



Security Council UN LIBRARY

NOV 1 1987

UN/DA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2756
29 October 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 October 1987, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. BUCCI

(Italy)

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

Mr. DELPECH
Mr. TSVETKOV
Mr. LI Luye
Mr. ADOUKI
Mr. BLANC
Count YORK von WARTENBURG
Mr. GBEHO
Mr. KIKUCHI
Mr. BELONOGOV
Mr. AL-SHAALI

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

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

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

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2755th meeting, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Cameroon, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, India, Kenya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Senegal, South Africa, Turkey and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Badawi (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gharekhan (India), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar), Mrs. Astorga Gadea (Nicaragua), Mr. Ritter (Panama), Mr. Alzamora (Peru), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Manley (South Africa), Mr. Turkmen (Turkey) and Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2755th meeting, I invite the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to take a place at the Council table.

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

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2755th 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: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representative of Angola, Bangladesh, Canada, Cuba, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Zimbabwe, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in 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. De Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Siddiky (Bangladesh), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Oramas-Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Karoui (Tunisia), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Security Council that I have received a letter dated 28 October 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 matters 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 the Council that I have received a letter dated 28 October 1987 from the representatives of the Congo, Ghana and Zambia, 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 entitled 'The situation in Namibia', the Security Council, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, extend an invitation to Mr. Solly Simelane, the Deputy Permanent Observer of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)."

The letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/19238.

(The President)

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

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now resume its consideration of item 2 of the agenda.

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

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): First, allow me to extend my congratulations to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council, and to thank them for allowing me to take part in the discussion on the situation in Namibia. We are not merely bowing to tradition when we say that you are conducting the work of this Council with wisdom, experience and much skill and that you represent a country for which we have great respect.

I also wish to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. James Victor Gbeho, Permanent Representative of a sister country, Ghana, for the exemplary and responsible manner in which he conducted the work of the Council in the month of September.

Barely two days ago the international community in great unison commemorated the Week of Solidarity with the people of Namibia and their sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

That meeting followed the special session of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in Luanda in May of this year and its meeting at the Ministerial level in New York at the beginning of this month, and was a prelude to the debate that the General Assembly will have on the question in a few days.

And now, once again, the Security Council is meeting to consider the fate of Namibia, which South Africa continues to occupy illegally. This continued concern

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

shows the interest of the international community, which in 1976, in Dakar, held one of the first international conferences devoted to this question, followed by those in Paris in 1980 and 1983, and in Vienna, Brussels and New York in 1986. It has never ceased to give attention to the question of Namibia, as can readily be seen. The lack of true political will to make the South African régime recognize common sense and law is more than obvious.

It is all the more frustrating that the United Nations has not yet been able to meet the challenge posed by the colonialist, racist régime despite Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and despite the Council's adoption of a plan, which has been universally accepted, for the settlement of the Namibian question, regarding which the Secretary-General informs us that all pending matters concerning its implementation have been settled.

Having decided to turn its back on history, South Africa continues to link the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and thus Namibian independence, to the withdrawal of Cuban troops, whose assistance was legitimately requested by the Angolan Government in the context of an agreement of solidarity, in keeping with recognized and applied international law.

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

It is no secret to anyone that these delaying tactics, at which South Africa is a past master, are motivated purely by economic greed and short-term strategic considerations which will not long resist the irreversible march to freedom of the Namibian people. The United Nations General Assembly, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Organization of African Unity and the Security Council have all categorically rejected the inclusion of any external element in the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. The principal organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council, has, in particular, declared unambiguously in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985) that

"the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are alien to resolution 435 (1978)".

The Namibian question, therefore, is in its essence and fundamentally a simple question of decolonization, which must be settled peacefully in keeping with resolution 435 (1978) and in the spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

The Secretary-General of our Organization, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, to whom I wish to pay a tribute, has shown his continuing readiness to assist and personal commitment to the Namibian cause and the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

The leaders of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representatives of the Namibian people, have given proof of initiative, realism, open-mindedness, a desire for dialogue and a sense of responsibility that we should all emphasize here. However, what has been the response to all those efforts if not arrogance and intransigence, with the establishment of a so-called

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

interim government, which your Council has declared to be null and void, and the use of the Territory as a base for the launching of repeated acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line States, thus violating their sovereignty and territorial integrity - two concepts respect for which is enshrined as a fundamental principle of international law.

On Namibian territory South Africa continues to make efforts to perpetuate its shameful racist domination, increase its repressive military presence and transpose to it the heinous system of apartheid and flagrant violations of human rights, thus creating in the region an increasingly explosive situation which, objectively, constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

At the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Admininstering Authority for the Territory until independence, and in the Declaration of 21 August 1987 of the member States of the Council deep concern was expressed at the rapid deterioration of the situation in Namibia, following the stepping up of the brutal repression by South African troops against the people of Namibia throughout the Territory, in particular in the so-called operational zone in the north of Namibia.

The permanent members of the Security Council, which are invested by the United Nations Charter with major responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must therefore recognize their fundamental role in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the high priority that the world Organization attaches to the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. It is inadmissible, and in any case not very honourable, for the United Nations, whose credibility is thus involved and whose authority is greatly undermined, that, 21 years after it put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, 20 years

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

after it created the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence and nine years after the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of a plan for the settlement of the Namibian question, the Pretoria régime should continue stubbornly to oppose the liberation struggle of the peoples and to occupy Namibia illegally, repressing its people with blood-letting and death.

The Security Council cannot go back on its word, therefore the principles applicable to the case of Namibia are clearly defined. Although the framework for their application was unanimously established by the Council itself and despite the efforts of many countries, including the front-line States, to make a contribution to the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and the responsible availability and readiness of SWAPO, the racist régime in Pretoria entrenches itself in blind intransigence and holds hostage any final solution of the problem. Your Council therefore has no choice but to move to action.

In this connection we request the implementation of paragraphs 16 and 17 of the final communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in New York on 2 October 1987, and in such a way as to initiate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), thus at long last putting an end to the untold sufferings of the Namibian brother people and the looting of their resources, so that international law and the fundamental principles of freedom and human dignity may prevail.

Apartheid, that crime against humanity, is the source of all the evils besetting the southern part of our continent, and it is the absolute duty of the Security Council to ensure that this inhuman and heinous system is immediately and totally dismantled so that the people of South Africa may live under a régime of

(Mr. Sarré, Senegal)

equality, democracy and fraternity for all, the people of Namibia may join the concert of free and independent nations and the front-line States may live in peace and devote their efforts to development. In this connection the sole logical response, that the Security Council, the United Nations body with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, can make to South Africa is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the San Francisco Charter.

