



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.85

21 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 20 November 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. MAKEKA (Vice-President) (Lesotho)

- 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 3.25 p.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. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The debate on Namibia this year is of particular significance. Before the next Assembly finishes, it will have been 20 years since the illegal occupation of this Territory began, and in the 40 years of its existence our Organization and its General Assembly will have spent 20 years confronted with challenges to its political and moral authority brought about by this occupation. It is clear that if, by the twentieth anniversary this serious breach of the international legal order - which we are under a duty to protect - has not been repaired, the damage to the credibility and authority of this Organization will be immense.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

For that reason Peru, in keeping with its militant commitment to this cause, sent its Prime Minister to the special series of meetings of the Security Council on Namibia, held in June this year on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, and stated here that the time had come to extirpate this bloody vestige of colonialism and oppression and any other form of subjugation, domination or foreign exploitation, always associated in one form or another with the same phenomenon of racial discrimination.

At the Security Council's commemorative meeting on 28 September 1985 the only specific case to which the Foreign Minister of Peru referred in his statement was that of Namibia, when he said:

"Peru believes that the time has come to replace lamentations with the action required by the Charter and, given the disregard for the Council's resolutions on Namibia and other matters, to take the maximum enforcement measures under Chapter VII to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, which is repulsive to our conscience as free men, thus restoring to some extent the credibility of the highest international body." (S/PV.2608, p. 53)

Last week this conviction prompted us, together with other non-aligned members of the Security Council, to submit a draft resolution which called for the application of obligatory and selective sanctions provided for in these cases under Chapter VII of the Charter, but which was the subject of a twofold veto, in spite of our efforts and readiness to achieve a constructive and dynamic consensus.

In my present capacity as Co-ordinator of the non-aligned countries in the Security Council, I said at that time, and I repeat again today, that this draft resolution was in keeping with our own sovereign interpretation of the requirements of a political strategy in the case of Namibia and that, consequently, any negative judgement reached on the draft resolution by any interested party was necessarily subjective.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

Our desire to negotiate and to reach an understanding was abundantly proved by the vast majority in favour of the draft. But to negotiate means to achieve a convergence of views when this is possible and when there are no insuperable differences of opinion as regards substance and principle; this was not the case on this occasion, and achievement of a consensus would have involved abandoning principles and backing down, and that is something we will never do.

Peru will continue to press, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, for the application of mandatory selective sanctions which will enable progress to be made towards the liberation of Namibia.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The pace currently imposed upon us by the forces of resistance is too slow. The warnings and deadlines, once ignored, as they have been, must be succeeded by new measures. What may have been sufficient yesterday is not sufficient today, and any improvement on previous positions that may be achieved in forums other than those of the United Nations can not dictate the course or the pace of history, as defined by our Organization.

It was said in the debate in the Council that the vetoes cast there would be misinterpreted by South Africa as support. The way to avoid such misinterpretation is not to avoid resolutions but to avoid vetoes. Let us not forget the effect which those vetoes have on political and moral thinking in the countries concerned, which are rejecting colonialist apartheid more vigorously every day, and are becoming less and less willing to accept that anyone should continue to maintain the positions of a past that we all want to leave behind.

South Africa would be ill-advised to consider those vetoes a long-term gain, because we are sure that these will be the last that the situation will allow. As we said in introducing the draft resolution of the non-aligned countries, we are convinced that the draft resolution will inevitably, like others, give a new impetus, by the twofold approach of action and omission, to the inexorable march towards the independence of Namibia.

The cards are on the table. The public comparison of attitudes and conduct no longer permits and will permit less every day, of vagueness and postponement. Sooner or later we shall all have to demonstrate once again and for all which side we take on this issue, which is such an offence to the legal, political and moral conscience of the world.

I should therefore like to repeat here the same words which, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, I ended my statement at that meeting of the Security Council:

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

"We ... trust that the growing awareness of all the peoples of the world of the undeniable justice of Namibia's case and the inexorable force of history will allow us soon to overcome those disagreements and together bring about the end of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and ensure the final achievement of its freedom and independence." (S/PV.2629, p. 31)

Mr. ZUYONOK (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Marking the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the historic United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the international community can rightly be proud of the significant achievements during that period in solving the problems of decolonization. Since the approval by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Declaration on decolonization, 56 former colonies and non-self-governing territories have gained independence and became equal Members of the United Nations.

Yet, despite these indisputable successes in decolonization, the final elimination of the remnants of colonialism, racism and apartheid in all its forms and manifestations is still one of the most important tasks of the United Nations.

Among the most urgent problems of decolonization requiring an immediate solution there is the question of ensuring the genuine independence of Namibia, now under the occupation of the racist régime of South Africa. The representatives of African countries and of many other non-aligned countries have already spoken on this question with sufficient clarity and conviction.

Next year will be the twentieth since the United Nations, by decision of the General Assembly, revoked South Africa's Mandate to govern the Territory of Namibia - a Mandate in fact used by the Pretoria régime for the enslavement of the local population and the predatory use of the country's natural resources -

(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

and assumed direct responsibility for the protection of the rights and interests of the Namibian people and for their achievement of genuine independence.

It is well known that over the past few years, the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on decolonization, have made repeated and persistent efforts to achieve a practical solution to this problem and attain their noble goals. However, the colonial situation of Namibia still remains in essence unchanged and the situation in the southern part of the African continent has heated up to its limit and is now extremely explosive.

The colonial racist régime in South Africa is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and is exploiting the natural and human resources of that Territory, carrying out all out terror and repression against the Namibians and above all against the members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. They are carrying out further militarization of the occupied Territory, and are forcibly using it as a bridgehead for armed aggression against Angola and other neighbouring sovereign States.

The position of the United Nations as regards Namibia has long been defined and enjoys support by all progressive forces in the world. It has been repeatedly, clearly and specifically reflected in many resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations. In brief, the essence of this position is that the presence of the administration and armed forces of South Africa on the Territory of Namibia contradicts the rules of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and must be unconditionally halted. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and is an open challenge to the United Nations.

(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

The question of Namibia is a question of decolonization and any attempts to distort its nature are unacceptable. The Namibian people have the inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) of the United Nations General Assembly, endorsing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The national liberation struggle carried out by the Namibian people by all the means available to them, including armed force, is just and legitimate, and therefore deserves full support by the United Nations, which bears a special responsibility for the speedy attainment of the independence of Namibia.

Taken together, the above-mentioned decisions of the United Nations, and in particular the resolutions of the Security Council 385 (1976), 435 (1978), 532 (1983) and 539 (1983), lay down clearly and in detail the political basis for the just solution to the problem of Namibia and also the machinery for ensuring its transition to independent development. Unfortunately, these well-founded and generally recognized decisions of the United Nations still remain unimplemented, since the South African colonizers are not merely continuing cynically to ignore the will of the international community as clearly expressed in those resolutions, but are also striving by every available means to perpetuate their illegal control over the human and natural resources of Namibia.



(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

The documents of the United Nations and the statements of many delegations contain a catalogue of the crimes of this inhuman apartheid régime in South Africa and Namibia, which is still capable of such crimes in order to prolong its existence. The nature of the policy of apartheid and the monstrous act of the South African racists have frequently been mentioned in the debate on the relevant item on the General Assembly's agenda. It was demonstrated a long time ago in the United Nations that South Africa's criminal apartheid régime could not ignore the many decisions of the United Nations so flagrantly, continue to occupy Namibia illegally and increase its acts of armed aggression against independent sovereign African States if it were not receiving support of all kinds from several Western countries, and above all from the United States and Israel. It is well known that the complete coincidence and closely interwoven nature of the economic, political and strategic aspirations of the imperialist circles of certain Western Powers and the racist régime of Pretoria lie at the basis of their identical positions and tactics in blocking a settlement of the Namibian problem.

On the surface, the roles of the partners in this evil alliance are somewhat different however. Pretoria presents various kinds of invented and obviously absurd pretexts and prior conditions and other obstacles to avoid implementing the decisions of the Security Council, and the United States and certain other Western countries actively use them to protect the racist régime from effective international sanctions and to bring additional pressure to bear on African countries in order to obtain further concessions. In practice, "constructive engagement" serves the specific purposes of the participants, namely, to impose on the Africans a neocolonialist solution to the problem of Namibia and southern Africa as a whole.

My delegation fully shares the conclusion that at this time the main reason for the non-implementation of all the decisions of the United Nations, of the

(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the forums of the non-aligned movement, aimed at supporting the just and legitimate demands of the oppressed people of Namibia, is not only the obstructionist position of the South African racists but also the policies and actions of their partners in this "constructive engagement".

This is clearly confirmed by the continuous attempts by the United States and South Africa to legalize the puppet groups in Namibia in the form of a so-called interim transitional Government, to establish some kind of link or to draw a parallel between the independence of Namibia and extraneous and irrelevant questions and to insist on "reciprocity". Counting on the desire of the African peoples to live in conditions of peace and stability, certain Western countries are using the Pretoria régime to exert open pressure on the countries of the African continent in order to aggravate the general situation in southern Africa and to remove the question of Namibia from the United Nations and solve it in their own favour. To this end, and also to justify their interference in the internal affairs of independent African countries of the region, and at the same time to belittle the significance of the national liberation struggles of the people of southern Africa, the Pretoria régime and its direct protectors from across the ocean are constantly bandying about the trumped-up story that the conflict situation in this region, and in particular the situation in Namibia, is only an element of the East-West confrontation.

Faced with these manoeuvres and tricks by the united forces of racism and imperialism, which are so dangerous for the fate of Namibia and the independence of the African States, the United Nations must definitely take steps to bring persistent, unrelenting and increasing pressure to bear on South Africa and its various protectors in order to force them to implement the decisions of the Security Council, and to take into account the will and the demands of the people of Namibia and of the overwhelming majority of the States of the world.

