



Security Council

UN LIBRARY

NOV 1

UN/SA COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2759

30 October 1987

ENGLISH

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

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 30 October 1987, at 3 p.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. GARVALOV
 Mr. YU Mengjia
 Mr. ADOUKI
 Mr. BROCHAND
 Count YORK von WARTENBURG
 Mr. GBEHO
 Mr. KIKUCHI
 Mr. BELONOGOV
 Mr. AL-SHAALI
 Sir Crispin TICKELL
 Mr. OKUN
 Mr. AGUILAR
 Mr. ZUZE

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN NAMIBIA

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

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

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

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

(The President)

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

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

At the invitation of the President, 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: 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: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. The first speaker is the representative of Jamaica. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BARNETT (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation wishes to express to you, Mr. President, and through you to the other members of the Security Council our sincere appreciation of the opportunity afforded us to participate in the Security Council's resumed consideration of the situation in Namibia.

Although among the last speakers to participate in the debate under your presidency of the Security Council for the month of October 1987, we have been encouraged by the fine manner in which you have guided the deliberations of the Council thus far. Let me also take the opportunity of extending through you to the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Ambassador Victor Gbeho, our warm congratulations on the exemplary manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Security Council during the hectic weeks of September.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

It remains the fervent hope of the Jamaican delegation that the Security Council's present deliberations on the situation in Namibia will provide a much needed opening and a refreshing change of direction out of the protracted impasse surrounding Namibia's independence. As I have had occasion to observe in the past, the seemingly endless cycle of debates on Namibia in the Security Council has served only to bring out feelings of weary cynicism, bitterness and frustration within the international community, and especially on the part of the suffering and oppressed people of Namibia.

Already in this debate we have seen an increasing number of our African colleagues shaking their heads in despair and disillusionment at the course of these debates and at the fact that the Security Council's important resolutions and decisions have been rendered, by inaction, indolence and complacency, mere meaningless pieces of paper. We also empathise with the mounting frustration and impatience of the leaders of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) over the betrayed trust of the Namibian people and the statement by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia earlier this year that the case of Namibia represented a classic example of failed collective efforts by the United Nations.

Those are very strong indictments which challenge our collective wisdom and faith in the United Nations as mankind's best hope of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war and protecting the fundamental human rights, dignity and worth of the human person and the equal rights of all nations, large and small. After all, Namibia remains to this day the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The people of Namibia continue to expect that the United Nations, through its primary organ, the Security Council, will fulfil its obligation to bring the Territory to independence without further delay and force Pretoria to terminate its illegal military occupation of the Territory, which it has usurped.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

In his latest report (S/19234) of 27 October 1987, the Secretary-General, in his concluding remarks, has observed that it is now over nine years since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Yet, he has quite rightly pointed out, successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition.

In the Secretary-General's report we have also noted with interest the fact that the leadership of the Pretoria régime has sought to convey to the Secretary-General's Special Representative full assurances that the Government of South Africa remains committed to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and that it will not act in any manner that would abrogate the international obligations to which South Africa has committed itself.

But what are we to make of these so-called assurances and commitments? The implementation of the United Nations plan has from the outset been undermined, frustrated and scuttled by South Africa's duplicity and intransigence.

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

It has tightened its military and political stranglehold over the Territory, stepped up its repression of the Namibian people and continued to use Namibia as a military base for its acts of aggression and destabilization attempts against the front-line States, with repeated incursions into Angola. Moreover, the Pretoria régime has continued to hold Namibia's future hostage to extraneous issues, involving the presence of Cuban forces in Angola through the "linkage concept", which has been rejected by the international community and by the Security Council itself in its resolution 566 (1985).

We firmly believe that any meaningful credibility of the Security Council's deliberations over Namibia can be restored only by a far greater resolve not to acquiesce in the face of Pretoria's machinations and duplicity. It must reject and set aside once and for all the pernicious linkage pre-condition, which has only served to facilitate Pretoria's continued control over the Territory, as well as its persistent attempt to transform the Namibian question into an issue of East-West confrontation.

Meanwhile, the situation in Namibia continues to deteriorate as a result of the increasing repression of the Namibian people by the South African occupation forces throughout the Territory, including the so-called operational zone in northern Namibia, which has led to the loss of innocent lives. In their concerted efforts to snuff out and forcibly deprive the Namibian people of their legitimate aspirations, the Pretoria régime's occupation forces have resorted to new waves of brutalities and repressive actions against the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and their supporters in the Territory.

The Security Council, and in particular its permanent members, must be especially mindful of the grave implications of the failure to act responsibly in applying the requisite pressure against South Africa, in order to put an end to the

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

continuing instability and tensions in the region. We believe that the same set of circumstances which galvanized and prompted the Security Council to decisive action in 1976, by its resolution 385 (1976) and again in 1978 by its resolution 435 (1978) containing the settlement plans, should again inform the Council's debate and provide the basis for enlightened decisions.

The Secretary-General himself has, despite the daunting circumstances, remained hopefully optimistic and expressed the conviction 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.

Now that we have seen the failure of constructive engagement, we strongly endorse the Secretary-General's sentiments. We hope that his wise counselling will provide useful inspiration in guiding the outcome of our deliberations. Having regard to the deliberate and painstaking efforts he has undertaken so far, we believe that the Security Council should seek to enhance the negotiating role of the Secretary-General and give collective support to his actions to bring about the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations settlement plan. The Secretary-General must be provided with firm assurances by the permanent members of the Council that his diplomatic efforts will be fully backed up by sustained pressure on the Pretoria régime to agree to a final and definitive timetable for the implementation of the settlement plan for Namibia, since all outstanding issues have now been resolved. In the event of South Africa's non-compliance, it must be made abundantly clear that enforcement measures under Chapter VII will be rigorously applied.

We are all fully aware that the inordinate delay in Namibia's independence has been as a result of the futile attempts by the Pretoria régime to buy time, in

(Mr. Barnett, Jamaica)

order to keep in place its apartheid system and to perpetuate its grand design for regional dominance and control of neighbouring States. Consequently, to accept the independence of Namibia as a unitary State ruled by a black majority would not merely involve admitting the inapplicability of the apartheid ideology to Namibia, but would also deal a savage blow to its moral, logical and practical justification in South Africa itself.

But as we have seen, even the moral and ideological justification for apartheid in South Africa has begun to crumble as a result of the bold and courageous action by the oppressed majority to rid themselves of the shackles of racial oppression and subjection. Similarly, the aspirations of the oppressed majority in Namibia have gained sustenance and support from the indomitable resistance of their courageous brothers in South Africa.

The international community should therefore move expeditiously in tackling the source of instability and tensions in the region. We endorse the views of the Secretary-General that the people of Namibia must be permitted to enjoy the freedom and independence that is their right, and that the concerted action of the world community should now be directed to achieving this objective.

It is the unmistakable duty of the Security Council to play the decisive role in this endeavour.

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

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on the wisdom and competence you have demonstrated in presiding over the Council this month. We are all the more pleased to see you presiding over the Council since you represent a country with which my country is linked by bonds of friendship and mutual respect.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

I wish also on this occasion to pay a tribute to the competence and sense of responsibility shown by our colleague and friend, Ambassador Gbeho, Permanent Representative of Ghana, during his presidency of the Council last month.

The Security Council is meeting to consider the question of Namibia six months after a meeting on the same problem which resulted in failure. The Council was unable to adopt the draft resolution sponsored by my country and other members of the Non-Aligned Movement. That draft resolution called for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Government of South Africa. The Council failed to adopt it because of the negative votes of certain of its permanent members. Our co-sponsorship of the draft resolution and support of it stemmed from our historical experience and the deep conviction we reached from the failure of the endeavours of the international community to convince the racist régime to comply with the wishes of mankind embodied in the United Nations Charter and the numerous resolutions adopted by various United Nations organs.

However, the Council's failure to adopt a resolution does not mean that we have reached the end of the road. The history of any people is that which the sons of the people carve for themselves. It is a history recorded in the blood they shed in defence of their right to live as human beings.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

The problem of Namibia is a question of colonialism. However, it is a type of colonialism which by its very nature is unique. That is the reason for the international community's stand against it. While the traditional type of colonialism dominated the peoples of Asia and Africa under the pretext that they were not able to govern themselves, South Africa dominates Namibia in order to entrench a system that has been rejected by the international community - that is, apartheid. Traditional colonialism used to camouflage its excesses by claiming that it was exercising a "sacred trust" vis-à-vis the peoples of Africa and Asia. South Africa does not bother. To it, the people of Namibia are an obstacle in the way of apartheid and are dealt with as such. Traditional colonialism was a sort of club whose several members believed in the same ideology, even if their interests and ambitions differed and clashed. The Government of South Africa is a racist gang motivated by an ideology that compounds the worst excesses of colonialism.

That is the reason for the unique stand of the international community on the question of Namibia. This has been reflected in the way it has sought to deal with the problem through the numerous resolutions on the matter adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council - particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which calls for Namibia's accession to independence, and General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and made the Territory the direct responsibility of the United Nations. We must also bear in mind the 1971 Opinion of the International Court of Justice, which affirmed the illegality of South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

In the teeth of such unanimity, the South African Government continues to refuse to withdraw from Namibia and continues to export apartheid to that Territory. It does this not only to continue to rape the Territory and plunder its resources but also to consolidate apartheid in South Africa itself and use Namibia

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

as a front line of defence of apartheid and a launching pad for acts of aggression against the front-line States.

