



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.84
21 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 20 November 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Vice-President) (Democratic Yemen)

- 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 10.45 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 PEOPLES (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. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to express to the delegation of Colombia, through you, Mr. President, our deep sympathy on the occasion of the disaster which has befallen their country and at the cost of thousands of lives and terrible material damage. We affirm our solidarity with the people and Government of Colombia as they face the consequences of this disaster.

Once again the General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia, which has become the most important and serious question facing the United Nations within the framework of decolonization. As it discusses this question, which is related to international peace and security and the destiny of the people of a Territory for which the time has come to occupy its legitimate place among the independent countries of the world, the General Assembly must recall the important positions of principle which were expressed here some days ago.

The General Assembly has considered the question of apartheid and stressed the link between it and the expansionist occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime and the exportation by the racist régime to the people and territory of Namibia of its apartheid structures, accompanied by all its practices of repression and fragmentation.

(Mr. Al-Fattal, Syrian Arab
Republic)

The general debate on apartheid certainly emphasizes the fact that the situation in southern Africa is undergoing qualitative changes and transformations as a result of the struggle of the black masses. The apartheid régime is now threatened and besieged by these masses, which have now shaken it vertically and horizontally, by the very precise blows they continue to direct at its forces and protectors.

The brutal repression of this heroic resistance is only an expression of the terror which now afflicts the white oppressors and heralds a new phase in the epic struggle between the masses who are breaking the chains and an exploiting minority which is greedily concerned only with its own selfish interests.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

This upsurge in South Africa has been accompanied by the joining of ranks between the armed struggle of the Liberation Army of Namibia and broad sectors of the people of Namibia and South Africa. Thanks to this alliance against this common enemy the people's liberation army of Namibia supported by the revolution of the Namibian people has inflicted serious losses on the enemy, the racist occupiers, who number at least 100,000 troops. These recent developments have a serious impact on the future of the expansionist and tyrannical apartheid system in South Africa and Namibia as well as on the south African region at large.

Among the first results is the fact that the initiative is no longer in the hands of the white minority but has moved to the representatives of the popular masses, especially the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as well as the two movements, the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC).

The participation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa in the struggle against the common enemy is the most important development in Africa's international affairs. This will inject new momentum and dynamism, and have a far-reaching impact on the decolonization process in the region. These developments will influence the action of the United Nations and the type and quality of solidarity and support which all the persecuted masses should receive in their pursuit of the liberation struggle.

The General Assembly and the Security Council must take into consideration those positive developments, particularly since they help to speed the march toward liberation. Furthermore, decision-making is no longer the monopoly of the capitals of the Western States which manoeuvre, through their covert and overt support of Pretoria, in order to circumvent the interests of the African peoples in both territories. This decision-making initiative now belongs to the struggling peoples who achieve self-determination through their authentic struggle.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

This evolution must be positively and clearly reflected in the United Nations which is committed to the independence of Namibia and to opposing apartheid.

These important developments have shaken the conceptual patterns of Western politicians on the one hand, while on the other they have sown terror in financial markets and the spheres of influence of transnational corporations. Their foremost concern is to salvage what they can of their wealth, privileges and investments, while forgetting that authentic popular revolutions can never be expected to act as guarantors of their gains extracted from the toiling masses and their generous land. Land belongs to he who tills and mines it. Wealth belongs to the nation and production to the people as a whole. Yes, the Namibian question could have been settled through peaceful means by implementing Security Council resolution 435v(1978) which embodies the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. SWAPO has opted for peaceful means and has displayed acknowledged flexibility, whereas South Africa has chosen distortion deviation and attempts to change that decision. It has tried through its supporters to ban United Nations intervention in this matter. It has resorted to a ploy called "linkage and parallelism" and "constructive participation" as well as "active constructive participation". All of these are dilatory verbal formulas and policies aimed at giving South Africa enough time to dash the hopes of the peoples of the region by military decisions and to gain time to proceed to plunder the uranium, diamonds, copper and oil resources which have recently been discovered. It also seeks to dismember and divide Namibia and impose puppet rulers and annex strategic ports and off-shore islands to the territory of South Africa and place all those facilities at the service of the military and strategic areas of world imperialism.

The policy of "parallelism and linkage" proposed by the United States as an irreversible request, impedes the independence of Namibia on the one hand and leads to hegemony over struggling Angola. It also places Angola under the military and

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

economic influence of the United States. Therefore, "constructive participation" is only an endorsement of the apartheid structure without which the apartheid régime could never maintain its domination and practise its iron-grip policy both at home and abroad.

Everyone is now aware that the solution of the Namibian question, which was about to be reached in the late 1970s, is now further away than ever following the intransigence of Washington and Pretoria, which have imposed on the implementation of Namibia's independence, - assuming they were really for independence - conditions which neither the United Nations nor SWAPO nor any other party can accept since they involve the sovereign rights of independent Angola, part of whose territory is occupied by South Africa. Furthermore, South Africa, by installing a puppet interim government in Namibia, believes that it can exclude SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, as a principal negotiating party. Such action constitutes a gross violation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

The failure of the Lusaka negotiations is but additional evidence of Pretoria's malicious designs inimical to the settlement plan.

Though we pin hopes on the ability of the revolutionary forces in Azania and Namibia to pursue the struggle with all means and to achieve victory, we are aware that the road to victory is a long one and that sacrifices will indeed be enormous. Because we realize that the racist régime, supported by the major Western Powers, especially the United States and other countries including Israel, will not abandon their material and strategic interests until they are convinced that the price they have to pay for remaining there is higher than the cost of giving them up.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab
Republic)

We wish to reaffirm here that our African brethren will thwart the propaganda campaign which excludes their struggle from its colonialist context and use that campaign in order to place it in the context of East-West relations. The United States seeks to use that campaign in order to serve its global strategy, while everyone knows that the colonialist problem arose with the arrival of the first white settler and that wars waged by whites a century ago, to exterminate the indigenous population coincided with the wars waged by the United States against the indigenous population of Red Indians in America.

A matter of grave concern is that it intends to expand the scope of its aggression against the peoples of Africa and entrench the concept of "linkage". This was reported by the American media in relation to the Administration's implementation of a scheme at the beginning of this month to destabilize and overthrow the régime in Angola.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Joseph Harsch exposed that scheme in his article in The Christian Science Monitor of 5 November this year, in which he proves that the United States Administration has already taken such a decision, by which it arrogates to itself the right to intervene in the internal affairs of another country by supporting UNITA, an organization that has been trained, financed and directed by the white Government of South Africa since Angola gained its independence in 1975. Harsch goes on to say that after the State Department's statement this month (spoke in English)

"Conservative political elements in Washington have opened a campaign in favour of abandoning negotiation and going over to either overt or clandestine aid to UNITA (or both). Republican Jack Kemp of New York and Democrat Claude Pepper of Florida have introduced bills to provide 'non-lethal' aid to the Savimbi forces. Other pending bills would give military aid. CIA Director William Casey and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger are reported, unofficially, to favour clandestine aid."

(continued in Arabic)

That declaration is in flagrant contradiction of Security Council resolution 574 (1985), adopted on 7 October, when the Council for the third time condemned South Africa for its third act of aggression against Angola since June. That air raid led to the death of more than 65 people. The Council denounced that aggressive act and called upon South Africa to withdraw all its forces immediately and unconditionally from Angola. The United States abstained in the voting on a paragraph in the draft resolution calling on Member States to assist Angola to strengthen its military capability to enable it to confront the aggressive escalation by South Africa. The United States representative said in the Security Council:

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

(spoke in English)

"Angola needs peace, not more foreign troops, foreign intervention and imported arms." (S/PV.2617, p. 51)

(continued in Arabic)

How can we reconcile such a declaration and the statement by the State Department reported in the article that I quoted? Does the United States have a right to intervene in the internal affairs of Angola and overthrow the régime there through Savimbi? Is that legitimate, because that is what South Africa seeks, whereas the decolonization of Namibia is illegitimate? The conclusion is obvious. There is only one reality in the light of that declaration - that the United States is bearing South Africa's military burden in Angola and thus preventing Namibia's accession to independence - all within the framework of the policy of constructive engagement. Is not the assistance to the elements hostile to the governing régime in Angola direct assistance to Pretoria to allow it to tighten its grip on and escalate its repression of the South African peoples in revolt?

The hypocrisy of the United States is similar to that of the representative of the Zionist entity, who misled the Assembly on 30 October with regard to the racist and colonialist nature of Israel. He started reminding our African colleagues of the assistance supplied to them by Israel, which has been extorted from the pockets of the American taxpayer. In the most ridiculous manner, he compared the Zionist movement and the African movements. There is no better answer to his allegations than the words of the representative of one of the front-line States when he put Israel and South Africa on the same level in the Security Council. After the latest act of aggression against Angola, he said:

(spoke in English)

"Aggression is as essential to their existence as oxygen is to human beings."
(S/PV.2616, p. 13)

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

(continued in Arabic)

The nature of Israel, its racism and its sabotaging role in the Arab region and against African countries are all well-known matters that do not need to be repeated. United Nations reports on apartheid and Namibia, whose contents are based on Western sources, prove without any doubt that there is close co-operation between South Africa and Israel. Those reports are full of indications of the "special relationship" between Pretoria and Tel Aviv. A report of Standing Committee II to the United Nations Council for Namibia says:

"nearly all of the recent arms developments by ARMSCOR have been derivatives of Israeli products. There is co-operation in the manufacture of a new generation of tanks, a revolutionary fighter, naval vessels and submarines, as well as artillery and small arms. Israeli defence scientists are on secondment in South Africa. South African industrial firms are recruiting Israeli workers, especially skilled workers, in electronics computers and engineering. There are several hundred South Africans in Israel at any one time being trained in weapon systems, battle strategy and counter-insurgency warfare. Israeli 'counter-terrorist experts' have been training SADF forces and the South African police. In addition, Israel has supplied the latest electronics for both fighter aircraft and ground troops." (A/AC.131/179, para. 60)

The United Nations Council for Namibia condemned that special relationship in paragraph 26 of its report dated 13 June 1985 (A/40/375). That condemnation covered co-operation in the political, economic, military and other fields. Israel, which is now the seventh largest arms producer in the world, supplies South Africa with all its weapons requirements, including weapons of mass destruction. A July issue of The Economist stated:

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab
Republic)

(spoke in English)

"It is not often that Israel cherishes its unpopularity among the Arabs' third world friends, but this does at least guarantee splendid sales to South Africa, Taiwan and some Latin American countries."