(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

An example of real and effective measures against the racist régime of Pretoria at this stage might be comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The application of such sanctions by the Security Council has long been advocated by the African States and many others, including the Byelorussian SSR. The pretext used by the Western Powers in trying to avoid the question of applying sanctions against South Africa, namely, that they could not have any real impact on the apartheid régime, is quite untenable. If such sanctions were not a real threat to the South African racists, the United States and other Western countries would obviously not oppose their introduction so stubbornly and even make use of their right of veto in the Security Council as was done by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom last week.

My delegation considers that the United Nations must resolutely condemn what is being done by certain Western Powers in their efforts to circumvent the decisions it has already taken on sanctions against South Africa, and furthermore that it must adopt additional urgent measures to overcome the opposition of those States to the Security Council's adoption of a decision on the introduction of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Like the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations, the Byelorussian SSR is firmly and consistently in favour of the speedy achievement by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence, in a territorially united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We are in favour of the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal from Namibia of all troops and of the administration of South Africa. We are in favour of the transfer of all power to the people of Namibia through SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and by the Organization of African Unity as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Zuyonok, Byelorussian SSR)

The Byelorussian SSR fully supports the growing demand for an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and to all the various manoeuvres used to delay the settlement of the Namibian problem. We fully support the demand that real independence be granted immediately to Namibia and to the people of that country in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations on this question, in their entirety, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We have been and continue to be on the side of the freedom fighters who are struggling to rid southern Africa of colonialism and racism. My delegation supports the United Nations appeal to the international community for assistance of every kind to the front-line African States in their efforts to defend their national independence and territorial integrity from the aggressive encroachments of the racist colonizers of Pretoria.

Mr. OFWONO (Uganda): During this session, we marked the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and also the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. However, the question of Namibia still remains one of the most critical issues under discussion. The reports now before us clearly indicate that there is no evidence of any progress having been made since the last session regarding the decolonization of Namibia. The Secretary-General, in his recent report to the Security Council was forced to conclude 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)

This is a sad commentary on the otherwise commendable record of the United Nations in the decolonization process. The delay in achieving independence for Namibia is in fact all the more agonizing because Namibia has been and remains a unique responsibility of the United Nations. The hopes and aspirations of the Namibian people, who have suffered under colonial domination for over 100 years, for self-determination and independence, remains unfulfilled because of the lack of action by this Organization.

Although the General Assembly in 1966 in resolution 2145 (XXI) terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and the United Nations plan for Namibian independence embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was arrived at after protracted negotiations, the United Nations efforts for the decolonization of Namibia have been rendered fruitless because of South Africa's successive manoeuvres and its intransigence, aimed at maintaining its domination over Namibia.

Today the prospects for the implementation of the plan for Namibia remain very bleak. Meanwhile, the situation in the region continues to be grave and to pose a threat to international peace and security; consequently it calls for

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

decisive action by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter because of the policies pursued by that régime.

In Namibia itself, the racist régime has continued to unleash a reign of terror against the Namibian people. The Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, in his statement gave a graphic picture of the prevailing situation in that Territory. It is a picture of the increased militarization of Namibia, of increased brutality, detention, torture, murder and disappearances of Namibian people. In addition, South Africa has declared various parts of Namibia as so-called security zones with the aim of hiding the crimes it commits against the Namibian people and the real military situation in that Territory.

The natural resources of Namibia are being massively plundered by the racist South Africa in collaboration with its friends in contravention of Decree No. 1. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the recent hearings held by the Commission on Transnational Corporations have continued to highlight the callous disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people by the transnational corporations of certain Western countries. Such activities, coupled with the policies of co-operation with South Africa, only lends legitimacy to and encourages South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. It is, therefore, an urgent duty for all member States to implement Decree No. 1 and for the General Assembly to ensure that: first, all foreign affiliates terminate their business activities in Namibia unless their parent corporations have concluded a contract or entered into other appropriate arrangements with the Council for Namibia; secondly, transnational corporations remit the financial returns accruing from the sale of, or other dealings relating to, the natural resources extracted from Namibia to the Council for Namibia in trust for the future independent Namibia; thirdly, transnational corporations do not pay taxes, royalties or other forms of

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

economic rent to the Government of South Africa in respect of their business activities in Namibia; fourthly, the Council for Namibia take appropriate action to recover from transnational corporations such payments made to South Africa since 1966, irrespective of the payments made to the occupying Power; and fifthly, the importation of, processing of, or other dealings relating to, the natural resources of Namibia be prohibited unless authorized by the Council for Namibia.

Such measures would ensure that the people of Namibia can have a chance to enjoy their natural resources when they achieve their independence.

In the region of southern Africa, the racist régime has continued to pursue an aggressive policy of intervention, subversion, giving massive assistance to bandits and using the Territory of Namibia for launching armed attacks against the neighbouring States, in a systematic attempt to intimidate them into accepting its policemenhip and to discredit SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The policy of constructive engagement of the United States with South Africa, which has been complemented by the repeal of the Clark Amendment, has in fact given the racist régime comfort in pursuance of its aggressive policies. This year alone, the Security Council has been convened a number of times to consider complaints against the South African racist aggression by Angola and Botswana. With more covert and overt aid being mobilized for UNITA and other fellow bandits, as has been reported in the press, the situation in that region will continue to deteriorate.

There is no evidence that South Africa is willing to let Namibia be free. South Africa has, in spite of its condemnation and rejection by the international community, continued to thrive on the linkage pretext; an excuse invented for it to give the Namibian question an East-West context in order to block any movement towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

The recent assembling of yet another puppet group in June this year to form a "transitional government" in disregard of its condemnation and rejection by the international community is a clear illustration of South Africa's attitude.

Meanwhile, South Africa is actively engaged in an intensive propaganda campaign which gives the false impression that it is prepared to co-operate with the United Nations in the search for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian decolonization question. In a recent letter to the Secretary-General, while deciding on its choice of the electoral system to be used in Namibia, the only pending issue since 1982, the racist régime, in its usual vein, continues to question the impartiality of the United Nations and to insist on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of the United Nations plan. To many delegations, the manoeuvres of the racist régime were not surprising. It is a continued demonstration of its lack of seriousness and bad faith regarding the implementation of the United Nations plan.



(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

We, therefore, condemn and reject the establishment and operation by racist South Africa in certain Western countries of so-called Namibia information offices, with the aim of legitimizing its puppet institutions in Namibia, in particular the so-called interim government, and demand that they be closed immediately.

The racist régime of South Africa could not have continued to demonstrate such brazen intransigence and duplicity had it not been for the encouragement and support it enjoys from its powerful friends, which are ready to go to any length to protect it from any punitive measures because of their own selfish vested interests.

The continued misuse of the power of veto, demonstrated in the Security Council last week by two permanent members which are members of the Western contact group, in a desperate attempt to protect South Africa from selective mandatory sanctions, not only gives wrong signals to that régime but also gives the impression that those countries are comfortable with the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the continued plunder of that Territory's natural resources.

Uganda has never had any illusions about the racists' intentions regarding Namibia. We have also refused to understand and accept any policies of friendship with South Africa pursued by some member States. Such relations only give credibility to the policies of that régime. We have maintained that no progress will be realized without resolute action by this Organization through the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

We condemn the continued linkage of the decolonization of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We maintain that Namibia remains a unique responsibility of the United Nations and that the Security Council should immediately shoulder its responsibility regarding that Territory. Thus, we appeal to all the permanent members of the Security Council to honour the international consensus on the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

(Mr. Ofwono, Uganda)

In the meantime, the General Assembly should unreservedly endorse the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in document A/40/24 (Part II).

May I at this juncture pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, which has discharged its responsibilities with a sense of deep commitment and with competence. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the work done by the Council to promote the interests of Namibia and its oppressed people in preparation for independence continues to be outstanding. In this connection, my delegation pays a special tribute to Ambassador Sinclair, the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the Commissioner for Namibia for their untiring efforts and dedication in preparing Namibia for nationhood.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the front-line States for the steadfast support they have given to the liberation struggle in southern Africa in spite of the heavy odds they face. I also take this opportunity to reaffirm the solidarity of the Government and people of Uganda with the people of Namibia in their just struggle for independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic representative.

Mr. NYAMDOO (Mongolia): The Mongolian delegation would like to reiterate once again its position on the question of Namibia at this juncture at which the worsening situation and the instability created by the repeated and systematic acts of aggression and occupation perpetrated by the apartheid régime pose a serious threat to the peace of the region and to international peace and security.

As the Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic, Comrade Jambyn Batmunkh, pointed out in his message to the participants in the commemorative meeting on the occasion of the twenty-fifth

(Mr. Nyamdoo, Mongolia)

anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

"The racist régime of Pretoria and its imperialist protectors are persistently sabotaging the granting of independence to the Namibian people and equal rights to the indigenous population of South Africa, and they are pursuing a policy of State terrorism against neighbouring States and defying the United Nations and world public opinion."

Historically speaking, the Mongolian people, having previously endured the colonial yoke and its pernicious effects, have always supported and continue to support the just struggle of colonial countries and peoples for their national independence and freedom.

The Mongolian People's Republic is of the opinion that the United Nations has primary responsibility for Namibia in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted by the General Assembly in 1966. It is therefore incumbent upon the United Nations to ensure the speedy attainment of genuine independence by the people of Namibia. It would be most appropriate for the United Nations, in this year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the General Assembly and of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, to take concrete and effective measures to compel South Africa to comply with the resolutions and decision on Namibia. We should also bear in mind the fact that this year marks the fortieth year of United Nations efforts to bring independence to the Territory.

