group on Namibia whose task it was, they claimed, that of assisting the United Nations towards speeding up Namibia's independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), which contains all the essential elements for a democratic and peaceful transition of our country to statehood.

Like now, except for Canada's absence at this time, these States were represented in the Security Council. Well here we are 10 years later: Namibia is not free and resolution 435 (1978), which along with resolution 385 (1976) endorsed the United Nations plan on Namibia, remains unimplemented. As the contradictions in the role of the "Western Five" started mounting and the negotiation process assumed its own dynamics, the group slowly but surely started losing any proper contact with the situation on the ground in Namibia.

(Mr. Gurirab)

In 1977 the Carter Administration took over power in Washington. We welcomed the pronouncement of its officials about a new Africa policy predicated on the principle of the sanctity of human rights. At least, we felt, the political style of the new actors in Washington was refreshing.

At the same time, however, the cast of countries comprising the so-called contact group could hardly have inspired trust and confidence in us. We were sceptical about their ability to play an honest role as political brokers in the question of Namibia. We saw them as friends of racist South Africa, and their interests in the region as being too closely tied up with Pretoria's, and not with the well-being of our people. The proof was their conspicuous voting record in the United Nations. We told them so - indeed we continue to tell them so - and we also repeated this to our supporters and friends.

What actually made us agree, albeit under protest, to participate in the negotiation process were four essential factors which interacted, in our thinking, in a way that provided the crucial margin of assurance.

First, SWAPO has always maintained that negotiations grow out of the intensification of the armed struggle. In this context, we consider political, military and diplomatic actions as being complementary and not contradictory. We continue fighting while negotiating until the other side - in this case, the fascist Botha régime - agrees to sign a cease-fire agreement. Those who would want us to lay down our arms must have the courage of their convictions and first persuade the régime to abandon the military option, eschew violence and implement resolution 435 (1978).

Secondly, we acknowledged the indispensable role of the United Nations in all the efforts aimed at expediting our freedom and felt encouraged that the proposed exercise would be carried out within the framework of the United Nations on the basis of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).

(Mr. Gurirab)

Thirdly, we were further reassured in the knowledge that the front-line States would help in providing the much needed back-stopping in the negotiation process.

Fourthly, as the sole and authentic representative of our people, SWAPO would participate in the negotiations as a full member in order to represent the interests of our people and present their point of view.

That is how it came about that SWAPO signed up in 1977 and agreed to do business with the now defunct Western contact group and, through it, with the Pretoria racist régime. The racists tried to avoid facing us directly.

There comes a time when leaders of a struggling people are called upon to sit down at the conference table, not in submission but as an act of statesmanship, to negotiate with the devil himself in the interest of freedom and to end human suffering. That is why we are on record as repeatedly calling upon Pretoria to meet us at the conference table as the first step towards the commencement of the implementation process. I repeat this call here today.

That having been said, let me now try to encapsulate the relevant developments that were taking place in our region in 1977 and how they, in our view, formed a centre-piece in the Western strategy on Namibia.

The Contact Group came into being in the period following the decisive victories scored by the revolutionary forces in Mozambique and Angola. The Smith-Muzorewa clique in Salisbury found itself in the precarious situation of having the noose closing around its neck as a result of the sustained and effective military actions by the combatants of the Patriotic Front. None other than Mr. Henry Kissinger himself brought this truth to the racist puppet clique during his African trip in 1976.

The 1976 Soweto massacre dramatized the situation and spurred South African youth and students to a heightened political consciousness. They decided to leave

(Mr. Gurirab)

the country for military training in order to take up arms as combatants of the Umkhonto We Sizwe, the military wing of the African National Congress (ANC).

In Namibia opportunities opened up in many respects for the intensification of the armed struggle. To this end the SWAPO leadership gave specific directives to its military wing, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, in terms of military actions and political mass mobilization inside the country. Lastly, the front-line States had constituted themselves as a viable political power-house intent on playing an active role in any serious search for practical solutions to the problems of the region, including in particular those relating to the struggles for liberation that were being waged by the freedom fighters.

This brief summary of the major developments at that time in and relating to southern Africa will, I believe, provide a background to the Western diplomatic initiatives and to what SWAPO's position was and is today.

There might be some disagreements about details or the intentions of the parties concerned in the process I have described. But this much is indisputable: Resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented. The Western contact group is dead in the water - dead by suicide. Some of the key members of the group made an about-turn and started tampering with the resolution, which is their own brain-child, thus showing their bad faith and unwillingness to put pressure on Pretoria to implement it.

Our initial scepticism and reluctance have been borne out by this bad faith and duplicity. The glorified Western diplomatic initiative on Namibia, launched in 1977, has failed to effect realization of the goal of Namibia's independence. In retrospect the whole exercise appears to have been a carefully contrived stratagem whose real objective was to stop what some members of the group considered an unacceptable and precipitate radicalization of the situation in southern Africa.