(continued in Arabic)

As for the different types of Israeli weapons exported to South Africa, according to the article they are:

(spoke in English)

"Dagger jets, Dabur-class patrol boats, Gabriel missiles, mines, 'smart' bombs for A-4 fighters. At least 36 Kfirs, worth more than \$430m, have been sold to South Africa.

"South Africa buys Reshefs (mounted with Italian guns), Gabriels, Merkavas, two-seater Scorpion helicopters and Aliya corvette patrol boats."

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Israeli occupation of Palestine, the Syrian Golan Heights and parts of southern Lebanon and the fact that the two racist régimes - the one in Tel Aviv and the one in Pretoria - apply identical forms of repression are confirmation that those régimes are two sides of the same coin.

The struggle of the Namibian people is closely linked to South Africa's penchant for expansionism - at the expense of the neighbouring countries and the front-line States. And all of this is done in co-operation with developed Western countries. The struggle of the Palestinian people also is the result of imperialist policies, which use Israeli hegemonism as the spearhead for the fulfilment of imperialism's aims of domination of our region.

In New Delhi, from 19 to 21 April 1985, an Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries was held to discuss specifically the question of Namibia. At that meeting, Israel was placed where it deserved to be - in the group of imperialist countries. I wish to quote the following from the Declaration of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries:

"The Bureau notes with grave concern the escalating collaboration between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and in Pretoria. It notes the similarity of aggressive measures such as the "iron fist" policy and "hot pursuit" adopted by both régimes against the peoples of South Africa and Namibia as well as Palestine, South Lebanon and other Arab territories occupied by Israel. It, further, condemns the persistence of both régimes in continuing and increasing their collaboration in the political, economic, military and nuclear fields, as such collaboration constitutes a threat to international peace and security". (A/40/307, para. 37)

Finally, if we wish to put an end to the aggression by apartheid against Namibia, we must strive by all means to make the Security Council implement

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

resolution 435 (1978) expeditiously. At the same time, we must impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. We must strengthen the boycott of South Africa, in implementation of General Assembly resolutions and decisions of other forums. We must exert all efforts in support of the struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in all spheres, especially in regard to its armed struggle for the liberation of Namibia. Such measures must be co-ordinated. We cannot expect to oblige the Pretoria régime to withdraw completely, from all the territory of Namibia, unless a diversity of means is used in the national, African and international struggle to decolonize Namibia.

We wish to state on this occasion that we support the plan, which appears in document A/AC.131/191, to promote international action with a view to achieving Namibian independence. We also support the decision taken at the non-aligned meeting in Luanda concerning the convening of the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter if Pretoria did not comply with Security Council resolution 566 (1985). But that decision met with a deplorable setback recently because of the veto cast by the United States against the draft resolution submitted by the group of non-aligned countries in Security Council document S/17633, dated 15 November 1985. Once again, the United States and the United Kingdom have abused the right of veto to block the adoption of this draft resolution calling for the imposition of selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter and the Security Council's responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Among those selective mandatory sanctions would have been an oil embargo, an arms embargo, the prohibition of all new investments in South Africa and Namibia, the termination of all export credit guarantees for exports to South

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

Africa and Namibia and the prohibition of the importation of uranium from Namibia and South Africa. And here the mask comes off. The United States and the United Kingdom prefer the colonization and occupation of Namibia to continue, in violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Both countries wish to enable South Africa to shirk its responsibilities in the implementation of the United Nations plan for peace in Namibia. We believe that this double veto will result in further racist repression of the people of South Africa and the people of Namibia. It will certainly divert the process of peace from the course set by international legitimacy.

The Syrian Arab Republic is not intimidated by the threats made by imperialist circles in an attempt to prevent countries from dealing with colonial questions frankly, correctly and in accordance with principles. Decolonization is a duty; it is a commitment. The facts before us should lead us to adopt even stronger decisions to consolidate international action and assure more assistance to the militant people of Namibia and its liberation movement, SWAPO, as well as to the threatened African countries. We must place on the shoulders of the Western countries, and especially the United States and Israel, the responsibility for the continued impeding of the implementation of United Nations resolutions. Anyone who remains silent about a crime becomes an accomplice in that crime. Concealing the identity of the criminal contributes to clearing him.

We shall spare no effort in extending all possible assistance to SWAPO and the Namibian people so that they may regain their independence on their unified national soil.

We are convinced that our struggle against Zionism is a contribution to the struggle against racial discrimination, which is the other face of colonialism, supported by imperialism. The real terrorists are those who oppose and repress the aspirations of peoples to freedom, independence, justice and equality.

(Mr. El-Fattal, Syrian Arab Republic)

In conclusion, I extend our thanks to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its subsidiary bodies for their tireless efforts. We support all the recommendations of the Council which appear in General Assembly document A/AC.131/328, in all its parts.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): This year, on the fortieth anniversary of the creation of our Organization, we have taken note of the great successes achieved by the United Nations since its inception. During the recent anniversary session of the General Assembly, many speakers praised in particular the work being done by the United Nations in the area of the full implementation of the rights of people to self-determination and independence. This United Nations activity has also been influenced considerably by the increase in the Organization's membership, which has increased threefold since the United Nations was founded.

Czechoslovakia, one of the founding Members of the United Nations, notes with regret that Namibia has still not taken its place as an independent sovereign State among the Member States of the United Nations. This Organization has been considering the question of Namibia virtually since its foundation in 1946. Next year will mark the twentieth anniversary of General Assembly resolution 2165 (XXI), which ended the Republic of South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia. At that time, the continuing presence of South Africa was declared to be illegal. Many resolutions have been adopted calling for an unconditional cessation of the illegal occupation and colonization of Namibia. One of the major problems in Africa would be resolved if those demands were realized.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) shows the right way to achieve that goal by peaceful means. Yet the Namibian people still have not become free. One hundred thousand South African soldiers are now in Namibia. For over 13 years now a state of emergency has been declared in more than two-thirds of the country. The Pretoria régime has been carrying out a monstrous repression of the civilian population; it has been killing those fighting for freedom and independence; it is holding many political leaders and supporters of the South West Africa People's

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Organization (SWAPO) in prison, and imprisoned patriots are cruelly tortured.

Those are the methods to which the racist apartheid régime of South Africa resorts to suppress the broad national liberation movement of the Namibian people.

Neither the high concentration of South African troops in Namibia nor any acts of tyranny or oppression by the occupation forces of the Pretoria régime have been able to break the Namibian people's determination to achieve freedom and independence. That régime has not been able nor will it be able to, stamp out the militant resistance of the leading force and the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO.

Several days ago in the General Assembly, the Secretary-General of SWAPO stated - that that organization will continue to intensify its struggle further until it liberates its country, its people and its natural resources.

Why are the Pretoria racists employing every means to retain their rule over Namibia? It is a fact that in many respects Namibian territory is of considerable importance to the economic prosperity of South Africa. The outrageous plunder of the country's natural resources and the exploitation of its population play a significant part in subsidizing South African economy and financing the Pretoria leaders' aggressive intentions. For the racist apartheid régime Namibia is a source of such important raw materials as lead, copper, zinc, tungsten, uranium and iron ore, which is widely mined there; and tremendous profits go to South Africa from diamond mining. The Pretoria régime also uses Namibia as an enormous training ground and testing range for new kinds of weapons. From Namibian territory it launches acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States, against Angola in particular. In this year alone the Security Council has been forced to meet twice to consider South African aggression against Angola.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Moreover, Namibian territory is being used as a refuge for the counter-revolutionary gangs of UNITA. That is why South Africa refuses to grant independence to Namibia; that is the reason why it refuses to respect Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In trying to delay the inevitable end of its colonial rule in Namibia, the Pretoria régime continues in its totally unjustified policy of linking Namibian independence with the question of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Those troops are in Angola at the request of the Angolan Government, to defend Angola from South African attacks. The linkage policy represents nothing less than an inadmissible interference by South Africa in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, Angola.

The latest of many South African racist attempts to establish a neo-colonialist solution of the Namibian problem was the creation of the puppet government in Windhoek. It is not surprising that the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, SWAPO, has categorically rejected this ploy by the Pretoria régime.

Our delegation considers that the establishment of a so-called provisional government is an attempt to achieve a settlement of the Namibian problem outside the framework of United Nations decisions, and to impose on Namibia a neo-colonial version of independence, as well as excluding SWAPO from the solution of the future of Namibia.

Of course the racist régime of South Africa could not continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of aggression, openly ignoring international law, the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions without the broad diplomatic, political, strategic, military and economic support of the United States of America, certain other Western States and Israel. For the imperialist States, South Africa remains the main bastion in southern Africa and their direct

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

military political partner. For example, South Africa is an important supplier of strategic raw materials to the United States. More than 500 American monopolies are operating in South Africa and Namibia. In violation of resolution 418 (1977), which bans the sale of weapons and military hardware to South Africa, American firms have supplied that country, during the past 10 years alone, with weapons and military material worth no less than \$500 million. Also, American companies have helped South Africa to create its own military industry. Not far from Johannesburg a large aircraft factory was constructed which operates under American patents. Co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field is also becoming dangerous. At the same time Washington is trying to include the Pretoria régime in the military co-operation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), as evidenced by the transfer of the military base at Simonstown to that bloc.

We should also mention the personal contacts between the imperialist States and the racist régime of South Africa in other fields, particularly those of culture and athletics. The scale of this co-operation is indicated in documents regularly published by our Organization.

The United States and its closest allies verbally condemn apartheid. They condemn the occupation of Namibia by the South African régime. They are forced to do that by the determined attitude of the world community. They present their policy of constructive engagement as if it could lead to the elimination of apartheid and the granting of independence to Namibia. They loudly welcome cosmetic reforms by the apartheid régime, "the South African alternative" to the solution of the Namibian problem is depicted as a peace effort by the Pretoria régime, in an attempt to create the illusion that that régime has become peaceful in nature, primarily thanks to the present American Administration.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

Just a few days ago two allies of the South African racists, the United States and Great Britain, revealed their real position. By exercising their right of veto they prevented the Security Council from adopting a resolution which would not only have condemned the Pretoria régime, once again, but at the same time would have contained effective economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Claims that supposedly mandatory economic sanctions would harm the South African and Namibian peoples themselves are totally unfounded. The harm would be done to those who are preventing the Namibian people from realizing their right to self-determination. The United States and British position clearly demonstrates that the profits which they derive from economic co-operation with South Africa are much more important to them than the interests of oppressed peoples. The human rights and the struggle for freedom and independence which they love to talk about at length on some occasions, are in this case passed over in silence.