The United Nations has exerted all possible efforts to discharge its responsibility with regard to Namibia, but we note that the Security Council has been prevented from taking effective measures against South Africa in the exercise of its responsibilities under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations

(Mr. Nyandoo, Mongolia)

on account of the vetoes cast by some permanent members of the Council. Last week the United States and the United Kingdom vetoed in the Security Council the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries members of the Council seeking to impose selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa. This once again demonstrates the obstructive approach of those two countries to this matter.

(Mr. Nyandoo, Mongolia)

The Mongolian People's Republic views the installation of a so-called interim government in Namibia as an attempt by the régime of South Africa aimed at impeding the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic resolutely condemns and rejects any attempt by South Africa to impose a so-called internal settlement in Namibia and considers such action illegal and null and void, in accordance with Security Council resolution 439 (1978).

South Africa's occupation of Namibia has been repeatedly declared illegal by the United Nations. In defiance of the will of the international community, Pretoria, encouraged by the support of its Western allies, especially the United States, persists in that occupation. The people of Namibia are being subjected by the régime to brutal repression, cold-blooded murder, arbitrary arrests and detention. Western transnational corporations and South Africa continue ruthlessly to plunder and exploit the natural resources of the Territory, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions. In order to reinforce its illegal occupation of and colonial domination over the Territory, Pretoria is engaged intensively in a massive militarization of Namibia. Moreover, Namibian territory is being used continuously by the racist régime for the commission of acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring sovereign and independent African States.

Mongolia categorically rejects any delaying tactics and the policy of linkage of Namibian independence to extraneous and irrelevant issues, including the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces from Angola. In fact, the linkage concept has been unequivocally condemned and totally rejected by the majority of States.

In view of the continued sabotage by the South African racist régime of United Nations efforts to bring independence to Namibia, the Mongolian People's Republic

(Mr. Nyandoo, Mongolia)

fully supports the demands of the overwhelming majority of States for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express its support for the efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee of 24 to ensure the immediate solution of the Namibian question in the genuine interest of its people. It also commends Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity for the important role that they play with regard to this cause.

My delegation reaffirms the solidarity of the Mongolian people and its Government with the Namibian people in its heroic struggle under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole authentic and legitimate representative.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): The year 1985 is a year of anniversaries: 40 years have passed since the creation of the United Nations; 25 years have passed since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Next year, 1986, will be the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The international community would like to see the United Nations taking more than symbolic note of those anniversaries. The question of Namibia which we are discussing now, must not languish on the international agenda to be highlighted by ritualistic commemorative meetings. Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, in his statement on Namibian independence before the Security Council last week, exclaimed:

"it is already too late ... the delay has, indeed, become intolerable. Once again we say: enough is enough". (S/PV.2624, p. 29-30)

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Secretary-General, deserves our full support for all the efforts he has made both personally and through his representatives to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the sole effective blue print for the independence of Namibia. Seven years after its unanimous adoption by the Council, with the acceptance of both SWAPO and the South African régime, that document remains valid. However, the Secretary-General, in his report to the Security Council, has candidly conceded 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)

The Security Council considered the situation in Namibia only last week and I do not intend to review those discussions. I would, however, like to extract four central factors of grave concern to us all.

First, South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. Its repression of the people of Namibia continues unabated and the report of the Council for Namibia records the constant harassment, detention, torture and cold-blooded murder of innocent civilians, the displacement of whole communities and various other inhuman practices.

Secondly, South Africa remains adamant, seemingly impervious to the international opprobrium that is being heaped on it, and notwithstanding this seeks to retard the process towards Namibian independence through various pretexts, prevarications and postponements, including the now discarded linkage of Namibian independence to the issue of Cuban troops in Angola.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

Thirdly, the racist régime has increased its militarization of Namibia, where over 100,000 troops are maintained - a ratio of South African soldiers to Namibian civilians of 1:12. That is the situation which caused SWAPO's Secretary for Foreign Relations to describe Namibia as "an armed fortress".

Finally, the captive territory of Namibia is being used as a beach-head for aggression against independent African States, adversely affecting the stability and peaceful development of the region and threatening international peace and security.

While international opinion is being increasingly mobilized against apartheid South Africa, and practical voluntary measures against it are being taken by a number of countries, including those of the West, developments within South Africa itself leave little hope of a change of heart by the régime.



(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

The Commonwealth Heads of Government, meeting in the Bahamas last month, adopted a special Accord on Southern Africa, which stated:

"South Africa's continuing refusal to dismantle apartheid, its illegal occupation of Namibia, and its aggression against its neighbours constitute a serious challenge to the values and principles of the Commonwealth ..."

At an earlier Commonwealth meeting in New Delhi the view had already been expressed that

"only the eradication of apartheid and the establishment of majority rule on the basis of free and fair exercise of universal adult suffrage ... can lead to a just and lasting solution of the explosive situation prevailing in Southern Africa". (A/40/817, p. 7)

The question of armed struggle against apartheid South Africa has been discussed in the Security Council as well as in the General Assembly. The resort to arms can stem from one of basically two sets of circumstances. First, as in South Africa, it can originate from conditions in which there is no scope for the peaceful resolution of grievances, in other words, where a just cause - in this case, the legitimate struggle of the majority against the ruthless racist minority - has no peaceful means of redress. On the other hand, violence can be used as a chosen means to effect changes where such changes do not enjoy the support of the majority. Violence in such cases is not a last resort, but a cold-blooded exercise which rejects the peaceful means precisely because the use of such peaceful means would only show up the lack of support for those advocating violence. In Namibia and South Africa the legitimate aspirations of the majority to self-determination and independence are thwarted by the minority, which itself uses violence, while glibly denouncing the struggle of the majority, who have no other recourse for expressing their grievances.

Violence and the resultant bloodshed and loss of life that it brings in its

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

wake must be avoided. Violence and bloodshed throttle democratic means of political expression, leading to confusion, chaos and turmoil, conditions under which totalitarianism can breed. The turmoil that could ensue if Namibian independence is kept bottled-up can be avoided only if Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is implemented in its entirety, without delay and without incompatible pre-conditions. Obstacles to its implementation must be clearly recognized for what they are: merely the means of perpetuating racist colonial domination of the people of Namibia. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the key to peaceful change in Namibia, and to delay its implementation is to hasten violence. As the Commonwealth Heads of Government have indicated in their Accord on Southern Africa, it is our duty

"to leave nothing undone that might contribute to peaceful change in South Africa and avoid the dreadful prospect of violent conflict that looms over South Africa, threatening people of all races in the country, and the peace and stability of the entire Southern Africa region". (A/40/817, pp. 7, 8)

Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): The discussion of item 34, "Question of Namibia", this year takes on a special character, since this session of the General Assembly coincides with the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The representative of Luxembourg, exercising the presidency of the Council of the European Communities, has already presented to the General Assembly the views of the Community, Portugal and Spain on this item. While fully associating myself with what he said, I wish to make some comments, confining myself to the basic aspects of this very important issue.

It is a matter of grave concern to the Government of Greece that the Namibian people have not yet been able to exercise their inalienable right to

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

self-determination, because of the adamant refusal of the Government of South Africa to abide by the various resolutions of the United Nations. During the past year, following the conclusion of regional agreements between South Africa and neighbouring States, we have had some indications, momentarily, that progress could be made towards the normalization of the situation in the region. However, the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, the South African raid on the capital of Botswana, Pretoria's decision to proceed with its infamous plan to impose in Namibia the so-called provisional government and the deplorable deterioration of the situation of the black majority in South Africa seem to have diminished the prospects for peaceful dialogue in the area, at least for the time being.

The latest developments with regard to Namibia are all the more to be condemned because it is not the first time since the Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia that the Government of Pretoria has attempted to impose unilaterally its policy of an internal settlement in Namibia, in total disregard of the wishes of the Namibian people. Previous efforts have failed, and this most recent one is also doomed to fail, since no settlement can be expected to work and last unless it is approved by the people of Namibia.

Along with all the speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum, I should like to stress the firm conviction that the question of Namibia can be solved only through the full, immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only internationally accepted basis for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence. Questions that fall outside the United Nations plan must not be used as a pretext for preventing its implementation.

The Namibian question has been made to appear complex, like many other international problems. In reality, we consider it to be simple. What the people of Namibia have been asking for throughout all these years is the right to

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

self-determination and genuine independence. However, South Africa has shown no sign that it is willing to abandon its delaying tactics, and it attempts to perpetuate its domination over Namibia by avoiding fulfilment of its binding commitments. This is a policy which does not even serve the best interests of South Africa itself. It is high time for the Pretoria Government to show political will and co-operate fully with the United Nations in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which would not only bring about independence for Namibia through peaceful and democratic means but also make an important contribution towards peace in that troubled region.

As we have done in similar cases, we strongly condemn the continuing military occupation of Namibia, which runs counter to the Charter and to the numerous resolutions of the Organization. We also condemn South Africa's violation of the territorial integrity of the front-line States, and in particular its repeated raids into Angola, using Namibia as a springboard for such actions.

(Mr. Dountas, Greece)

As to the domestic situation in South Africa, it continues, unfortunately, to deteriorate, to the detriment of the black majority. We are following with deep concern the recent escalation of violence in that country owing to the latest repressive measures taken by the Government of South Africa in a desperate effort to perpetuate its grip on the majority of the population - which is fully consistent with its system of apartheid. The racist philosophy of South Africa can only fuel the vicious circle of violence. The declaration of intent recently announced by the Pretoria Government did not contribute in any way to the improvement of the situation. Even those few who had had some expectations saw their hopes dashed by what was in effect a smokescreen operation. The Government of South Africa has so far refused to enter into a real dialogue with the representative black groups on a future political settlement. Now, more than ever before, it is imperative that a genuine dialogue be established between the South African Government and the authentic representatives of the African majority, a dialogue directed towards the peaceful abolition of the system of apartheid.