(Mr. Gurirab)

What was most feared by some of the countries involved was the revolutionary politics of the national liberation movements and the option towards a socialist transformation which Mozambique and Angola had elected to pursue. The alleged political radicalization and the burgeoning socialist transformation, it was felt, would not augur well for the capitalist interests in the region and would also threaten the survival of the racist minority régimes. And so what was presented in 1977 as a plan of action to save the oppressed Namibian people turned out to be a rescue operation contrived to protect the status quo.

(Mr. Gurirab)

We have nothing to show in terms of progress. We are left with the painful memories of the Kassinga massacre, the Oshikuku massacre and many other similar instances of wanton killings of our people by the brutal tyranny represented by the Botha régime and its local armed agents in Namibia.

Looking back over the past 10 years we see a wasteland of broken signposts strewn around everywhere, reminding us of the amazing evolution of diplomatic language that has characterized the negotiating process. In the spring of 1977 we were introduced to "talks about the talks" and moved along to "exploratory talks". The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) in September 1978 was preceded by several sessions of "proximity talks". In 1979 we went to Geneva for the "high-level simultaneous consultations", and in 1981 we participated in the "pre-implementation meeting" in the same city, where we engaged, inter alia, along with others, in "confidence-building measures". With the advent of the Reagan Administration we saw the imposition of the idea of "phased negotiations", coupled with such notions as "check list" and "private understandings". In addition, the destructive United States policy, otherwise known as the policy of "constructive engagement" and "linkage pre-condition", has become part of this intriguing glossary.

The bright side of it all is that we were able to see our way through these confusing linguistic acrobatics. We kept the integrity of our Movement intact and successfully fought back against the efforts of racist South Africa and its collaborators aimed at changing the equation of the colonial conflict in Namibia. They sought to manipulate the discussions away from the central objective of Namibia's independence by trying to put SWAPO and the United Nations in the dock, as if the two of them were the obstacles to the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia.

Another familiar gimmick too often employed by the Botha régime and readily seized upon by its supporters and apologists abroad has been the "puppet factor".

(Mr. Gurirab)

The unsuccessful but still persisting objective has been the creation of a viable puppet group - clearly a contradiction in terms in Namibia - as a political alternative to the people's movement, SWAPO, which is fighting for a genuine independence free of any foreign interference. To that end, millions and millions of rand have been wasted and a chain of bogus institutions and puppet groups have been created, including the latest one installed on 17 June 1985 in Windhoek. What gives cause for indignation is not Pretoria's intentions and its political chicanery, but, rather, the fact that certain Western countries and their mass media, instead of dismissing such fraudulent schemes, are treating them as viable political options, the result being that those nonsensical antics, treated as significant developments, help contribute towards the further undue delay of our independence. I know that during this debate the spokesmen of the Boer Republic will repeat that diatribe, and some will ascribe merit to it.

Our plea before the Security Council is straightforward, and we believe it is the only logical and reasonable thing left for the Council to do: we urge the Security Council to implement resolution 435 (1978) immediately and unconditionally and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against racist South Africa as an additional, necessary and peaceful pressure on it to start implementing that resolution.

The case I have made so far underlines the Job-like patience of our people in the face of the endless killings, political obfuscation and diplomatic impasse. Our people's suffering means nothing to those whose primary preoccupation is our riches and the profit they reap on the backs of the Namibian masses. I talked about the bad faith of the members of the former contact group and the credibility gap between their words and their actions, the fact being that some of them, notably the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, are the ones obstructing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and opposing

(Mr. Gurirab)

sanctions. I also pointed out that the call for sanctions against racist South Africa is a universal call that has become a mighty stream gathering force worldwide as it flows southwards in the direction of apartheid South Africa. Nothing can stop it now. It will continue to grow stronger as the peoples of the world continue to assert their power, until apartheid is destroyed and the illegal occupation of Namibia is terminated.

The United States of America must be dissuaded from its linkage precondition, which is holding hostage our freedom and thereby emboldening racist South Africa in its prevarication. SWAPO will not hesitate strongly to condemn and reject that unholy alliance. We know the extent of British economic and financial interests in, and its historical ties with, the apartheid State, but if all there is to British policy is the security of the jobs of its citizens and the profits from investments in South Africa and Namibia, is there no place for the future in those calculations?

I have a few specific and serious words to address to the Federal Republic of Germany: my people have very painful memories of the German colonial rule in our country. All of us bear the scars of the genocidal policies that resulted in the wholesale extermination of communities in Namibia. As leaders, we cannot forget that ugly chapter of horrors in our history. We shall teach our children about them, lest we be found guilty by future generations of a national amnesia, instead of learning from a negative example about the evils of the philosophy of racial supremacy, a variant of which, in the form of apartheid, we are fighting today.