We cannot agree with this policy of certain imperialist States with respect to the Pretoria régime. The position of principle adopted by the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and other socialist States was reflected in the Declaration adopted on 23 October of this year in Sofia at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty:

"During the consideration of the situation in southern Africa, support was been expressed for the selfless struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for the freedom and independence of their country, and it was emphasized that Namibia must be granted independence immediately. Participants in the meeting resolutely condemn South Africa's policy of apartheid as well as the mass repression of the indigenous African population, and demand that support for the racist régime of Pretoria should cease. They call for an end to

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

aggressive acts, interference, and military intervention by imperialist forces against Angola and other States of southern Africa."

Czechoslovakia commends and welcomes the work and conclusions of the United Nations Council for Namibia that indicate the correct manner in which the immediate and unconditional cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia can be achieved and the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence realized on the basis of preserving the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

We resolutely and fully support the courageous struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, authentic and legitimate representative. We consider that the task of putting an end to the crimes committed against the Namibians and achieving the complete independence of Namibia is of exceptional importance and cannot be put off any longer.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): Meeting as we do, on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, to consider colonial issues such as the problem of Namibia, we cannot but conclude that in spite of the great strides made by the United Nations in decolonization, there still remains much work to be done and that the task placed on our shoulders of assisting colonial peoples to obtain their freedom and independence is both onerous and pressing.

Almost two decades ago, by resolution 2145 (XX), the General Assembly decided to end South Africa's Mandate over the territory of Namibia. It declared South Africa's continued presence in the Territory illegal, and placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The following year, by General Assembly resolution 2248 (XXI), the administration of the Territory was delegated, until full independence, to the United Nations Council for Namibia. South Africa

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

has since then refused to recognize the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and has contemptuously rejected repeated the appeals and calls of this Organization, of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the Organization of African Unity, to grant immediate independence to the Territory.

What is more, South Africa has not only intensified its repressive policies within Namibia, but is using the Territory as a springboard for military operations and numerous acts of aggression against its neighbours and especially the People's Republic of Angola.

In the meantime the plundering of Namibia's resources is continuing unabated, despite the enactment of Decree No. 1 by the Council for Namibia.

The contempt of the Pretoria régime for the international community and international law is further demonstrated by its acts of destabilization, subversion and aggression, aimed at neutralizing the opponents of its illegal occupation of Namibia and of the system of apartheid.

Aware of its obligations, the international community has demonstrated a rare show of unity on a major international problem by adopting a programme of action providing the only acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia. The responsibility for its non-implementation rests squarely with the régime in South Africa. We are heartened by the Security Council resolution of 26 July this year as being a step in the right direction.

We are also heartened by the fact that the Namibian people are more determined than ever before to continue their struggle for freedom and human dignity. Moreover, the international community is becoming increasingly more aware of the just cause of the Namibian people, and it is now more and more involved in forcing South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. The moral and material support which the international community provides to the Namibian people, especially to the front-line States and to the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

people, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), is indicative of the rejuvenation of the determination and solidarity of the world community. For no man is an island. What is taking place in Namibia affects all of us. The rights denied the people of Namibia are principles denied to our respective peoples, since freedom is one, universal and indivisible.

The continuation of the occupation of Namibia contrary to solemn General Assembly and Security Council resolutions is an affront to all humanity. That the Namibian people are still subjected to colonialism and to institutionalized racism is a grave injustice and an arrogant denial of cherished human values. The arrogance reflected that attitude, however, must be attributed partly to our own failure as members of a world body whose primary responsibility is to maintain international peace and security. Have we done everything in our power for the people of Namibia? Or have we instead allowed the forces of aggression to prevail over the principles of freedom, peace and justice because of the inability of our Organization to implement its solemn decisions - a function so important to our Organization's success?

In order to preserve the authority, prestige and usefulness of the United Nations and to eliminate the threat to international peace and security posed by the South African use of the Territory as a springboard of aggression, the Security Council must proceed immediately to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Sanctions are appropriate and, if applied by all, they can be truly effective. And sanctions are particularly needed as a contribution to the peaceful settlement of this grave problem and to end the policy of apartheid.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

The issue of linkage introduced by the South African régime is foreign to the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The issue before us is a clear case of decolonization, as President Kyprianou has said, and as such it should not be linked in any way to other extraneous issues in the region.

South Africa is solely responsible for the stalemate we are witnessing in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitutes the only internationally acceptable basis for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. The people of Namibia must be allowed to achieve their legitimate aspirations and inalienable rights. They must be freed as soon as possible from colonialism, oppression and racism, and the world community, including the Western contact group, could play a still more important role in this regard.

We fully support the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination in a united country, including Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other adjacent islands, in accordance with United Nations resolutions and the declarations of the Non-Aligned Movement, and we reiterate our continuing faith in the Security Council as regards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

Cyprus is as proud of its membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia as it is aware of the great responsibilities and obligations that honour entails. For this reason, in spite of our small size and meagre resources and in spite of the occupation of our own country and the uprooting of our own people, we continue to exert every effort, including contributions to the various United Nations funds for Namibia, to enable the heroic people of Namibia to fulfil their rightful aspirations. In this regard we believe strongly that what is primarily and badly needed is material, financial and other assistance, rather than repeated expressions of outrage or of condemnation of apartheid.

We fully endorse the Vienna Final Document and the Luanda Final Declaration of the Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, and condemn the installation

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

in Namibia of a so-called government, in violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We reaffirm our full support for the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until independence and reiterate our support for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on Namibia in 1986 and of an international consultative conference on Namibia not later than May 1986.

Mr. AL-NAJJAR (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): When the year 1985 comes to an end, 100 years will have elapsed since the Berlin Conference, at which the colonialist division of the African continent took place and where the colonialist domination of Namibia began. By the culmination of our celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations we had listened to statements by more than 70 heads of State or Government, all of whom condemned colonialism and rejected both its new and its old methods. We listened to all those who participated in the celebration of the establishment of our Organization as they enumerated the successes and failures of the United Nations. They were all unanimous in declaring that the elimination of colonialism from many parts of the world was among the most important achievements of the United Nations. However, the question of Namibia has remained on the agenda of the General Assembly since its first session, in 1946, despite the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of October 1966, which declared the termination of the racist South African Government's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia and the illegality of its continuing occupation of that Territory. It also declared that the totality of the Territory of Namibia should become the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

We believe that the situation in Namibia should be considered as a question of colonialism and should be analysed and settled accordingly. Indeed, to place the

(Mr. Al-Najjar, United Arab Emirates)

problem outside that framework and in the framework of East-West relations would totally falsify its real nature and would lead to further difficulties in establishing peace and security in southern Africa.

The desperate attempts of the racist Government in South Africa to reach an internal settlement and its cosmetic reforms and constitutional falsifications are insufficient to deal with this tragedy. The ideal solution resides in the fulfilment of the aspirations and demands of the Namibian people as expressed by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people, on all occasions and in all conferences. It also lies in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the liberation of Namibia, as endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978. That resolution is the only basis for the settlement of the illegal situation in Namibia by peaceful means. The Namibian people, through their sole representative, SWAPO, have declared their full support for that resolution and other resolutions on this question adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The real obstacles in the way of implementing the Security Council resolution are the lack of political will on the part of some of the major countries and the arbitrary use of the veto in the Security Council for the benefit of the racist Government in Pretoria. The Yalta Conference, in February 1945, affirmed that the permanent members of the Security Council should not resort to the veto when dealing with the settlement of disputes. Despite that we find some major States continuing to use the veto whenever the questions of Namibia and Palestine are considered by the Security Council.

The failure of the United Nations to secure implementation of its resolutions has nothing to do with its structure; the reason is to be found in the absence of

(Mr. Al-Najjar, United Arab Emirates)

the necessary political will on the part of some of the industrialized countries to compel South Africa to submit to the demands of the international community as expressed in many Security Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Al-Najjar, United Arab Emirates)

The Security Council resolutions on this matter, of course, expresses the Council's rejection of all the intensified efforts made by the racist Government of South Africa in order to create obstacles to prevent the independence of Namibia. Among the most important obstacles introduced is the question of linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from the Republic of Angola. That linkage constitutes interference in the internal affairs of an independent State Member of the United Nations, and such interference in the internal affairs of States is totally prohibited by the Charter.

The support that the racist Government of South Africa receives from the industrialized countries is due to the strategic interests of some Western countries and transnational corporations. Suffice it to refer to document A/AC.131/180, paragraphs 90 to 107, to see quite clearly the position of those States with regard to the Boer Government, and the military and political support given to the South African racist régime by the governments of some States, which declare themselves to be the defenders of human rights, freedom and independence. That is why the racist Government rejects all the resolutions of the international community. Paragraph 109 of that document refers to the pressures placed on the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to grant to the racist Government of South Africa a loan of \$1.1 billion, despite the opposition of five of the Fund's own executive directors.

The intensified colonialist presence in the Territory is quite clear when the man in the street considers the number of colonialist corporations - 335 from the West - engaged in plundering the resources of the Territory, which was blessed by God with natural resources, including uranium, diamonds, copper and other minerals.

Despite the exploitation of those resources, which led to large profits and the flow of wealth and resources to the Western economies in the form of dividends, interest benefits and the transfer of capital, the Namibian people have not

(Mr. Al-Najjar, United Arab Emirates)

benefited at all. Reports show that the per capita income of the white inhabitants is 3,000 rands; however, the per capita income of the Namibians, who are the legitimate owners of the Territory and the resources, is 125 rands - that is a ratio of 1 to 24.

One need merely to refer to document A/AC.131/115, dated 25 April 1984, paragraphs 51 to 60, to see the documented figures relating to the plunder of the resources of the Territory by the Western colonialist countries. The uranium resources are used in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

Since the creation of the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine in 1948, political, economic and military relations between the two racist régimes, Pretoria and the Zionist régime, have continually increased. Those relations have reached their peak during the past 10 years and have arrived at an alliance which not only threatens peace and security in southern Africa and the Middle East, but also threatens international peace and security. Mr. Robert Mugabe, the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, has said:

"This evil crime of apartheid is not only limited to the African continent; as a matter of fact, the principle of Zionism is dangerously and racially equivalent to the concept of apartheid and proof of that is to be found in the level of political, economic and military co-operation, which is irrefutable and which is continually increasing between the Boers and the Zionists. Indeed, this is in reality an unholy alliance."