Mr. EISSA (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): The attention of the international community is now focused on this body's deliberations on the question of Namibia. Frustrations have been accumulating on that question, because it is still unresolved. There is an increasing conviction that the continued suffering of the Namibian people, the denial of its basic human rights and the prolongation of the occupation of the Territory of Namibia not only undermines the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination enshrined by the international community for 40 years, since the United Nations was founded, but also constitutes a grave threat to the security and stability of that region and the world as a whole.

The General Assembly, in discussing this question again today, recalls that 25 years have passed since the adoption of the historic resolution 1514 (XV), the

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

That Declaration has been a source of inspiration to so many nations and peoples.

It is a regrettable irony that the United Nations, whose efforts in the field of decolonization constitute a remarkable, historic record replete with achievements, finds itself unable to complete the decolonization process in the Territory of Namibia. The continued illegal colonial occupation of Namibia by South Africa is a constant challenge to the capabilities of the United Nations, and has undermined its credibility and frustrated the hopes and aspirations of the international community. While millions of persons in former colonies now enjoy freedom and independence, the Namibian people - at a time when we are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations - are still subjected to the worst forms of repression and occupation and their wealth is blatantly plundered.

It is therefore more imperative now than ever before firmly to oppose Pretoria's plans and to intensify the struggle on all fronts to ensure the triumph of the principles of freedom and human dignity. Only in that way can we give concrete form to the direct responsibility for Namibia entrusted to the United Nations under General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted in 1966. The international family, as it approaches the year 1986 - the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia - has learned many lessons and drawn many conclusions. It has confirmed on more than one occasion and in more than one forum its total support for the courageous struggle waged by the Namibian people. It has expressed the conviction that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the people of that country, despicable behaviour and a challenge to the will of the international family as a whole. The international community continues to support the struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative. SWAPO embodies the Namibian people's aspirations to liberation and freedom. In all kinds of forums, it has demonstrated its flexibility, wisdom and spirit of responsibility. This is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of SWAPO, and we must hail the heroic role it is playing at a time when the racist régime has chosen the role of a rebel, an outlaw defying the will of the international community and pursuing its policy of disregarding United Nations resolutions, brutally repressing the people of Namibia and turning the Territory into a springboard for the carrying out of aggression against the countries of the region.

The persistence of the racist régime in occupying Namibia reflects its despair and fear as it faces the upsurge of liberation in South Africa and Namibia. It can find no way to deal with this problem except by mobilizing its forces of repression, until history writes the final chapter: the victory of these peoples - whose determination no one can oppose. It seems that the racist régime in Pretoria has not really learned the lessons of history. World public opinion has become more aware of the dangers posed by the policies and practices of the racist régime. There is a connection between the uprisings and the breaking out of revolution in South Africa, on the one hand, and the important positive developments on the international scene, on the other. The condemnations of Pretoria's policies by sectors of the international community and by governmental circles and the masses are among those developments. This is also reflected in the voluntary measures adopted by some countries, which felt that they had to take decisive steps in accordance with resolutions adopted by the meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity in Addis Ababa last July and confirmed by the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries in Luanda last September. It was clearly reflected also in the deliberations last week in the Security Council.

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

It is the duty of the hour to apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in order to isolate the racist régime politically, economically, militarily and culturally, and in other ways, and in order to force that régime to comply with United Nations resolutions. It is no use saying that this is not feasible or is useless. It flies in the face of reality to speak of the negative effects of sanctions. There is no alternative to freedom. The struggling people in South Africa are ready to pay any price to achieve it. Those who have any doubts should understand that the word "liberation" has no equal in the dictionary of the repressed and the persecuted.

It is unnecessary to say that the application of mandatory sanctions will strengthen the international community's attempts to promote human rights and the peaceful coexistence of peoples and nations. It will also serve other purposes of the Charter and the requirements of international peace and security.

In that context, my country, Sudan, is following with great concern the continued co-operation between the two parts of the unholy alliance - Pretoria and Tel Aviv - and the negative effects that this co-operation has on the struggle of the peoples of the African and Arab regions. This co-operation covers all fields, including the nuclear field. It is a desperate attempt to swim against the tide of increasing international condemnation of those two régimes. It is an open secret that this co-operation constitutes a continued challenge to the ability of this forum to meet the aspirations of the peoples and to ensure their right to self-determination.



(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

If we are to talk to South Africa in a language that it understands, by applying comprehensive mandatory sanctions, this means that we must implement immediately and unconditionally Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia. An objective assessment of developments in the situation since the adoption of that resolution seven years ago clearly shows that the racist régime is still manoeuvring and making a peaceful settlement conditional upon extraneous issues which have nothing to do with the essential purpose of resolution 435 (1978).

South Africa has persisted in placing more and more obstacles in the way of any effort to seek a peaceful solution. It took as a pretext the large military element in the proposed United Nations team to assist in the transition period. It followed that by rejecting the presence of the forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in Namibia at the time of the cease-fire. It also hinted at what it called the bias of the United Nations. It was not satisfied with delaying dealing with the question of choosing the electoral system, but went on to prepare a plan to maintain its occupation of the Territory by linking the independence of Namibia with the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. Completing this vicious circle, the racist régime, as a further pretext, announced that the declaration on the choice of the electoral system would be made when a date was set for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which in turn would depend on the solution of the linkage problem, and so on.

The United Nations Secretary-General summed up his unfruitful efforts in his deliberations with the Pretoria authorities in a report to the Security Council of 6 September 1985, in which he stated, in connection with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978),

"In the circumstances, I indicated that I was not in a position to record any further progress in my discussions with South Africa." (S/17442, para. 8)

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

While Pretoria was deceiving the whole world by claiming to be negotiating on a peaceful settlement, it was seeking to perpetuate an internal settlement that has been called the Multi-Party Conference and the establishment of an interim government, which the international community had condemned as illegal and null and void, just as it had previously condemned the establishment of bantustans in South Africa.

The racist Government, since the beginning of its series of challenges to the international community, including its rejection of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, has persisted in seeking to consolidate its illegitimate presence in Namibia, the intensification of the militarization of the Territory and the imposition of military service on Namibians aged between 17 and 55, to serve the colonialist army of occupation. The régime has also extended its laws based on apartheid, and other aggressive practices, to Namibia.

Any political settlement of the question of Namibia must include the immediate and unconditional end of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the withdrawal of the military forces of that racist régime and a guarantee of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only acceptable basis for such a settlement.

The Assembly must reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence in accordance with the United Nations Charter, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), resolution 2145 (XXI), of 1966, and other resolutions on the question of Namibia. The Assembly must ensure the preservation of the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the other offshore islands. It must reject all the manoeuvrings of South Africa designed to perpetuate its domination of the Territory. At the same time, the Assembly must provide material and moral support to the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. It must also call upon the

(Mr. Eissa, Sudan)

Security Council to respond to the will of the overwhelming majority of the international community by imposing against the racist régime mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Meanwhile, the Governments of the international community must adopt without delay, individually or collectively, legislative and administrative measures aiming at isolating the Pretoria régime and strengthening the international tide of opposition to South Africa, which we believe is one of the most important features of the international political scene at the present time.

There is perhaps no need to end my statement by stating that the Government and people of Sudan, which, since the people's victorious April revolution, has always considered the question of Namibia to be one of its major concerns, will always support the heroic people of Namibia in its struggle for freedom and liberation.

Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Since this is the first time that I have had the opportunity of speaking in the General Assembly, Sir, permit me to express our satisfaction at seeing a man of your experience and background presiding over our deliberations. Our peoples shared a common past which they have both overcome. Today, as an integral part of the Hispano-American community, they share the efforts to achieve justice, democracy, peace and development. I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your wise conduct of the proceedings of the General Assembly at this session.

In 1986, 20 years will have elapsed since the approval of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). Today, 19 years later, the provisions of that resolution have still not been carried out. Namibia continues to be an outrage, a festering colonialist wound. The liberation and accession to independence of that country are a challenge and at the same time the common heritage of the whole of mankind.

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

The United Nations, whose work in connection with decolonization has ultimately proved its most fruitful endeavour, cannot allow itself to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of resolution 2145 (XXI) while Namibia is still enslaved and with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) still not occupying the seat in this Organization reserved for Namibia by the international community. This is the time to repeat that the question of Namibia is a problem of decolonization and thus to repudiate emphatically its inclusion within the context of the East-West confrontation, as has been attempted by the allies of Pretoria.

We identify ourselves with the people of Namibia and express our solidarity with them and their vanguard, SWAPO. We share with SWAPO the long and heroic history of struggle against tyrannies imposed by the common enemy, only too well known to our peoples.

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

The constant state of tension in southern Africa and the constant threat to international peace and security have their roots in the aberrant régime of apartheid. That régime is the offspring of another similar régime which unleashed the Second World War and which the whole world joined in defeating. It is imperative today as it was then to have the world unite to put an end to apartheid and with it the illegal occupation of Namibia.

It is ironic, however, that the apartheid régime should receive today the support and co-operation of some of those who claim credit for having contributed to the defeat of nazism, and fascism 40 years ago.

Resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, in particular 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 566 (1985), are being flouted with impunity by the South African régime and its powerful allies in open defiance of the international community and of the most fundamental rules of human decency.

