



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.82  
21 November 1985

ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 19 November 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)  
later: Mr. BASSOLE (Vice-President) Burkina Faso

- Question of Namibia: [34] (continued)

- (a) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia
- (b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General
- (d) Report of the Fourth Committee
- (e) Draft resolutions

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 General Assembly.

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

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 34 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/40/24)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLE (A/40/23 (Part VI), A/AC.109/824, 825 and 826)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/687 and Add.1)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/40/882)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/40/24 (Part II), chap. I)

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): On Friday, 15 November 1985, the Security Council, one of the main organs of the United Nations and on which the Charter has entrusted the highest function, namely, the principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, with a view to ensuring rapid and effective action by the Organization under Article 24 of the Charter, has given the international community as a whole, and the United Nations in particular, a demonstration of its inability to solve the problem in southern Africa in general and in Namibia in particular.

The delegation of Zaire, as the representative of an African State, is deeply frustrated by this attitude which serves the interests of the racist authorities of South Africa, encouraging them to persist in their illegal occupation of Namibia, flouting all the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, and constitutes in the eyes of the heroic people of Namibia, headed by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and all of Africa, a show of defiance and disrespect for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

Speaking for the first time in the debate in the Security Council on 13 November 1985, the Secretary-General of SWAPO, Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, who was recently released from prison after 18 years of detention, quoted the important statement made by the President of SWAPO during the meeting of the Security Council held last June in the following words:

"The world outside demands economic sanctions against apartheid South Africa. The Security Council bears a special responsibility and must act now, promptly and decisively, to secure the implementation of its ... resolutions, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Now is the time for this most important organ of the United Nations to do what is called for and what is necessary, namely, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations [against the racist Pretoria régime] as the most effective additional means to ensure South Africa's acceptance of the authority of the Organization, and its compliance with United Nations resolutions on Namibia." (S/PV.2624, p. 28)

This moving appeal, made in the Security Council by a worthy son of Africa and the President of SWAPO and supported by all the delegations of the non-aligned countries which spoke during the meeting of June 1985 in the Security Council, should have alerted all Member States, whether permanent members of the Security Council or not, and should have been favourably received by them, especially since the racist régime of South Africa was establishing a so-called interim Government in Namibia at the very moment when the Security Council was meeting. How, then, are we to interpret the position of some of the permanent members of the Security Council which during the vote on resolution 566 (1985), abstained, thereby permitting the adoption of resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June 1985 which,

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

"1. Condemns South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant defiance of resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations;

"2. Reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people against the illegal occupation of the racist régime of South Africa and calls upon all States to increase their moral and material assistance to them;

"...

"13. Strongly warns South Africa that failure to do so would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions;

"...

"16. Decides to remain seized of the matter and to meet immediately upon receipt of the Secretary-General's report for the purpose of reviewing progress in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, to invoke paragraph 13 above (rés. 566 (1985)).

With resolution 566 (1985), the Security Council began an irreversible process of taking decisions for the independence of Namibia; consequently, the implementation of that resolution adopted by a majority of 13 with two abstentions implied that if the Secretary-General were to present an unsatisfactory report and if the racist régime of South Africa proved to be intransigent, the Security Council would comply with resolution 566 (1985) and adopt mandatory comprehensive sanctions against racist South Africa, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

As both those things happened, and in view of the Final Declaration of the Conference of the Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries held in Luanda from 4 to 8 September 1985, the draft resolution in document S/17633 of 15 November 1985, sponsored by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru, Trinidad & Tobago, was in accordance both with the spirit and the letter of resolution 566 (1985), 19 June 1985 of the Security Council.

Since the Security Council has backed down on the Namibian question, is there any further point in appealing to it? Should the question be taken away from the Security Council completely and referred to the General Assembly for the necessary decisions on the basis of the majority rule?

Furthermore, the representative of the racist régime of South Africa who had been authorized to speak in the Security Council on 13 November demonstrated his arrogance by stating that the Security Council was not competent to deal with the question, when he stated:

"It is to be regretted that the Council should once again have to devote its time to the question of South-West Africa. The world is full of threats to international peace which should be the subject of debate in the Council."

(S/PV.2624, p. 42)

Is it not surprising to see the representative of the racist régime of South Africa forecast the outcome of the work of the Security Council by making such a statement? Did he not know beforehand that those supporting him would use their veto to prevent any decision being taken on the question? If such were the case, would this not be a sort of connivance between the representative of South Africa

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

and those who were going to oppose that draft resolution from the very outset of the work of the Security Council? Those are questions which my delegation is raising.

My delegation is convinced that, despite the interests which some States might have in Namibia, their responsibilities under certain resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly as well as of the Security Council nevertheless remain.

I say so because of the obligations they assumed as Member States and founding members of the United Nations on the one hand and, on the other, because of the commitments they assumed under resolution 1514 (XV) on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the twenty-fifth anniversary of which we are celebrating this year, and General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating South Africa's mandate over Namibia, the twentieth anniversary of which we will celebrate in 1986, without forgetting Security Council resolution 435 (1978) which established the plan for the solution of the question of Namibia and constitutes the valid basis for its final settlement.

It was in conformity with the spirit of resolution 1514 (XV) that the General Assembly, while reaffirming that the provisions of that resolution are fully applicable to the people of the Territory of South-West Africa, recognized by resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the right of that Territory to self-determination, freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

In that resolution the General Assembly declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory and had in fact disavowed the Mandate. The Assembly decided that the Mandate conferred upon his Britannic Majesty, to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of South Africa, was therefore terminated and that South Africa had no further right to administer the Territory, which henceforth would come under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

That was the reason for the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa, charged with recommending practical means by which the Territory should be administered, so as to enable its people to exercise the right of self-determination and achieve independence. Almost 20 years have passed since then without the racist régime of South Africa having taken a single step towards making that resolution effective and capable of implementation.

On the contrary, during that period the racist régime of South Africa has tried to strengthen its apartheid policy in Namibia in the fields of education, health, housing and land, with repressive legislation, violation of human rights and exploitation of the labour force.

The system of Bantu education has been officially diluted in order to maintain the supremacy of whites over blacks. The education given to blacks is based on the idea that they must be trained to serve as underlings and as a cheap labour reserve available to an economy controlled by whites. That explains the existence of a large proportion of illiterates in the Namibian population.

The health sector in Namibia is characterized by flagrant injustices which ensure that the health services for the black majority are rudimentary or non-existent, while the health service networks to which the whites have access have very modern infrastructures.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

The living conditions of black Namibians are directly governed by the Native Urban Areas Proclamation of 1951, which regulates the right of Namibians to reside in urban areas. In the urban centres black Namibians must live in districts that are separate from those reserved for the whites and Coloureds and are characterized, moreover, by minuscule sheet-metal shacks where black families live in crowded, unhealthy conditions.