Also, however, as leaders of a struggling people, we in SWAPO decided some years ago to establish contacts with the Bonn authorities aimed at finding a basis for understanding now and co-operation in the future. There are Namibians of German origin in our country, and there are other Namibians in the black communities, children of miscegenation. These are important reasons for us not to

(Mr. Gurirab)

allow ourselves to become forever prisoners of past horrors. For some years we felt that progress was being made. The Bonn leadership, particularly in the Foreign Ministry, was forthcoming. Today, however, all is lost. The present Bonn policy is becoming more and more inimical to the interests of the Namibian people. Bonn now works in an overt manner, hand in glove with the Pretoria régime, providing financial underpinnings to the puppets and is helping to undermine resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Gurirab)

A bipartisan commission is being contemplated in Bonn; this would take full charge of so-called development aid to Namibia in advance of the achievement of independence in our country. That we condemn and reject. The situation is so bad that I had the duty to say this here before the Security Council.

The report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/18767 of 31 March 1987 is before the Security Council. I take this opportunity once again to commend the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts in promoting the cause of Namibia and, in particular, for redoubling his effort for the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In the report we find a reiteration of the well-known position that the Secretary-General and his Special Representative are ready to start the implementation process. Regrettably, they are unable to go forward because of the linkage pre-condition insisted upon by racist South Africa and the United States Administration. The linkage pre-condition stands rejected by the Security Council and the rest of the international community, but it remains the primary stumbling-block in the way of the achievement of freedom and independence in our country. We shall continue to repeat our condemnation of those responsible for that obstruction.

In conclusion I wish to state the following: The Namibian people, like oppressed and dispossessed peoples everywhere, have the inescapable obligation - indeed, the sacred duty - never to leave their liberation to anybody else, but to remain dedicated and faithful patriots in their patriotic cause. That is the legacy of our anti-colonial struggle, which spans a period of more than a century. We have been fighting, weapons in hand, for more than 20 years, under the leadership of SWAPO, against the Pretoria Fascists and their huge occupation army. The fact that we are still here to tell the story of the indomitable spirit of our people and the gallantry of the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia - who continue to inflict heavy casualties on the enemy and to shoot down

(Mr. Gurirab)

its warplanes and helicopter gunships - must be seen as confirming the fact that we very much intend to fight on, whatever the cost, until the final victory. That victory will come sooner rather than later, with or without sanctions. This Council - no less than SWAPO, the Namibian people and the rest of the world - bears a heavy responsibility to lessen the cost of that victory in terms of human lives.

The adoption by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions will go a long way to obviate the ominous prospect of an even more extended military confrontation, human suffering and worsening race relations. At last we shall all be able to look forward to the start of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). History will then have recorded that the Western Powers came full circle in a common effort in the Security Council for Namibia's independence, thereby helping validate the continued efficacy of the United Nations itself.

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

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

Mr. MANLEY (South Africa): On behalf of the South African delegation, I should like to convey to you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council.

It is ironic that the Council is gathered not to deliberate on how the international community can contribute to the well-being of the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia, but to consider the imposition of further punitive measures which, if imposed, will certainly harm the economy of that Territory and the well-being of its people. As has become customary in deliberations on the South West Africa/Namibia issue, the spirit of the United Nations Charter will be ignored and the real issues standing in the way of the resolution of the long-standing dispute will not be addressed.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

The South African Government has repeatedly stated that it stands ready to implement United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to bring about internationally recognized independence in South West Africa/Namibia. The record of the negotiations shows that blame cannot be laid at the door of South Africa or of the inhabitants of the Territory for the delay in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The fact is that the only remaining obstacle to the independence of South West Africa/Namibia is the lack of commitment on the withdrawal from Angola of the extra-continental force of over 40,000 Cubans. This should clearly be stated and recognized.

Members of the Council will be aware that the holding of free and fair elections in South West Africa/Namibia under conditions free of intimidation is an important element of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). How is it then conceivable that free elections can be held in the Territory in the shadow of the menacing presence of such a major Soviet surrogate force in the region. It defies all reason. South Africa will simply not abandon its obligations to the inhabitants of the Territory. It will not unilaterally abandon the people of the Territory to such an uncertain fate.

For the sake of the credibility and integrity of this Council, it must deliberate dispassionately and impartially on recent developments and set in motion the process of a peaceful resolution of the problem.