Senegal, in co-operation with all countries and peoples that believe in freedom, dignity, human values, and human rights, is determined to embark on that course. The day is not far off when the martyred people of Namibia will at last see dawning of freedom and true independence. To achieve this, our united efforts must be more resolute and sustained in the vanguard of the struggle of the international community in favour of the fundamental values which are the very basis of our human society.

That is my contribution to today's debate, and once again I thank you, Mr. President, and through you all the other members of the Council for affording me an opportunity to address the Council.

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

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

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to extend to you our warm and sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for this month of the Security Council, the highest international organ responsible for the maintenance of world peace and security. We are certain that your considerable abilities are more than adequate for your formidable task and great responsibility, thanks to your long diplomatic experience, political wisdom and personal qualities. Your presidency of the Council is indeed significant for my country, in view of the bonds of friendship and co-operation that exist between our two countries and which date back to their common endeavour in the building of civilization. Your presidency of the Security Council is also personally significant to me in the light of the bonds of friendship between us.

I wish also at this time to extend to your predecessor, Ambassador Gbeho, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, our sincere appreciation of the ability and wisdom he displayed in steering the work of the Council last month in very difficult international circumstances.

Once again the Security Council is meeting to consider the question of Namibia, of which the Council has been seized for many years. It remains a burning question. The suffering of the Namibian people under occupation continues to increase and instability in southern Africa is aggravated from one day to the next regardless of the fact that the path to a peaceful settlement of this question is there for all to see, since it has been well defined some 10 years, when Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was adopted unanimously. That resolution is collectively considered to be the only internationally acceptable plan for ending the racist occupation of Namibia and restoring the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Moreover, the reports of the Secretary-General reaffirm each year that all the obstacles that stood in the way of the United Nations plan have been resolved and that the plebiscite that should be held in the region under United Nations supervision is impeded only by South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, a concept that is totally alien to resolution 435 (1978) and has been rejected by the international community as intervention in the sovereign affairs of two independent States.

We believe that the current situation is basically the outcome of the arrogant intransigence of the Pretoria Government, which has continued to create obstacles and fabricate pretexts to justify its refusal to respond to the will of the international community, and its adamant disregard of the fact that the world community has deprived South Africa of the right to claim any legitimacy for its presence in the Territory, which was made illegal in 1966 when the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for administering the Territory.

There is no doubt that this aberrant régime receives a degree of support and co-operation that encourages it to persist in its abhorrent policy. That policy is the reason for the deteriorating situation in the region and the destabilization and threats to peace and security not only in the region but throughout the whole continent. We believe, therefore, that to end that support to Pretoria would be to take the first step towards forcing that régime to desist from its intransigence and defiance of the international will, moving it towards compliance with the principles of right and justice and making it listen to the voice of reason and heed the call for peace.

There is no doubt that the members of the international community are unanimous as to the illegitimacy of the South African presence in Namibia and the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

need for its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the region. However, the Pretoria Government continues to refuse, as it has for more than 20 years, to heed the dictates of legitimacy. It continues to occupy Namibia without any basis in law. It continues to apply its abominable apartheid policies, which run counter to the most basic human rights and the principles of justice and the equality of all men.

That régime is deeply embroiled in acts of assassination and terrorism. It continues to intimidate Africans and detain patriots and African politicians as well as the white champions of justice and freedom, muzzle the press and stifle the economies of neighbouring countries.

While it salutes the front-line States and pays a tribute to them for their courage and resolute stand against their bullying neighbour and supports the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, Egypt believes that over and above such support something positive and effective should be done immediately so that the stand of those countries which are opposed to occupation and racist practices may be translated into concrete action and have concrete and realistic returns. Egypt has contributed to the Fund for the support of the front-line States established at the summit meeting of non-aligned countries in Harare and calls for intensified international efforts in helping the front-line States to find alternative communication routes for their foreign trade so as to reduce their dependence on South Africa. We consider this to be a most urgent requirement.

We call on the Security Council once again today to rise to the level of its responsibilities under the Charter and play its role in defending the rights of countries and maintaining peace and security in the world.

We call once again on the Council today to seek ways and means of enforcing resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia. It is the Council's

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

responsibility to end the injustice to and the acute suffering of the Namibian people, restore their rights, show the aggressors that there are limits which they cannot exceed and force them to respect the principles of the Charter.

We therefore call on the Council to expand the mandate of the Secretary-General to allow him to begin the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence by arranging a cease-fire and dispatching the United Nations Transition Assistance Group to make the necessary preparations for a plebiscite in Namibia, in keeping with the experience and practices of this international Organization.

The representative of SWAPO stated once again before the Council yesterday that it is quite prepared to sign an immediate cease-fire agreement and to co-operate in peace initiatives. While paying a tribute to the Namibian leadership for their wisdom and political flexibility, we hope that the other side will respond and that in the coming weeks we may witness significant progress towards peace.

We in Egypt are fully aware that Africa's independence will not be complete and Africa's peoples will not be truly free unless Namibia becomes independent and its people become masters of their destiny and decide their own future. We have fully supported all African liberation movements in the struggle for freedom and independence. SWAPO is one of the movements that found assistance and refuge in Cairo. We take pride in the fact that SWAPO's first office was established in Egypt and that from the capital of Egypt its political work began in pursuit of the same legendary struggle towards new horizons of peoples in occupied lands as has always won the appreciation and respect of the whole world.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

We in Africa are aware that our struggle against South Africa does not stop at the borders of our continent; it is a struggle being waged on an international level. On our side stand all the people of good faith and all those who cherish peace and call for justice. When all this is combined with the determined struggle waged by the peoples of southern Africa, there can be only one, inevitable outcome: victory - and in the near future.

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

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Allow me, Mr. President, to begin by expressing the Argentine delegation's satisfaction at seeing you presiding over the Security Council during the month of October. We have already had a chance to appreciate your diplomatic skills and your great dedication. We are quite sure that you will leave the imprint of deep responsibility on the work of the Council. You can certainly count on my delegation's full co-operation.

I take this opportunity also to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador Victor Gbeho. He deserves our gratitude for his hard work as President of the Council in September. His tireless vitality and the valuable initiatives he took were of constant benefit to the Council. He once again demonstrated his abilities and his delegation's active commitment to the Council's work.

The Security Council has been convened to consider the question of Namibia for the second time this year. Unfortunately, since we discussed this subject last April no progress has been made towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for the independence

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

of Namibia. That plan continues to be the only internationally agreed basis for the peaceful settlement of this question.