There is a very elaborate system of land expropriation and confiscation of cattle which reduces the blacks of Namibia to poverty in their own country.

I turn to the repressive legislation and the violation of human rights. Amnesty International and all Member States struggling to safeguard human rights should study more carefully the situation prevailing in Namibia in that regard, because the legal situation created by resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, which ended South Africa's Mandate and was subsequently confirmed by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, dated 21 June 1971, no longer permits the racist South African régime to maintain its illegal presence in Namibia and to apply merciless, repressive laws and proclamations against the blacks of Namibia.

On 12 December 1984 the General Assembly adopted resolution 39/50 A, in which it condemned all the so-called laws and proclamations of the illegal occupation régime in Namibia and declared them illegal and null and void.

Since 1967 the South African régime has promulgated a serious series of laws providing for very severe punishment - death, life imprisonment, lengthy detention - whose essential purpose is to hamper the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for its liberation and independence.

If the international community, and particularly certain Member States, are to show their solidarity and sympathy with humanity and suffering peoples, they should



(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

first think about the black Namibian women who can in no way participate in contractual labour. That compels them to remain alone when their husbands and sons leave to work elsewhere; and they have to survive on subsistence farming and on the money that the men of their families can sometimes send them. Not only do they have to carry out their traditional tasks, such as household work, educating their children and working in the fields, but they have to take over tasks traditionally carried out by men, such as building shelters, clearing land and racing cattle.

That is the lot of Namibian women, condemned to a life of solitude and impoverishment and hardest hit by the social pathology of contractual labour.

That is the situation in Namibia, which should be of special concern to the General Assembly in this session in which we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and should lead the Assembly to take a decision without delay on the totality of the proposals submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Secretary-General and the Fourth Committee, and on the draft resolutions, which my delegation fully supports.

The problem has lasted for too long, and it is time for it to be solved in the well-understood interests of the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO. The contact group, which, under Security Council 435 (1978), began to take steps in favour of Namibia's independence, should not allow itself to be discouraged by the cynicism and delaying tactics of the Botha régime.

Whether it concerns the choice of an electoral system or the setting of a date to begin implementing the plan envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the contact group, which to some extent enjoys the confidence of the South African régime, should show more commitment and determination in its dealings with the régime.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

There is no justification for the conditions set by the régime relating to the so-called linkage.

My delegation condemns the South African racist régime, which has been so arrogant as to use Namibia as a springboard to satisfy its belligerent instincts with respect to neighbouring States with which it has signed bilateral agreements.

My delegation strongly supports the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for independence and admission to membership of the United Nations. Therefore, we support all the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 34 in the hope of soon seeing the representative of Namibia join us here in our Organization.

Mr. VALLE (Brazil): When the Security Council adopted resolution 566 (1985) last June, the international community once again sent a strong and clear message to the South African Government. We then recorded our intention "to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter" (Security Council resolution-566 (1985), para. 13) if South Africa failed to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations independence plan for Namibia.

On that occasion, as now, there were very few doubts as to the likely attitude of Pretoria, its record showing constant violation of United Nations resolutions and persistent breaches of international law. Members of the Security Council, in consequence, decided that the moment had arrived to warn South Africa that the United Nations, in fulfilment of its primary responsibility for the Territory, would no longer tolerate the tactics being used to avoid the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Time went by and South Africa gave no indication that it would comply with this last call by the Security Council. The Secretary-General reported in September that there had been no progress in his recent discussions with Pretoria concerning resolution 435 (1976) and he warned that

"The continuing delay undermines the credibility of the South African Government at a time when the world is watching with growing concern the increasingly tragic developments occurring in the area". (S/17442, para. 12) It was against that background that, last week, the Security Council met again, with the unfortunate results we all know.

It is no surprise that South Africa has tried to divide opinions and to confuse the deliberations of the Security Council. That was the intention when Pretoria, at the request of the so-called Government of National Unity, illegally established in Windhoek, announced that it had selected a system of proportional

(Mr. Valle, Brazil)

representation as a framework for elections leading to the independence of Namibia. That was done in an attempt to arrest the in-depth consideration of mandatory sanctions, as envisaged in paragraph 13 of resolution 566 (1985), and to obtain indirect recognition of the puppet administration, which now presumptuously addresses the United Nations as the representative of the Namibian people. What is even worse, South Africa thought that it could combine the choice of the electoral system with a renewed attempt to link the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues, incompatible with resolution 435 (1978).

Given the hostile policies of the apartheid régime, it is saddening to note that the Security Council was once again exposed to the power of the veto as a means of preventing stronger action against South Africa. Owing to the negative votes of two permanent members, the Council was unable to adopt enforcement measures that would consolidate the intensified efforts of the international community to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia. The inability to impose sanctions was certainly received as a great victory in Pretoria but, in the world at large, it represents another blow to the authority of the United Nations. It would seem appropriate at this stage to look into some of the arguments that have been advanced for preventing the imposition of sanctions.

We question the idea that the isolation of Pretoria in selective areas could lead to greater suffering by the black majority in South Africa and in Namibia. Certain countries, however, believe that foreign investment could positively support what they see as the peaceful forces of change in southern Africa. It is the belief of those few countries that pressure could be exerted from within the apartheid system, and that foreign investment would be the tool for increasing leverage in favour of reforms in the policies and practices of the South African Government. If that were the case, how could we explain, for instance, the rising

(Mr. Valle, Brazil)

tide of violence and brutality sustained by Pretoria against this same majority that foreign presence and support would purportedly be defending? How are we to believe that peaceful forces of change are being stimulated, when we witness a growing pattern of aggression by South African forces against neighbouring States? Why should we agree that a mild and ineffective combination of pressure and persuasion is enough, when we hear daily that black men and women in South Africa and Namibia are being tortured by the racist régime?

Those are some of the questions left unanswered by those countries that prevent the Security Council from exerting a more decisive influence. Those are the questions that we have to put to ourselves when, at the end of the day, we report on the role of the United Nations in the solution of international conflicts.

Brazil considers it inconceivable not to find among us, as full Members of the United Nations, the representatives of a free Namibia. The occupation of the Territory is a permanent threat to the prospects for lasting peace in southern Africa. We stated in June, and it is our obligation to repeat now, that further hesitation in adopting measures to press for the independence of Namibia could result in the aggravation of disputes and tensions in the region. In addition to strict compliance with mandatory measures previously imposed by the Security Council, Brazil has adopted a set of voluntary sanctions against South Africa. We are aware that individual actions amount to considerable pressure on the racist régime of Pretoria. They are not, however, a substitute for further concrete measures adopted by the Security Council in fulfilment of principles of the Charter relating to international peace and security. The Council has just lost an important opportunity to act decisively. It is our hope that it will not falter the next time it takes up the Namibian question.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): Last week in the Security Council we listened to the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, as he spoke of the intransigence, the prevarication and the arrogance displayed by South Africa in its administration of Namibia. He brought to the Council and to this Assembly personal testimony of the suffering his people have endured. He came with a legacy of intense personal suffering as a result of his commitment to the freedom of his homeland.