Hardly more than a year ago an initiative was undertaken to break the deadlock of the Cuban presence in the region. This led to a firm proposal by President P.W. Botha that 1 August 1986 be set as the date for commencement of implementation of the settlement plan based on United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978), provided that a firm and satisfactory agreement could be reached before that date on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

The proposal was a serious attempt to facilitate resolution of the issue and to revitalize the process of negotiation. It was generally welcomed, including by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Soviet Union, however, indicated an unwillingness to assist the peace process in South West Africa/Namibia and Angola. On 18 March 1986 the MPLA Government in Luanda conceded the principle of the withdrawal of Cuban forces and declared its willingness to contribute towards the independence of South West Africa/Namibia. No effort, however, was made by the MPLA Government to take any concrete steps to this end. On the contrary, military and weapon supplies and systems of Soviet origin have continued to pour into Angola.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

A well-intentioned attempt by South Africa to demonstrate good faith and establish a firm commitment to the settlement of the South West Africa/Namibia dispute was therefore allowed to slip away owing to lack of similar resolve on the part of others, and in particular of the MPLA Government in Luanda.

The South African Foreign Minister, Mr. R. F. Botha, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 28 July 1986 reiterated the point that South Africa does not believe that the people of South West Africa/Namibia can indefinitely be denied their right to self-determination and independence. The people of the Territory are eager to move rapidly towards the achievement of this goal and South Africa has associated itself with the attainment of this objective at an early date.

The international negotiations regarding the future of the Territory have more often than not been characterized by unfounded accusations that South Africa harbours sinister motives regarding the future of South West Africa/Namibia. Such vindictive accusations by certain members of the international community reflect a total lack of concern for the well-being of the people of the Territory and do not take account of the realities which obtain in South West Africa/Namibia.

It is a fact that South Africa is assisting the Territory to protect its people against armed attacks from Angolan territory by elements that wish to impose their will on the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia by force of arms; that SWAPO is given active support by the armed forces of Angola and the Cuban forces in that country in the perpetration of acts of terror against the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia; that South Africa makes a substantial contribution towards the material well-being of the people of the Territory and annually provides financial assistance in order to ensure the undisturbed functioning of the administration of the Territory; that assistance is rendered by South Africa in the transport, educational, medical and other fields in South West Africa/Namibia.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

Debates have taken place over the years in various forums of the United Nations on the South West Africa/Namibia question. Yet again, the Security Council is seized of this question. Neither the arguments which will be advanced in this debate nor the action proposed will be new. Sanctions will assuredly exacerbate the problem. They will also deal a blow to the aspirations of the people of the Territory and have a negative effect on genuine efforts to resolve the problem. They will moreover retard the eventual independence of the Territory.

It is a false, dangerous and callous assumption that sanctions will have a positive effect on the situation. It is false because it does not address the real issues which are at stake in this question, both for the Territory of South West Africa/Namibia and for southern Africa. It is dangerous because punitive measures will increase tension in the region. And it is callous because the effect of sanctions will be felt most by the very people which such action purports to assist. Despite severe droughts in recent years, the people of the Territory have food, their medical needs are cared for and the children go to school. With the resources at their disposal, Namibians have done well.

Over many years South Africa has annually provided direct and indirect financial assistance to the Territory and has shouldered much of the financial burden brought about by the development of a sophisticated infrastructure in the Territory.

A decision by the Council to impose sanctions on South West Africa/Namibia will have consequences which will also not end at the frontiers of that Territory or South Africa. Apart from the economic effects sanctions will have on the rest of the sub-continent, they will also be debilitating in respect of the capacity for resistance of all of the States of southern Africa against foreign intervention by elements which do not have the interests of the peoples of southern Africa at heart.

(Mr. Manley, South Africa)

Those are some of the unpalatable facts which the members of the Security Council must consider as they deliberate upon this matter. The States of southern Africa must similarly take cognizance of these realities. Surely, the real drama which is being played out in southern Africa should be clear to those who have not been blinded by the prejudices and preconceived notions which have led to attempts to isolate my country. Surely, it must be clear that the economic dislocation of any part of southern Africa is a logical prelude to a more insidious strategy for the region. A Cuban expeditionary force is ensconced within Angola and, under the direction of Soviet military advisers, is systematically being prepared for forays further afield. Neighbouring countries with economies weakened by the effects of sanctions must inevitably fall.

The time has come for the leaders of southern Africa squarely to face the realities. South Africa remains ready to enter into discussion with those leaders in southern Africa who recognize that the interests of all in the sub-continent dictate that peace, stability, progress and prosperity depend on our resolving our differences ourselves. Ultimately it is the people and leaders of South West Africa/Namibia who will have to decide on the future of their country.

South West Africa/Namibia cannot be expected to wait indefinitely for independence. If all other endeavours fail to break the existing deadlock in the negotiation process caused by a lack of tangible progress on Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola, consideration will have to be given by the South African Government and other parties to alternative means of achieving internationally recognized independence for the Territory.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn this meeting now. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, the next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place at 3.30 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.