South Africa claims that it is prepared to co-operate in the implementation of the plan. However, facts such as the inauguration in Windhoek of an interim administration which the Security Council in resolution 566 (1985) declared to be illegal and null and void prove the contrary. In fact, the South African Government is illegally continuing its policy of colonialist occupation of the Territory of Namibia, having extended to that Territory its odious policy of apartheid and persecution of the leaders of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Argentine Republic has repeatedly condemned that policy of the South African Government, by means of which it perpetuates an anachronistic and untenable colonial situation that lacks any justification. In the face of the position of the South African Government, it is only logical that we, together with the other non-aligned countries, should have declared our frustration. It is also logical that we should have called for concrete action by the Security Council, including that provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to make the Pretoria régime comply with the United Nations decisions on this question and on that régime's policy of apartheid.

It is now high time that South Africa put an end to its defiance of the will of the international community - defiance that has served only to increase tension in southern Africa and disturb international peace and security. It should adopt, in that regard, a really constructive approach and undertake an explicit and formal commitment to comply with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Delpéch, Argentina)

All the conditions required for the implementation of the plan were met in November 1985, when the parties involved reached an agreement on the system of proportional representation for the elections in Namibia - as is stated in the Secretary-General's reports (S/18767 and S/19234) on the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). The Secretary-General reminds us also in his reports of his proposal to the South African Government for the establishment by that Government of an early date for a cease-fire and the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The racist Pretoria régime's response to that proposal contained prior conditions extraneous to the United Nations plan. The Security Council rightly declared those conditions unacceptable in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985).

Accordingly, as we see it, there is no valid legal reason why the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia should not be implemented. We agree with the Secretary-General that

"if the question of Namibia is re-examined with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territory, it should be possible to open the way for implementation of the United Nations plan". (S/19234, para. 25)

That is why my delegation will co-sponsor a draft resolution to be submitted by the non-aligned members of the Security Council. In this regard, we believe that the Council should authorize the Secretary-General to make arrangements for a cease-fire between the parties to the conflict and to take the necessary administrative and practical steps for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We hope that the other members of the Security Council will be in a position to go along with this initiative.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

The end of the Namibian tragedy and the total, definitive eradication of the hateful system of apartheid are inescapable priorities for the international community. It is my delegation's firm hope that the Security Council will find a way of moving towards a solution to the Namibian question, heeding the opinion of the majority of the international community. Such a solution should include due recognition of the Namibian people's right to self-determination, recognition of its national identity and respect for the territorial integrity of the country and the exercise of its right to exploit and use its natural resources.

By virtue of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must insist on the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). If South Africa persists in its intransigence, the Council should adopt all the necessary measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, to achieve its aim. That will demonstrate the existence of the political will to ensure that Namibia's independence becomes a reality. The Council should not flinch from such efforts until a just, democratic and egalitarian society has been established in an independent Namibia.

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

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to say how pleased my delegation is at your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for October, and to wish you all success in the discharge of your lofty responsibilities. We are all the more pleased since you represent a country where I was Ambassador and of which I have the fondest memories.

I wish also to convey my delegation's gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador Gbeho, for the confident and highly professional manner in which he guided the work of the Council in September.

At the request of the Group of African States, the Security Council last April held an extensive discussion on the situation in Namibia. A draft resolution was submitted on the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to compel South Africa to carry out the United Nations plan on the granting of independence to the Territory, contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Members of the Council are well aware of the reason why the Security Council has been unable to carry out its task.

On 2 October the United Nations Council for Namibia held a ministerial meeting and conducted a thorough analysis of the situation in and around Namibia, confirming the wisdom and urgency of the measures proposed at earlier forums with regard to the independence of the Territory. Its final communiqué contains a number of highly important initiatives, the implementation of which would guarantee the exercise of the Namibian people's inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Among them, we wish to single out the call for the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and for the holding, without further delay, of consultations on the composition and establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

South Africa's defiant contempt for the many decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on the granting of independence to the Namibian people and its stubborn refusal to carry them out have compelled the Security Council once again to consider the situation in and around Namibia in order to highlight the true causes behind the failure of the Territory to accede to independence and to take the necessary measure to achieve the ultimate goal.

In flagrant contradiction with the clearly expressed will of the international community and with the decisions thus far adopted by the Security Council, racist South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia, which constitutes an act of aggression against the people of Namibia. It is imposing the infamous system of apartheid on the Territory, a system which has been repeatedly condemned by the international community. The policy of mass repression and genocide practised by the 100,000-strong army of occupation and the police units has assumed increasingly monstrous dimensions. This year we have witnessed a rapid deterioration of the situation in Namibia, owing to the mounting brutal repression inflicted by racist South Africa on the people of Namibia, including the massacre of children and adults, the bombing of houses, schools and hospitals, the destruction of property, attacks on workers' settlements and churches, the arrest and torture of leaders, members and supporters of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) - all of which has given rise to vigorous condemnation of the régime by the entire international community.

Moreover, the Territory of Namibia is being used as a springboard for countless acts of aggression, sabotage and destabilization against neighbouring independent African States, first and foremost the People's Republic of Angola. As pointed out in the final communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia:

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

"... those criminal policies of racist South Africa constitute a threat to international peace and security." (S/19187, para. 11)

We express our full solidarity with the front-line States, and we consider that all-round support for those countries would be of immense importance, as much for the solution of the question of Namibia as for their peaceful development in the manner of their own choosing.

The spurious argument advanced to justify Pretoria's refusal to implement United Nations resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia is the linking of the immediate granting of independence to the Territory with the presence of Cuban troops in the People's Republic of Angola. This linkage pre-condition has been dismissed by both the General Assembly and the Security Council; in resolution 539 (1983) the Council rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978). The People's Republic of Bulgaria categorically rejects this artificial pretext. Also, we insist that the policy of "constructive engagement" with the Pretoria régime be brought to an end. It is well known that this policy of collaboration with racist South Africa in the military, economic, political and nuclear spheres provides support to that régime and enables it to maintain its arrogant attitude vis-à-vis the aspirations of the Namibian people for national independence and, indeed, United Nations decisions and resolutions on the question.

We vigorously reject any attempt to alter the nature of the Namibian question by presenting it as part of an East-West global confrontation. The question of Namibia is one of decolonization and of the struggle against apartheid; hence there are two parties to the conflict: the people of Namibia, fighting for their independence, and the occupation régime of South Africa.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

With the situation in the Territory continually deteriorating, the people of Namibia have been waging a heroic struggle for decades to achieve their national independence, under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO. They have a legitimate and inalienable right to fight by every means, including military means, against the aggressor and occupier, applying the principle of self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter. All peoples and States that cherish the ideals of the United Nations are on the side of the Namibian people. The Bulgarian people are in full solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO. We shall continue to give them multifaceted support in their struggle for national independence.