That is the truth of the co-operation that exists between the Zionists and the Boers, a co-operation designed to oppress the Namibian and the Palestinian people, a co-operation to plunder the natural resources of the peoples, a co-operation to continue acts of aggression by those régimes against neighbouring States.

Finally, on behalf of the United Arab Emirates, I wish to salute the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole legitimate

(Mr. Al-Najjar, United Arab Emirates)

representative, SWAPO. We fully support all the efforts made by SWAPO to achieve the independence of Namibia and to protect the resources of the Territory. We condemn all attempts made by the racist Government to prolong its presence on Namibian territory. We wish to reaffirm our full support for the legitimate rights of the Namibia people, and the territorial integrity and unity of its territory, including the Walvis Bay, Penguin Islands and adjacent islands. We condemn the oppression and the state of emergency imposed on its black citizens and we call upon all freedom and peace-loving countries to make every effort possible to compel the racist Government of South Africa to release the political prisoners in southern Africa. The United Arab Emirates also condemns all efforts aimed at a settlement of the question of Namibia outside the United Nations. We have expressed our total rejection of the decision of the racist Pretoria Government to establish a puppet Government in Namibia. We wish to reaffirm our call for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Government of South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We fully support the appeal of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session addressed to the international Community to provide aid and assistance to the front-line States to enable them to defend their people, national sovereignty and territorial integrity against the continual aggression carried out by the racist Pretoria Government.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros) (interpretation from French): On this fortieth anniversary of the founding of our Organization and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption, in 1960, of resolution 1514 (XV) which contains the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, it is unacceptable that the will of the international community to create a free world for all peoples should encounter the intransigence of one State. The illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime is a challenge to our Organization and to the conscience of mankind. It calls in question the ideals of peace and justice which have become a recurring theme in our statements.

The persistence of this problem is a serious threat to the sub-region and to international security and stability. Indeed, the use of Namibia's territory by South Africa as a springboard for destabilization and aggression against the States of the sub-region is an affront to the Organization and has caused heavy losses in human lives and considerable economic destruction. We still remember the last South African raid on Angola's independent territory.

The illegal occupation of Namibia has numerous adverse consequences and the Namibian people is undoubtedly affected the most seriously, as is obvious from the forced exile of its sons and the widespread pillage of the country.

The refusal of South Africa's minority régime to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia's accession to independence reflects its contempt for the international community.

South Africa, in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and its brutal exploitation of the Namibian people, has always resorted to delaying tactics and subterfuge of all types.

My country, the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, condemns such South African practices, the main purpose of which is to prevent the Namibian people from exercising its inalienable right to independence.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

In any event, Namibian independence should not be linked to external factors. This is why we continue to believe that the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a ludicrous pretext which demonstrates the bad faith of the Pretoria racist Government. For the independence of Namibia is one thing and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is another.

Angola is a sovereign and independent State which has no need of lessons from anyone. It is morally and legally able to conclude whatever defense agreements it wishes with any State.

History has taught us that only the will and conscience of a people are decisive factors in the irreversible tide of peoples to determine their own future.

For 38 years now, under the courageous leadership of its sole representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the people of Namibia has been waging a heroic struggle to free its territory from South Africa's military occupation.

This struggle has touched the right chord among world public opinion which today is mobilized behind the brave people of Namibia.

South Africa uses various methods to oppose our common will to settle this dispute by peaceful means. The formation of a puppet government in Namibia constitutes the most recent attempt by the South African Government to divert the attention of international public opinion from its military and economic aims in Namibia.

The international community condemns and rejects the so-called interim government as well as all the institutions which have been established by the Pretoria authorities.

At this point in my statement I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to reaffirm the solidarity of the people and Government of the Comoros with the just struggle of the Namibian people and its sole representative, SWAPO.

We remain convinced that only the comprehensive application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can definitively resolve this distressing problem. It is high time for South Africa to heed the voice of reason and co-operate with the United Nations in seeking a just and lasting solution to this problem. It is for States which are friends of South Africa to bring pressure to bear upon it to modify its intransigent position which cannot last.

The system of apartheid is on its deathbed in South Africa itself, and there is no longer any reason why it should not be buried in Namibia.

In conclusion, everything leads us to hope that next year at this time we will no longer be speaking of an occupied and plundered Namibia but of an independent Namibia, Member of our Organization.

Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): The first hundred years are over, and we are now embarking upon the second hundred years from the time when the people of Namibia fell under foreign rule and began their resistance to colonialism and their struggle against man's injustice to his brother.

Nineteen full years have elapsed since that resistance to colonialism took the form of an armed struggle which is mobilizing all the people - men, women, youth and the elderly - under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

An objective analysis of and a clear far-sighted look at the problem of Namibia and the various stages of its development in southern Africa, at the international level, and in particular, in various United Nations organs in particular, reveals the total ignorance that may be the lot of an industrial State which is advanced in modern technology, such as the South African régime, and certain other industrialized States that are still supporting it, providing it with the means of exercising force and creating all sorts of pretexts for that purpose.*

* Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen), Vice-President, took the Chair.

It is an abhorrent injustice committed by a white man against another man because he is not white. This stark fact of reality today in South Africa and Namibia cannot be denied by any one. The continued practice of the horrendous apartheid system in South Africa and Namibia deprives the South African régime of its claim to continue as a socio-political system of any international legitimacy whatsoever. Those considerations today are self-evident truths of a global order based on the moral, legal, political, and economic principles that today constitute a part of the fair and balanced international system existing under the auspices of the United Nations and its Charter.

Let us review the reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia and see which States are dealing extensively with South Africa. We find that they are among the richest countries in the world; they are those that have some of the highest per capita incomes in the world, and that are among those which least need to increase their per capita income by a few more cents. We note that the countries which boycott South Africa and pay the price for such a boycott include some of the poorest countries in the world that really need every cent of their per capita income. Is not the problem, in its international dimensions, a moral problem in the first place, and only secondarily an economic, political, military, or strategic problem? This is the core of the external aspect of the problem. As for the internal aspect of the problem, that is represented by the policies and programmes of a racist Government and a sick society, as well as the practices of a white racist rule against the coloured population in South Africa and Namibia. This is, also, in essence a horrendous ethical problem, which demonstrates the repugnancy of the ideas that are implanted by the force of evil into the minds of some men and the way they are translated into measures that touch upon the relations between peoples.

The era of imperialism has ended forever. It is the responsibility of the United Nations to fight its last vestiges wherever they exist, and in whatever form

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

they appear, by all the means available to it, whether those involved are great Powers, small régimes or gangs that call themselves States.

Imposing the rule of barbarism, and finding new methods of terror and of usurping the rights and the resources of peoples, is a crime against humanity, the price of which must be paid by the perpetrators.

In 1966, the United Nations declared the termination of the mandate of South Africa over Namibia, thus removing any legitimate pretext for the illegal and immoral régime that had imposed itself there. In 1968, it established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority over Namibia until independence, and asked the Council to defend the rights and interests of the people of Namibia, until they achieve their freedom.

I should like here to express our thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, for their unrelenting efforts to implement the resolutions of the United Nations and its various organs.

The United Nations has adopted many realistic resolutions with which we are all familiar, and that deal appropriately with the various aspects of the problem and prescribe the proper solutions for it. Those resolutions must be implemented if the problem is to be successfully solved.

Part of the reason for our failure thus far is the direct and indirect encouragement that the Pretoria régime is receiving from those Member States which are under the illusion that to continue dealing with an illegitimate and immoral régime may guide that régime to the right path, despite all the tests that regime has failed on every level, and all its attempts to justify its actions.

But the greatest failure lies with the Pretoria régime itself; that is the core of the problem. Racism is, at its heart, an evil and corrupt ideology that

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

will ultimately destroy those who believe in it. It is an ideology adopted for generations by a sick group of people in South Africa whose thirst for exploitation has blinded them to all the values and realities of life, so that they forget that oppression of man is but a short-term process, that despair leads to the worst consequences, and that it is not possible to defeat a man who decides to die defending himself and his dignity no matter how superior the power he faces.

Namibia is a large and extensive country which is rich in mineral resources, agricultural potential and oceanic resources. Those resources are being exploited by foreign interests operating under the umbrella of the racist South African administration. They are being stolen and funnelled to destinations outside its borders in a race against time. Four mining companies that are owned by South African and other foreign corporations monopolize 95 per cent of the production and export of minerals, and own 80 per cent of the mineral assets in the country. It should be noted that minerals account for half the gross domestic product and 90 per cent of the country's exports.

In Namibia, which is rich in mineral and agricultural resources, 95 per cent of its black people are engaged in agriculture, producing 2.5 per cent of its gross national agricultural product, while 5 per cent of the white population are engaged in agriculture and control 97 per cent of the agricultural and livestock resources of the country. Those resources are being exploited by methods that aim at getting a quick return of profits through the depletion of Namibia's resources by the quickest and cheapest means.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

Moreover, the racist educational system, which entrenches white superiority, the sparse and limited medical services, and the oppressive legislation, arbitrary detention and police terror, are factors that complement the despicable picture of South Africa's presence in Namibia, at the expense of the Namibian people, through its régime, government, laws, practices and corporations.

The problem of Namibia is global, not a regional, one. It started first in South Africa's society, then its moral, political, economic, and security dimensions expanded, so that it can no longer be considered regional. It is primarily the problem of a corrupt régime based on the notion of treating one citizen as a lesser human being than another on arbitrary grounds. It is a régime that strips that citizen of his basic rights and transforms him into a captive in his own house and homeland, a slave under the skies of his own country. It is on the basis of that malevolent ideology that the police, exploitative corporations and imperial and colonialist organizations operate. They find other parties - who, from the inside or the outside, co-operate with them and justify their crimes, or are lenient with them, all for the sake of some commercial profits at the expense of man and his dignity.