Nearly 20 years ago, when I was last a representative to this Assembly, we deliberated on, and rightly condemned, the retrospective legislation that was used to condemn him and other SWAPO members to long periods of imprisonment in South Africa, far from their own homeland. We welcome the fact that he is now free to join us in our discussions.

Forty years ago New Zealand's then Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Peter Fraser, appealed to South Africa to follow New Zealand's lead and place South West Africa under the trusteeship of the United Nations. His appeal went unanswered. It is unanswered to this day. Only one country refused to acknowledge the responsibilities inherited by the United Nations towards the Territories that had once been under League of Nations Mandates. Only one people for which the progress to self-determination had been placed in the sacred trust of an administering Power failed to have its rights recognized. Only one Administering Power deliberately and systematically denied both the responsibility of the United Nations and the rights of the people over whom it held the interim responsibilities of government.

In Article 2 of the League Mandate, South Africa undertook to carry out its duty to

"promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants of South West Africa".

(Mr. McDowell (New Zealand))

The introduction of the systems and institutions of apartheid constitute by themselves a flagrant denial of those obligations. Successive reports of the Council for Namibia and of other organizations have laid bare the appalling disparities in health care, in educational opportunities and in living conditions among the people of Namibia.

The educational and training policies of that Government have left an acute shortage of Namibians available to fill the future manpower needs of the economy and of the administration. In the health field, approximately 16 per cent of all children die in infancy. This indicates once again a systematic failure to provide the necessities of medical care for one sector of the community, while another has generous facilities provided for it. Such discrimination cannot be justified or tolerated. No less alarming is the evidence of malnutrition and of the re-emergence of endemic diseases that had almost been eradicated 15 or 20 years ago. The record of health care is itself an indictment of South Africa's administration and of its once professed commitment to promote the moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants of Namibia.

Economically, Namibia enjoys natural wealth through its mineral reserves, its agriculture and its fisheries resources. These give it a potential for economic development that is greater than that of most other States in the region. A strong and viable economy should now be in place for the transition to an independent Namibia. But South Africa has not fulfilled its responsibility to safeguard the rights of Namibians to their natural resources. The refusal to implement the United Nations plan has bred an understandable reluctance to invest in the Territory.

Much has been said and documented about the way in which the mineral wealth of Namibia has been exploited. Much less has been recorded about the way in which Namibia's potential exclusive economic zone has been raided. The waters off the Namibian coast have the potential to make Namibia one of the world's most important fisheries nations. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) research shows that with a proper management policy there would be a consistent annual yield of approximately 1.4 to 1.5 million tonnes. Such a policy is now urgently needed in view of the serious over-fishing of that resource, principally, I note, by non-African distant-water fishing fleets.



(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

The Council for Namibia has already signed and ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In our view, it is appropriate that, as proposed in its recommendations drawn up in Vienna, the Council should proclaim an exclusive economic zone in order to provide the framework necessary for the proper management of this resource after independence. We would expect all member countries, and especially those that have proclaimed economic zones themselves, to support such a declaration by the Council and in the meantime to refrain from fishing in waters of the potential exclusive economic zone of Namibia.

Through patient negotiation with Pretoria, the five Western Governments in the contact group have attempted to find a way in which the South African administration could be handed over to an independent Namibia. Their plan for a way forward, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was recognized by all in this Organization as the only acceptable basis for the independence of Namibia. South Africa itself accepted this resolution. What we have seen since that time can only be described as a calculated programme of obstruction by the Government of South Africa. The so-called Multi-Party Conference administration was established by South Africa almost immediately, despite the rejection of this move by the people of Namibia. Whenever progress towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) has seemed to be made, new issues have been raised by Pretoria. In 1982, for example, South Africa accepted a set of principles concerning the constituent assembly for an independent Namibia and the principles that should be embodied in a new constitution. When the Secretary-General went to South Africa the following year the South African Government expressed the view that the technical obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been removed. But then the old pattern reasserted itself. New conditions were laid down by South Africa in particular a question of the linkage of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Angola. New Zealand joined in the condemnation of this manoeuvre to obstruct progress by the introduction of such extraneous issues.

South Africa's expressed willingness to negotiate on Namibia has been accompanied by a concerted programme of regional destabilization. While on the one hand it gave the impression that it was willing to be flexible when it agreed to participate in the Lusaka negotiations in 1984 and undertook to begin the disengagement of its forces in Angola, its insistence on the question of linkage stymied progress. The reported withdrawal of troops from Angola has been followed by reports of commando raids in Cabinda and by bombing attacks against Angola, the effects of which have been studied by the Security Council investigation Mission.

In Namibia the latest internal administration set up by South Africa has again shown Pretoria's disregard for the United Nations plan, which it earlier agreed to, and its reluctance to accept any authority there which is not compliant with its wishes. Such an administration is entirely unacceptable to the New Zealand Government, which endorses the Security Council's rejection of it as illegal and null and void. We reject totally the suggestion by the representative of South Africa in the Security Council last week that the future of United Nations involvement in Namibia should be contingent on its meeting conditions laid down in Pretoria.

Last week the Government of South Africa finally conveyed to the Secretary-General its decision on the electoral system it preferred in order to bring about the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We might have hoped that this decision would signal a genuine willingness on the part of Pretoria to see the settlement plan implemented. Instead, it offered a spate of reasons why it should not be implemented. In particular we see raised in this letter from the South African Foreign Minister issues which had already been settled in the discussions South Africa held with the contact group over three years ago.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Last month Commonwealth Heads of Government, meeting in Nassau, added their unanimous voice to the condemnations of South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia. They argued that if South Africa failed to comply with the views of the international community various measures would be taken by Commonwealth Governments in an effort to bring about orderly and peaceful change and the realization of political, economic and social justice both in South Africa and in Namibia. The New Zealand Government does not find any satisfaction in taking such measures, but we do so because we are committed to the achievement of the goals that the programme of action was designed to bring about.

New Zealand notes that, although the debate in the Security Council last week did not result in a resolution being adopted, it did demonstrate a substantial measure of agreement on the need for action against South Africa. We regret that this agreement could not have been capitalized on in the form of a resolution that would not only have sent a clear message to the Government of South Africa that there is no sympathy in the international community for its continued occupation of Namibia or for the steps it has taken to try to create a measure of acceptability for its internal administration but also made clear that the international community is now intent on taking practical steps to bring pressure to bear on Pretoria.