The conflict in and around Namibia has entered a critical phase. It is not only in southern Africa that international peace and security are threatened. Therefore, the United Nations is duty-bound to take appropriate steps to guarantee an immediate, comprehensive solution of the Namibian question. Settling this dangerous situation by peaceful means would also make a concrete contribution to implementing the general system of international security proposed at the forty-first session of the General Assembly by the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The documents adopted at numerous international intergovernmental and non-governmental forums this year and in 1986 make it quite clear that Chapter VII of the Charter makes provision for the use of such effective peaceful means - comprehensive mandatory sanctions - against the racist régime of South Africa. The Security Council's historic responsibility for finding a solution to the question of Namibia should be highlighted. The Council must therefore make its contribution in order that appreciable progress may be made, thus also giving great impetus to

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

the new political thinking and appropriate approaches to confronting and coping in a lasting manner with the vast world problems affecting the interests of all mankind, which are more and more making themselves felt in international relations.

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

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

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): Mr. President, we would crave your indulgence and, through you, that of the other members of the Security Council, to refrain from traditional courtesies, because the hour and the seriousness of the topic before the Council fill us with emotions of frustration intermingled with outrage. You, Sir, must know of the high esteem in which we hold you and your dear country. The traditions of our noble fathers do not permit of public manifestations of our sense of pride at the dignity and quality of leadership provided to the Council by our brother, Ambassador Victor Gbeho, last month.

We deeply appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Council's deliberations, and sincerely hope that the Council's decisions will introduce into public perceptions of the multilateral process a bridge of greater credibility. We must not be above owning that the results of our past efforts may have failed to infuse a sense of legitimacy into the periodic meetings held to examine the critical issues of our times. We appear to display expertise in working out compromises of language and substance that convey, at best, a sense of false optimism to those victims whose peril and predicament we claim to address.

Cameroon is a committed member of the United Nations Council for Namibia. We have not come here to join in the chorus of acrimony and condemnation, which seems to characterize a body of this nature, convened to deal with the erupting volcano of revolt and desperation in southern Africa, to which Namibia belongs.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We have not sought this opportunity to restate old arguments, not even in new words; we have not come to reiterate familiar themes synopated to ritualistic denunciation of the archdeacons of the apartheid system in Pretoria, who seem to all of us here to be facing a self-destructive crisis of cultural and moral decline.

We have not come to pass judgement, either, on those among us who do not share the common political assessment of the wrongs and dangers of racism and deprivations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the region.

For us, selective name-calling, as the current jargon goes, concepts of linkage, collaboration and vacillating racial motivations and the like are all well-known elements. They constitute arguments that have led to counter-productive vetoes, unproductive division and resolutions without resolve. The records are saturated with resolutions that by-pass action.

We also seem to draw absurd comfort from the ever-rising numbers of voices against the régime in Pretoria: some satisfied that the day's labour has been fruitful, because of a large vote in favour of the contents of sheets of paper at the General Assembly; others confident and reassured by the intractable power offered by the veto to block any wording considered distasteful in similar documentation before the Security Council.

So at the end of each year each side in the political drama entertains aristocratic feelings of victory and convenient complacency. The central issues involved in all of this hardly find solutions. The decisions we make bear no substantive relationship to the real solutions called for by the serious crisis in southern Africa. Where they do, prima facie, the absence of a follow-up would suggest that we merely pay lip-service and consciously permit the storm of irrelevance to overcome our efforts.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The régime in Pretoria has grown accustomed to our dallying and no longer sees any threat from the actions and inactions of this body - an institution that was established to be the watch-dog for international peace and security.

And so blood flows in southern Africa. The cries of men, women and children vibrate across the globe, calling in desperation for help - help for survival, help to end conditions of senseless belligerency and of war. The brutality, death and destruction of material resources are promoted by freakish redefinitions of morality and cruelty.

Blood is flowing. In Namibia the legitimate representatives of the people are hunted in genocidal absurdities which transcend the confines of rational thinking.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Blood is flowing, tarnishing also beyond redemption the image of those who wield power, driving the black populace everywhere in southern Africa, and especially in Namibia, to inevitable measures of resistance never contemplated in the original quest for fundamental freedom.

As the Pretoria régime mocks the totality of our universal attitude and indolence with consummate contempt and arrogance, that region of Africa can find no leadership to avert the obvious tragedy of the future. More lives will be lost, leaving indelible scars which time will find difficult to heal. Generations of leaders are being born into the region and schooled in the most despicable forms of racism in an atmosphere in which morality and decency as we know them are unknown. The people of that geographical region, some of whom are so-called whites concerned about the future, have looked to the world for some light in the darkness that haunts their homeland. The international community has provided only words and resolutions, which have now become irrelevant through ineffectiveness. How much we have vindicated Shakespeare's prophetic lament by our comparative complacency. As the character Mark Antony in the tragedy "Julius Caesar" put it,

"Blood and destruction shall be so in use,

And dreadful objects so familiar,

That mothers shall but smile when they behold

Their infants quartered with the hands of war." (Julius Caesar, 3:1)

Look at the televised reports of happenings in southern Africa. Watch how, indeed, blood and destruction have become so commonplace. See how our mothers - yes, even the dedicated mothers of families - wear smiles tinged with cynicism as their unarmed defiant children choose death instead of slavery. See what has happened to the quality of the smiles that have always typified our African faces. See through all of that and contemplate what lies ahead. How long can the rest of

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

the world afford to incur the condemnation of the dying and the living dead as they shed costly blood? How much longer can the world tolerate the gathering clouds that bar visions of harmonious multiracial nation-building by the people of an independent Namibia or Azania?

We firmly believe that this occasion is an appropriate moment to call seriously for a truce, the Olympian truce of the ancient Greeks. Let us jointly examine what has happened to the universal conscience to seek some light in the apparent darkness that blurs our view of the dangers around us.

It is time for this historic body, the Security Council, to turn some of mankind's attention away from the exaggerated danger of a global nuclear holocaust, an event made unlikely by a mature consciousness of the disaster it would bring on all human existence on this planet. It is imperative that the members of the Council, my dear friends, commence a new process of addressing the task of finding effective and practical solutions to critical contemporary issues, for some of them could trigger a real malaise with regard to global peace and security, because we neglected to act at moments when the seeds of pestilence were being sown. The item before the Council today is one such issue.