Thus, we are faced, in the question of Namibia, by two interrelated issues: the issue of independence for the Namibian people and the issue of the struggle against apartheid. We can achieve neither of those aims unless we force the South African régime to submit to the international will. Since the present situation threatens peace and rewards aggression, it is the international community's duty to take steps to solve the question and ensure that the will of the international community is not flouted. The United Nations Charter made this the Security Council's responsibility, as is clear from the Articles of Chapter VII of the Charter. That Chapter sets out the philosophy of the founders of the Organization. It was a philosophy drawn from the bitter experience of the past, and the lesson it teaches us is that, in our epoch, regional problems cannot remain regional, as was the case before. They are problems that affect the international community as a whole. All nations are now interdependent, by the very nature of modern life. Moreover, we all have a common interest in safeguarding international peace and security.

Therefore, Chapter VII of the Charter should be set in motion, if only to give credence to the significance of international unanimity and uphold the credibility of the Organization. The application of Chapter VII may also prove to be a useful and much-needed lesson to certain Governments that have made it a practice of flouting the resolutions of the Organization. It may be a deterrent, too, to those who may find it expedient and feasible to defy the international will.

That is why we have called and continue to call for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against the South African régime. It is a régime that should not be allowed to continue to defy the international will. The loopholes in the

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

solid unanimity of the international community, which enable the apartheid régime to defy and prevaricate, should be closed, as they should be in the case of any other delinquent régime.

Moreover, we believe that there is no place for any linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. They are two completely different issues.

The draft resolution before the Security Council is a practical text. It is based on the Secretary-General's report to the Council of 21 March this year and his further report of 27 October. It authorizes the Secretary-General to organize a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO.

We support the Secretary-General's efforts and hope that he will be able to achieve positive results that will permit the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable rights, foremost among which is the right to self-determination and independence. We hope that this draft resolution will be supported by all the members of the Security Council.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to the people of Namibia for their courageous struggle under their legitimate representative, SWAPO. We are convinced that that struggle will be rewarded by freedom and independence.

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

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

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): First, I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. You represent a friendly country, Italy, with which my own has very close relations and ties. Your experience and diplomatic skill, which we have

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

noted during the Council's consideration of other items this month, ensure that you will guide the Council's deliberations to a successful conclusion.

I express also to the representative of Ghana, Ambassador Victor Gbeho, our deep gratitude for the exemplary way in which he presided over the Council last month. I pay a tribute to him for the success that was achieved during that month.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Twenty-one years have elapsed since the termination of South Africa's mandate over Namibia, and nine since the adoption of the resolution establishing the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). The racist Pretoria régime, however, still stubbornly refuses to leave Namibia. Indeed, the racist régime has used these years to introduce legislative, structural and administrative changes in order more deeply to entrench its authority and illegal occupation of Namibia, and to further its criminal, heinous exploitation of its human and natural resources.

It used Namibian territory to launch acts of aggression against the front-line States, thereby destabilizing them and causing untold human and material suffering in those countries. The result is continued deterioration of the situation in Namibia, which further increases the gravity of the plight of its friendly people.

These practices constitute a flagrant violation of international instruments and values and of resolutions of the Security Council, especially resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). They are, further, a violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. All this, without doubt, constitutes a real threat to international peace and security.

The pre-condition of linking Namibia's independence to the resolution of irrelevant and extraneous issues is not part of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The proof of this is that the Security Council has rejected such linkage in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985). [It is not logical to link Namibia's right to independence to Angola's right to security. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola is a completely separate issue, especially since they are there at the request of the Angolan Government, whereas South Africa is present in Namibia illegally and contrary to the wish of the Namibian people.] Therefore, the

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

pre-condition of linkage is the only obstacle to implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

The teachings of Islam and its eternal values recognize the principles of freedom, justice, peace, fraternity and the equality of all mankind without discrimination as to colour or race. They do so to enable the human being to find his proper place in accordance with Islamic law, which stipulates that the most important freedom is a human being's liberation from slavery to another human being and the liberation of a people from slavery to another people. Invoking these high Islamic principles, the Islamic nation has always attached great importance to issues related to the African human being, especially questions of liberation and self-determination in Namibia and other parts of southern Africa. The spirit of Islam is diametrically opposed to all the practices to which the racist régime resorts in South African and Namibia, which reflect the most hideous form of enslavement and exploitation of man by man.

The Islamic nation, represented in the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which Kuwait has had the honour to chair, has given particular attention to supporting the causes of liberation in southern Africa. This support for the liberation struggle of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa was clearly reflected in the deliberations and resolutions of the Conference when it was convened in Kuwait in January of this year. Those resolutions renewed the call of the Islamic nation for the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. They also supported the just armed struggle of the South West Africa People's

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Organization (SWAPO) to achieve national independence in a unified Namibia and to enable the Namibian people to eradicate the system of apartheid and exercise its fundamental rights and democratic freedoms.

The summit Conference in Kuwait again expressed the Islamic nation's condemnation of the Pretoria régime's insistence on linking the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola to Namibia's independence as a pre-condition. The Conference expressed its satisfaction at resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly rejecting that kind of linkage.

I should like here, on behalf of my delegation, to pay tribute to SWAPO for having sincerely expressed the actual situation in Namibia, for having presented the international community with the different options available, and for having stressed the urgency of speedy action to ensure Namibian independence. Kuwait supports SWAPO in its armed struggle and diplomatic quest. It lauds SWAPO'S flexibility, which it has witnessed on a number of occasions.

Kuwait also supports the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), by which it decided to establish a United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia to ensure the early independence of Namibia, which will eradicate all forms of racial discrimination and apartheid and establish majority rule through free, just and impartial elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

We call upon the Security Council to meet its responsibilities and maintain and preserve international peace and security. We call upon the Security Council to work for a settlement within the framework of the United Nations, even if it

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

has to compel South Africa to comply with resolution 435 (1978) and other resolutions or to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

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

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

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): Like so many others who have spoken, my delegation finds no real pleasure in coming before the Council time and time again to demand freedom and independence for Namibia. Our pleas have been completely ignored by Pretoria in the past, so that our words now appear to have become empty and ritualistic. We believe, however, that so long as the people of Namibia remain in bondage we cannot and should not remain silent.

Our disconsolate spirit, however, has not made us pessimistic or, worse yet, ungracious. I therefore wish, first, to express our sincere thanks to the members of the Council for allowing us to speak in this debate. May I also be permitted to convey my delegation's best wishes to you personally, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October, and to offer congratulations to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Ghana, on the able manner in which he conducted the Council's work during September.

On this occasion, I do not propose to be long. We should not, I believe, at this stage be discussing extensively or exhaustively a situation that we have all agreed is intolerable and requires immediate action by the United Nations. Indeed, if our Organization is to be taken seriously by this and future generations, it must ensure that situations such as that existing in Namibia are not allowed to prevail with impunity. The Security Council, as the body charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, has a special responsibility to take decisive action to force the Pretoria régime to obey its call for the unconditional liberation of Namibia.

Guyana is therefore fully supportive of the initiative taken by the Chairmen of the African Group and the Non-Aligned Movement to request a meeting of the Council and to advance a draft resolution which would give a clear and unambiguous mandate to our Secretary-General in response to his call for a

*determined effort on the part of all those directly concerned, as well as by

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

the international community as a whole, to emplace UNTAG in Namibia in 1987."

(S/18767, para. 33)

The Secretary-General has already informed us that in his view there are no outstanding issues which should impede the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. This assessment is conveyed in the report made to the Security Council in March and in his latest report, which is before us. There can therefore be no further pretext for not fulfilling the terms of resolution 435 (1978). At bottom - and this we seriously believe - the independence of Namibia is a decolonization matter, to be settled in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The Pretoria régime, however, has successfully managed, with great cunning and clever obfuscation, to cloud the issue with a cover of extraneous considerations. The most deplorable of these is the strategic argument and the continued linkage of Namibia's independence with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

At the same time, the spokesmen for Pretoria are bold in their asseveration of its readiness to honour the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) and, further, they say, to co-operate with the United Nations in their fulfilment. Let the Council therefore call Pretoria's bluff by endorsing the call made by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, for a cease-fire. Such a proposal, which proves in our eyes the political courage and determination of SWAPO, deserves a positive reply from Pretoria. For South Africa to reject it would not only signify the rejection of a peaceful solution to the conflict in the region, but reveal the true motivation of the white minority rulers. It is not too late, however, for Pretoria, if it so wishes, to respond to the voice of reason and to relinquish control of the Territory.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

The signing of a cease-fire agreement, accompanied by a halt in the policy of repression practised by Pretoria, would, we believe, be a first step towards implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and thus foster the opportunities for peace in Namibia. With a cease fire in place, it should not be too difficult for the Secretary-General to carry out consultations necessary for the launching of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). As the name of that body suggests, it is intended to facilitate a peaceful transfer of power, and we think that it can, if it is allowed to do so.

As the Commonwealth Heads of Government recognized at the Conference in Vancouver only a matter of days ago,

"The impasse in Namibia's progress to independence seems to have assumed the proportions of a permanent stalemate."

The challenge, therefore, they said,

"is to develop an effective process leading to the resolution's implementation."