New Zealand looks forward to the day when Namibia joins the United Nations as a free and independent State. There is no reason why that day should be delayed. The modalities for the transition to independence have been agreed. If the few and final steps that need to be taken continue to be obstructed by extraneous and unilateral conditions, this Organization will need to consider further the steps that should be taken to ensure that the rights of the people of Namibia and the legitimate objectives of the United Nations are no longer frustrated.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): When the United Nations was formed 40 years ago, Member States, including South Africa, assumed responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose peoples had not yet attained a full measure of self-government. The States agreed also to assist the inhabitants of those Territories in the progressive development of their free political institutions. But South Africa, instead of fulfilling this noble mandate, betrayed its trust and demanded that Namibia be annexed to what was then called the Union of South Africa.

South Africa rebuffed peaceful transition to an independent Namibia, which led to the war of liberation launched in 1966 by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Also in that year the United Nations General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and created the Council for Namibia, which is the only internationally recognized Administering Authority over the Territory of Namibia.

In assisting the people of Namibia in attaining independence the Council has been playing a very important role and has achieved considerable results over the years. The Conference organized by the Council on the Intensification of International Action for the Independence of Namibia at United Nations Headquarters in September 1985 was the latest important stage of this process. The Conference deplored the fact that on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Namibia was still occupied by the South African régime. The Conference also pointed out that, owing to the intransigence of the racist régime and the collaboration of certain Western Powers, the United Nations had been unable to fulfil its responsibility 19 years after it had terminated the Mandate of the racist régime over the Territory.

We have started our annual discussion of the question of Namibia at a time when the struggle against the illegal occupation of Namibia and against apartheid

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

has reached new heights of intensity. The South African régime continues its aggression against the Namibian people and uses the international Territory of Namibia for launching acts of aggression and destabilization directed against Angola and other independent African States. The régime persists in its refusal to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. This intransigence is clearly demonstrated by its recent installation of yet another puppet institution, the so-called transitional government.

In the past year there has been no change in the position of the South African régime concerning the unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Had South Africa not received political, economic and military support from some well-known countries, it would not have been able so stubbornly to defy intense international pressure.

I should like to reiterate our firm conviction that only effective sanctions against South Africa can lead to fundamental changes in the régime. Each delay in introducing effective sanctions helps the racists and consequently causes further harm to the people of Namibia. That is why the delegation of Hungary cannot agree with the stand taken by the United States and the United Kingdom delegations at the latest meeting of the Security Council. In our view, they have to reconsider their position and take into consideration the real need of the Namibian people for independence and self-determination, in accordance with the demands of the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations.

We are convinced that such sham solutions or other manipulations by the South African régime can lead nowhere. Our firm conviction is that Member States should further intensify their efforts to impose effective and mandatory sanctions, individually or collectively, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, in order to achieve Namibia's early independence.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

Taking into consideration the interests of the Namibian people and the realities of the present situation in the region, we believe that this is the only peaceful solution for the region.

I take this opportunity to emphasize the urgent need for Namibia's independence. Any attempt to link this issue to any irrelevant, extraneous demands is inadmissible and must be firmly rejected as a delaying tactic by Pretoria.

In conclusion, I should like to express the solidarity and full support of the people and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative. Let me also express our firm conviction that Namibia will soon be a free and independent country and that we shall be able to welcome its representatives in our midst here at the United Nations.

Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again the delegation of Mexico is taking part in a debate on the question of Namibia in order to reiterate its unswerving commitment to the process of decolonization in Africa and in other regions, and to express in solidarity support for the people of Namibia through their sole genuine representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

On this occasion we must also point out that we have let pass both the fortieth anniversary of the Organization and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples without resolving in a just and definitive manner this intolerable colonial situation.

It is also necessary to recognize that the celebration of those anniversaries is not complete, and could not be complete, as long as the apartheid régime

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

continues to oppress and exploit the people of Namibia in open, cynical defiance of the decisions and principles adopted by this Organization and upheld over the past forty years.

The question of Namibia has thus spoiled the celebration of historic anniversaries which, as the Foreign Minister of my country said in the Assembly on 23 October, should have been an opportunity for

"... reaffirming and fulfilling the commitments made, of defining effective ways for finding solutions and of pooling their political will in favour of the values and aspirations that gave rise to our international Organization."

(A/40/PV.46, page 58)

In addition, the persistent intransigence of the Pretoria régime, together with the impunity it enjoys, thanks to the support being given to it by some countries represented here, through acts of omission and commission, force us to recognize that there is a dangerous paralysis in our Organization the consequences of which go beyond the case of Namibia and are a major concern to the vast majority of the United Nations membership.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

Contempt for international law and the obstacles - which are linked to the interests of certain major Powers - that many countries encounter in their struggle to attain their right to self-determination unquestionably represent a serious setback for the international community as a whole. By the same token, the decolonization process and the development of mechanism for international co-operation and consultation have represented progress towards the democratization of international relations and respect for human rights in the broadest sense.

The case of Namibia is unequivocal. This is a question of decolonization and we must not allow it to be artificially placed in the context of East-West confrontation or understanding. We stress the fact that a relaxation of tension between the Power blocs should contribute to a solution of international problems provided this does not lead to a new definition of spheres of influence or security, thus frustrating the desire of most countries for independence and development.

As Mexico said last year from this rostrum, the independence of Namibia is not just a symbol in matters in which the future of a subjugated people and the validity of the principles of the United Nations Charter are at stake, but a case whose outcome will determine whether the aspirations of the developing countries will be fulfilled in the near future.

The exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia has reached intolerable proportions. Our country has constantly said that it is opposed to violations of human rights no matter where they occur, therefore we can only condemn the system of apartheid which has been imposed on Namibia and South Africa. That system institutionalizes the violation of human rights and has been quite rightly defined by the General Assembly as a crime against humanity.



(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

I take this opportunity to say that my delegation attaches great importance to the public hearings on the activities of transnational corporations functioning in Namibia and South Africa that have recently taken place.

Mexico reaffirms its conviction that the solution of this problem lies in the immediate implementation of relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Diplomatic efforts should be seen simply as a quest for methods that would make possible the implementation of those decisions, and not in any way as a subterfuge in order to distort, circumvent or violate them. We categorically reject any linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and questions relating solely to the sovereignty of independent nations. That is in keeping with the most elementary principles of international law and the Charter of our Organization. We stress also that any delay in the implementation of that resolution is inconsistent with commitments that all Member States represented here have entered into.

We absolutely reject any attempt by the Pretoria régime to impose a so-called interim solution on Namibia. In particular we condemn the establishment of the so-called provisional or interim government set up last July. It was declared null and void by the United Nations Council for Namibia on the very day that it was created and by the Security Council in resolution 566 (1985).