Southern Africa is no longer a location remote from the major seats of economic and military power. It was a region of vital strategic interest for the victorious Powers during the two major wars of the century. It may still be of such, or more, interest. Nuclear weapons have found their way into the area, a region of uncertainty and induced instability. The situation continues to lend itself to an arms race which, if controlled now, could release energies as well as resources for recycling into development endeavours. Neglected or permitted to degenerate further, it will increasingly constitute a global disaster waiting impatiently to happen.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Namibia's freedom, the reinstatement of the dignity and worth of the African personality in southern Africa and the attainment of peace and security by the front-line States, especially Angola and Mozambique, would usher in a new era of economic progress, not only for the subregion but for Africa as a whole.

A free Namibia, a peaceful Mozambique, an unmolested Angola and a South Africa cleansed of the fantasies and illusions of a retrograde ruling class would take their rightful places with other members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in enhancing Africa's struggle against economic odds in a cruel world. When Africa is given a fair chance to address its internal economic woes it will cease to be a burden on the industrialized sector of the international community. Movement away from the evils of armament and civil strife would, through co-operation, strengthen our capacity to develop our continent with the same resources that have nourished phenomenal development in many of the great Powers of today.

So it can be seen that there are many incentives for peace and justice in southern Africa. The alternatives are too wasteful and ghastly for an informed generation such as ours.

This is a great moment. The Security Council must act decisively to bring about a cessation of the hostilities that continue to deprive Namibia of self-determination and self-sufficiency and perpetuate instability in the entire subregion. This must be done by the Council because of its responsibility under the Charter and perhaps even more because those that have the capability and the political and military influence are members of this body.

Namibia's freedom has, fundamentally, never really been at issue even in the minds of the leaders of Pretoria. The world acclaimed the Council's achievement as represented by resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). An anxious world asks no more than that the Council take effective steps to implement what was fully

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

supported by all the permanent members, as well as, significantly, by Pretoria. The Secretary-General's report underlines Pretoria's continuing commitment to resolution 435 (1978), even if Mr. Botha must stubbornly associate this with extraneous issues.

The Secretary-General, whose quiet diplomacy must be commended, has thus informed the Council for Namibia and this Council that all the conditions outlined in resolution 435 (1978) have been met. We have heard the leadership of SWAPO, the sole representative of the Namibian people, declare its willingness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement, once again demonstrating its characteristic instincts and aspiration to peace. The Security Council must contribute to a much-needed sense of the credibility of international institutions and the multilateral process. The hands of the Secretary-General must be strengthened by the Council's full backing to negotiate the follow-up necessary.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The Council is but a legal personality, like the parent body, the United Nations. It is, in the final analysis, the will and action of States that constitute its achievement. The fundamental responsibility rests with the permanent members of the Council. The Secretary-General may be expected to dedicate his energies for the good of existing Charter principles, but he can do nothing substantive unless the permanent members demonstrate not only a political will but also a visible commitment to exclude ideological confrontation from their relations on the issue of Namibia's freedom.

Once again, we seize this opportunity to appeal to the United States of America to bring to bear in our quest for lasting solutions the great dream of human freedom of their founding fathers. There is a nation born of spectacular revolution, which declared certain fundamental truths to be self-evident:

"that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness".

Resistance to inequities and love of freedom constituted the haemoglobin of the American political blood type.

As John Adams, the second American President, put it:

"The Revolution was effected before the war [of Independence] commenced. The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people."

Namibians of today share a similar chemistry of thought and experience with Americans of over two centuries ago. With forlorn hopes, the peoples of southern Africa watched the celebrations of the two-hundredth anniversary of such a justifiably proud, successful economic, technological and social giant as the United States. This great nation cannot afford to let them down. Its own freedom

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

as a people, based on such noble ideals, is called into question while fellow mortals elsewhere languish in conditions that Americans morally and spiritually reject as a way of life.

The peoples of this nation and their accredited parliamentary representatives are reacting with refreshing awareness to the tragedy. Is it too much to ask, in common fellowship and in a spirit of friendship, that this nation join in active championship of lasting peace for Namibia's future and that of the region? America must mobilize so that Namibia's freedom may not be delayed any longer.

We call upon the Soviet Union, another nation born in a number of historic revolutions in this century. The ups and downs of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from which Russia's history took its rhythm, moulded a crucial era of revolutions between 1900 and the 1930s. The Russian peoples witnessed transformations that launched one of the major systems of our times. The emancipation of the serfs, the defeat by a Far Eastern country, the experience of two world wars - all these consolidated a nation with a blend of European and Asian blood, equipping the Soviet Union to understand the nature of the struggle to survive. In the prophetic words of Nicholas II, the depressive conditions made "social revolution in its most extreme form ... inevitable". They, too, should understand the pangs of the hunger for freedom that Namibians and the black South Africans feel.

The leadership of the Soviet Union has declared a commitment to this Organization and to international peace through the Charter principles. Recent follow-ups to that declaration demonstrate the political will to contribute to the international peace process. This is welcome. The Soviet policy of encouraging the struggle of peoples for self-determination should stir the leadership to new quests for the realization of the stated objectives of that policy.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We are passing through an oasis of hope in a desert of international chaos in many areas. The summit meetings, followed by consultations at lower levels, between the United States and the Soviet Union, present an opportunity for non-confrontational dialogue between the two supreme military Powers. With every step they take they tread history. They can do more than that inspired by the lofty universal ideals of the age. They can make history, sharing a common aspiration to steer the cause of peace in southern Africa. They can give guarantees to all involved in the conflict in southern Africa.

Pretoria must know by now that it has chosen a wrong and dangerous path towards the future it wants for generations of southern Africans to come. The system by which the racists have attempted to suspend time may well be proving cumbersome. In the prevailing circumstances, years of rhetoric make retreat from apartheid difficult; the meanness of the spirit endures. Botha and his clique must be seeking and hoping, deep down and in silence, for redemption. Let us provide an excuse for change. Let us show them that this universal body is truly ready for change. Let us call for a cease-fire and a truce, for the time is ripe to make it clear that not even the acquired nuclear capability can suppress the will and determination of peoples indefinitely. Further bloodshed and repression must be prevented.

We call on France and the United Kingdom, both nations that had critical formative years in revolutions and have lent their languages and culture to help blend new forms of relationships among peoples and among nations. We strongly appeal to those nations to join forces to end the reign of terror and the waste of human and material resources in southern Africa. What is happening there goes against the ethics of their culture and the legal norms they hold so dear.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The two nations that, respectively, gave the world the Magna Carta and the Napoleonic codes must actively champion the cause of freedom, for those historic documents were born in the rejection of cruelty and injustice: the same conditions which our brothers and sisters reject and for protesting against they are murdered by the brutality of better armed occupation forces.