We venture to think that UNTAG, if allowed to function as intended when it was conceived, could provide an effective response to that challenge and create the material conditions that would allow resolution 435 (1978) to be smoothly implemented. The Council must therefore, we urge, preserve the idea and quickly translate it into reality.

It is now 21 years since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated by the United Nations. A whole generation of Namibians has come of age not knowing what peace is. Is it to be condemned in perpetuity to a life of humiliating serfdom? Furthermore, how can we profess here at the United Nations a concern for women, youth, the aged, the disabled and all such groups unless we can also assure the people of Namibia of a safe and secure future? In echoing here the cries of the Namibia people for the right to freedom and self-determination, my delegation

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

finds renewed courage to carry the struggle forward. We therefore urge the Council to do whatever it must to dislodge the oppressive minority régime in Pretoria from its illegal occupation of Namibia. Let there be no hesitation, therefore, in the adoption and urgent implementation of the draft resolution before the Council.

It is my delegation's hope that the next time we have cause to come before the Council on this matter, we shall be able, if not to celebrate Namibia's independence, at least to feel that freedom is not far off and that the Council's purposes are not in vain.

This debate is taking place, significantly enough, during the Week of Solidarity with the suffering people of that Territory declared by the Council of Namibia. Speeches and statements have, with abundant and suitable rhetoric, attempted to demonstrate the sympathy and support which the international community has for the Namibian cause. However, as we have determined, words will not suffice to convince an oppressed people that they are not alone in their struggle.

The Security Council must therefore now go beyond rhetoric to assist Namibia in the practical ways suggested in the draft resolution before us to defend and free itself from ruthless domination by South Africa.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Guyana for his kind words.

The next speaker is Mr. Jai Pratap Rana, Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. RANA (Nepal), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid: Allow me at the outset to express my appreciation to you, Sir, and through you to other members of the Security Council, for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the agenda item now under consideration by the Council. At the same time, I should like to extend the warm felicitations of the Special Committee to you on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October and to express our confidence that you will, as usual, guide the deliberations of the Council with wisdom and skill. May I also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana for his active and constructive role as President of the Security Council last month.

On 7 April 1987, when the Council met in urgent session to consider the question of Namibia, the Special Committee against Apartheid drew the attention of the international community to the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory of Namibia. During that debate the Special Committee against Apartheid, along with the majority of speakers, emphasized that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should be the basis for bringing about the speedy and long-overdue independence of Namibia. However, this was not possible due to the negative votes cast by two permanent members of the Council. The failure of the Council to implement its own resolution has not only emboldened the apartheid régime of Pretoria to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibia, but has also helped it to carry out, with impunity, acts of oppression and exploitation of the people and resources of that Territory.

Furthermore, the Pretoria régime is today intensifying its ruthless repression of its majority and is actively pursuing a policy of aggression and destabilization against independent neighbouring African States. Clearly such an unacceptable

(Mr. Rana, Acting Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

state of affairs cannot continue without seriously undermining the principles and credibility of the United Nations.

The Special Committee has therefore asked to speak today as much to express its deep concern over the deteriorating and dangerous situation in Namibia and southern Africa as to reiterate its support for and solidarity with the heroic people of Namibia who, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative, are today continuing their fight for freedom and dignity.

While highly appreciating the Secretary-General's initiatives and those of his Special Representative for Namibia to find ways of expediting implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the Special Committee strongly condemns the apartheid régime's insistence on linking Namibia's independence with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, an issue which is irrelevant and extraneous to the independence plan. It remains imperative for the international community to resolve this impediment to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Likewise, the Special Committee considers any established so-called interim administration in Namibia to be illegal and contrary to relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

The intransigence, duplicity and bad faith displayed by the racist régime to prevent the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia only prolongs and aggravates the conflict in southern Africa and the suffering of the people living in that area, thereby denying to a whole generation the right to live in dignity, peace and security. Therefore, the Special Committee urges the Council immediately to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations as the most appropriate and

(Mr. Rana, Acting Chairman,
Special Committee against
Apartheid)

effective peaceful means of forcing South Africa to terminate apartheid and its illegal occupation of Namibia. In this connection, the Special Committee endorses the proposal made by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia that the Security Council decide on arrangements for a cease-fire and the deployment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in conformity with its resolution 435 (1978).

In conclusion, the Special Committee takes this opportunity to commend the people of South Africa and Namibia for their heroic struggle against apartheid, illegal occupation, repression and terror and to reaffirm its support for their right to self-determination and liberation.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf I wish warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. I am proud to recall that your country, Italy, was one of the first in Europe to establish diplomatic relations with Ghana, soon after our attainment of independence from colonial rule in 1957. Since then co-operation between the two countries, particularly in the economic field, has widened and deepened, no doubt to our mutual benefit. We have confidence therefore in your leadership as we again debate the vexed question of the situation in Namibia.

I should also like, with your kind permission, to place on record my sincere gratitude for the kind words expressed to me by several delegations on the conduct of Ghana's presidency for the month of September. Without the genuine support of all Member States without exception our task would have been very difficult to carry out.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Member States of the African Group at the United Nations requested the Council to meet urgently in order to consider the situation in the Territory of Namibia. In the words of the Chairman and spokesman of the Group, Mr. Rabetafika, Permanent Representative of Madagascar, the action has been taken

"to express the concern of the Group not only at the tragic plight of the Namibian people, the victim of one of the most brutal and cruel forms of colonial exploitation, but also at the chronic inaction of the Security Council with regard to the question of Namibia, which remains a special responsibility of the United Nations and, in fact, of the international community in general". (S/PV.2755, p. 8)

The Group's perception of the Council is of course based on the fact that numerous resolutions have been adopted in the past only to be contemptuously set aside by South Africa without an appropriate response from the Council. Indeed, resolution 566 (1985), inter alia, strongly warned South Africa to co-operate in ensuring the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) or else the Council would be obliged to take appropriate measures under the Charter, including action under Chapter VII thereof.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

That warning, predictably, has been rejected by South Africa and the Council has yet to take action as it promised it would.

Members of the Council will recall that in November 1985 and again in April 1987 the question of Namibia was thoroughly debated in the Council, but the request to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the relevant provision of the Charter was frustrated by the negative votes of some permanent members. In what way, therefore, is the current debate warranted and how should it differ from previous ones?

The Ghana delegation is of the view that the situation in Namibia today is so threatening to life, property and international peace and security as to warrant this urgent meeting of the Council. Furthermore, the African Group and other members of the Non-Aligned Movement have chosen to request the Council to complete action mandated in resolution 435 (1978), adopted nine years ago: that is, to seek a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as a first step in the events leading towards the establishment of a United Nations transition assistance group in the Territory.

Since last April, when the Security Council considered the issue of Namibia, the racist régime has, true to form, continued its systematic repression and brutal treatment of the people of that Territory. Homesteads have been raided and scores of people arrested and detained. In short, there has been a steady worsening of the situation in the Territory, which South Africa continues to occupy illegally.

In his testimony before the Fourth Committee on 9 October 1987 the spokesman of a Namibian-based non-governmental organization, the Lutheran World Federation, gave several examples of the conduct of South Africa in the Territory. Allow me to

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

quote but a few illustrations of South Africa's continued harassment of Namibians:

"(a) In April 1987, at least 13 schools were bombed or set on fire in Northern Namibia. Also bombed and burned was the Lutheran Clinic at Onheneliwas, as well as the state school offices next door. Eye-witnesses reported seeing uniformed members of the South African Defence Force in the vicinity;

"(b) On Sunday, September 20, 1987, the Roman Catholic Church at Omulukila in Northern Namibia was fire-bombed. The South African military blamed the attack on SWAPO but the Roman Catholic Church authorities said they did not believe that SWAPO was responsible. This Church was built about ten years ago with the aid of West German funds;

"(c) On April 23, 1987, 65 year-old Lutheran Pastor Frederick Nghihalwa, from Ohalushu, in Northern Namibia, was dragged from his office in the afternoon by South African soldiers, beaten unconscious, and then driven in a truck several miles into the bush. He was released at two in the morning. He died in hospital on July 22 as a result of the assault;

"(d) On March 17, 1987, security forces abducted Nathaniel Shikongo from the Lutheran Hospital at Onandjokwe shortly after his admission. He was waiting for an X-ray of his leg, broken and wounded by a bullet. He has not been seen since;

"(e) The Principal of the Lutheran Oshigambo High School, Timoteus Ndakunda, and his wife, Ndahafa, were detained by South African soldiers on March 14, 1987. They were brought from the school to a nearby military base, where they were chained to the fence for the night, apparently as hostages against a possible attack by SWAPO guerrillas;

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

"(f) On July 14, 1987, South African troops invaded Lutheran church grounds at Berseba in the South of Namibia and with tear gas, rubber bullets, and sjamboks dispersed a peaceful gathering of 300 parents and students who had come to celebrate the opening worship service for a new secondary school. A Roman Catholic priest and a Lutheran teacher were among those seriously hurt in the police action; and

"(g) On August 18, 1987, the offices and homes of student organizations, SWAPO, and union officials in Namibia were raided in cities and towns throughout the country. Five internal leaders of SWAPO were arrested under the Terrorism Act. This was the subject of a protest by the United Nations Security Council. On September 11, in a courageous and unprecedented ruling, Judge Ken Buthume of the Supreme Court of South West Africa ordered the release of those five detainees, plus two others being held under the Terrorism Act. He said that the Terrorism Act was 'draconian' and that the arresting officers had not acted in strict compliance with the Act. The State will appeal."