We reiterate our appeal to the Security Council to impose on South Africa the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter for cases such as this in which the violating State is threatening international peace and security and has repeatedly refused to implement resolutions of the Security Council. We believe that the Security Council has not fulfilled its responsibilities in this case. As we said last week, the continuing obstruction of the Council contributes to the maintenance of an illegal, unjust situation which endangers international peace and security.

(Mr. Moya-Palencia, Mexico)

The seriousness of the violations calls for an effective response from the international community. The Security Council's refusal to adopt sanctions on the pretext of the alleged effectiveness of persuasion has served only to disguise the complicity of some and strengthen the position of the violating State. Recent events in South Africa have not convinced them of the brutal, repressive character of the apartheid régime or its unjustifiable refusal to accede to the demands of the South African majority and the international community. How then can we hope that it will peacefully abandon the Territory of Namibia?

It is time for a vigorous reaction by the United Nations. The General Assembly must urge the Security Council to adopt a much more active and decisive position. The delegation of Mexico has acted along these lines and will continue to do so until Namibia is independent. That is why we enthusiastically support the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on Namibia which we hope will adopt the decisions needed for the immediate achievement of our common objective.

Having reiterated the position of Mexico on the question of Namibia, I should like now to refer to the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until independence. My country is honoured to be a member of that body.

The year which is about to end deserves attention for a number of reasons, one of which is the splendid leadership of Ambassador Sinclair of Guyana, with his forcefulness, ability and experience he has set in motion a process of reactivation of the working methods and political strategy of the Council.

The Council for Namibia represents both a progressive attempt to find a solution to the conflict and the first attempt at a multilateral effort to exercise collective responsibility. For that reason it is a unique body and must be

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

protected and strengthened. At the same time, it could be improved upon and developed. Mexico has always supported improvements in working methods in order to achieve greater effectiveness, advocating decisions of major importance in order to make the Council a dynamic body capable of fulfilling its mandate and, in particular, of enforcing its own decisions.

We attach special importance to the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and firmly support the decision regarding the initiation of legal process in national tribunals against companies and individuals unlawfully involved in the exploitation, transportation of or trade in these resources. This, together with other decisions adopted, or being studied, will surely yield positive results in the defence of the resources of the Territory. This is essential in view of the exorbitant unlawful exploitation which is taking place at the hands of certain South African and foreign economic interests. By doing this and by taking other action the Council would be not only implementing its mandate but increasing its prestige and in this way giving proof of seriousness and determination.

I should like to conclude by pointing out that in 1986 it will be 20 years since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated and 20 years since the heroic struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization began. We must not let that year pass without celebrating the emergence of a free, independent Namibia, in accordance with the wishes of the international community as a whole.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The international community is celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations this year, and the question of Namibia has been with the Organization for a period of 39 years of its existence, ever since the General Assembly started consideration of the question of South West Africa, otherwise known as Namibia, at its first session in 1946. Few international questions have received such attention or produced such unanimity in the United Nations as the question of Namibia. All the countries of the world, with different ideologies and aims, have individually or through the United Nations, regional organizations or international forums, expressed their rejection of the continued occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the Pretoria régime and have called for the immediate withdrawal of that régime from the Territory so that its people could exercise their right to self-determination and independence. There has also been unanimity on the only possible acceptable and internationally recognized means of bringing about that independence, namely, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without linking that implementation to any irrelevant or extraneous elements.

In spite of all the efforts made by the international community over the years, the people of Namibia remain under the occupation of South Africa, and every day with their human rights are violated and their natural resources plundered. The racist Government is tightening its grip on the Territory, increasing its military presence and using the Territory as a base from which to commit aggression against neighbouring African States.

Responsibility for Namibia's failure to achieve its independence so far rests completely on the Government of South Africa. From the outset the racist régime in Pretoria spared no effort in erecting obstacles and fabricating pretexts to prevent

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

the implementation of the resolutions of the international Organization on Namibia and the attainment of independence by the Territory.\*

South Africa has used the stratagem of casting doubt on the impartiality of the United Nations in order to hamper the process of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to link that resolution with extraneous issues that have nothing to do with the problem, in complete disregard of the interests of the people of Namibia and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic and sole representative of the people.

The letter dated 12 November 1985 from the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs addressed to the Secretary-General, contained in document S/17627, raises more questions than it answers. What is meant by statements about the transitional Government and combining them with the choice of the electoral system that will be introduced in Namibia in implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)? The establishment of such a body has been rejected by the United Nations and has been dismissed as null and void. Therefore it has no authority to speak before the international Organization. If it is South Africa's intention, through that letter, to make its position clear with respect to the electoral system, which is the only question pending concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), it should be borne in mind that, in his statement before the Security Council on 13 November, its representative said that his Government insisted on linking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola. The question of Namibia is, above all, a question of decolonization. Any attempt to make it otherwise has been rejected as an attempt to delay independence for that Territory.

---

\*Mr. Bassole (Burkina Faso), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

The attempts by the Pretoria régime to link its withdrawal from the Territory to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola, in addition to delaying the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), transforms the problem from one of decolonization into one of a conflict between the super-Powers and threatens to introduce the cold war and its harmful effects to a continent which has chosen the course of non-alignment, away from conflicts between the super-Powers.

The further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia (document S/17442) stated that no progress had been made in recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also stated that the continued delay in implementing that resolution undermined the credibility of the South African Government at a time when the world was watching with growing concern the increasingly tragic developments occurring in the area. Egypt concurs completely with that report, namely, that the international community has a responsibility for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Failure to proceed on Namibia is affecting the reactions of the international community to other grave developments in the region. Here I should like once again to refer to the discussions held by the Group of Experts on the responsibility of transnational and multinational corporations. Those discussions have made it clear that those corporations must shoulder part of the responsibility that should be borne by the international community as a whole, without exception.

I should also like to reiterate the position of Egypt that we explained before the Security Council last week in the discussion on the question of Namibia, namely, that it is imperative for the Security Council to use all the means

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

available to it under the United Nations Charter, including the provisions of Chapter VII, to require South Africa to implement the Council's resolutions on Namibia - resolution 435 (1978), and particularly the Council's clear warning in resolution 566 (1985) adopted on 19 June 1985, that if South Africa failed to co-operate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General, it would "consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the above-mentioned resolutions". We fear that the failure of the Council to fulfil its obligations will cast a shadow over its prestige as the highest international body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

It is regrettable that the deliberations of the Security Council on Namibia ended last week without reaching a resolution, particularly in view of the fact that all the members of the Council, without exception, at various stages of the discussion expressed their agreement on the objective, which is to achieve the independence of Namibia, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). It is even more regrettable that the inability of the Council to reach a resolution acceptable to all on how to achieve that objective might send a wrong signal to the Pretoria régime that there are some who agree with, or at least condone, its policies and continued attempts to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolutions on Namibia.