We call on those four nations - the United States, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom - to seek new measures and to provide new leadership to ensure that nothing impedes the achievement envisaged and inspired by resolution 435 (1978). It is perhaps the last frontier of peace still open. Let not extraneous issues divert their noble efforts.

We also call on the Federal Republic of Germany, a technological giant of our time, linked in history to a colonial past, which must shed tears at the knowledge of what has happened in the South West Africa that they were forced to abandon seven decades ago. The realistic policies they proclaim towards African development is appreciated, but there is attached the extra obligation towards a friend in desperation. Namibia needs them to help influence change and to plan the true course towards a free and prosperous future.

We must of necessity call on our Chinese friends, also permanent members of the Council, whose oriental wisdom could provide leadership to a confused world. Since they share common aspirations with the deprived of the times, we count on the Chinese Government and people to bring pressure to bear on those who are incapacitated by proclaimed divergencies of means or methods in a common cause.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The term "revolution" should frighten none of these great nations. Their own individual experience demonstrates that for struggling peoples seeking self-determination it means the inevitable change that liberates the human spirit and inspires new human relations for a better life. Whether a revolution is later betrayed or not is immaterial. Namibians seek a revolutionary change in a quest for an opportunity to embark on shaping their own destiny, not to destabilize any neighbours or peoples. It is their fundamental right to govern or, if you prefer to pass external judgement, to misgovern themselves as they wish.

Let us ambassadors and representatives meeting here today not join the escapists. In the final analysis, nations are composed of peoples. We here are the human agents of Governments far removed from the political and diplomatic climate in this Chamber. It is to us that Governments entrust the responsibility of promoting as well as assessing the response to national foreign policies.

The Namibian issue has many facets. We cannot escape the moral as well as the professional responsibilities to fight for our beliefs and the purposes of the Charter which provide a common basis for the universal aspirations here. It is our duty to our Governments, to our nations, to our peoples and to decency to apply our individual influences at every opportunity. We appeal for a contribution to the strengthening of the universal conscience; Namibia provides a challenge to all of us.

Many artists, including song writers, have joined in the chorus of entreaty for the times; we hear the song on the radio:

"People everywhere want to be free.

If there's a man who needs a helping hand,

All you need is help pull him through,

Mighty situation for man to be free."

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

An Afro-American poet wrote a plea in utmost sorrow over her son: "Don't wipe away my tears!" Her African mother counterpart must be rendering the same exhortation to all of us today:

"Don't wipe away my tears -

Blood and destruction are no longer my fears,

I grieve for my children

And my children's children.

They knew no peace to understand my love.

People out there make nations with no love.

I wept and cried for them all.

In secret I called for help

To save my husband, my sons, my daughters, my friends, my country, their future

My cries no one seemed to hear.

No one seemed to care.

Where is the United Nations?

Where is God? O God, where are thou?

Don't wipe away my tears!

My people have learned that

Freedom can only come from our own effort,

Even from our meagre means;

Give them freedom!

Don't wipe away my tears!

My tears don't bother me now!

Wipe first the fears of a Pretoria gone mad.

They took me away from my little home;

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

From my farm and hoe and corn they took me.

Wipe first the conditions that make me a widow, childless, friendless.

Get me away from here, back to my home and farm, and hoe and corn.

Give my people freedom.

Go tell those who kill my people,

Go tell those who try to kill my spirit,

Go tell them, tell them to stop.

Go tell them, tell them I weep for them too.

Do all these for me, for us, will you?

Wipe away cruelty and deprivations and death and injustices.

You wipe out my tears."

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

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

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): At the very outset, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic wishes to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. Your rich diplomatic experience will certainly help to bring these extremely important meetings to the successful conclusion we all desire. We wish you every success in the interest of the just cause of the Namibian people.

Our high appreciation goes also to the representative of Ghana, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, who, with his well-know diplomatic skill and great commitment, guided the work of the Security Council in September.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

My delegation thanks you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to outline the position of the German Democratic Republic on the situation in Namibia.

Anniversaries and commemorative days play an important part in the social and political lives of people and of nations. They often serve as occasions on which to reflect on one's own strength and to look with pride and joy at what has been accomplished. At the same time they provide encouragement to strive for new achievements, to launch new efforts. And it is precisely this latter aspect which is relevant to the events relating to the unresolved question of Namibia. I have in mind the current Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as well as the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia this year. Both events show that the Namibian people is still being denied its right to freedom and independence. And for that very reason both events must prompt us to redouble efforts on behalf of the just cause of Namibia. To this task the German Democratic Republic is deeply committed. The more so, since we are confronted with the fact that the problem does not seem to be nearing a solution. The reasons for that have been made clear during this debate, which my delegation has followed with close attention.

In his statement yesterday, the representative of SWAPO, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, described the manoeuvres undertaken by Pretoria and its accomplices in order to prevent a just solution and bring about a neo-colonial settlement. We have also heard about the disastrous consequences of this criminal policy for the Namibian people day by day, consequences which extend far beyond the borders of the country.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

The unresolved question of Namibia is rightly characterized as a main cause of the continuing dangerous situation in the region. The decades-long illegal occupation by South Africa and the denial of the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence constitute a flagrant violation of the norms of international law. They pose a threat to peace and security in the region and in the world at large. Moreover, the occupied Territory is still being used by Pretoria as a springboard for aggressions and for acts of destabilization and State terrorism against neighbouring countries. As recently as this month Angola again fell victim to that policy of the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

What else is needed to support the inescapable conclusion that the Security Council must at last live up to its responsibility? The Council's main concern must be to take resolute action towards implementing its own decisions, no less and no more, and that should be realized by those Western members of the Council that veto or vote against sanctions and thus prevent the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

In fact, what is more important: to assure the profits transnational corporations are extracting from plundering Namibia or to attain the noble goal of self-determination and independence for the people of that country? We in the German Democratic Republic are proud of being at the side of those who can answer that question in the spirit of progress, humanity and peace.

I referred earlier to Pretoria's manoeuvres which are aimed at achieving a neo-colonial settlement of the question of Namibia. Recent developments have indeed shown that the South African Government is devising ever new schemes towards that end. In disregard of relevant United Nations resolutions it seeks, with the help of puppets, to grant phoney independence to Namibia. With this farce Pretoria is pursuing a twofold objective: on the one hand it wants to get rid of the colony in a face-saving way and present a forthcoming attitude to the outside world while on the other hand it wants to preserve its claim to rule the resource-rich Territory.