Of course, in recounting this array of acts of brutality testified to by the report of the Secretary-General, by Governments, and by non-governmental organizations and other humanitarian groups all over the world, we are not unmindful that the violence of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia in its manifold aspects has become for some the normal order of business in that Territory, at best to be profited from, at worst to be tolerated and checked with rebuke and an ongoing "constructive" parley.

Human sensibilities are often blunted by the repetition of ills. Even the worst forms of brutality in Namibia replicated with frequency on a massive scale over several decades are apt to make of each new act of violent repression just one

(Mr. Gbehò, Ghana)

more incident to be philosophically endured as the price for political and economic engagement. And yet Namibians, because of the humanity that they share with the rest of us, even including the South Africans who oppress them, are expected to be protected by the Charter by international law and by the Security Council. So let members of the Council agree that violence and brutality are unacceptable, especially when used by an illegal power against a defenceless colonial people.

It is necessary for the Security Council, therefore, to bring to book the illegality and violence of South Africa's occupation of Namibia as often as it must, so as to implement its own solemn decisions in resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 566 (1985), decisions which, in their scope, authorize the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with racist South Africa to resolve outstanding issues envisaged within the purview of resolution 435 (1978) towards its speedy implementation.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Acting on that mandate, the Secretary-General reported to the Council on 31 March 1987 that:

"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)

It is that conclusion of the Secretary-General that provides the basis for the Security Council to take the requisite steps to put into place the preliminary machinery anticipated in resolution 435 (1978). The steps envisaged by operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution are logical in the scheme measures required to implement that resolution. No doubt the cease-fire and emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) are actions predicated on the willingness of Pretoria, as well as on the willingness of the legitimate representatives of the Namibian people, to engage in negotiations and to co-operate with the Secretary-General. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for its part, has in this spirit indicated its readiness to fulfil its obligations.

But what of the other party? Consistent with its history of equivocation, it continues to hold out on the pretext of requiring the resolutions of certain elements, namely the withdrawal of Cuban troops from sovereign Angola, as the basis for its future compliance with the Security Council-mandated plan for the independence of Namibia, an issue not only within the sovereign competence of Angola and Cuba but also a matter over which the Security Council has no competence or jurisdiction. Indeed, the Council has rightly declared this issue to be irrelevant and extraneous to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

Herein lies an interesting paradox: South Africa is seeking to perpetuate its illegal administration and occupation of Namibia by an invalid proposition which is vitiated as of no effect and consequence in its essence by the terms of

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

resolution 435 (1978). By its insistence on this pre-condition South Africa is flouting the authority of the Council and failing to comply with the Council's decisions. Because of an interesting, if not cynical, play of forces, the Council is hamstrung in its effort to bring South Africa to book by the negative votes of some member States. It cannot therefore implement its own decisions. Meanwhile, by reason of this default, the Security Council is in practice held hostage to the concept of linkage, which it has repeatedly rejected. If the Council must redeem its promise and reputation in the matter, then those whose negative votes give succour to illegality must strive, in the name of principle and international morality, to move in support of the Council and not South Africa at all cost.

The time has come for the Council to show unity and purpose in face of South Africa's contempt for the Council. This judgement of South Africa's conduct in the matter is no speculation, because members of the Council themselves heard the representative of that country state yesterday, on 29 October 1987, its insistence on linkage and, therefore, its intention to ignore once again the Council's rejection of that theory. Indeed, that representative even implied that the Council's stand is because it is blinded by rhetoric and propaganda.

Having listened to the representative of South Africa's gratuitous and self-righteous statement, we are convinced that no one can be fooled by South Africa. It is simply obsessed with Angola because its ward, UNITA, does not run that country. Its hatred for the legitimate Government of Angola and its disproportionate dissertation on the present economy of Angola were a deliberate attempt to shift the focus of our debate. Well, South Africa has said its piece, and it is up to the Council to show the world, and especially Namibians, that it is capable of upholding the principles and purposes of the Charter and that it can defend right from the evil machinations of wrong.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It is to achieve this objective that the Ghana delegation has joined our other Council colleagues of the Non-Aligned Movement in submitting the draft resolution now before us. It offers the Security Council an opportunity to reclaim a measure of coherence and authority by mandating the taking of concrete steps towards the implementation of the objective stated in operative paragraph 2 of resolution 435 (1978), namely, that

"the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration from Namibia and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976)".

In that sense the present meeting of the Security Council is a historic one, and my delegation fervently hopes that the draft resolution can be adopted with the affirmative vote of all members of the Council. It would send a clear message to Pretoria that the Council will no longer underwrite illegality and equivocation on an issue on which it requires no new lessons.

The people of the international Territory of Namibia, a Territory held in sacred trust by the United Nations, bleed in anguish and unending torment. It is the hope of the Ghana delegation that a unanimous decision on the draft resolution will give this sacred trust, so long trampled upon, a new vitality and meaning.

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

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): Sir, let me express the sincere congratulations of the United States delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Your statesmanship and broad vision are well known to all. I also wish to express our sincere appreciation to last month's President, Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, for his extraordinary contribution to the work of the Council.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

The United States welcomes this debate on Namibia. In the nearly seven months since the last meeting of the Security Council on this question much has happened, and I am pleased to be able to bring members up to date on recent efforts to resolve this long-standing international problem.

Let me make my country's position absolutely clear from the outset. The issue that we are facing today stems from the fact that the Republic of South Africa is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia. South Africa has no right to be in Namibia, no right to control the internal and external policies of that country and no right to use it as a staging area from which to violate the borders of neighbouring States.

Since 1978 the United States has fully supported, and has actively sought, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) for the independence of Namibia. The United States is currently actively involved in negotiations to achieve this goal.

Great progress has been made in clarifying the procedural technicalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978) inside Namibia. Election timetables have been established, basic political freedoms for all Namibians are guaranteed, a constitutional and security framework for a future independent Government have been outlined and United Nations supervision to ensure an orderly transition has been agreed upon.

(Mr. Okun, United States)

The United States takes a measure of pride in having been part of the successful efforts of the front-line States, the United Nations, the contact group and the parties on the ground in arriving at a successful framework for the future of an independent Namibia.

The international pre-conditions for an agreement, however, remain to be achieved. Without a settlement that addresses the security concerns of both Angola and South Africa, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) will not in fact be achieved. The South Africans, in particular, have made clear that they will not relinquish their hold over Namibia until the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is addressed. The Angolans, in turn, have made it clear that they will not consider their borders secure until the South African presence in Namibia is a thing of the past.

All parties to the Namibian conflict acknowledge that a meaningful and lasting agreement on Namibia's future can be achieved only if the security concerns of both principal outside parties involved are addressed. Angola and South Africa have also supported our role as mediator in the efforts to reach a settlement.

Previous resolutions ignore the fact that the parties to the conflict in Namibia recognize the hard political realities of the region and the possibility of further prolonged stalemate, and are therefore willing to work towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in the context of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and of South African troops from Namibia.

Securing the withdrawal of foreign forces from the region so that resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented remains the objective of the United States in its negotiations with the Governments of Angola and South Africa. Since April of this year, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Crocker has met with Angolan Government representatives four times in an effort to accelerate the negotiations

(Mr. Okun, United States)

towards a successful conclusion. Recent discussions have been serious, detailed and business-like. They have helped to clarify what steps must be taken for an agreement to be reached, an agreement that is acceptable to all sides in the conflict.

United States-Angolan contacts are continuing. The United States remains committed to achieving a settlement of the Namibia problem that will protect the security interests of Angola as well as of other parties involved, and that brings independence to the long-subjugated people of Namibia.

It is in this context that the United States wishes to address the draft resolution before the Security Council. We share the expressed goal of achieving the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We also share the continued concern at South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. We support, as has been established through the lengthy negotiations on the technicalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978), a cease-fire prior to the date of implementation, and the emplacement of the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG). We welcome the constructive role played by the Secretary-General and the Secretariat in the search for a solution to the Namibia question.

None the less, we think it is unrealistic and inappropriate for the Council to ask the Secretary-General to proceed to the final procedural steps - on which all parties are agreed in principle - prior to the establishment of an agreed political settlement; and we do not believe the Council would add to its credibility by calling on him to do so. For those reasons, the United States will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution now before the Council. Negotiations on a settlement continue and we sincerely hope they will bear fruit.

In closing, let me note the request made by Mr. Kozonguizi of the so-called transitional government of Namibia that he be permitted to participate in the

(Mr. Okun, United States)

Council's deliberations as representative of the parties comprising the Multi-Party Conference. As the Council knows, the United States believes that it is important for this Council to maintain studious impartiality and that therefore a request by a person who might have legitimate contributions to make to the debate should be granted consideration regardless of political affiliation. As in the Council's April deliberations, however, this latest request comes in the guise of entities that form the transitional government of national unity of Namibia - a body whose existence has been declared null and void by this Council. My delegation therefore does not believe that the Council is obliged to consider favourably Mr. Kozonguizi's request as presented.

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

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

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): Allow me to extend my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October and for guiding its work during this month with such distinction and success. Your great experience and diplomatic skills give us cause to feel confident that the issues before the Security Council, and in particular the question of Namibia which is the subject of this debate, will receive the attention and guidance they most deserve.