As a Saudi Arabian Moslem, I feel compelled, while reviewing this painful situation of the racist régime in South Africa and Namibia, to refer to that other ugly racist régime, Zionism in Palestine: Zionism, which denies the Palestinian Arab his right to his homeland under the sun and skies of his country merely because he is an Arab, while it grants the right of immigration to any Jew; Zionism, which denies the Arab citizen his land and usurps it on various pretexts in order to build settlements for immigrants because they are Zionists; Zionism, which prohibits the Arab from participating in many vital aspects of economic and industrial activities in his own land and the land of his forefathers and transfers

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

those activities to the hands of Zionists from the outside, merely because the first is an Arab and the second is a Zionist; Zionism, which applies against the Arabs the most repugnant systems of oppression, terror, imprisonment, torture and expulsion from the country, while the Zionist terrorists - enjoy police protection and immunity, and some of the gang leaders even enjoy parliamentary immunity, because they are Jews; Zionism, which prevents the Moslem or the Christian from exercising his religious rights because he is a Moslem or Christian Arab, while it protects the Zionist when he commits aggression against Moslem or Christian places of worship.

That ugly racism being practised in Palestine against its Arab population is the living peer of racism in South Africa; it is the bond of brotherhood between two régimes swimming against the current of history. In the light of this obvious comparison, the extent of the social, scientific, political, economic, military and commercial co-operation between Israel and South Africa is not surprising. Nor is the extent of the support being given to South Africa's racist régime by the Zionist elements and organizations in the outside world and their supporters in senates and parliaments, in order to prevent the application of sanctions against the régime and to justify its crimes.

We have seen in the publications of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London the extent of Israel's role in exporting arms to South Africa. The United Nations Council for Namibia also noted in its report last year a report in The New York Times of 8 May 1982 that some Israeli officials had said that South Africa was the largest importer of Israeli arms. But, despite the condemnation of the General Assembly, in resolution 38/39, of the increased co-operation between Israel and Pretoria, and despite its call for an end to that co-operation, especially in the military and nuclear fields, that overt and covert co-operation continues on the

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

largest scale in all spheres, from nuclear weaponry to the arming of the secret police.

South Africa's attempt to break the will of the Namibian people and the black people of South Africa merely because they are not white and its recourse to attacking neighbouring countries in order to terrorize them and subjugate them to its will are characteristic of racist régimes. Such action is rejected by the international community. South Africa practises it against black citizens and the neighbouring countries, and Israel practises it against Arab citizens and Arab countries far and near. These are the bad examples of unacceptable régimes. This international Organization has rejected them and condemned their methods of rule and their laws and regulations. It has also castigated their rulers, denounced their acts and condemned their methods of conducting trade and industry. It places on those leaders the historical responsibility for what they are doing.

The world has condemned those régimes, and we stand with the rest of the world in condemning and deploring them; we are co-operating in the efforts to put an end to their inhumane practices. The Islamic summit Conference held in Casablanca in January 1984 condemned the developments taking place in South Africa and declared its support for the struggle of the people of Namibia against imperialism. There is no international council that has not reiterated that condemnation; there is no international forum of importance that has not deplored those régimes.

From this rostrum, we reaffirm this year again our condemnation of those régimes and practices, and our support for the people of Namibia, for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and for the rights of the people of South Africa. We call upon this international Organization to reaffirm its stand and step up its efforts until the people of Namibia are liberated from their oppressors and the people of South Africa are freed from their captors, until both of those

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

peoples achieve their rights indeed, until all peoples exposed to that form of injustice and aggression fully achieve their rights. Those are the facts of life, if only the oppressors cared to understand them. That is the law of history, if only they cared to live by it.

Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore): As this is the first time that I have spoken from this rostrum since the tragic disaster in Colombia, I would ask to be allowed to convey our deepest condolences to the people of Colombia. We are much saddened by the terrible loss of human life in this tragedy.

Of all the political issues on our agenda - and there are many - there is only one on which we can say that there is an open-and-shut case: the question of Namibia. On this issue there is no moral or political ambiguity. Remarkably enough, among the Member States, there is total unanimity. With such unanimity, it is a crying shame that the question of Namibia has still not been solved.

Nineteen years ago South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated by the United Nations in General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which was adopted on 27 October 1966. Some countries questioned the validity of that decision. However, at the request of the Security Council for an advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice declared the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be illegal.

In the 40-year history of the United Nations, unanimity among the members of the Security Council has been rare, which helps to explain the relative impotence of that body. However, on Namibia such unanimity has often been achieved. For example, in its resolution 301 (1971) the Security Council endorsed the opinion of the International Court of Justice; two subsequent Security Council resolutions - 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) - laid down, first, the general principles of a settlement which was understood at that time to be acceptable to South Africa and, secondly, a specific plan of action which was also understood to be acceptable to South Africa.

Over the years, however, the South African régime has devised many disingenuous arguments to frustrate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). First came the flimsy argument that the military component

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) was too large. Next came the objection that the armed forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) that would be found inside Namibia at the time of cease-fire should be restricted to bases within the Territory. Then, in an audacious move, the South African régime suggested that the United Nations was not an impartial organization. Finally, when there were no more issues that the South African régime could find, it concocted the extraneous issues relating to the presence of foreign troops in Angola.

In raising such extraneous issues, South Africa is following a pattern of behaviour that is only too common among those Powers that continue to occupy territories illegally. To distract attention from their illegal occupation, such Powers try to point to neighbouring third countries, whether they be Thailand, Pakistan or, in this case, Angola, and suggest that these third countries are responsible for their continued illegal occupation. Fortunately, all such efforts to raise extraneous issues have always been rejected.

We in Singapore particularly deplore the South African attacks against the front-line States, and we wish to express our solidarity with those States, especially Angola, Botswana and Lesotho, which have borne the brunt of South Africa's recent aggression and intimidation.

The Security Council, in adopting resolution 566 (1985) earlier this year, strongly warned South Africa that failure to co-operate fully with the Council and the Secretary-General in implementing the resolution

"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".

(Security Council resolution 566 (1985), para. 13)

(Mr. Mahubani, Singapore)

In response to that, the Secretary-General has recently confirmed, in his report of 6 September 1985, that:

"there has been no progress in my recent discussions with the Government of South Africa concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". (S/17442, para. 12)

It is therefore regrettable that the most recent meeting of the Security Council, held on Friday, 15 November 1985, failed to reach agreement to impose mandatory selective sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In the last 20 years the Namibian population has suffered terribly. Apart from the evil of continued colonization, it has had to suffer the additional evil of apartheid. Successive reports of the United Nations have laid bare the terrible conditions in health care, in educational opportunities and in living conditions. There is even evidence of malnutrition. Such appalling living conditions give the lie to South Africa's claim that it is promoting the well-being of Namibia's inhabitants.

The Special Committee of 24, in its report of 20 August 1985, has also condemned South Africa's continued illegal exploitation of Namibia's mineral and other resources. Other Powers have taken advantage of the situation by illegally exploiting the Territory's marine resources, which have the potential to make Namibia one of the world's richest fisheries nations. All such illegal plunder should cease immediately.

Those who have helped directly or indirectly to prolong the South African occupation of Namibia should ask: whose interests are served by delaying the process of securing freedom and independence for Namibia? Time and time again we have been told that peaceful change is preferable to armed struggle. However, these advocates of peaceful change have to prove that the process of peaceful

(Mr. Mahbubani, Singapore)

change in Namibia can indeed succeed. If the process of peaceful change fails, the people of Namibia will have no alternative but to intensify their armed struggle in order to achieve their liberation from South Africa's colonialism and racism. It must be remembered that the alternative to peaceful change is not acquiescence in the status quo: it is change by violent means.

In the face of the continued ruthless occupation and exploitation of Namibia, my delegation supports the struggle of the Namibian people to liberate themselves from South Africa's colonialism and racism. We welcome the leading role played by SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in their efforts to secure freedom and independence for their country. We recognize the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia to liberate their country by all means at their disposal. We call upon the international community to continue its support for the people of Namibia.

Finally, this statement would not be complete without a mention of the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in sensitizing and educating world public opinion on the question of Namibia, through regional seminars and symposiums organized in Africa, the Caribbean, Europe, North and South America and Asia. In this connection, we in Singapore were pleased to have the honour of acting as host to the Asian symposium on "The Immediate Independence of Namibia: A Common Responsibility" in early May 1985.

Mr. OYUUE (Gabon) (interpretation from French): Speaking today on the third day of our debate on the question of Namibia, may I say at the outset that the people and Government of Gabon are deeply distressed that Colombia, a State Member of our Organization, has just been struck by a most destructive natural calamity. May I extend to that country's authorities, as well as the families of the victims and the people of Colombia, our heartfelt condolences and the assurance of our solidarity.

The question of Namibia is a major tragedy of the utmost concern to our Organization. It gnaws at our conscience every day. Whether we analyse this tragedy on the basis of its colonial origins or of the international community's inability to find satisfactory solutions quickly, we can only be outraged by the fact that after the test of time, after two world wars, the Namibian people continue to suffer injustice.

Yet when the United Nations was established in 1945, many peoples and nations of the world placed much hope in this noble project, one of whose main tasks was to struggle against international injustice and, more particularly, against all forms of oppression. Indeed, at a time when we have just enthusiastically celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we must recognize the positive aspects of the campaign the Organization has been waging since its inception in favour of the small countries that had been placed in the grip of the colonial system. However, we cannot but deplore the fact that the United Nations mission in this area is unfinished and will remain so while territories like Namibia are still under foreign domination.

Given this impasse, the safety of the Namibian people rests in its determination and the legitimacy of the political struggle it has been waging against colonialism since 1884.

While the first hours of this age-old struggle were waged against German imperialism, it is a fact that after the First World War South Africa was added to the list of enemies of the Namibian people.

Twenty-five years ago, the creation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) became a symbol of the hostility of the Namibian people towards South Africa, which had consistently refused to grant independence to that country which it held in its grip since 1929 due to the complicity of the League of Nations and indeed of certain colonial powers of that era.

When in 1966 the United Nations ended South Africa's Mandate in Namibia, its aim was clearly to encourage a policy of decolonization for that Territory, whose people, as so many others, aspire to sovereignty and independence.

Without the shadow of a doubt, the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1967 reflected the will of the international community to ensure better protection of Namibia's interests, the more so since South Africa continued to plunder its resources and to maintain its military occupation of the Territory. Thus, despite every attempt made by the international community to seek ways and means to achieve the independence of Namibia, South Africa continues to implement plans which are essentially no more than a determination to maintain the status quo favourable to South Africa. This year, one of those manoeuvres was the imposition in Namibia of a so-called internal administration, which has quite properly been opposed by the United Nations and other international bodies.