Thanks to the co-operation of certain Western Governments with apartheid, South Africa is continuing illegally to occupy Namibia. Profitable opportunities, accompanied by great economic advantages, are granted to transnational corporations in South Africa and in Namibia as a result of that co-operation.

Those corporations, which by the mere fact of their presence in Namibia are in violation of international law, are ruthlessly exploiting valuable non-renewable resources which are the property of the Namibian people alone and whose use has not been authorized either by that people or by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only body legally responsible for that Territory until Namibia achieves independence.

South Africa, with the sole aim of perpetuating its colonization of Namibia, has set up a provisional government which, as is only too well known to the whole international community, is made up of imaginary parties which are puppets

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

of Pretoria. Furthermore, they have the arrogance to come here to the United Nations and call for "impartiality" of treatment, with the sole objective of misleading the international community which recognizes in the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) the sole and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia which, furthermore, enjoys the status of Observer in our Organization.

In the face of the irresistible onslaught of the heroic freedom fighters of SWAPO, by the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, and in another of its well-known manoeuvres to continue its crimes against Namibia, South Africa has conscripted Namibian citizens into the armed forces in order to make them take part in actions against their own and neighbouring peoples. This has been severely condemned by our Organization and our Movement, and we call for an immediate end to this type of action.

With the same intention of remaining in Namibia, the Pretoria racists are continuing to follow "constructive suggestions" by the United States and are making their departure from Namibia dependent upon irrelevant issues which have nothing to do with the matter. The international community has repudiated this policy of linkage and continues to insist that South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia be unconditional and immediate.

These attempts to entrench and institutionalize the apartheid régime and the illegal occupation of Namibia cannot but convince the international community that the so-called provisional administration and the "constructive engagement" policy are nothing more than delaying tactics designed to continue to deny the Namibian people their inalienable rights.

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

In the face of these facts, we maintain that until there is political will on the part of Pretoria's chief collaborators to put an end to the martyrdom of the South African and Namibian peoples, state terrorism will continue, as will the occupation of Namibia and the destabilization of the front-line countries, the invasion and illegal occupation of part of the territory of Angola and the generalized repression: in a word, it will be apartheid that continues.

The impunity enjoyed by the Pretoria régime in carrying out its immoral policies and its practices of State terrorism against neighbouring countries by making use of the Territory of Namibia, are the result of the firm support which it enjoys, the fruit of the policy of "constructive engagement".

Imperialism is an accomplice in Pretoria's crimes, as in the past it was an accomplice in the genocide committed against my people throughout the Somoza dictatorship, and still is now in the indiscriminate murder of our people, often defenceless civilians, over 11,000 of whom have been killed. It is also an accomplice in the crimes committed by the counter-revolutionary gangs against the Angolan people, the people of Mozambique and other front-line States.

We cannot avoid mentioning similarities between our regions, between southern Africa and Central America. While South Africa defies the findings of the International Court of Justice, in Central America the United States flees the jurisdiction of the Court and evades justice. Both are placing themselves beyond the pale of the law and stand in violation of international law and order.

Innumerable attempts to punish South Africa for its illegal behavior have been thwarted by the United States and some of its Western allies. The international community, the people of South Africa and Namibia agree that the application of sanctions by the Security Council is an effective way to of exerting pressure of Pretoria and eliminating the hateful apartheid régime. The whole world

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

is calling for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The world is calling for an oil, arms and investment embargo. It is calling for the suspension of credit, the suspension of technological aid, nuclear information and the importation of uranium from Namibia.

Nevertheless, whenever the General Assembly or the Security Council, in response to this universal outcry, attempts to take measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, those attempts are blocked or vetoed by Pretoria's allies. Fresh in our minds is what occurred last week in the Security Council when, during the discussion of the problem of Namibia, a draft resolution was vetoed which attempted to respond to the international outcry for sanctions against South Africa.

In the case of Namibia and apartheid, as far as the Government of the United States is concerned, pressures do not work, pressures which they themselves apply against other regions and other countries. In the case of Pretoria, there are no violations of human rights; there is no State terrorism; there is no repression, no destabilization of neighbouring countries, no illegal occupation of territory, there is no people struggling valiantly against an immoral minority Government.



(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

We can only ask why, if the United States reserves the right to go round the world overthrowing or destabilizing popular Governments, it does not flex its muscles to help the peoples of Namibia and South Africa to throw off the racist yoke? Of course, it does not do so because it knows that their cause is just, and the Government of the United States is very much afraid of just causes. What it does, however, is repeal the Clark amendment in order to finance, train, direct and organize, by means of gangs of mercenaries in the service of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), terrorist actions against Angola, like those which are actually under way against my own people.

Why does the United States not impose an economic blockade on South Africa as it does on Nicaragua? Why does it not mine South African ports as it mines Nicaraguan ports? Why does it not conduct economic, political and diplomatic offensives against South Africa as it does against Nicaragua? Why does it not publish White Books as it does on Nicaragua? A White Book in the case of South Africa would not be full of unfounded slanders. Why in the case of South Africa does it not prepare a CIA manual in order to facilitate the assassination of leaders and members of the population in general? Why does it not help the Namibian people, SWAPO and the South African black people to free themselves once and for all?

No, the United States wants only to help the Bothas and the Samozas, the UNITAs and the contras.

In southern Africa, as in Central America, there will be no peace until the United States undertakes to respect the self-determination and sovereignty of peoples. Unless there is the fundamental political will to do this, the road to independence for Namibia will become even more difficult, but it will be completed, just as was the Sandinist revolution in Central America.

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

Our peoples know very well who is the common enemy. Namibia will be free. It will be free because that is the will of history. Apartheid has been condemned by history and the same history will also condemn those responsible for perpetuating that odious régime. We have a clear example that shows that, when a people rises up and undertakes to throw off the chains imposed by the colonialist and neo-colonialist yoke, it will be successful. We are firmly convinced that the people of Namibia, with its vanguard, SWAPO, has taken that decision and, sooner rather than later, will bring about final liberation.

The position of my people and Government with regard to the liberation of Namibia and South Africa has been, is and will continue to be clear-cut and based on principle. We have stated repeatedly at international meetings, and from this very rostrum, that it is a disgrace to humanity and a cause of shame for our Organization that the inalienable rights of the people of Namibia have been denied and that we should have celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations without a free and independent Namibia and without SWAPO, which represents the people of Namibia, having been able to be seated as an equal among us as a full Member of the Organization. We repeat today that we shall continue to maintain these positions of principle even though we are aware that such positions on the part of Nicaragua are not acceptable to the Government of the United States. If the cost of an independent, non-aligned international policy, a policy based on truth, is sabotage, blockade and State terrorism against our people, our people will be ready to pay that price, ten thousand times over, if it is necessary for the maintenance of our dignity and independence, and to keep faith with the thousands of Nicaraguans who gave up their lives for a free and sovereign country. We shall maintain our international solidarity in humanitarian causes.

(Mr. Chamorro Mora, Nicaragua)

I wish to express the gratitude of my delegation for the hard work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia to bring about the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia. Similarly, we wish to express our gratitude for the valuable information given to us in the reports to the General Assembly by the Council for Namibia, the Special Committee of 24 and the Secretary-General.

In conclusion, we should like once again to affirm our solidarity with the Namibian people and SWAPO, to whom we extend the hand of friendship, as we do to the continent of Africa, which is on the road to freedom. With them we share the same aspirations and hopes.

Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of Namibia continues to be one of the items of greatest importance for consideration and decision by the United Nations. While the supreme international body has adopted unequivocal decisions, the Government of Pretoria continues to delay ever further the completion of the process of decolonization, which affects the development of peace and security in southern Africa.

The vast majority of the international community have called for the immediate and total application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations itself has emphatically repeated that demand, as have the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Movement and other intergovernmental and regional bodies, so that the people of Namibia may freely and genuinely exercise their right to self-determination, national independence and territorial integrity.

At its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly once again condemned the racist régime of South Africa for sabotaging the talks on the independence of Namibia held in 1984 in Lusaka and Mindelo and repeated that there were two parties to this conflict - the Namibian people, represented by the South West Africa

(Mr. Mufiz, Argentina)

People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of that subjugated nation, and the illegal colonialist régime imposed by the South African authorities.

(Mr. Mufiz, Argentina)

The international community and in particular the front-line States, as well as the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have many times given evidence of their good will and patience in finding a just, peaceful and honourable solution to the Namibian question.

In a weighty advisory opinion handed down 14 years ago, the International Court of Justice established that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and that any act or measure by South Africa in that Territory had no validity.

In 1984 Security Council resolutions 535 (1984) and 539 (1984) condemned the maintenance of the status quo in Namibia and, furthermore, it was fully confirmed that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the sole basis for a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia and that the independence of that Territory could not be subject to any conditions that were not contemplated in the independence plan adopted by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and that affect the sovereignty of independent States. The Pretoria régime must accept the realities dictated by justice and history. It must give up its policy of obstruction and bring its actions back into line with promoting the process of Namibia's independence. It must give up once and for all the policy of intimidation, aggression and illegal occupation against neighbouring States and, in particular, against Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho.

The Non-Aligned Movement at the recent Ministerial Conference in Luanda, Angola, condemned the continued maintenance of the colonial régime in the Territory of Namibia, reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence and to the preservation of its territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and adjacent islands.

(Mr. Muffiz, Argentina)

Unfortunately, last week the United Nations Security Council found itself prevented from adopting measures which would have provided for further efforts by the international community to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia.