Allow me also to convey, through you, our profound gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador James Victor Gbeho, for his outstanding leadership of the Security Council during the last month.

May I also avail myself of this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for the great efforts and energies

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

he has devoted to carrying out the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council of ending the illegal occupation of Namibia and hastening the achievement of its overdue independence.

The question of Namibia has been debated by the Security Council for more than 20 years and a total of 19 resolutions have so far been adopted on this issue - not to speak of those which have been vetoed. It is a matter of great concern to the international community that the Pretoria régime has treated the Security Council resolutions with contumely and has continued with impunity its policies of oppression, racist domination, violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and repeated aggression against neighbouring States, in pursuit of its objective of perpetuating its illegal and racist stranglehold over a proud and unconquerable people. The suppression of Namibian independence has entailed heavy loss of life and incalculable damage to property inside Namibia and political and economic destabilization in the neighbouring States.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) lays the internationally accepted basis for the independence of Namibia. It is incumbent upon the Security Council to assert its leadership and take the necessary measures to enforce its authority and ensure the implementation of the plan, which envisages the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. No excuse or diversionary tactics by Pretoria should be allowed to impede the implementation of the plan.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

It is an established fact that it is only South Africa's defiance of the international community's will that stands in the way of Namibian independence. We all know that in December 1983 the Secretary-General informed the Security Council that all major outstanding issues under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved. The Secretary-General reiterated this assurance in his report to the Security Council in 1986 in which he said once again that all the conditions for implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia as laid down by the Security Council had been met, but, nevertheless, the right of self-determination was being unjustly denied to Namibia because of the illegal perpetuation of control by South Africa, which continued to insist on inadmissible extraneous linkages.

In his latest report on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia, the Secretary-General informs us of his total rejection of the linkage pre-condition and his call for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay. The Secretary-General concludes his report by saying that

"successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the placement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Arica's insistence on the linkage pre-condition."

(S/19234, para. 25)

Nevertheless, the Secretary-General remains convinced that concerted action by the international community can ensure the achievement of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia, as is their right.

The continued efforts of the Security Council to pave the way for the earliest achievement of independence by Namibia were greatly reinforced by the convening of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia early this

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

month in New York. The meeting was held as an expression of the serious concern of the members at the continuing defiance by the South African régime of the will of the international community and the denial of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

The Security Council is obliged to heed the appeal addressed to it by the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia that the time has come for the Security Council's own decision on Namibia to be implemented. Indeed, this urgent meeting of the Security Council has been convened as a result of the transmission of this very appeal to the Security Council by the African Group.

It is our hope that the Security Council will fulfil our expectations in this respect by unanimously adopting the draft resolution before it, which is balanced and non-controversial in every respect. It has been introduced by the non-aligned members of the Security Council in order to authorize the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has already expressed its readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa to facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The cause of freedom in Africa and the welfare and well-being of the people of Africa are very close to the hearts of the people of Pakistan. Emerging as a nation by the exercise of the right to self-determination, we have never forgotten the circumstances of our birth and the acclaim with which the peoples of Africa, then under colonial rule, received the new sovereign State. True to our origins, we have been most consistent and active in promoting the process of freedom from colonial rule in the continent of Africa. We shall continue to do so until the last vestige of colonialism is removed from Namibia. We salute the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the people of

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Namibia, under whose leadership the freedom movement in Namibia has matured and Namibia is poised to take its place among the sovereign, independent States of the great continent of Africa.

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

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

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I should like, first of all, Sir, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the most important organ of the United Nations. We are confident that under your guidance the work of the Council will be conducted efficiently and effectively. At the same time, we should like to express our sincere appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Victor Gbeho of Ghana, for his able presidency over this body in the month of September.

In a few days the question of Namibia will be debated in the plenary session of the General Assembly. The fact that the Security Council is seized of the same question at this stage is indicative, we believe, of the seriousness and urgency with which we must deal with this issue.

The independence of Namibia is long overdue, despite the overwhelming support it receives from the international community. Since 1966, when South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted countless resolutions and decisions affirming and reaffirming the legitimate and inalienable right of the people of Namibia to independence and national sovereignty.

It is regrettable that South Africa has found it possible to ignore the will of the international community with impunity. It is regrettable that for decades

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

solemn resolutions of the United Nations dealing with such an important issue as the decolonization of Namibia have remained unimplemented. This represents a basic weakness in the United Nations system and we can only hope that the question of the non-implementation of United Nations resolutions and decisions will be taken up for consideration in the context of our efforts to strengthen this Organization.

On 27 October we observed the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). On that occasion, in his message delivered to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, reiterated the support of the Government and people of Cyprus for the struggle of the Namibian people for the realization of their inalienable rights. The message of the President, inter alia, rejected

"any attempt to link any other issue with a settlement of the problem in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We therefore call for the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), including a cease-fire."

Also, a few weeks ago, on 2 October, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a special ministerial meeting during which member States had the opportunity to express their support for the just struggle of the Namibian people and to call for the implementation without further delay of United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia.

All this activity in the context of the Forty-second session of the General Assembly leaves no doubt that the question of Namibia is at the forefront of the agenda of the international community. At the same time, we cannot but realize the urgency with which we must face this problem.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

We believe that there can be no further delay in proceeding with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which forms the universally accepted basis for a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia. The human suffering in Namibia resulting from the suppressive and racist policies of the South African régime brooks no further delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

The position of the Non-Aligned Movement on this matter, reaffirmed only a few weeks ago at the Ministerial Meeting of the Movement held at United Nations Headquarters between 5 and 7 October, is clear and unequivocal. At that Meeting

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation reaffirmed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence within an untruncated territory, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all adjacent offshore islands, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. They stressed that it was legitimate for the Namibian people to use all available means, including armed struggle, in their quest for the realization of this right, and requested all States to render increased political, diplomatic, military, financial and material support to the legitimate and heroic armed struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic and legitimate representative.

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation reiterated their support for the Secretary-General in his efforts regarding the settlement of the Namibian question and urged him to begin implementing United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any further delay."

Cyprus, as a non-aligned country and as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, fully subscribes to the position of the Non-Aligned Movement on this

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

matter. Responsibility for the stalemate we are witnessing in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) lies solely with the South African régime, and our responsibility is to ensure the full compliance by that régime with United Nations resolutions.

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

The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Let me at the outset convey my congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for the month of October. We regard your country, Italy, as a friend in our struggle for justice and freedom in southern Africa. We are therefore confident that with your rich diplomatic skills and wide-ranging experience the Council will be guided to a successful conclusion of its deliberations. Allow me also to express the appreciation of my delegation to your predecessor, our brother the distinguished son of Africa Ambassador Gbeho of Ghana, for the able and skilful manner in which he handled the affairs of the Council last month.

It is often said that "world history is the world's court". If that be the case, I wonder what the future historians, those jurists of tomorrow, will have to say of us, of the United Nations and indeed of our contemporary world when our actions or inactions with regard to the plight of the Namibian people - their struggle for freedom and independence - are brought before them. I wonder too what they will say of the great nations of today, which, having reached the dizzy heights of modern technological civilization, found themselves impotent in the face

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

of a barbaric racist régime, a mutant from yesteryear, that flouted every norm of civilized behaviour. Will they not wonder why these great nations which overcame ideological differences and united to fight the racist doctrine of nazism in the Second World War found their will to act sapped when a similar crime against humanity in the form of the racist doctrine of apartheid was committed against the people of Namibia and South Africa? What could have immobilized these nations? What indeed makes many of us so reasonable and cerebral about the suffering in Namibia and South Africa? "Let us not be emotional," we are counselled. "We should be rational. The situation in southern Africa is very complicated. It requires patience and persuasion." In another era such voices were accused of appeasement and collusion. Yet on the question of apartheid they are said to be wise, moderate, balanced and realistic voices. Why this difference? Could it be that the hue of the victim's skin has something to do with our hesitancy and prevarication, our reasonableness and moderation? If it were so, it would be a grievous fault, and grievously shall we answer to the court of history.

Yesterday the Council listened to the usual charade of half-truths, untruths and complete falsehoods from Pretoria's representative. Some of these have been ably exposed by my colleagues the representatives of Angola, Botswana and Ghana. I just want to expose one of them in particular, to make the point of how such falsehoods might occasionally escape an unwary listener.

In his statement Pretoria's representative said:

"An examination of the record of the Namibian issue during the past 40 years shows that South Africa has consistently sought the peaceful resolution of this problem". (S/PV.2757, p. 21)

That seems harmless enough. But the truth, as everyone knows, is that for much of the past 40 years South Africa has been trying to bring Namibia, first,

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

into the Union and, later, into the Republic of South Africa. To demonstrate to the Council the so-called consistency of South Africa in peacefully solving the Namibian problem, let me quote from a statement made before the South African Parliament on 17 February 1949 by Prime Minister D. R. Malan of South Africa in connection with Namibia:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"We shall place South West Africa in a position where it will be invulnerable against any type of propaganda and incitement. Knit South West Africa and the Union in such a manner, knit them together constitutionally in such a way that the two areas will be in future inseparably bound together. In order to achieve this, let us make use of the unquestionable right which South Africa possesses, the right which South Africa also possessed when the Mandate was still in existence and the principle in regard to the Mandate had not yet disappeared, and bring about a position of closer affiliation of the two territories, the Union and South West Africa, even if, at least for the present, we do not go so far as the ultimate limit of incorporating South West Africa into the Union. Even if we do not go to that limit of incorporating South West Africa into our country, we can still knit South West Africa and the Union so closely together constitutionally that they can never again be separated."