All these manoeuvres are clearly forms of ill-intentioned acts committed by South Africa to hamper and sabotage the process leading to Namibia's independence.

Gabon is deeply concerned over the persistence with which the Pretoria authorities are continuing their illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia. In that regard, my delegation welcomes the fact that several meetings and seminars on the question of Namibia were organized throughout the world this year. Furthermore, these meetings have helped to arouse the awareness of

international public opinion on the Namibian problem, which is essentially both moral and political.

I wish here particularly to express satisfaction that last April the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement held a special meeting on the question of Namibia, with the substantial participation of ministers for foreign affairs of the members of that institution.

The interest which our countries showed at that meeting demonstrates the desire of the international community as a whole in seeing Namibia accede to independence, particularly on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), whose significance was recently reaffirmed by that same body in resolution 566 (1985) of 19 June 1985.

At the same time, my country deplores the fact the Security Council was unable last week to discharge its responsibilities with regard to the situation in Namibia; by rejecting a draft resolution due to the negative vote of some of its permanent Members.

In any event, my delegation believes that the relevant steps taken by our Organization in the matter may be considered valid measures likely to guarantee the independence of Namibia. Consequently, full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), among others, is the only acceptable framework likely to promote the decolonization of Namibian territories.

Accordingly, it is my delegation's view that any policy aimed at establishing a link between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Angola remains unacceptable, inasmuch as those troops are there under agreements concluded between sovereign States, pursuant to Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

In this connection, I wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm Gabon's unswerving support for SWAPO in its relentless struggle for the liberation of Namibia. In this regard, I would recall, if need be, that the Government of Gabon

(Mr. Oyoue, Gabon)

has just taken important steps which demonstrate my country's support for the Namibian people's struggle to achieve its legitimate rights.

As indicated by the Head of State, His Excellency El Hadj Omar Bongo in the General Assembly on 18 October, when he spoke on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations:

"these measures include the granting of diplomatic status to SWAPO, the issue of special stamps, the profits from which will be donated to SWAPO, and the granting of scholarships to Namibian students." (A/40.PV.40, p. 6)

In adopting these measures at a time when the minority régime in South Africa is confronted more than ever before with the inescapable consequences of its abhorrent apartheid policy, the Gabonese Government wishes to reiterate its country's commitment to a continuation of its struggle in the international community for the independence of Namibia and the total elimination of racial discrimination in that part of the world.

(Mr. Oyoue, Gabon)

So long as Namibia's progress towards independence is compromised by the delaying tactics of the Pretoria authorities, peace and security in southern Africa will not be truly assured.

Like all other regions, that part of the world which has suffered so much humiliation and oppression at the hands of South Africa is more than ever in need of calm. All the parties concerned should therefore, as sovereign States, exercise their legitimate rights to self-determination.

The accession of the Namibian people to independence is part of this dynamic process, without which world peace and security will remain a figment.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. During this short historical period colonial empires have collapsed. However even now, 25 years after the proclamation of that international anti-colonial manifesto, Namibia remains under the domination of the most cruel and odious colonial racist régime - that of South Africa.

Two decades ago the United Nations withdrew South Africa's mandate to administer Namibia, demanded that that country be unconditionally freed and that its people be granted independence. However, today, 25 years later, despite the demands of the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council, and ignoring the will of the overwhelming majority of States in the world, the South African colonialists continue their illegal occupation of Namibia.

Protected by the Western Powers, South Africa is flouting the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and national self-determination, continuing its cruel colonial exploitation and terror against

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

the population of that country, maintaining racist order there, and using the territory of Namibia for its continuing acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent countries of Africa.

As a result, the situation in and around Namibia has become critical. For seven years now South Africa has been sabotaging the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which set forth a plan for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. Openly supported by the Western Powers, Pretoria is trying to gain time in order to continue Namibia's colonial exploitation in which not only South African companies, but also United States, British and other Western transnational corporations are participating. The colonial interests of South Africa and some Western Powers in Namibia are so intertwined and similar that roles have long been assigned in the constant manoeuvring that is designed to drag out the political solution of the question of Namibia's independence. Pretoria is doing everything possible to suppress the national liberation movement of the people of Namibia, and one after another is advancing prior conditions and pretexts in order to refuse to implement decisions of the United Nations Security Council. The United States and certain other Western Powers are protecting South Africa from effective international sanctions and providing it with all kinds of material, political and diplomatic support. At the same time, the Western Powers are trying to impose on the African countries and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) more and more political concessions in favour of South Africa.

Such is the nature of the official policy of constructive engagement between Washington and Pretoria. In essence, it is a colonialist conspiracy against the national liberation movement in southern Africa. Recently the colonial administration of Pretoria has been trying to piece together from among Namibian quislings a so-called interim Government in Windhoek, and the Western Powers

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

are doing everything they can to achieve the legalization of the Namibian puppet political groups within and outside the United Nations Security Council.

It is well known that the General Assembly and the Security Council have resolutely condemned South Africa for its creation of an interim Government in Namibia. They have declared that step illegal, void and contrary to United Nations decisions on Namibia. And yet the Pretoria representative is still trying to blackmail the United Nations, demanding that it recognize its puppets almost as a condition for United Nations participation in the election process in Namibia.

We witnessed this last week when the Namibian question was considered in the Security Council. We also witnessed something else. We see how Pretoria and Washington co-ordinate their activities to interfere in the internal affairs of Angola. South Africa is committing aggression against that country in order to save the Savimbi band, which is in the service of the racist régime, from defeat. And in the United States Congress the so-called Clark amendment is being repealed so that it will be possible to begin providing assistance to those puppets openly.

In many General Assembly decisions and in a number of the latest Security Council decisions - in particular the latest, adopted in June of this year - various attempts to link the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues have been condemned and unconditionally rejected as incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Thus the position of the United Nations on this issue is extremely clear. This so-called linkage has also been condemned in decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of African Unity and other important international forums. But still conspiring with each other directly, South Africa and the United States, for the umpteenth year, have been trying to impose as a

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

condition for the granting of independence to Namibia the linking of implementation of Security Council decisions on Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. That is another example of constructive engagement.

The United Nations is directly responsible for the political future of Namibia, for its decolonization and its achievement of genuine independence. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and United Nations decisions in general indicate the ways and means of achieving the transition of Namibia to free and independent development.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

All the manoeuvres of Pretoria and its accomplices carried out behind the back of the United Nations and in circumvention of its resolutions, in order to turn the Namibian settlement into a neo-colonialist matter, must be resolutely condemned. We must strengthen the role of the United Nations in the Namibian settlement by means of achieving effective participation and permanent control by the Security Council, and not by any group of States, in Namibia's achievement of genuine independence. It is the duty of the United Nations to take measures so that the implementation of its decisions on Namibia may be achieved in the near future.

The Soviet Union prefers the path of political settlement of international problems, including that of the liberation of Namibia. As is well known, the machinery does exist for such a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other decisions of the Council and the General Assembly. Yes, we do consider a political solution of this question preferable and for that reason the Soviet Union supports the demands of African and other countries for the introduction by the Security Council of the strictest, most mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The adoption of such coercive measures against the Pretoria régime is not only the most direct way to liberate Namibia but also, as experience has shown, the only effective method which will force Pretoria to grant Namibia independence and normalize the situation in southern Africa. All the other measures taken by the United Nations against the racist régime of Pretoria over two decades have been insufficient and ineffective. For that reason, it must be clear both to delegations in this hall now and to the whole world that only one way remains; comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Demands for mandatory sanctions resounded once again in statements of the representatives of African and other non-aligned countries as well as of the socialist countries during the recent discussion of the Namibian question in the Security Council. Unfortunately, the Security Council was unable to take the necessary decision because two permanent members of the Council - the United States and the United Kingdom - used their veto against the resolution proposed by the non-aligned countries. In so doing they stated that they would be ready to support a draft resolution which did not contain measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. However, everyone can see that such a path would mean that the Security Council would simply be marking time and encouraging South Africa to continue its colonialist and racist policy against Namibia and other African countries. In this case, no decision seems preferable to a bad decision.

It is unfitting for the Security Council to be confronted with the stubborn refusal of the aggressive régime of Pretoria to submit to its decisions and to the will of the United Nations and to continue, year after year, to adopt the same decisions, which have long ago been shown to be ineffective. If we really want to do something, if we really want to make progress in solving the problems of southern Africa - and the overwhelming majority of States consider it necessary to achieve the elimination of a hotbed of colonialism and racism in that part of the world - then we must put ever-increasing pressure not only on the Pretoria régime but also on those who stand behind it and give it comprehensive support.

Western propaganda has been trying to cast a smoke-screen over the problem of southern Africa, putting forward the lie that the conflict in that region is a manifestation of the confrontation between East and West; that, supposedly, the problem of Namibia also reflects that confrontation. In this way they try to create a pretext for interfering in the affairs of southern Africa and openly to combat

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

the national liberation movements. However, the time is past when people were simple enough to believe such fairy tales. The African and other non-aligned countries clearly understand now that the problem of Namibia is a problem of decolonization.

The non-aligned countries at their conference in Luanda rejected:

"all the manoeuvres aimed at distracting attention from the central question of the decolonization of Namibia by references to East-West confrontation, to the detriment of the legitimate desire of the Namibian people to achieve self-determination, freedom and national independence."

Our country's position on the question of Namibia has no secret or unmentioned parts. The Soviet Union is in favour of the speedy accession by the Namibian people to their inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We favour the immediate and complete withdrawal of the South African troops and Administration from Namibia. We favour the transfer of total power to the people of Namibia, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has been recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

The Soviet Union has given and will continue to give full support to the just struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, which they have been waging for their liberation with all the means at their disposal. As is known, that is fully in keeping with United Nations decisions. Our country favours a peaceful political solution of the problem of the liberation of Namibia, which must be granted independence by means of the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other fundamental decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It is high time to take effective measures to eliminate colonialism and racism from southern Africa. The racist régime of South Africa is in its death throes. Determined efforts are necessary to overcome the obstacles raised by Pretoria and its patrons to the liberation of Namibia and to achieve the rapid granting of genuine independence to the Namibian people.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Since this is my first opportunity to speak after the catastrophic disaster in Colombia, I should like, on behalf of my Government, to convey our deepest condolences to the Government and people of Colombia.