Both apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia are specific challenges to the credibility and effectiveness of our Organization and to an international order based on the maintenance of peace and security, respect for law, and the promotion of human dignity. It is now 40 years since South Africa has been violating with impunity the fundamental principles and specific provisions of the United Nations Charter. The moral authority of the Organization is being seriously called into question and we must react vigorously to prevent this contemptuous attitude from eroding an international system which it is the duty of all of us to maintain and consolidate.

Indeed, as confirmed by the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Pretoria régime has not only failed to take substantive measures to promote independence, but quite to the contrary, it has continued to increase internal repression against the people of Namibia and has stepped up its harassment of the leaders and members of the South West Africa People's Organization. The irrational economic system imposed has remained unchanged and the military bases and installations which make it possible to carry out aggression and exert pressure on neighbouring countries continue to operate.

The Argentine nation fully shares the feelings of the Namibian people with regard to its freedom and development. The people and Government of Argentina are firmly convinced - and in this we are in total agreement with the overwhelming majority of the international community - that the independence of Namibia will become possible only if there is immediate compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 432 (1978), which guarantee the full territorial integrity of that nation.

(Mr. Mufiz, Argentina)

Consequently, my delegation believes that the Security Council should adopt all the necessary measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, so that the process of the decolonization of Namibia can become a reality as soon as possible.

The elimination of colonialism in all its forms and of the apartheid régime are clear aims of the international community. The Argentine Republic once more repeats its support for all the efforts of the United Nations and, in particular, of the front-line States, to ensure that the Namibian nation immediately achieves its independence and territorial integrity.

Finally, I should like to express our gratitude to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until it becomes independent; to its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia; to its Acting President, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana; and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra.

Similarly, we should like to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for the considerable work he has done in dealing with this question and to reaffirm our commitment and support for the action taken to promote the just cause of Namibian independence.

Mr. GUSTAVSSON (Sweden): The people of Namibia might put a pertinent question to this Assembly. It might ask why, 40 years after South Africa's claim on Namibia was rejected by this Assembly, the United Nations has still not been able to enforce its own decisions.

Last Wednesday in the Security Council we were reminded of this well-founded sense of frustration of the people of Namibia. The Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Mr. Andimba Toivo ja Toivo said:

(Mr. Gustavsson, Sweden)

"Forty years ago, when the United Nations was founded, it was already too late for our independence. Twenty-five years ago, when the famous Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted, it was already too late. Next year, 1986, will mark the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's mandate over Namibia; it is already too late. More than seven years ago, the Security Council adopted the United Nations Independence Plan for Namibia, contained in resolution 435 (1978), it is already too late, and the delay has, indeed, become intolerable. Once again we say, enough is enough." (S/PV.2624, pp. 29-30)

The fact that the Namibian issue still remains unresolved is indeed a human tragedy and an international disgrace. The credibility of the United Nations is at stake.\*

---

\*Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Vice-President, took the Chair.



(Mr. Gustavsson, Sweden)

The United Nations has a special responsibility for Namibia. It is not just a colonial remnant and a case where a people is denied its right to self-determination. The people of Namibia, like that of South Africa, is under the yoke of the unique system of apartheid. Namibia has become part of South Africa's strategy of establishing a cordon sanitaire for the white minority régime. Furthermore, South Africa is not only illegally occupying Namibia but also using Namibia as a springboard for terrorism and military actions against neighbouring States, in particular Angola. South Africa's policy is a threat to international peace and security. It could well turn Namibia into an area of direct East-West confrontation.

My Government condemns in particular the latest attacks by South Africa on Angola and South Africa's training, arming and financing of the UNITA forces. The South African Government has itself admitted this support to UNITA. This assistance has the obvious aim of destabilizing Angola and makes the solution of the Namibian issue even more difficult. My Government, in response to the appeal by the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, has denounced this venture by South Africa.

My Government is profoundly concerned about the persistent refusal by South Africa to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978) containing a plan for the independence of Namibia. The resolution constitutes the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful, just and lasting solution to the question of Namibia by democratic means. My Government rejects the attempts to introduce into the Namibia plan any extraneous such issues as the condition that the Cuban forces should be withdrawn from Angola before the implementation of the plan can start. It is unacceptable that the implementation of the Namibia plan should be made dependent on an issue

(Mr. Gustavsson, Sweden)

that is irrelevant to the independence of Namibia and the legitimate aspirations of its people. The United Nations plan for Namibia must be implemented without pre-conditions and without further delay. Even the South African Government itself must realize that further delay in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can no longer be tolerated.

Allow me to express on this occasion my Government's appreciation of the initiative taken last year by the President of the People's Republic of Angola towards establishing a constructive climate for further negotiations aimed at finding solutions to the problems in southern Africa. Such negotiations could facilitate early implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, which is long overdue. My Government condemns the delaying tactics employed by South Africa. Furthermore, we reject any measures that violate the national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola. My Government is concerned about some recent developments which could be seen as support for those forces in the region which are not interested in a peaceful development.

My Government noted with satisfaction the adoption last June of Security Council resolution 566 (1985) on Namibia. We regard this resolution as an important step in the right direction. For the first time in the case of Namibia the Security Council has agreed to consider the use of sanctions or sanction-like measures against South Africa. The Security Council warned South Africa that failure to co-operate now with the United Nations in the implementation of the Namibia plan would compel the Council to consider new, appropriate measures, including measures under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

South Africa has not so far demonstrated any willingness to start implementing the Namibia plan. The Secretary-General's report to the Security Council bears

(Mr. Gustavsson, Sweden)

evidence of this intransigence on the part of the South African Government. The long-awaited response from the South African Government regarding the choice of an electoral system has since been communicated to the Secretary-General, although in an ambiguous way. The response can be seen as an attempt by South Africa to legitimize the so-called transitional government in Namibia - a body unanimously declared null and void by the Security Council. South Africa has also reintroduced its unfounded allegation of partiality by the United Nations. In addition, in its response in the Security Council South Africa insisted on the linking of Namibia's independence to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola - an extraneous issue repeatedly rejected by the Security Council. Accordingly, the Swedish Government finds it logical that the Security Council take without further delay the effective action foreseen in its resolution 566 (1985).

Increased international pressure on the South African Government, in particular through mandatory sanctions decided upon by the Security Council, is necessary to bring the implementation of the Namibia plan to a speedy conclusion. We therefore regret that the Security Council was unable a few days ago to reach a consensus on such sanctions. My Government appeals to all Members of the United Nations and in particular the permanent members of the Security Council to join in these efforts and to adopt further unilateral measures against South Africa to that end.

Sweden for its part fully subscribes to the request in Security Council resolution 566 (1985) for appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa. Sweden has adopted such measures and others beyond those specified in the resolution, including a ban on all new investments in South Africa and Namibia.

(Mr. Gustavsson, Sweden)

In our view there is room for further measures by individual countries to safeguard the interests of the Namibian people. The exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, including its maritime resources, should be halted. Appropriate international measures should be adopted to that effect.

There are no Swedish companies involved in such exploitation in Namibia and new Swedish investments in Namibia are prohibited by law. In addition, my Government has stated its view that imports of uranium from Namibia to Sweden are unacceptable as long as Namibia is illegally occupied by South Africa. My Government has also drawn the attention of Swedish importers to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974.

In our view an effective arms embargo would contribute to the halting of the military build-up in Namibia with its detrimental consequences for the people of that Territory. The United Nations arms embargo should therefore be strengthened.

The main burden of the struggle for Namibia's freedom and independence is carried out by the people of Namibia themselves. Nevertheless, the United Nations has a clear responsibility to help the people of Namibia. My Government therefore appeals to all Members of the United Nations to contribute to, or in case they are already doing so, increase their contributions to the various United Nations funds and activities intended for the people of Namibia.

Sweden has continuously increased its humanitarian assistance to the people of Namibia and is one of the main contributors to the funds and activities mentioned above. My Government would in this context like to stress the need for rendering increased moral and political support as well as humanitarian assistance to the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO). Swedish assistance to SWAPO during the present fiscal year amounts to approximately \$6 million and is meant for

SWAPO's civilian activities, a Swedish programme of direct assistance which started already in 1970.

The legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence cannot be silenced. The remnants of colonialism in Namibia must come to an end. The South African Government still has the choice between either a peaceful transition in accordance with the demands of the international community or a change that will come as the result of a confrontation with unforeseeable consequences. A continuation of the brutal occupation of Namibia will very likely force more people there to take to arms and to build up an ever-increasing resistance by all available means.

The people of Namibia should have to wait no longer for its independence. The international community has a direct and unique responsibility to fulfil here. It should, at last, try to live up to the expectations of the Namibian people and to make a decisive contribution to the elimination of one of the most long-standing and serious issues on the agenda of the United Nations. That would be an invaluable contribution to the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on Decolonization. More importantly, it would be an historic service rendered to the people of Namibia.

Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Only last week the Security Council of this Organization was convened to consider the question of Namibia. That meeting itself was triggered by an earlier sitting of the Council which had decided that if the colonial régime of South Africa failed to heed the universal demand for the freedom of Namibia, the Council would be convened to consider and take appropriate action. In his report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General submitted that there has been no progress in his contacts with the South African régime. It was a statement that underscored the continued South African defiance of this Organization.

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of  
Tanzania)

The issue of Namibian independence is one of the items that has featured on our agenda since the inception of this Organization. A decade has now elapsed since the Assembly, through resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated the South African Mandate over Namibia. By that act, the Assembly expressed universal revulsion at the racist suppression of Namibia and its colonization by Pretoria. It was an act of faith, faith in the cause of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and a commitment to ensure the independence of Namibia.

The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council was an affirmation of that act of faith and a reaffirmation of the commitment of this Organization to assist the Namibian people in their determination to win their freedom. At its adoption, resolution 435 (1978) was heralded, and remains today, as the universally accepted plan for the peaceful resolution of the problem and the key to the independence of Namibia.