Consistently peaceful about the future of Namibia? South Africa's sense of peacefulness is the killing of Namibia's independence for ever. This statement is full of such half-truths and falsehoods. We have heard that Angola's Government is militaristic. Well, all the Angolan Government's troops are in Angola. It is the South African Government which has its troops in Angola. It is South Africa which is militaristic, not Angola. And so it goes on and on, all a tissue of lies.

The history of the international community's involvement in the issue of Namibia is well known. We do not need the South African representative to warn the Council against what he calls being blinded by rhetoric and propaganda. It is he who has been guilty of rhetoric and propaganda, not anyone else.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The decision of the United Nations in 1966 to assume formal responsibility for and authority over the Territory of Namibia was a milestone on that Territory's long and arduous road to freedom and independence. Equally significant was the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978) endorsing an internationally agreed plan to bring Namibia to independence. These actions by the United Nations brought hope to the Namibian people, who for years had suffered under German colonialism and subsequently Pretoria's racist occupation. But, regrettably, all these hopes have come to naught.

Over 20 years have passed since the United Nations assumed authority over Namibia, and it is now nearly 10 years since a plan for Namibian independence was adopted. Yet the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence remains unfulfilled. Over 100,000 South African troops occupy that Territory of less than a million inhabitants. And Pretoria is doing all in its power to consolidate its illegal stranglehold on the Territory. Those who dare to oppose the racist régime's schemes are incarcerated in detention camps. Reports from Namibia speak of gangs of the notorious South African special death squads, known as Koivet, armed with pick handles, knives, machetes and iron bars, roaming th countryside, committing acts of terrorism against innocent civilians, assaulting and raping women and children. Despite the blackout of news and information imposed by the racist régime, fresh reports of Pretoria's acts of brutality and murder filter daily to the international community. For this we have to thank the various church organizations, human rights bodies and other non-governmental organizations, some of whose reports we have just heard this afternoon.

The tragedy of Namibia lies in the fact that all this is occurring in spite of the existence of an internationally negotiated framework in the form of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This resolution was adopted by a consensus of all

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

the members of the international community, including South Africa. It provides for the holding of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control. But before this can take place a cease-fire must be signed by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa. After that, the Security Council will pass an enabling resolution for the arrival of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to administer the transition.

Since 1978, the Secretary-General, against odds, has made valiant efforts to clear the way for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But to date Namibia is still occupied and still not free. The blame for the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978) must, first and foremost, be squarely placed at the door of the apartheid régime. Pretoria's intransigence on the Namibian question is well known to all. It was South Africa that torpedoed the so-called high level simultaneous consultations held in Geneva in 1979. It was Pretoria that sabotaged the so-called pre-implementation talks held in Geneva in 1981. It is the same apartheid régime that now seeks to impose an internal administration on the Namibian people in a futile attempt to circumvent the internationally agreed plan for Namibia. And it is the same racist régime that now holds Namibia hostage to extraneous and irrelevant issues through the so-called linkage pre-condition. Yes, Pretoria is the principal culprit in this saga.

But we would be less than candid if we said that the apartheid régime is acting alone on this issue. [Unfortunately, the racists have their accomplices in this sordid affair. Linkage, as a pre-condition, did not exist in 1978 when the United Nations plan for Namibia was born. It did not exist in 1980. Then, South Africa had no security concerns involving Cuban internationalist troops. These so-called concerns were foisted on South Africa from outside. They were

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

concocted in 1982 and adopted the same year by South Africa. The origins of linkage are in Washington. South Africa only co-opted linkage as a convenient pretext for delaying Namibia's independence. Washington bears a heavy responsibility in this matter.] The Secretary-General, in his report dated 31 March 1987, states:

"This linkage pre-condition, which dates back to 1982, now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia."

(S/18767, para.32)

We want the United States, as the originator of linkage, to be left in no doubt as to the strength of feeling of the international community on this matter. We regard linkage as heartless and immoral. It is extraneous and irrelevant to Namibia's right to freedom and independence.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We have said before, and we say it again here, that Namibian independence is being held hostage to the linkage pre-condition. It is a mere pawn on an international chess board. This the Foreign Minister of Zimbabwe has previously characterized as blackmail and hostage-taking, a practice we deprecate, irrespective of its victims or perpetrators. We recall that the Security Council in resolution 539 (1983) has itself categorically rejected the so-called linkage as irrelevant to the plan for Namibia.

Furthermore, those who have given solace to the apartheid régime through their negative votes in the Council are equally guilty in delaying Namibian independence. We hold them responsible.

As on past occasions, we have been told that there are secret negotiations under way that have a bearing on our meetings here and the draft resolution before the Council. The truth is that we have heard this line before. That argument is now threadbare. We have rejected, and continue to reject, these bilateral negotiations as irrelevant to Namibian independence. I submit that the time has long passed for the Council to continue to allow itself to be put off by such irrelevant issues before assuming its responsibilities on the question of Namibia. The time for the Council to act is now, because all the relevant elements are already in place.

In November 1985, the Secretary-General reported to the Council in March this year,

"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)

Nearly two years have now elapsed since, as the Secretary-General reported, all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations plan were resolved. The

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

question we have for the Council is this: If all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations plan for Namibia have been resolved, why has resolution 435 (1978) not been implemented? By not proceeding with implementation, when all the relevant issues have been resolved, the Council runs the risk of being misunderstood, for it would appear as if the Council as a whole, through its inaction, now condones the surreptitious introduction of extraneous issues.

The Council has an obligation to proceed with the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We therefore urge it to adopt the draft resolution in order to trigger the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) before the end of this year. That is the least the Council can do. To tarry any longer can only mar and tarnish its image. We have waited too long for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. Further delay is intolerable. The unanimous adoption of the draft resolution before the Council is crucial, not only for the sake of the people of Namibia, but, more important, in order to redeem the honour of the United Nations and in particular that of the Council.

Let the Council make it clear to South Africa that should it continue to obstruct Namibia's independence the Council will have no alternative but to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter in order to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime. The Council has recently demonstrated commendable resolution in the Gulf war. It is honour-bound to show similar conviction in fighting racism and occupation in Namibia. The situation in Namibia is no less serious. It spells grave danger to the stability of southern Africa. It threatens world peace and security. We hope the countries which constitute this important body, charged with the responsibility for the maintenance of world peace and security, will not be found wanting on this issue.

In the meantime, the international community should increase its diplomatic, material and moral support for the people of Namibia through their legitimate

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

representative SWAPO in order to enable them to intensify their struggle for independence. We in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have pledged ourselves to support the liberation movements of southern Africa and the front-line States through the Movement's Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund. We thank all those countries which have already generously contributed to the Fund and appeal to others which have not yet done so to join in this noble cause.

In my opening remarks, I referred to the saying that "World history is the world's court". I should like to end with it. The way in which we are judged tomorrow depends on our actions or inaction of today. Here, I submit, what is at stake in our deliberations on the question of Namibia is more than the independence of that Territory. What is at stake is the very authority and credibility of our Organization, the United Nations, particularly of the Security Council, the body empowered by the Charter to maintain peace and security. Has the Security Council the political will to uphold its authority and credibility in the face of a régime that has flouted every semblance of civilized behaviour? Or shall it be said of it in future that the great nations of the twentieth century, whose technological advances conquered the skies above and which prided themselves on enjoying the most advanced technological standards ever achieved by man, were found to be too feeble to act to restore the most fundamental right of a people - the right to self-determination? This is the challenge before this world body.

Finally, let us not forget that the question of Namibia is not just about self-determination. It is also about apartheid and racism. As that famous African-American scholar and author, William Edward Burghardt Du Bois, stated early this century, the great question of the twentieth century is the problem of the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

colour line. In Namibia and South Africa we all come face to face with that great question. For that reason the Council bears a heavy responsibility on our behalf in the judgement of history

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

Mr. Peter Dingi Zuze, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at its 2,755th meeting, wishes to make a further statement, and I now call on him.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I thank you for once more calling on me, Mr. President. As our debate on the question of Namibia comes to a close, may I also take this opportunity to thank you personally for the efficient manner in which you have guided our deliberations. We have all benefited from your wisdom and experience.

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council
for Namibia)

A review of the statements made during these proceedings reveals a common element. All who spoke have accepted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only basis for an internationally recognized settlement of the Namibian question. There is also unanimity with regard to the essentials relating to the implementation of the plan. Such unanimity of views is also reflected in the assessment of how the implementation of the plan has been hindered by issues that are irrelevant and alien to the plan itself.

The main obstacle standing in the way of the independence of Namibia remains the refusal of the Pretoria régime to abide by the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. The attitude of that régime towards the United Nations has been characterized at every turn by contempt, duplicity, bad faith and intransigence. This has been clearly established in the history of the negotiations on the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of that Territory.