Only a few weeks ago, United Nations Headquarters was a hive of activity as world leaders converged on New York to commemorate two historic events: the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. These two solemn occasions, no doubt, provided ample opportunity to the members of the international community to reflect on the past and present achievements of our valued Organization, the United Nations. It was also a period for self-criticism, as the Members of this body critically evaluated the balance sheet of the United Nations and noted some of its shortcomings. Above all, it was a period of rejuvenation and jubilation. However, out of the critical assessment of the past and present, we hope, came a new commitment by all Member States to face the future with more determination and to work relentlessly for the fulfilment of the principles and objectives of our Organization.

Today, the United Nations is on the eve of yet another anniversary but of a different kind. It is an anniversary which, unlike this year's anniversaries, may go unheralded in the various corners of the world. It is an anniversary that predictably will lack the razzmatazz that we were all treated to a few weeks ago and for all practical purposes it might pass unnoticed by the world media.

This anniversary should be a sombre reminder to us all of the tragedy that is Namibia today. I am referring here to the year 1986 which, as all members might well be aware, marks the twentieth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2145 (XXI) which terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

And yet, nearly 20 years after this historic decision was taken, Namibia, the unique responsibility of the United Nations, continues to be held hostage by the racist expansionist régime of South Africa. Twenty-five years after the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization, the United Nations is still to assume its full and effective responsibility over Namibia to enable the oppressed people of that Territory to achieve genuine independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960.

It is not for lack of initiatives that Namibia is still not free. It will be recalled that the United Nations involvement in Namibia, not to mention the involvement of its predecessor, the League of Nations, can be traced back to its very inception in 1945. For two decades, the United Nations patiently and persistently sought to persuade South Africa to bring Namibia into the trusteeship system and to fulfil its Mandate obligations towards the people of that Territory. Ever since Pretoria's Mandate over Namibia was terminated, the United Nations, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, has tirelessly sought to secure South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia through a negotiated settlement, the central edifice of this process being Security Council resolution 435 (1978). There have been many more initiatives by the Secretary-General since then, the most recent of which was the contact made in July this year pursuant to Security Council resolution 566 (1985) of June 1985. The common factor for all these initiatives is that Pretoria has prevaricated at every turn and torpedoed each and every one of them, thus buying time for it to consolidate its illegal occupation of that Territory.

If the international community was slow in understanding Pretoria's unequivocal message, the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council, dated 6 September contained in document S/17442, makes it abundantly clear that the Pretoria régime has no intention whatsoever to heed the voice of reason on the

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

question of Namibia. Indeed, the recent events in Namibia and statements and deeds emanating from Pretoria itself have left us in no doubt as to what the true objectives of Pretoria are in Namibia and southern Africa as a whole. By deciding to press ahead with its decision to impose a puppet administration in Windhoek on 17 June this year, South Africa has clearly revealed its sinister design to deny the Namibian people the fruit of many years of struggle and sacrifice and to turn Namibia into an appendage of apartheid South Africa.

It is quite clear to us that what we have witnessed in Namibia during the past year is part and parcel of the racist régime's expansionist strategy, formulated by its apartheid progenitors as early as 1949. The then racist Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Malan, minced no words when he spelt out Pretoria's intentions towards the Territory of Namibia in his address to the South African Parliament on 17 February 1949:

"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 as 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."

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It must be obvious then that the emergence of a genuinely independent Namibia under the sole and legitimate leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) cannot be reconciled with Pretoria's maximum objectives in that Territory. Indeed, only the existence of a puppet Muzorewa-like buffer client state dominated and directed from Pretoria is compatible with the above-stated policy of the Pretoria régime. And it is only in this context of a Namibia that is formally independent but in reality is a mere appendage of South Africa that we should understand Botha's statement that he is prepared, in certain circumstances, to grant independence to Namibia even if the Cuban troops remain in Angola.

In the light of these facts, is it any wonder, therefore, that South Africa has sabotaged every initiative by the United Nations aimed at finding an early solution to the Namibia dispute? Is it any wonder that the Pretoria régime has played truant at every turn in the negotiation process that has been undertaken by the Secretary-General in an attempt to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978)? Nor is it surprising that the Pretoria racists have sought to lay one obstacle after another in the already long and arduous road to Namibia's freedom and independence. Surely this endless pattern of hide and seek antics on the part of the Pretoria régime testifies to our long-held conviction that the apartheid régime is not yet ready to allow the Namibian people to exercise their democratic and national right to independence and self-determination and that it would not do so unless firm and resolute measures are taken by the international community to force it to comply.

It is because we know the above true intentions of the apartheid régime towards Namibia that we find the ill-conceived policy of linkage so exasperating. We see it as an unashamed attempt to clothe racism in respectable Western ideological garb. But we cannot accept apartheid, irrespective of its wedding

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

dress. We reject a priori the so-called great Power interests in "spheres of influence" which seek to subsume the fundamental rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. And we assert the right of the people of Namibia to unimpeded nationhood without having to be encumbered by extraneous issues.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The people of Africa do not accept that Namibia and Angola - or other countries in Africa for that matter - are anybody's "spheres of influence" or "backyards". We reject totally the hegemonist concept of spheres of influence. Namibia and Angola, like all the neighbours of apartheid South Africa, are first and foremost African countries which are victims of the disease of apartheid, which is the root cause of much of the suffering of the people in southern Africa. It is aggressive, oppressive and murderous. It is not sui generis, as some people have tried to argue. It belongs to the genre of fascism and like its philosophic fountainhead, fascism, it must be fought and destroyed lock, stock and barrel. The fact that its victims in 1985 are blacks and not fair-skinned Jews as in the 1940s should not cloud our thinking. In the 1940s both capitalist and communist States joined hands to smash the evil doctrine of fascism in Europe. What stops them from doing the same thing today? It cannot be because anyone has the least doubt that apartheid is the quintessence of evil. All Member States of the United Nations have made their abhorrence of the evil system of apartheid known. What then stops them from uniting for peace and acting together resolutely to remove this abomination from the face of the earth? Can it be that the colour of the skin of the victim on this occasion has influenced our judgement? Has the inhuman slave trade so deadened the conscience of Western man that he has lost his sense of morality whenever the interests of men of colour are involved?

What the African countries need now are allies to fight apartheid. Whether these come from the West or East is totally irrelevant, just as it is of no consequence to the victims of the dreaded AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) disease whether the doctor who eventually discovers a cure to it is an American or a Frenchman. What those victims desperately want is a cure. Equally, we do not care who helps us to get rid of this evil. We welcome all assistance. And we shall be grateful to all those who help us to get rid of this scourge. We

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

energetically reject as patronizing and manifestly racist any suggestion that those that help us to defeat apartheid and gain independence for Namibia will automatically become our new masters. We have fought colonialism and racism for nearly 100 years. We have no intention of replacing one foreign master by another. The conclusion that Africans will inevitably be dominated by anyone who helps to liberate them is based on the racist assumption of the congenital inferiority of the black man, and we treat it with the full contempt that it deserves. It will never influence us as to who we shall co-operate with. It is also a denial of the lessons of the history of Africa over the last 20 years of its independence.

Recent moves by the United States, as revealed in The Washington Post of 16 October and The New York Times of 29 October 1985, to renew its aid to the apartheid puppets in Angola is threatening to engulf southern Africa in a raging racial inferno whose consequences are incalculable. Yes, the threatened entering of the United States into the southern African conflict on the side of white apartheid South Africa has frightening implications for world peace and security. It is not only a challenge to the people of Namibia and Angola; it is a direct challenge to the continent of Africa as a whole and to all those who value human dignity, justice and morality. It is a blatant violation of the United Nations Charter, of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of all precepts of international relations. We therefore call upon the United States to think again, before it is too late. We recall for the record that the present Government of Angola was forced to appeal to Cuba and other friendly countries for assistance because the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), in collaboration with South Africa, had already entered Angola on the side of UNITA and FLNA and was on the verge of imposing a puppet régime in Luanda. To quote the then CIA director of operations in the region, Mr. John Stockwell, in his book In Search of Enemies:

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

"To CIA, the South Africans were the ideal solution to central Angola. Thus without any memos being written at CIA Headquarters saying let us co-ordinate with South Africans, co-ordination was effected at all levels and South Africans at all levels escalated their involvement with that of the United States of America."

Angola has had no choice but to continue requiring help from its friends because South Africa, together with its allies, has continued to support the UNITA bandits either overtly or covertly. To quote Mr. Pik Botha's statement in 1981:

"The South African Government sees Savimbi in Angola as a buffer for Namibia. The South African Government believes Savimbi wants southern Angola. Having supported him thus far, it would damage South Africa's Government honour if Savimbi is harmed."

We are not unaware of the third parties which have been used by some powerful countries to continue pouring aid to Savimbi and other dissidents.

I am an African and as such I do not accept the concept of coincidence too easily. First we see the repeal of the Clark amendment; then we read that American right-wing crusaders are going to hold conferences of international bandits in Jamba, Angola, and Dallas, Texas; then we see American religious right-wing reactionaries visiting South Africa in an effort to whitewash Mr. Botha's apartheid; this is followed by President Reagan trying to say apartheid has been eliminated in South Africa; in succession to this the President goes on successfully to emasculate senatorial and congressional moves to isolate South Africa; after that South Africa openly re-enters Angola in support of UNITA; following which South African envoys are sent to Washington to report on the UNITA situation in Angola. Was it an accident, I ask myself, that of all the world statesmen who spoke during the United Nations fortieth anniversary celebration the only one to avoid making reference to the explosive situation in South Africa was

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

the President of the United States? Was it also an accident that he was the only speaker to refer to Angola as an area of conflict threatening world peace? Is it a coincidence that when South Africa decided, to all intents and purposes, to ban reporting on its internal situation, Washington switched the full glare of its media lights on Angola and away from South Africa's internal situation? Why has cold-war and McCarthyite rhetoric been exhumed from its grave to drum up fears of the communist bogey? No, I find myself agreeing with our friend principal secretary of state Polonius when he says of Hamlet:

"Though this be madness, yet there is method in't." (Hamlet, II (ii))

There is art and method in this apparently unconnected train of events. We cannot avoid the conclusion that there are those working hard to divert pressure from South Africa and provide its rulers with more room for manoeuvre for the preservation of apartheid. We reject these stratagems and warn their fabricators to desist from playing with fire. Southern Africa is a racial powder-keg and nobody, especially multiracial countries, including the United States, will escape the consequences of that explosion, communist bugbears not withstanding. Africa will not be diverted; our sights are locked on the target; and with Catonian insistence we shall continue to press that the evil citadel of apartheid be destroyed. Delenda est apartheid.