The fact that today, seven years since the adoption of that plan, we are called upon to still debate the question of Namibia, is a sad commentary on the history of this Organization. It is a bitter statement of defiance, with impunity, of this Organization by the racist régime of Pretoria. It is also a statement of duplicity on the part of those partners of South Africa who, through their misguided motives, have nurtured and encouraged South African defiance of our Organization.

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of  
Tanzania)

The question of Namibia is thus a long chronicle of the brutalization of that Territory and the suffering of Namibia. It is a chronicle of voracious economic exploitation and greed, the sole motivation of those institutions that sustain and encourage colonial slavery in Namibia. It is a chronicle of militarization and the utilization of the illegally occupied Territory as a springboard for aggression by South Africa, acting as the surrogate of imperialism in southern Africa.

But it is also a chronicle of the determination of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to win their freedom, using all means and channels available to them. Through SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative, the people of Namibia have fought politically and by armed struggle for their liberation. Like their brothers and sisters before them in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, they have stood firm against the onslaught of the racist and colonialist forces. Steeled in the struggle and firm in their commitment, they have also sought, in co-operation with the international community, to lessen their suffering by trying to bring the armed struggle to an end and lead Namibia to independence, also by peaceful means.

It was their efforts that facilitated the drawing up of the plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), to which they have remained unshakeably committed. It must be emphasized that to reach a position that facilitated the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) SWAPO had to make many concessions, exhibiting flexibility and political responsibility.

It is against that background, of great patience and co-operation exhibited by SWAPO, that we must analyse the response of the illegal and colonialist régime of South Africa, as well as the vacillation and equivocation of certain States that have been parties to all aspects of the negotiations leading to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Fom, United Republic of  
Tanzania)

South Africa and its supporters have dragged in one untenable excuse after another to delay Namibia's independence. They have imposed conditions and introduced totally extraneous issues, for the sole purpose of delaying the independence of Namibia, and for blackmail with a mind to obtaining strategic advantages in the area. They have sought, finally, to create so-called realities, which are nothing but doomed efforts to impede the independence of Namibia. It was a part of those same efforts that South Africa in June this year imposed its puppet institution, a so-called interim government in Namibia, which has been roundly condemned and declared null and void.

Revulsion at the policies pursued by the racist régime of Pretoria is, as we have stated, universal. There are doubts, however, as to whether the commitment to eliminate that threat to peace and security, that crime against humanity, is equally universal. At the same time, there has been a flurry of activity that in the final analysis seems aimed only at protecting apartheid and colonialist South Africa. In that respect, the policy of constructive engagement pursued by the United States of America, and the apologist attitude of some other Western countries, stands in sharp contrast to the words they speak about of rejecting the evil that apartheid and colonialism in Namibia represent.

It is no secret that those countries - which profess love for the oppressed African and friendship and support for the oppressors of the African - seem motivated more by their vainglorious global strategies, than by concern over the reality of the oppression of the people of Namibia and the black people of South Africa, or the reality of death and destruction rained on the people of Angola, Mozambique, Botswana and Lesotho.

If we all accept that colonial occupation of Namibia is wrong, if we all accept that the illegal occupation of Namibia is aggression against the people of



(Mr. Foun, United Republic of  
Tanzania)

Namibia and a threat to the sovereignty of neighbouring States and to peace and security in the area, surely that acceptance must be translated into practical action against the South African régime. Platitudes will no longer suffice.

It is imperative that the Assembly take resolute action to sustain its own decisions and that it call upon the Security Council to take measures for the freedom of Namibia and against the threat to peace and security that continued South African defiance represents. My delegation wishes to declare that the Organization can no longer afford the luxury of vacillation, if it ever could. What confronts us is clear: it is colonialism; it is apartheid; and it is illegality.

South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is a direct and violent defiance of the United Nations in its entirety. South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is the transplanting of apartheid - the system of institutionalized racism - a crime against humanity. That aspect must remain in sharp focus this year, when the world has commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the defeat of Hitlerite nazism in Europe. The Namibians, too, bleed.

Finally, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is the source of continuing aggression against the people of Namibia and against the people of Angola, whose sovereignty has been wantonly violated, and is thus a continuing threat to peace and security in the region.

For all those reasons, we demand action. For freedom and human dignity in Namibia, we demand action. We demand that those who seek to pamper and protect South Africa desist from pampering and protecting apartheid and illegality.

In this respect, I commend the efforts of those countries that have unilaterally started imposing voluntary sanctions against South Africa. We urge many more countries to follow the exemplary measures of the Nordic countries and

(Mr. Foun, United Republic of  
Tanzania)

countries such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which have gone a long way in fulfilment of the letter and spirit of the Charter to seek to ensure South Africa's compliance with United Nations resolutions. There is every reason to believe that sanctions, if strictly applied by the international community, will inevitably restore dignity, justice and freedom to the unfortunate majority of South Africans, and in this particular case to the people of Namibia. It is our hope that those countries - the United States of America and the United Kingdom in particular - which hindered action in the Security Council will reconsider their position and join all of us in co-operative action for the freedom of Namibia.

Permit me at this point to pay tribute to the heroic people of Namibia, under the sole and authentic representation of SWAPO, for their brave and determined struggle against the racist régime. It is our belief that an end to South Africa's arrogant and intransigent policies over Namibian independence is purely a question of time. It is certain that the struggling people of Namibia will sooner rather than later accede to independence. We therefore urge continued political, diplomatic, material, financial and moral support from the international community for the struggling people of Namibia.

(Mr. Fom, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

In conclusion, while thanking Comrade Toivo ja Toivo for a careful presentation of the Namibian case, I wish to place on record my country's total and unwavering support for the heroic people of Namibia in their efforts to win their national independence.

I take this opportunity also to express our highest appreciation to Ambassador Noel Sinclair, Acting President of the Council for Namibia, for the exemplary conduct of the Council's work and for its advancement of the cause of the Namibian people.

Mr. AKANGA (Togo) (interpretation from French): The question of Namibia has become a true test not only for the peoples of the Territory but also for the United Nations itself. It is a formidable test for the peoples because of the intolerable conditions imposed on them by the racist authorities of South Africa and because of the harsh repression unleashed against the militants of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). It is a test for the Organization itself because this question casts doubt on the confidence that the African peoples have placed in the Organization to find an effective solution to their problems.

When the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), international public opinion hoped - quite reasonably - that Namibia would accede to independence. But today the General Assembly must once again consider the question of Namibia. This item has been regularly inscribed on the agenda of sessions of the Assembly since 1946. At that time the item was entitled "Question of the Territory of South West Africa", but in 1966 the title was changed to "Question of Namibia".

Hence, everyone is familiar with this question through reports by the United Nations Council for Namibia and various meetings that have been held on the question, particularly the International Conference in Support of the Namibian People held in Paris in 1983 and the commemoration this year, here at the

(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

Headquarters of the Organization, of the International Day of Solidarity with the Namibian People.

It should be recalled, however, that by resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of South West Africa, which then became Namibia. Similarly, in its advisory opinion of 1971, the International Court of Justice declared that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa was under the obligation to withdraw from the Territory of Namibia so that it could accede to independence. A United Nations council was entrusted with the administration of the Territory until its accession to independence.

At the same time, under the responsible leadership of SWAPO, the Namibian people was consolidating its heroic legitimate - and henceforward legal - struggle for total liberation.

During the debates at the session commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations - which coincides with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - it was unanimously recognized that, despite notable successes by the Organization in the decolonization process, a speedy peaceful settlement to the Namibian problem was necessary in order to avoid dragging all of southern Africa into war and chaos, and thereby tarnishing the prestige of the Organization's decolonization work. We must therefore now take action to ensure the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia clearly laid down in the relevant United Nations resolutions.

The international community must mobilize its legal, economic and political resources to demand the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of South Africa, thereby ensuring that the Namibian people can exercise its legitimate rights to

(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

self-determination and independence, within the context of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In my delegation's opinion, that resolution embodies the appropriate solution in regard to any acceptable peaceful settlement of the question. My delegation feels that maintaining Namibia in a colonial situation, in defiance of the rules of international law, is a serious challenge to the international community. It is an increasing source of disquiet, impatience and frustration for the Namibian people and a threat to peace and security in Africa as a whole.

My delegation unreservedly supports the consistent plan for a settlement contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) - resolutions which, unfortunately, have not so far been implemented because of the South African racist régime's bad will and manoeuvres of all kinds. Backed up by further demands that have nothing to do with the question, those manoeuvres are clear indications that South Africa has no intention of leaving Namibia.

It is today an indisputable fact that South Africa and its allies bear the entire responsibility for blocking the implementation of the plan to settle the question of Namibia. My delegation is convinced that the so-called acceptance of the plan by South Africa was in fact a crude ruse devised in order to gain time to perpetuate its domination of Namibia by imposing on the Namibian people and the international community an iniquitous interim settlement giving Pretoria the right to instal in Windhoek a so-called interim government as a result of a so-called multi-party conference.

But the Namibian people and the international community have not been fooled; the manoeuvre has been unmasked. They have reacted strongly, categorically rejecting Pretoria's decision, which would result in extending the heinous system of apartheid to Namibia.

(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

Indeed, the Pretoria Government revealed its true intentions regarding the United Nations plan by stating at the Geneva meeting in 1981, the Lusaka talks in 1983 and the conference on Namibia in Mindelo, Cape Verde, in 1984 that it was premature to discuss the implementation of the plan - whereas SWAPO was prepared to negotiate a cease-fire and to set a date for elections that would lead to independence.