The Pretoria régime's continuing illegal occupation of the Territory, its plunder of the natural and human resources of Namibia and the flagrant and massive violations of human rights perpetrated by its troops in the Territory constitute a challenge to the world community, specifically to the Security Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Council for Namibia has an abiding concern about how South Africa's attitudes undermine the authority and prestige of the United Nations and of the Council itself as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence. Our concern is wider and deeper since resolution 435 (1978) represents the only internationally accepted framework for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) was significant not least for

(Mr. Zuze, President, Council
for Namibia)

the fact that it was introduced to and negotiated before the Security Council by five Western States which maintain close ties with South Africa.

The draft resolution before the Security Council constitutes a renewed and determined effort to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) so that the people of Namibia will be able to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence without further delay. It is a matter of grave concern that, despite protracted and tireless efforts by the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia, the Territory remains illegally occupied by racist South Africa, which continues to launch armed attacks against the front-line States from Namibian territory.

It is indeed imperative to underscore the gravity of the lack of progress on the Namibian question. Two and a half years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985) reaffirming its rejection of South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to such extraneous issues as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. Since then, we have come no closer to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

In contrast to the intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has once again expressed its readiness to sign a cease-fire leading to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). As a Council, we commend SWAPO for its statesmanship and positive attitude.

The Council for Namibia calls upon all States to restore the central role that the United Nations should play in ensuring Namibia's independence and to support the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution before the Security Council.

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

I call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. OKUN (United States of America): United States policy was hard to recognize amidst the distortions of the representative of Zimbabwe. He well knows that our policy favours the earliest independence for Namibia. As a matter of reality, however, until there is agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban troops in Angola, troops who are fighting not South Africans but other Angolans, it will not be possible to implement the United Nations independence plan for Namibia.

It is truly hard to complain about the alleged irrelevance of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola when the Angolan plataforma itself, the plataforma of November 1984, specifically addressed that issue, although it did so inadequately in our view.

The United States desires peace in the region and speedy independence for Namibia. These desirable goals, however, will not be achieved through an unwillingness to face facts, however unpalatable they may be.

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

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): I just want to make one point, and one point alone, in response to the representative of the United States.

The representative of the United States said that the representative of Zimbabwe is guilty of distortion. I want to assure the representative of the United States that the representative of Zimbabwe is not guilty of distortion; it is the representative of the United States who is guilty of distortion. As far as Namibia's independence is concerned, and as far as the international community is concerned, the reality is that all the issues relevant to the people of Namibia - who used to be colonial subjects of Germany and are now the victims of apartheid - have been fulfilled. What we have tried to do this afternoon - and we have tried before and shall try again - is to say that the United States introduced a reality. I do not want to refer to the reality which was started at the time of Angolan independence, with the introduction of forces assisted by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) that wanted to topple the Government of Angola: that is a reality which is now over. But, having accepted that Angola was now fully independent, the United States resurrected its intervention in Angola in 1982 with the coming of the present Administration, and it is that reality which the United States wanted the international community to accept by force majeure, by Stinger missiles, and various other surreptitious interventions.

It is that reality that we refuse to accept. We refused to accept it in 1975; we were forced to take cognizance of it in 1982; but we shall continue to refuse it and the international community is right to continue to refuse it.

What Angola and the United States do is entirely their own affair, but the United States has no right, no moral right, to keep the people of Namibia victims to apartheid, to murder, rape and assassination. The United States has no right, for any reason, to do that. The Namibian people have a God-given right to be free. They should not be pawns on the table of an international chess game -

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

an immoral table. Are we meant to expect and accept that? No, we do not.

We would go further and say that if only God had been kind enough to make Mr. Gurirab white instead of black, he would not be the victim he is now. I thought I should clarify that.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia and contained in document S/19242. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now. There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Mr. KIKUCHI (Japan): I welcome this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. I am confident that, with the benefit of your wisdom and broad diplomatic experience, you will conduct - as indeed you have conducted - our deliberations in a most skilful and fruitful way.

I wish also to express our sincere gratitude to Ambassador James Victor Gbeho for the superb manner in which he guided the work of this Council as its President during the month of September.

Two decades ago, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Nevertheless, in defiance of world opinion, South Africa remains unmoved and continues its illegal occupation of the Territory. [Despite the ceaseless efforts of the international community, the Namibian people are still being denied their right to self-determination.]

Japan's position on this issue is firm and unequivocal: Namibia's independence must be achieved in accordance with the wishes of its inhabitants, as

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

expressed through free elections to be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Japan steadfastly supports Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which embodies the only universally acceptable framework for a peaceful transition to independence.

It is recalled that both the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have indicated their acceptance of the settlement plan endorsed by that resolution. But South Africa, while professing willingness to co-operate with the international community, has in fact been working to prevent implementation of the resolution. Its obstinate insistence on the linkage pre-condition is a case in point. By insisting on this particular point, South Africa has blocked:

"successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan".

(S/19234, para. 25)

Moreover, South Africa continues to mount armed attacks against neighbouring countries, destabilizing the situation throughout the region and making the possibility of settling the Namibian question even more remote. Japan is gravely concerned over the continuing deterioration of the situation in Namibia, and condemns in particular the arrest of five SWAPO leaders and the repressive measures South Africa has been taking against students and labour organization leaders since last August.

Japan has taken vigorous measures to urge South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and abandon its racist policy of apartheid. In demonstrating its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Japan refrains from any action that would in effect acknowledge the present status of Namibia.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

For example, the Government of Japan does not extend grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind to South Africans in Namibia. It prohibits direct investment in South Africa and Namibia by Japanese nationals or corporations under its jurisdiction.

Japan has long been extending assistance to the Namibian people through its contributions to the humanitarian and educational funds and programmes administered by the United Nations, including the United Nations Institute for Namibia. It will provide such assistance as long as the need continues.

When the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) comes into being, Japan is ready to provide assistance in the form of financial contributions and personnel. And once the independence of Namibia is achieved, Japan looks forward to extending bilateral economic and technical assistance for the nation-building of Namibia.

For these reasons, and also as an expression of its unqualified support for the cause of Namibian independence, Japan will vote in favour of the draft resolution now before us.

(Mr. Kikuchi, Japan)

Before concluding, I wish to state that the main thrust of the draft resolution before us is to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in preparation for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

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

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

This debate has shown the extent of the concerns which exist for the lack of progress towards the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia and an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian problem. It has shown the impatience of the international community for the achievement of such a solution. There was a striking unanimity in the views which were expressed in this regard by the overwhelming majority of the speakers who have preceded me.

My Government fully shares the concerns and impatience. The United Nations has a special and direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia and for the exercise by the people of that Territory of their fundamental right to self-determination, freedom and independence. The terms for the achievement of these goals were set out with the adoption of resolution 435 (1978). That resolution, which is the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition of Namibia to independence, endorsed a settlement plan which, we want to point out, was accepted by both the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Yet, 9 years later, Namibia is still under an illegal administration and no progress has been achieved towards the implementation of the United Nations plan.

On the contrary, the South African Government has adopted a number of measures that run counter to the requirements of the settlement plan and that Italy considers null and void. It has raised difficulties in order to create artificial

(The President)

obstacles to the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It insists on introducing extraneous elements in all discussions concerning the application of the settlement plan. The statement made yesterday in the debate by the representative of South Africa was a further example of that unwillingness.

The policy of the South African Government with regard to Namibia can only be explained by the existence in South Africa itself of the problem of apartheid. Apartheid is at the centre of all the problems of southern Africa, and the lack of progress in the solution of the question of Namibia seems clearly to be an external projection of the inability of the South African Government to resolve its domestic confrontation between the majority of its population and the ruling minority. This is a further reason for the United Nations to stand firm on its principled position, which has found its expression in resolution 435 (1978) and which is consistent with the past glorious record of the Organization in the field of decolonization. We must insist on these principles, which reflect the path of history and of realism that cannot be abandoned without serious prejudice for southern Africa as a whole and for all of us.

Italy is deeply concerned at the situation prevailing in Namibia and the prolongation of South Africa's illegal rule over the Territory in defiance of United Nations resolutions and the clear and expressed will of the international community. We strongly deplore the serious violations of human rights which occur in the Territory as a consequence of that illegal rule. We view with great preoccupation the destabilizing policies pursued by South Africa in the region, often using the territory of Namibia as a base for military actions against its neighbours.

Therefore, my Government is convinced that there is a need for greater harmonization of the efforts of the international community aimed at achieving an early transition of the Territory to independence on the basis of the United Nations

(The President)

plan. We believe that the unanimity of views that exists on the need for early progress towards the independence of Namibia and the existence of a universally accepted framework for such a peaceful transition should allow greater coherence in the efforts of the members of the international community to exercise against South Africa the pressure needed to convince it to abide by Security Council resolutions on Namibia. We also believe that these efforts should translate into concrete programmes of assistance to and co-operation with the countries of the region and the victims of the illegal occupation of Namibia in order to help them resist the destabilizing policies of the Government of South Africa.

Accordingly, my delegation welcomed the non-confrontational tone of this debate and the sense of solidarity with the front-line States and SWAPO which emerged from it. We think that this is the correct approach to be followed in order to ensure greater effectiveness to the efforts of the international community. My delegation intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us and will lend its full support to the action the Secretary-General will undertake to implement it.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/19242.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Bulgaria, 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, Venezuela, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 14 votes in favour, none against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 601 (1987).

I shall now call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to make a statement following the voting.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): I am sorry that I have had to wait until the end of the month to convey to you, Sir, my best wishes on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. My best wishes are none the less sincere. Our thanks, equally belated, are due to your distinguished predecessor for his conduct of our business during September.