The non-aligned countries, meeting in extraordinary session in New Delhi in April this year and in a regular session in Luanda in September expressed grave concern over the deteriorating situation in Namibia and urged the Security Council to convene to consider further actions, including the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, against the Pretoria régime. It will also be recalled that the Security Council, in recognition of the threat to peace and security that the racist Pretoria régime represents in southern Africa, decided, basing itself on

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Chapter VII of the Charter, to adopt resolution 418 (1977) imposing an arms embargo on South Africa. In June this year the Security Council, in a modest step forward, adopted resolution 566 (1985), which inter alia urged Member States to take voluntary measures against South Africa, including: the stopping of new investments and application of disincentives; re-examination of maritime and aerial relations with South Africa; the prohibition of the sale of Krugerrands and all other coins minted in South Africa; and restrictions in the field of sports and cultural relations. Since then a number of countries have taken steps aimed at isolating the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

We note with satisfaction that the countries of the European Economic Community (EEC) have since jointly committed themselves to a number of economic measures against South Africa, as has the group of nations known as the Commonwealth, of which my own country is one, and that the United States of America has imposed unilateral measures.

The Nordic group of countries adopted a number of such measures against South Africa long ago, and so have a number of other countries, including the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), which a long time ago imposed an oil embargo on South Africa. The Security Council has had occasions to welcome these disparate initiatives, especially in resolutions 566 (1985) and 569 (1985).

One would have thought that all those different measures and the various declarations condemning apartheid provided a basis for international co-operation within the framework of the United Nations, and for concrete action against South Africa. But, alas, as we saw last week in the Security Council, that has not proved to be the case. The non-aligned nations and the members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) presented a draft resolution which in essence was designed to provide measures that were already legally binding in the United States as a result of the President's Executive Order and those binding upon the members of the Commonwealth with an enforceable international framework under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The authors of the draft resolution made it known that they were willing to modify any of the specific measures proposed, provided the elements that remained were to be adopted within the binding framework of Chapter VII of the Charter.

What happened is now history. Neither the United Kingdom nor the United States was willing to bring into a binding United Nations framework measures that they are already committed to implement under other arrangements. We were not

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

asking for anything new. And it cannot be that the two allies do not believe that South Africa poses a threat to international peace and security, for they subscribed to resolution 418 (1977), which imposed an arms embargo on South Africa and which clearly states that South Africa is a threat to international peace and security. That is a judgement they have both long passed and accepted. Why, then, those unctuous tones of regret as the representatives of the two countries tried hopelessly to justify their vetoes? There was no need for that. Those proposing the resolution had acted in good faith and had wanted to accommodate all those truly committed to the destruction of apartheid. We are left with no alternative but to be sceptical about the seriousness and sincerity of the commitment of those two countries to the measures to which they have already committed themselves. For why, if they are genuine in their commitment to oppose apartheid, do they not agree to be bound to honour those very same measures within the framework of the United Nations?

The Commonwealth Accord on Southern Africa says, inter alia:

"We agree upon, and commend to other Governments, the adoption of the following further economic measures against South Africa ..." (A/40/817, para. 6, (iii)).

We "commend to other Governments, the adoption of the following further economic measures", the Accord says.

It further states that:

"each of us will pursue the objectives of this Accord in all the ways and through all appropriate fora open to us." (Ibid. p. 9, para. 8).

The phrase "in all the ways and through all appropriate fora open to us" is very crucial indeed. It clearly supports the actions of those non-aligned and African members of the Commonwealth which last week sought to "commend to other governments, the adoption of the ... economic measures" of the Commonwealth

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

countries within the United Nations forum, specifically by bringing those measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. Most of the measures in the Commonwealth accord are themselves couched in Chapter VII language.

Indeed, if the above quotations from the Accord are read together with clause 21 of the Nassau Commonwealth Communiqué, which states that:

"Heads of Governments recalled that in New Delhi they had agreed that if South Africa continued to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations would have to be considered. They also agreed that the action which they envisaged in their separate Accord on South Africa should be directed equally towards ensuring South Africa's compliance with the wishes of the international community on the question of Namibia," (Ibid., p. 13, para. 21),

it must be clear that, contrary to the views of at least one member of the Commonwealth, efforts to bring the measures outlined in the Commonwealth Accord within the United Nations forum and its binding framework is very much in line with the letter and spirit of both the Commonwealth Accord and Communiqué.

For those of us who live in southern Africa the lines have been drawn. Apartheid must be dismantled before it destroys us all. Already, apartheid is daily destroying those who live in southern Africa. I am not talking of the daily slaughter of innocent demonstrators we have witnessed in the last 14 months and which has resulted in the death of about 1,000 people. No. I am thinking of the institutionalized murders and deprivations of which hundreds die daily in southern Africa. I am referring to the recent publication of the Race Relations Institute of South Africa, which, basing itself on the research of the Plate Medical Institution, has established that over 3 million black South Africans are starving or undernourished, 30 to 40 per cent of black children are underweight, and that

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

infant mortality in the dust bowls called homelands and in the shanty townships has reached the frightening figure of 190 out of 1,000 live births.

The immorality of those figures lies in the fact that this is occurring in a country that produces 12 per cent more food than it needs to feed all its people adequately. The Africans in South Africa are not suffering because of the vagaries of the weather or simply because not enough food is produced. No. Children are dying or are undernourished and men and women are starving in the midst of plenty because of the inhumanity of man to man. Apartheid is a killer. It murders little black children simply because they are unfortunate enough to be born black. And the super-profits the transnational corporations are afraid to lose if mandatory sanctions are imposed as well as the precious jobs that industrialized countries are not prepared to forgo in a sanctions régime are maintained at the cost of the blood of innocent infants.

This is no time for euphemisms. We must call a spade a spade. The apartheid virus does not respect national boundaries. It has infected and killed thousands more than even the much dreaded AIDS scourge. By supporting dissidents in Angola and Mozambique it has led to the slaughter and starvation of hundreds and thousands of innocent men, women and children. In Namibia, Botswana, and Lesotho innocent people, including refugees and children have been butchered. In my own country, Zimbabwe, apartheid, through its agents, the dissidents, has resulted in the rape of schoolgirls, and the murder and mutilation of farmers and peasants. Yes, we have today in Zimbabwe men and women whose lips, noses and ears have been slashed by the agents of apartheid in a futile attempt to bring down the freely and popularly elected Government of Zimbabwe.

Sadly, this is by no means the full story of the havoc apartheid has wreaked in southern Africa. In the last five years alone, from 1980 to 1984, the economics

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

of the nine countries of the Southern African Development Co-ordinating Conference (SADCC) have suffered damage and losses amounting to over \$US 10 billion as a result of the actions of the apartheid régime. That is the staggering price the nine SADCC countries have had to pay because of their position of principle against apartheid South Africa. That amount is nearly twice the value of all the development aid the SADCC countries have received in those five years, and equivalent to one-third of the value of their total export earnings during the same period. In short, the nine young developing SADCC countries have already suffered a colossal loss in the struggle against apartheid.

When the SADCC countries say that they know that they will suffer when sanctions are imposed against South Africa but that they do not want to be used as a scapegoat by those trying to shirk their international duty, they should be listened to.

It is in the light of the above that the intensity of feelings and the urgency of our appeals should be heard. We ask the international community to come to our help now. Tomorrow it will be to attend our funerals, if they choose to come then.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

It is sad to note that the international will to act decisively on the question of Namibia is continually being sapped by the unholy alliance between Pretoria and transnational corporations. There is no doubt in our minds that, in spite of the hot air and rhetoric to the contrary, the transnationals, as the chief beneficiaries of the evil system of apartheid, are ultimately responsible for delaying Namibian independence and the destruction of apartheid. If it was not for the collaboration of those bodies, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil boycott of South Africa would long ago have brought the apartheid State to its knees. Who refines and distributes petroleum products in South Africa and Namibia? Why, transnational corporations, of course. Who brings the technology and capital needed to modernize apartheid, if not the transnational corporations? And yet we are glibly told that they are a force for good, that they provide employment and training for the blacks. For goodness' sake, who ever said that even the slave masters did not feed their slaves and teach them enough to enable them to become productive?

No. The transnational corporations have not been good friends to the oppressed masses of Namibia. For, despite repeated United Nations resolutions, the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, Western-based transnational corporations continue to exploit the Territory's natural resources, and Western investments continue to support the apartheid military machinery in Namibia, thus perpetuating South Africa's illegal occupation of that international charge. The Secretariat background paper E/C.10/1985, prepared last September for the hearings on the role of transnational corporations in South Africa, states that as much as 60 per cent of Namibia's gross national product is repatriated abroad as company profits, interest payments and expatriate salary remittances. It goes on

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

to state that foreign economic interests operating in Namibia have taken no measures whatsoever to integrate the different sectors of Namibia's economy. The report further states that Western transnational corporations continue to service South Africa's military machinery by the production of military equipment, the provision of loans and so forth.

Collaboration between South Africa and Western capital serves only to strengthen apartheid and prolong the agony of the oppressed masses of Namibia and South Africa. That is why my delegation strongly feels that comprehensive mandatory sanctions are the only peaceful option left to the international community in its endeavour to rid South Africa of this evil system. We therefore urge all the members of the international community - in particular, the Western permanent members of the Security Council, who again recently abused their right of veto by blocking the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa - to assume their international obligation under Chapter VII of the Charter.

At this time, when the Pretoria régime is in desperation, intensifying its acts of brutality and aggression against the people of Namibia and the neighbouring States in the region, it is imperative that the international community increase its support for the people of Namibia, through their authentic and legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to enable them to intensify the struggle for liberation. The international community owes it to the people of Namibia to provide the material and other support which they badly need to continue their struggle for self-determination and independence.

I should be remiss if I did not conclude without paying my delegation's well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts aimed at an early solution to the Namibian problem. We assure him of our unswerving support for his efforts.

(Mr. Madenge, Zimbabwe)

Finally, allow me to extend to the President of the Council for Namibia, our dear brother, Mr. Paul Lusaka, and through him to the members of the Steering Committee of the Council, our sincere appreciation for the report and recommendations before us today. Our special thanks go to our good friend, Mr. Sinclair, of Guyana, who has skilfully directed the work of the Council in his capacity as Acting President during the past year. The recommendations before us in document A/40/24 have our fullest support.

The struggle continues!

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.