These activities of the racists, which are contrary to international law, are backed up by attempts in Western quarters aimed at consolidating by means of well-directed, so-called development aid, the puppet Government in Windhoek, the installation of which was declared null and void by Security Council resolution 566 (1985). We believe that the Namibian people, with the participation of all groups of the population, must determine its future in free self-determination, as

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

evisaged in resolution 435 (1978). Any attempt by the occupiers and Western circles to reach internal settlements through the drafting of a constitution, the holding of referendums or other political manoeuvres constitutes an open challenge to this world Organization and must be resolutely countered by it.

Pretoria's peace-threatening policy and its disregard of United Nations decisions on apartheid and Namibia prove that the régime in South Africa shows no willingness whatsoever to solve the problems of southern Africa by political means. Together with its closest ally it continues to set pre-conditions for the granting of independence to Namibia.

Typically enough, those conditions were once raised precisely at a time when a settlement of the problem based on resolution 435 (1978) seemed to be within reach. South Africa's demands have thus become the main obstacle standing in the way of implementation of the Security Council's resolutions on Namibia.

By contrast, the People's Republic of Angola, the other front-line States and SWAPO have time and again demonstrated their good will to contribute in a constructive manner to a rapid settlement of the question of Namibia and the other problems in the region. The German Democratic Republic welcomes the recent initiative of the Government of Angola to ease the situation in the region. Angola's proposals demonstrate the political will for a just settlement of the problems in southern Africa.

An entirely different thing is the policy of so-called constructive engagement, the destructive character of which has been revealed repeatedly. That policy has come to be a synonym of undisguised support for Pretoria.

The régime of South Africa must be isolated internationally in order to force it into surrender and thus enable all peoples in the region to determine their future freely and without outside interference.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The German Democratic Republic therefore supports the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and expects the Security Council to take appropriate action if Pretoria continues not to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

As long as South Africa and its allies block the road to an independent Namibia, the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will have to go on with its liberation struggle. It has international law on its side, and it can be sure of the solidarity of all peace-loving nations, including the people of my country.

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

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

Mr. KAROUI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Allow me first of all, Sir, to fulfil the pleasant duty of congratulating you most warmly upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. Tunisia is happy to see in the presidency of the Council the representative of a country with which it maintains the best good-neighbourly relations of friendship and co-operation.

I should like also to express the same heartfelt congratulations to your predecessor, Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, on the exemplary manner in which he conducted the work of the Council in the month of September.

Given the gravity of the matter that it is called upon to deal with and by reason of the reaction it has elicited and the hopes it arouses, the Security Council is meeting once again to pronounce itself, inspired by the ideals and

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

principles that the United Nations helped to define and which the Council itself is responsible for defending and seeing applied.

In this last quarter of the twentieth century, more than 25 years after the adoption by our Organization of the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), we are still dealing with the implementation of the principles called self-determination and independence, freedom and justice.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

There is still today on African soil, in Namibia, a people fighting for recognition of its right to dignity and independence. There is still today on that same African soil an enclave in which oppression, repression and exploitation have become a system, where the régime installed there dismisses the inalienable right of peoples to self-determination and flaunts with as much assurance as arrogance, in the name of its selfish interests, its utter contempt for the will of the international community and the decisions of the United Nations.

In our view, it is inadmissible that the Namibian people has not yet gained its freedom and independence. It is all the more inadmissible in that the Namibian cause enjoys the support of the international community as a whole, that the United Nations has made that cause its own and assumed responsibility for it.

By Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains, in our view, the corner-stone of any solution aimed at the establishment of peace and stability in the region, the international community, as far back as nine years ago, outlined the framework and modalities by means of which a just and lasting solution to the Namibian question could be found.

We should not be surprised at South Africa's reluctance to subscribe to Namibia's independence. We long ago analysed and identified that reticence as a deliberate rejection of any solution in keeping with justice and law, concepts that are hardly compatible with the philosophy of apartheid. Our surprise stems rather from the inability shown so far by the international community to bring the Pretoria régime to bow to the law. Our surprise stems also and above all from the thought that there are those who in recent years have succeeded in altering the nature of the debate on the Namibian question.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

The undertaking, in fact, consisted in minimizing the substantive issue, which is purely a question of decolonization and the right of a people to self-determination, and directing the discussion towards ancillary questions, artificially grafted on and in any event alien to the United Nations plan and in no way connected with the struggle of the people of Namibia for dignity and independence.

It is necessary to revert to the substantive issue. The question that seems to us to be fundamental today is whether the application of the principle of self-determination to the Namibian people and the proclamation of the independence of Namibia should wait upon the goodwill of the South African authorities, or whether South Africa should be placed in the position of being no longer able to oppose them. Will power be transferred to the Namibian people in accordance with the various relevant resolutions of our Organization? Is there still any chance of success for the plan so laboriously worked out by the United Nations in accordance with resolution 435 (1978)?

These are the questions that we asked ourselves, questions that were accompanied by anxiety, scepticism and hope. We say hope because, imbued as we are with the principles of freedom and justice, having faith in the virtues of negotiation and dialogue and always advocating the peaceful settlement of disputes, we ventured to hope that reason would finally prevail, even among those who have distinguished themselves by their contempt for the human person and the fundamental principles of international law. We say hope also and above all because we were reassured by the fact that the United Nations plan had the support and endorsement of the entire international community, and because we were convinced that, deprived of support and seriously threatened with isolation, South Africa would not continue in its attitude of arrogance and defiance.

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

Our scepticism, on the other hand, was founded on the very nature of the Pretoria régime, which is based essentially on repression, oppression and aggression and would not of its own accord accept the language of negotiation or the concept of democracy or elections.

What can one expect from a régime that abroad carries out a policy of continued, characteristic aggression against neighbouring African States and internally is notorious for the inhuman practices of apartheid, its acts of exaction and violence against innocent populations and death sentences passed in a mockery of justice on young people whose only crime is to believe in the existence of freedom and the possibility of finding dignity.

Toivo Hermann Ja Toivo, one of the leaders of the Namibian liberation movement, addressed in the following terms the South African judge who in 1968 condemned him to 20 years' imprisonment:

"We are Namibians and not South Africans. We do not acknowledge today and will not recognize ever that you have the right to govern us, to impose on us laws drawn up without our participation, to treat our country as if it belonged to you and ourselves as if you were our masters."

The means of moral pressure which some say they exercise on the Pretoria régime have had the results of which we all know: the same arrogance and the same defiant attitude on the flimsiest pretexts.