Egypt believes that while awaiting the Security Council to assume its responsibility, and in the absence of a clear resolution to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, the countries of the world which have expressed their support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), have the duty and responsibility to apply those sanctions without delay, both individually and collectively.

The Pretoria régime demonstrates to us every day that it is unable to understand the lessons of history and to recognize its inevitable course. A glance at that régime and its attempts to destabilize neighbouring African countries will demonstrate, without doubt, that there is nothing it can do to stem the tide of liberation and independence surging through the whole of Africa, but the near-sightedness of that régime is one of its distinguishing qualities.

Finally, to our heroic struggling brothers in Namibia, we say that we will spare no effort in supporting physically and morally their honourable struggle to achieve their independence and freedom under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) their sole, authentic representative. This cause is ours and Africa's independence will not be complete until Namibia has achieved independence.



Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): The forty-year old history of the United Nations which has rightly received the tributes of many representatives at this commemorative session is at the same time the history of the efforts made by this world Organization and the overwhelming majority of its Member States to implement the right of the Namibian people to self-determination.

As far back as 1946, under resolution 65 (I), the General Assembly rejected South Africa's proposal, so impudently submitted to the Assembly to incorporate Namibia into the territory of the South African State. Relentless pursuit of this struggle for Namibia's independence, despite all resistance, is an expression of the anti-fascist, anti-racist, in short, democratic character of the United Nations Charter and of the Organization itself, which was founded as a result of the victory won by the States of the anti-Hitler coalition over the fascist forces. That commitment also comes from the unbroken will for freedom of the Namibian people which has for more than 100 years resisted clearly superior oppressors.

As was pointed out by Erich Honecker, Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, the region of southern Africa is at the present time one of the hotbeds of tension in the world, a flashpoint that may spark a new world war and therefore places a dangerous burden on the international situation. The still-unresolved question of Namibia is an integral part of that situation in the south of the African continent, which is becoming increasingly explosive. Responsible for this situation, which is untenable in the long run, are South Africa and the imperialist Powers backing that régime, since it is a fact that the striving by the racist rulers in Pretoria for regional hegemony suits the global and strategic ambitions and economic interests of some Western States. The aim is to perpetuate Namibia's role as a springboard for imperialism and to stem historical progress in southern Africa. The apartheid régime can defy the implementation of the clear-cut decisions and resolutions adopted by the Security

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations organs, because it can safely rely, for the reasons just mentioned, on the overt and covert support of its patrons.

Only a few days ago, on Friday last week, we again saw who is preventing decisive measures to be taken against the racists. It is those forces which so wordily argue for a peaceful change in South Africa and a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, but, at the same time, by misusing their right of veto, block the path to such a settlement of the conflict in southern Africa. The "No" of two permanent members of the Security Council against the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned States in the Council is a "Yes" for the white minority in Pretoria to continue its policy of State terrorism inside and outside the country and its wilful defiance of world public opinion. History has clearly shown that all support given to the régime in Pretoria has only led to an exacerbation of the policy of apartheid in South Africa and to increased aggressiveness against South Africa's sovereign neighbouring States.

Do we really need more examples to prove that truth? Do the acts we are daily witnessing not provide sufficient evidence of that? Acts of murder are committed against representatives of the South African people, who are united in their struggle, their leaders are arrested, Angola and Botswana are attacked, gangs operating in Angola and Mozambique are supported, the Territory of Namibia is illegally occupied and its people colonially oppressed - what else can be added to Pretoria's blood-stained record? What else must happen to make South Africa's allies follow the demand for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter to be imposed on that régime?

(Mr. Huckle, German Democratic  
Republic)

The need for such sanctions has also been shown by the latest report of the Secretary-General on the implementation, or rather non-implementation, of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, contained in document S/17442. In this connection, we deem it necessary resolutely to reject the policy of so-called constructive engagement since it promotes the delaying tactics of the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic Republic)

The debate in the Security Council last week clearly demonstrated that South Africa's ruling white minority, which is backed by imperialist countries, has the impudent intention to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia. With the installation of the puppet régime in Windhoek, South Africa intends to exclude the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, as well as to exclude the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) from the settlement of the question of Namibia and to confront the world with faits accomplis. Implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is to be obstructed and to be postponed to some vague date in the far and distant future.

The German Democratic Republic regards the intention of the Botha régime to bring about a so-called internal settlement in Namibia as a new, though futile, attempt to continue the system of colonial and racial oppression and unscrupulous exploitation of the Namibian people, a policy which is contrary to international law. My country resolutely condemns any collaboration with the racist régime in Pretoria. It fully supports the statement made by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights at this year's session, and I quote from its resolution 1985/9:

"that such collaboration promotes the illegal occupation of Namibia and gross violation of human rights in southern Africa and enables South Africa to acquire the means necessary to carry out acts of aggression and blackmail against independent African States, thus increasing the threat to peace and international security".

Also the linkage upon which a certain party continues to insist between a settlement of the question of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban contingent from the People's Republic of Angola, is vehemently opposed by the German Democratic Republic, since the linkage represents an open violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) combined with the blatant attack against Angola's sovereign right to guarantee its security and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Hucke, German Democratic  
Republic)

The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime inflicts ever new suffering on the Namibian people. The people of Namibia under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, is forced to continue its hard and bitter struggle for the implementation of its right to self-determination and the independence of its country. The German Democratic Republic sides in firm solidarity with the Namibian people and its liberation organization, SWAPO, in their just struggle.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): As we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization, the question of Namibia remains a major issue on the agenda of the General Assembly. Seven years ago, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which provides for a peaceful transition to majority rule in Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision of the United Nations. That plan was accepted by all the parties concerned, including South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). It remains the only universally accepted and valid framework for solving the question of the independence of Namibia.

In spite of this and of subsequent efforts both by the Members of the Western Contact Group and the Secretary-General, the illegal South African occupation of Namibia continues.

The Government of South Africa must bear the full responsibility for Namibia's failure to achieve independence. South Africa's demand for the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola as a condition for implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is not acceptable. Resolution 435 (1978) should, in the opinion of my Government, be carried out without delay and unrelated to other issues which might be of importance to the countries in the region. This is important in order to avoid further bloodshed and suffering.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

In June this year the South African Government set up a so-called interim government in Namibia, a move which was unanimously condemned by the Security Council. This setting up of an interim government has further complicated the process towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and my Government considers this to be just another example of the South African Government's delaying tactics in Namibia. We do, however, welcome the fact that South Africa after much delay has now informed the Secretary-General of its choice of electoral system for Namibia, thus removing the last remaining technical obstacle to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But as long as the South African Government continues to insist on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a condition for implementing the resolution, prospects of a rapid solution to the Namibia conflict are slight. As the Secretary-General noted in his report to the Security Council on 6 September this year, the continuing delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) further undermines the credibility of the South African Government.