My delegation did not intervene in this debate as our views on the question of Namibia were fully set out in our statement to the Council on 9 April of this year. I should also like to draw the Council's attention to the passage on Namibia in the Okanagan statement and programme of action on southern Africa issued at the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting at Vancouver on 16 October. That passage clearly states the views of my Government and of other member Governments of the Commonwealth.

Like others who have spoken, our aim is to see the Territory achieve internationally recognized independence at the earliest possible time and by the most peaceful means. We welcome any measure designed to give new impetus to efforts to give effect to resolution 435 (1978), which we regard as essential to the discussion. We therefore supported the adoption of resolution 601 (1987) and are pleased that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not insist on including elements unacceptable to certain members of the Council.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,
United Kingdom)

As a matter of principle my delegation believes that the Council should not ask the Secretary-General to undertake tasks which are unrealistic either in themselves or by virtue of their time frame. Indeed, for the Council to act otherwise would undermine its authority and its standing.

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

It seems to us that operative paragraph 5 of the resolution strikes the right balance in this respect. The resolution should not only preserve the elements of the United Nations settlement plan but also give the Secretary-General discretion to conduct his negotiations in the way best designed to produce a successful outcome. We are content to leave this difficult task to his excellent judgement. But if he were forced to report to the Council that he had not been successful my delegation would not consider that the Council was, as a result, obliged to proceed to action under Chapter VII. The Council would in such circumstances need to reassess the situation and take the action it judged best to lead to independence for Namibia and, in the words of several speakers during this debate, end the sufferings of the Namibian people.

The fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the resolution we have just adopted refer to a number of resolutions previously adopted by the Council and the General Assembly not all of which my delegation was able to support. Our acceptance of resolution 601 (1987) implies no change in our position on those earlier texts.

My delegation has noted the request that Mr. Kozonguizi should be permitted to participate in the Council's discussions on this agenda item. The position of the British Government in this matter is straightforward. We do not and shall not recognize the so-called transitional government of national unity. We remain firmly committed to United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But the Council should be impartial in providing opportunities to address it to all those individuals who are eligible to contest the elections to be held in Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), elections which we should all like to see take place as soon as possible. The request before the Council is

(Sir Crispin Tickell, United Kingdom)

in conformity with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure. In keeping with that important principle of impartiality my Government supports the request and would have wished to see Mr. Kozonguizi to be given an opportunity to address the Council.

In conclusion, I emphasize that it remains our firm intention to continue our efforts to bring about the earliest possible implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. We wish the Secretary-General well in his discussions and we hope that in due course he will be able to deliver a favourable report to the Council. South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia must end and the people of the Territory must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination.

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

Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization, to whom the Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2,755th meeting, wishes to make a further statement. With the consent of the Council, I call upon him.

Mr. GURIRAB: I am grateful, Mr. President, for the opportunity accorded to me to make a brief concluding statement and crave the indulgence of the Council members. You, Sir, have been effective and generous in the course of these meetings. Your sense of justice and fair play has touched us deeply.

I have a confession to make. In preparing myself for the debate on the critical situation in Namibia, which has just concluded, I thought that my mind was playing a tantalizing trick on me. I started thinking about the spirit of the approaching holiday season and I had this nagging idea which kept exercising my mind that the noble ideals of peace and generosity usually associated with this time of year might actually manifest themselves during this debate and engender

(Mr. Gurirab)

open-mindedness and compassion for the suffering Namibian masses on the part of certain delegations. I thought it would be possible for the Council, this time, to adopt unanimously the draft resolution - now resolution 601 (1987) - that was put before it. Need I say I was wrong, that is as far as the question of unanimous adoption was concerned.

That I was guilty of the crime of day-dreaming was made clear to me when I was rudely jolted back to the real world of the linkage-pushers and die-hard racist murderers of Pretoria - the world of those who, by their sinister use of verbal terrorism and vicious name-calling, would want to turn the victims of their unmitigated actions into villains. It is indeed true that those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable. History is replete with many examples which corroborate that truism - no less, I dare say, in Namibia. The very reason for the founding of SWAPO itself in Namibia in 1960 and its launching of the armed struggle 21 years ago bear out that inevitability.

This debate was about a cease-fire, about ending violence and about giving freedom and democracy a chance in Namibia. The drafters of the resolution were very meticulous in ensuring that all the elements that might invite objection from some people would be left out - and they did just that. The members of the non-aligned caucus in the Council also sought in earnest unanimity of views on the draft which would lead to its unanimous adoption. I know for sure that they tried their level best. Well, unanimity we did not get; but 14 votes in favour is an outcome that is very good indeed. In particular, the mix of positive votes shows some new converts, whom we welcome and urge to stay put in that mix of decent world citizens until Namibia is free.

(Mr. Gurirab)

Unanimity in decision and in the message that the Council sends to Pretoria is very important. The Secretary-General would need that kind of reassurance in order to be able to forge ahead in good conscience and with confidence, fortified in the knowledge that he enjoyed the full backing of the Security Council in implementing the present resolution. Whole-hearted support for him by the United States in this regard is indispensable. We, as so many others before us have done in this debate, call upon the United States of America to play a positive role in assisting the achievement of our freedom now.

Who is for a cease-fire, peace and democracy in Namibia and who today stands in opposition to that noble goal? We all listened to all the statements made during the debate, and it is not difficult to draw the obvious conclusion. Nearly all the delegations, particularly those of the front-line States and of SWAPO, reiterated their positions in favour of an immediate cease-fire, the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and democratic elections in Namibia, as envisaged in resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Gurirab)

Are we to conclude that those who are half-hearted about a cease-fire are in fact for war and violence in Namibia?

The rude awakening that I sustained came about first when a warning shot was fired in the form of a statement in exercise of the right of reply at the end of the opening meeting on this item by a certain delegation whose unwavering support we need most to set the process in motion. Following that warning shot, we learnt later that the very same delegation managed to find some difficulties in the draft resolution and said that it could not vote in favour of it as then drafted. But the amendments it suggested were retrogressive and would have turned the draft resolution into something else, contrary to the wishes of the co-sponsors and the aspirations of the Namibian people themselves. That is the only delegation that abstained today in the vote on the draft resolution, which essentially, I repeat, calls for a cease-fire and the beginning of Namibia's independence process.

I should like to refer to Ambassador Okun's statement, with much pain and with a great sense of disappointment. The expression "security concerns" is a euphemism for "linkage". Many speakers addressed this issue, and I am very disheartened to have heard this afternoon various attempts to justify and seek to legitimize linkage before this Council.

While we express our indignation and disappointment at this unconscionable behaviour by a country which was the principal author of the settlement proposal, we nevertheless hope that this lone abstention will not be used as an excuse for not rendering all the necessary practical assistance to the Secretary-General in doing his job and implementing the present resolution with speed and efficiency.

The scurrilous and belligerent language that we heard yesterday from the lips of the apostle of apartheid does not belong in this Chamber. It belongs to the world of extraterrestrial creatures, about which Hollywood has made a few horrifying movies. He may delight in the theatre of the absurd. Our people are

(Mr. Gurirab)

dying and we have no time to play around. How audacious, pretentious and arrogant it was of him to allege that he or his fascist régime cares about the plight of the very people that they are butchering daily. Our people know this only too well. They also know that their own sons and daughters, represented in SWAPO, could never be responsible for carrying out terrorism in any form or shape against them, let alone killing our own little children. That is an outrageous idea. It is they, the Namibian people, who give SWAPO the necessary support and strength as their own liberator in the struggle. We reject with the contempt that it deserves the vicious and ridiculous allegations made against us by that filthy Boer.

Our own people also know that it is the Botha régime that has turned our country into a huge army barracks and militarized the entire society, relying on violence, daily atrocities, dusk-to-dawn curfews, martial law and strict press censorship. South African troops invaded Namibia in 1915, before the birth of Sam Nujoma, before the creation of SWAPO. Today they number 100,000 troops. That is violence. Ambassador Victor Gbeho enumerated this afternoon a few examples of Pretoria's State terrorism in our country.

In conclusion, I wish to thank all the delegations that voted in favour of the draft resolution. I am particularly happy to have witnessed the affirmative votes cast by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany. I can only express my sincere expectation and hope that they will now stay the course towards ensuring the early independence of our beloved country, Namibia. Special thanks go to our comrades and friends, the Chairmen of the Group of African States and of the Movement of Non-Aligned countries respectively, for their timely initiatives in requesting the Council to meet on the critical situation in Namibia.

Canada, one of the original members of the now defunct contact group of five Western countries, is not represented on the Council at this time. It has

(Mr. Gurirab)

recently demonstrated remarkable imagination and leadership on the burning issues facing southern Africa. The statement made here yesterday was an exemplary demonstration of its moral courage and support for freedom for Namibia.

Let us now together proceed, on the basis of resolution 601 (1987), which has just been adopted, to restore to the Namibian people their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence, as envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO is ready. It is now up to the Security Council to compel the Botha régime to reciprocate and accept a cease-fire as the first step in that process.

I wish, in conclusion, to extend the season's greetings to all at the table and to the United Nations Secretary-General, whom we wish well in fulfilling his new mandate to carry out a mission not only for Namibia but also for the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Mr. Gurirab for the kind words he addressed to me.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.