The time has come for action, for realism, for international solidarity and for recourse to the means provided for in the Charter, in the particular, comprehensive mandatory sanctions which alone will deprive South Africa of the means on which it relies to continue in its arrogance and defiance. We must respond to the long-held expectations of the people of Namibia, the whole of Africa and all peoples throughout the world that cherish peace and justice. We are

(Mr. Karoui, Tunisia)

convinced that the sacrifices of the Namibian people will not have been in vain. Thanks to the determination and foresight of SWAPO, the legitimate representative of the Namibian people and its sole valid spokesman, Namibia will soon achieve freedom and independence.

We propose that we respond to the violation of the law, to domination and to racist violence by the legitimate application of the mandatory measures provided for in the Charter. Our ultimate objective is to turn the page of decolonization once and for all.

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

The next speaker is Mr. Solly Simelane, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SIMELANE: First, Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the excellent way in which you have been guiding the Council's work and the great patience you have shown throughout these deliberations.

May I also express my appreciation to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Ghana, for the talents and diplomatic skills he showed as President of the Council during the month of September.

Since yesterday we have been listening to a number of statements here that must move any heart not made of stone. It is sad that some members of the Council - perhaps for reasons of racist principle or avaricious self-interest - continue to fraternize with the Pretoria racist régime in spite of the deafening screams emanating from the torture dungeons in Namibia and South Africa, torture perpetrated by a subclass of torturers who are psychologically deranged.

In 1948, as we all know, the Afrikaaner Nationalist Party came to power following an all-white election. In the same year, apartheid became an official State ideology. Its proponents openly declared that it was a variation of nazism. These were the same people - leaders and members of the Afrikaaner Nationalist Party - who had spent the years of the Second World War in prison because of their openly pro-Hitler pronouncements and activities.

Barely three years after the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, acting in exemplary concert, had vanquished Hitlerite fascism and militarism, the world would incredulously witness the unbridled expansion of Western collaboration with apartheid South Africa - the blatant reincarnation of nazism in South Africa. The

(Mr. Simelane)

resulting economic boom for whites would translate itself into a rapid erosion of whatever vestigial rights still belonged to the black majority. It would also take the form of a rapid deterioration in the very physical circumstances of our people. The prosperity of whites and their Western collaborators, including the Federal Republic of Germany, derived directly from the oppression and exploitation, the uprooting, dispossession and dehumanization of our people, on the scale of Hitler's programmes.

Apartheid was the heir to a 300-year-old legacy of repressive white minority racist settler colonialist rule. In the last 40 years it has sought to provide the final solution to the problems that beset the survival of white racist minority rule in our country. In the pursuit of this most inhuman objective, it has transformed our country into a police State. In the last two years alone, through a succession of three ever-more-total states of emergency, it has imposed virtual military rule on the black townships, in the process savaging even infants and children in their thousands with its draconian measures.

Consistent with the paranoia and expansionist impulse that are the trademarks of fascism, the Pretoria racist régime has always sought to buffer itself and to be the dominant Power. In this regard, violating the norms of international law, it has, since the termination of its Mandate in 1966, illegally and forcibly occupied Namibia, even as for over a decade it has sought, through military aggression, economic blackmail and sabotage and outright political subversion, to destabilize and subjugate the front-line and other independent African States of southern Africa. In the majority of cases it has carried out these atrocities using illegally occupied Namibia as its launching ground.

In the interest of its violently repressive and illegal rule, the Pretoria racist régime has turned Namibia into a vast military barracks, where the ratio of soldiers to civilians is an astounding 13 to 1. In an attempt to stifle the armed

(Mr. Simelane)

resistance of the Namibian people, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), it has resorted increasingly to the massacre of civilians and the bombing of churches as well as the persecution of Christians. Lately frightened by the growing importance of the labour movement in the overall struggle, it has taken to terrorizing Namibian trade unionists. Using its own explicit military might or through surrogate bands of bandits like the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) and the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR), it continues to sow woe and misery, death and destruction in catastrophic proportions in the front-line and other independent African States in the region, forcing the Governments of these young States to divert their scanty resources from the pursuit of economic and social progress to military defence. Pretoria has set the region on fire and is stoking that fire into a conflagration.

Not too long ago we were gratified to learn, through the Secretary-General's report, that all the formal and legitimate requirements for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), including agreement on the choice of an electoral system, had been met. However, our gratification was to be short-lived. The Reagan Administration continues to insist on linkage, in effect holding the prospect of Namibian independence falsely hostage to the right of the legitimate Government of the sovereign People's Republic of Angola to invite and keep within its territory whomever it wishes, in accordance with what it deems to be its legitimate security needs. Cuban internationalist troops were invited to Angola to help defend the territorial integrity of that country and the sovereignty of its people against South African aggression. South Africa continues to occupy parts of southern Angola; it also continues to attack that country. It seems to us that the racist South African threat ought to be removed before we even begin to contemplate the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist troops from the People's Republic of

(Mr. Simelane)

Angola. The when and how of the withdrawal should be determined by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, exercising its sovereignty.

The Pretoria racist régime also persists in the attempt to create ill-fated concoctions like the "interim government" designed to stall and play for time and to negate key provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Reagan Administration and the Pretoria racist régime, either because their consent to resolution 435 (1978) was tied to a secret agenda which had nothing to do with the decolonization of Namibia or because they do not have the good faith to match their deeds to their initial words, have made it clear that they are not about to countenance a free Namibia. However, the Namibian people cannot go on suffering indefinitely. Namibian independence cannot wait.

Apartheid itself cannot go on indefinitely. The struggles of the people of Namibia and South Africa and the resistance of the people of the entire region will ultimately bring it to an end. The question today is: should apartheid, which has already set southern Africa on fire, be allowed to go on until it has turned that fire into a conflagration threatening world peace and security? The world should obviously say: No.

(Mr. Simelane)

We must reject linkage as well as the the racist régime's unilateral initiatives in Namibia. We believe that the international community, acting through the Security Council, should adopt all necessary measures, including the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, against racist South Africa in order to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay.

Let us not forget: the last time some Powers tried to appease nazism, it resulted in the death of millions of people. Let us remember, as George Santayana once observed, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Finally, we wish to reiterate our principled solidarity with our fraternal and heroic Namibian people and our sister national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We similarly reaffirm our solidarity with the people of Western Sahara and their vanguard, POLISARIO, with the people of Palestine and their sole, authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and with all people everywhere struggling against oppression, exploitation and for democracy, peace and progress.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Simelane for his kind words addressed to me.

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

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.