The illegal South African occupation of Namibia must now be brought to an end. My Government has on numerous occasions joined the calls on South Africa to take meaningful steps towards granting Namibia independence. As those calls have gone unheeded, we have joined with other nations in calling for sanctions to be adopted by the Security Council against South Africa to put increased pressure on Pretoria. Furthermore, Norway has on its own and in co-operation with the Nordic countries adopted measures against South Africa to make it clear to the white minority régime that our countries cannot tolerate the continuation of apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia, two major problems that are closely interrelated. We stand ready to join other Member States in adopting the necessary mandatory sanctions against South Africa to bring the South African Government to face reality once and for all.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

On a more practical note, I should like to consider for a moment what can be done constructively to prepare Namibia for its independence. In the past Norway has expressed certain reservations about the activities of the Council for Namibia, as we have felt that the Council devoted too much attention to seminars and symposiums of limited value, instead of preparing in a practical manner for the challenges that an independent Namibia will face.

We therefore noted with interest and satisfaction that the Council at its meeting in Vienna in June this year decided to establish a 200-mile economic zone off the coast of Namibia. That step could be of vital importance in protecting the marine resources of Namibia, which today are threatened by over-exploitation by foreign interests. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) recently commissioned a report on how to protect the marine resources of Namibia, which will be presented shortly to the Council for consideration.

Norway is today in a position to offer some practical assistance in that regard. A Norwegian marine research vessel, the Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, is at present working in Angolan waters on a contract with FAO and may be able to start at short notice a research expedition into Namibian waters to map out the marine resources off the coast of Namibia. Norway offers this assistance for consideration by the Council and we hope that a prompt decision can be reached in the interest of preparing for the independence of Namibia.

In conclusion, I assure the Assembly that my Government will continue its contributions to the various United Nations activities for the benefit of the people of Namibia, such as the United Nations Institute in Lusaka and the Namibian Nationhood Programme. We shall also continue our co-operation with SWAPO in giving financial and humanitarian support for the benefit of Namibian refugees for as long

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

as that assistance is required, in the hope that in the not too distant future we shall have the pleasure of contributing effectively to the building of a free and independent Namibian nation-State.

Mr. AL-MAHMOOD (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Despite repeated General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia, since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 65 (I) and Security Council resolution 264 (1969), the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, whose Mandate over the Territory was terminated by resolution 2145 (XXI), continues, in utter defiance of the will of the international community and total disregard of international legitimacy and the right of peoples to self-determination.

That cannot be said to be due exclusively to the intransigence of the Pretoria régime; the implicit support it receives from certain Member States and their unwillingness to implement economic sanctions against the racist régime are an important factor in enabling it to persist in flouting United Nations resolutions and in its illegal occupation of Namibia.

In its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council rejected South Africa's insistence on linking Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues. It declared that the independence of Namibia could not be held hostage to the resolution of issues that were alien to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also provided for the possible adoption of sanctions under the Charter if South Africa continued illegally to obstruct Namibian independence and ignore the call for the withdrawal of the Pretoria régime's forces from Namibia. However, the Council has so far failed to impose sanctions on South Africa, thanks to the abuse of the right of veto in an attempt to protect the racist régime from the consequences of its defiance of the will of the international community and its disregard of international legitimacy.



(Mr. Al-Mahmood, Qatar)

In resolution 39/50 A the General Assembly condemned the increased assistance rendered by the major Western countries and Israel to South Africa in the political, economic, financial and particularly the military and nuclear fields. Emphasis was laid on the co-operation of certain Western States with the racist régime in activities related to processing Namibian uranium. The racist régime will not be deterred and it will not comply with United Nations resolutions unless the States that help it implement its present policy cease to do so. My delegation hopes that the States concerned will reconsider their position and will stand by legitimacy and justice in Namibia.

We affirm our support for the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under its sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We also commend the efforts made by the United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia despite the difficulties and obstacles placed in their way. We are confident that the march of history cannot be stopped and that the last vestige of abhorrent colonialism must be eliminated from the African continent, so that the stigma of the continuance of Pretoria's racist aggression against the right of the Namibian people to self-determination may once and for all be removed from the earth.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Having celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples at this session, we are unhappy that the problem of Namibia remains unsolved, despite the clear position of the international community categorically expressed in many resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. That is, unfortunately, the well-known result of the persistent refusal of the Pretoria régime to implement the

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

decisions of this world Organization. The many manoeuvres, machinations and procrastinations of that régime and its protectors across the Atlantic are the basic reason why the Namibian people has still not been able to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The United Nations has adopted a sufficient number of resolutions condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia as an act of aggression that tramples underfoot the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence and endangers international peace and security. Because of the international community's untiring efforts in support of the Namibian people and its sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the question of Namibia has for years now been at the forefront of United Nations efforts to ensure that the vestiges of colonialism and all forms of neo-colonialism are eliminated without delay and for ever from that region of the world.

Following the example of the United Nations, many other international forums, such as the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity, have expressed their serious concern at the persistent attempts of the imperialist and racist forces to erect one barrier after another on the path to the achievement by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

The pre-conditions set by South Africa and the United States - such as "linkage", "parallelism", "reciprocity" and withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola - have been condemned and rejected by the General Assembly. And now we see another attempt by the South African racists to impose new pre-conditions. They are trying to gain international recognition for the so-called interim government, which was manufactured out of whole cloth and in defiance of Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 566 (1985). That is another challenge to the international community which should be condemned and rejected by the United Nations. Last June, the Security Council declared that South Africa's decision to establish and proclaim that so-called interim government was illegal and null and

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

void. It called on all Member States not to take any action that could be interpreted as recognition of that South African puppet.

Colonial oppression is continuing in Namibia because of imperialism's geostrategic and neo-colonialist interests and ambitions, which are the basis of the policy of so-called constructive engagement with South Africa. This policy has been shown, in practice, to be contrary to the legitimate interests and aspirations not only of the Namibian people but also of the other sovereign States of the region. South Africa, which enjoys overall and generous political, economic, financial and military support from United States imperialism, is interfering ever more openly in the internal affairs of sovereign States such as Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia and is embarking on subversive actions whose purpose is the economic and political destabilization of those countries. It uses every means in its attempt to stop the wheels of history in that region of the world, including the establishment of relations of allegiance aimed at propping up the wobbling bases of colonialism and imperialism in southern Africa. That is also a desperate attempt to maintain in that region the inhuman, degrading system of apartheid, condemned by the entire world.

All those attempts are doomed to failure. That is eloquently proved by the situation in Namibia and the growing ferocity of the resistance of the masses in South Africa.

For almost 20 years now the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, has been engaged in a heroic armed struggle against the racist colonizers to achieve its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. As the Secretary-General of SWAPO, Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, has emphasized, the Namibian people is absolutely determined to continue its epic struggle until final victory. That people, which has been subjected to the most brutal kind of colonial

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

oppression for more than a century, has repeatedly demonstrated its determination to continue the struggle against the South African colonizer. Everyone knows that the state of emergency imposed on Namibia has lasted for more than 10 years now. At the beginning of this year, the northern part of the Territory, near the border with Angola, was declared closed to any traffic. Further measures have been adopted giving unlimited possibilities to the 100,000 South African occupation troops to engage in cruel treatment of the people and in acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, as indeed they did in September and October last. The transnational corporations also are able to continue, without any let-up, their merciless exploitation of the Namibian people and its national wealth. The racist régime is constantly perfecting its military machine by acquiring the most modern matériel - this is clear from the report of the Council for Namibia - and by continuing to develop its nuclear potential. That aggressive policy by the South African Government tangibly increases the threat to international peace and security, and especially peace in Africa.

The overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations and the international community as a whole have repeatedly expressed their support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, for freedom and independence. The most recent initiatives by the South African racists leave no room for doubt about their determination to continue cynically to defy the will of the international community. They have furnished more than sufficient proof of that.

The United Nations has also noted the ineffectiveness of attempts by certain countries to insist on the need for a policy of dialogue with South Africa. It has become clear that the only real way to make South Africa listen to reason is for the Security Council to adopt the mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. That is what the overwhelming majority of the States Members of

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

the United Nations have been demanding for a long time now. The most recent proof of this is the draft resolution of 15 November this year that was before the Security Council; it was supported by 12 Council members but was vetoed, as similar draft resolutions had been before, by the most open defenders of the Pretoria régime, the enemies of a just solution to the Namibian problem. Because of that, the only measure likely to isolate the South African racist régime and oblige it to put an end to its policy of aggression failed.

In the Bulgarian delegation's opinion, those who advocate "constructive engagement" with South Africa and lend it their total support should rather heed the voice of the international community and comply with its demands. If they do not, the responsibility for the failure to solve the question of Namibia, with all the negative consequences that this will have for peace and security in that region of the world, will fall squarely on their shoulders.

The summit meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty held in Sofia last October expressed categorical support for the heroic struggle of the Namibian people and stressed the urgent need to grant independence to Namibia. The Declaration adopted by that meeting stated among other things that:

"The participants ... resolutely condemn the policy of apartheid pursued by the Republic of South Africa and the mass repressions against the indigenous African population, and insist that support for the racist Pretoria régime cease. They demand an end to the acts of aggression, interference and military intervention by the imperialist forces against Angola and the other States in southern Africa". (A/C.1/40/7, p. 10)

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

So far as the People's Republic of Bulgaria is concerned, its position on the question of Namibia is well known. We resolutely condemn the continued illegal military occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the continuing exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia by the transnational corporations of Western countries.

I should like to reaffirm from this rostrum the firm determination of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to continue to support in every possible way the just struggle of the heroic people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO to gain genuine national independence. We also call on South Africa to withdraw immediately all its occupation troops and its administration from the occupied territory of Namibia, and to transfer all power to the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is opposed to all political manoeuvres or attempts to impose neo-colonial solutions that do not conform to the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. The question of Namibia can be resolved only on the basis of the relevant United Nations decisions, and in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

The People's Republic of Bulgaria remains faithful to the policy of the immediate and definitive elimination of all vestiges of colonialism. It will continue to make its contribution to the efforts of the world Organization to achieve a genuine and just solution of this problem.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Some speakers have said that the General Assembly keeps debating the same issues year after year. It is true that the subject that we are considering today has been a source of serious concern to the international community for many years. The failure to resolve it, and hence its continuous consideration here, is due to the obstinacy,

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

arrogance and disdain of the racists in Pretoria who, scorning the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, stubbornly remain in the Territory illegally.

In the course of this fortieth session of the General Assembly, 113 of the 137 speakers who intervened, have said that there is an urgent need for South Africa to cease employing subterfuge and to grant independence to Namibia.

As we all know, resolution 435 (1978) is the basis for the negotiation of a peaceful solution of this problem. We have considered its implementation on innumerable occasions. Yet Pretoria has come forward with its so-called linkage to try to delay the independence of Namibia and to complicate the situation in southern Africa. It is obvious that Pretoria is behaving in this way because it is counting on the support of Washington, as reflected in the incorrectly-termed policy of constructive engagement, which has only prolonged the agony of the Namibian people and that of the black masses of South Africa and of the countries in the area, victims of the policy of State terrorism practised every day by the racist régime in a vain attempt to remain in power.

History does not turn back; as night follows day, sooner or later Namibia will be independent. The way to the final liberation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa is being paved with the blood of the sons of these people who are unable to accept hypocritical harangues about human rights.

It is not necessary to repeat here that ever since the idea arose, many have spoken out to condemn the hypocritical idea of linkage. Even before internationalist Cuban troops went to Angola at the request of the people, the MPLA party and the Angolan Government, the United Nations had called upon South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. But the racists and their allies engaged in other kinds of trickery to maintain control over the mineral resources there and to continue to benefit from their strategic position on Namibian Territory.



(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Angola has demonstrated a constructive, flexible and responsible spirit by offering itself as a platform, which my Government supports, for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But now there is no talk of this offer, because the racists in Pretoria and their allies in Washington are more interested in overthrowing the legitimate Government of Angola. This is clear from the fact that the press in this very city has carried reports about talk of assisting UNITA, which is nothing more than an organization of criminals and bandits.

In the name of what law can there be any talk about providing "humanitarian" assistance to UNITA's bandits. Is this not a case of gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State which should be censured and condemned by the international community?

Just a few hours ago, the Security Council considered the question of Namibia and the resolution tabled was not adopted because there was an express reference to the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. That prompted two permanent members of the Council to veto the resolution. This veto will prolong not only Namibia's agony, but also that of South Africa's black population and that of the countries of the region. Why these attempts to avoid the inevitable, to prevent tomorrow from coming?

Cuba believes that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter must inevitably be imposed on South Africa because of its continuing occupation of Namibia and its aggressive racist policy in South Africa and in Namibia, which create a situation that threatens international peace and security.

It is time to heed the people of the world and to take action to curtail suffering. There must be no more subterfuge, delaying tactics and hypocritical tricks. Either one is for the liberation of the peoples of southern Africa, for independence and against apartheid, or one supports Pretoria, and therefore the

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

continuing violation of human rights and the policy of state terrorism which the racists are applying against the countries of the area. There is no longer any alternative to the expression of open, clear and specific support for the independence of Namibia and for the final elimination of apartheid.

The meeting rose at 1. p.m.