All those manoeuvres clearly show that we are dealing with a Government which is unique in its attitude and insolent in its international behaviour, a Government which must be treated with distrust and vigilance because, while it is terrorizing the Namibian people, it is also engaging in actions designed to destabilize the neighbouring States.

There is no need for further proof that, by its intransigence and arrogance, the South African racist régime is engaging inside Namibia in extremely brutal, heinous repression against the Namibian people, and outside Namibia in acts of armed aggression, subversion and destabilization against the neighbouring States, particularly Angola, Lesotho, Botswana and Mozambique, in violation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

In the view of my delegation, South Africa's belligerent behaviour towards the front-line States poses a serious threat to security and stability, and hence to peace, in southern Africa. Moreover, the massive intervention by South African armed forces in Angola last October, when the General Assembly - was in session, was typical of the usual tactics of the Pretoria authorities, which attempt to compromise the authority of the United Nations whenever it discusses the question of Namibia.

There is much proof of this. My delegation recalls in particular the bloody Kassinga massacre cold-bloodedly carried out by South African armed forces on the eve of the Security Council's debate on the question of Namibia in May 1978. We recall too the more recent murderous raid by those forces into Botswana, which claimed many civilian victims.

In this connection, my delegation wishes to reaffirm that the Government and people of Togo, under the leadership of His Excellency General Gnassingbe Eyadema, will continue to condemn energetically such displays of force, which demonstrate the ill will and bad faith of the South African authorities and their annexationist designs on Namibia. The international community should impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

My delegation reaffirms its strong support for the Final Communiqué of the meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, and for resolution 39/50 A, which condemns the racist régime's acts of military aggression, terrorism and destabilization against the front-line States and calls upon the international community to increase, as a matter of urgency, its financial, material, military and political support to help those States defend themselves against the South African aggressor, which continues

(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

with impunity to refuse to accept Security Council resolution 435 (1978), on the pretext of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

The deadlock in the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia results also from the unjust linkage which has been established between the independence of that Territory and the withdrawal of the Cuban troops at present in Angola at the request of the Government of a sovereign, free and independent State.

In our view, the question of Namibia is a problem of decolonization. However, in an attempt to divert the world's attention from the colonial aspect of the question it is being artificially presented as a problem of East-West rivalry. My delegation considers that it is indisputably a question of decolonization and that, in order to resolve it, its true nature must be restored. Through the introduction of this element, which is totally extraneous to the question of Namibia, it has been possible to delay the Territory's accession to independence.

My delegation reaffirms Togo's support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains the sole basis for a peaceful settlement acceptable to the entire international community and to the parties concerned. In this connection, the influential Members of this Organization have a decisive role to play and a historical responsibility to Africa, the Namibian people and the international community as a whole. My delegation hopes that all States will make a positive contribution to the emergence of an independent Namibia.

My delegation therefore calls on the international community to support and accelerate the imposition of the sanctions set out in Security Council resolution 566 (1985), with the aim of hastening the end of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Togo associates itself with all possible initiatives in the quest for an early, acceptable solution to the question of Namibia, a question which has been with us for too long.



(Mr. Akanga, Togo)

I wish on behalf of my delegation to reaffirm the Togolese people's support for and solidarity with the valiant Namibian people in its long, heroic struggle, carried out with determination and sacrifice, under the responsible leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its authentic representative. The experience gained in that lengthy struggle will surely help that people to free itself completely from the domination of the apartheid régime. Through its representatives, that people has shown its readiness to consider all the initiatives designed to lead to the solution of the question of Namibia, and it deserves justice.

My delegation reiterates the gratitude of the Government of Togo to the Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia for their devotion to the cause of Namibia and their unceasing efforts to hasten the advent of a free and independent Namibia.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again the General Assembly bears witness to the enormous interest of the international community in the continuing situation of the Namibian people. That interest is manifested not only in the large number of delegations which have shown their concern but also in the unanimous agreement on the urgent need for Namibia to achieve independence as early as possible through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only universally recognized basis for the achievement of that objective.

My delegation is participating in this debate also as a member of the Council for Namibia and of the Special Committee on decolonization, whose Tunis consensus was actively supported by my country. In both those bodies, Chile has frequently reaffirmed its unflagging support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and expressed the desire that this anomaly with which the international community has been confronted for so long be ended forthwith.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

At the extraordinary session of the Council for Namibia in Vienna and during the debate at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly my country expressed its hope that the contacts then under way would bear fruit. But today we see with deep concern that the glimmer of hope on the horizon has vanished, and that those contacts have virtually ended.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

The disappointment that that fact has aroused in us has on this occasion very special overtones, since in essence we all nourish the hope that, as we commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV), the greatest triumph we could place before history was the achievement of the independence of Namibia. My delegation thought that optimism was logical, since we could with difficulty accept the paradox of commemorating 40 years of the Organization's existence while at the same time we kept alive a problem affecting so many human beings which has been of concern to this Organization from its very inception. Unfortunately, that paradox has arisen. In spite of that, today Chile maintains the same position of rejection of the colonial system to which Namibia is subjected as in 1946. That is why today we again express publicly our disappointment.

Faced with the picture we have described, all we can do is concentrate our efforts on the work undertaken by the Secretary-General and the Council for Namibia. With regard to the first, my delegation is grateful for and welcomes the efforts made by Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar in order to achieve an agreement to bring to an end the unjust situation prevailing in Namibia. His intelligence and capacity are perhaps one of the few bases that keep alive our hopes for a peaceful settlement.

With regard to the Council for Namibia, my delegation applauds its dedication to the cause and wishes to emphasize the very wise action undertaken by its Acting President, Ambassador Sinclair of Guyana. In spite of the not very encouraging current situation, the Council for Namibia has pursued its efforts, and the clearest demonstration of that is the resolution it adopted at its special session in Vienna requesting special recognition for the 200-mile exclusive maritime zone. We believe that recognition of the 200-mile limit is one of the most valuable new elements that have now been brought into this debate on Namibia.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

Decree No. 1, an international rule the object of which is to protect Namibia's natural resources, is still being implemented and the action being carried out in Europe to obtain its international recognition by the courts of justice in some of the countries on that continent is a concrete step forward. To that we add the concern expressed by the Council with respect to the exclusive maritime zone - not only the one reiterated in its resolution A adopted by the Council and refers not just to the 12-mile but also to the 200-mile limit - the international community must realize that our concern is for all Namibia's resources and that we shall continue our efforts to preserve in so far as possible the whole of its heritage. In this connection, Chile hopes that publication of the study carried out by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on the amount of fishing along Namibia's coast will perhaps bring many surprises to this Assembly but, nevertheless, will give us a clear idea of the level of depredation of Namibia's maritime heritage and who are its exploiters by illegally taking advantage of the natural wealth which is the heritage of the Namibians alone.

In the same constructive spirit with which we have made these comments, we wish to say that, in connection with its sources of information, the Council for Namibia should resort to all available means so that our overall view of this question will be as comprehensive as possible. In this context, the Council for Namibia should continue to use especially the information derived from bodies which are part of the United Nations system since no one can deny their reliability.

I wish to end this statement by reiterating the Chilean delegation's decision to continue working for the achievement of Namibia's complete independence, a stand taken by my country as far back as the first session of the General Assembly in 1946; by reiterating our support for the work of the Council for Namibia; by reiterating our appreciation to the South West Africa People's Organization for its readiness to negotiate; while expressing again the hope that our efforts will

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

persuade South Africa to make its position more flexible and allow full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in order to achieve the peaceful settlement that we all expect.

Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Our Organization has achieved one of its undoubtedly great triumphs, namely, the process of decolonization the result of which has led to the ideal of universality in the membership of this Organization.

Bolivia and the other Latin American countries had the privilege of participating most actively in the drafting of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which led to its adoption in 1960. Since then we have followed with keen attention and at the same time supported every effort aimed at its implementation.

In commemorating the 25 years of that historic Declaration, the States Members of this Organization could well say that the colonial system has almost vanished and we should be satisfied with the work we have done and our achievements in this field. However, those achievements have been tarnished, because there is still one people in southern Africa clamouring for freedom and justice owing to the persistent refusal of the Government of South Africa to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

The international community has unceasingly demanded the implementation of the right of peoples to self-determination. We face that challenge by requesting understanding and the right climate that would enable that people to exercise its right to self-determination, with the holding of free and just elections, internationally supervised, and with the full participation of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative.

(Mrs. Carrasco, Bolivia)

It would take too long and be too painful to list the efforts of the international community to exert pressure on South Africa under the provisions of the various resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international forums.

By resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, the United Nations recognized its heavy responsibility for administering Namibia and preparing a programme to realize its self-determination and independence.

Since then, the United Nations, has in a number of resolutions, firmly supported the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. It was assumed that those efforts would culminate in the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), which set out the ways and means by which the people of Namibia could decide its own destiny through free and impartial elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. But that attempt was frustrated, despite the efforts of the Secretary-General, because obstacles are being created that prolong the suffering of human beings whose sole aim is to live in dignity within their own Territory.

Bearing in mind that these measures are not achieving the withdrawal of South Africa, and in response to an appeal addressed by the Co-ordination Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Security Council met to resume its consideration of the question and adopted resolution 566 (1985) which, inter alia, warns South Africa that unless it co-operates fully in the implementation of the United Nations plan, the Council would have to meet again to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under with the Charter.

As no change took place in Pretoria's arrogant attitude, barely a week ago the Security Council again considered this dramatic situation. Regrettably, the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries members of the Security Council,

(Mrs. Carrasco, Bolivia)

in which they noted that the continued refusal of the Government of Pretoria to comply with existing resolutions constituted a serious threat to international peace and security, was not adopted as the international community expected. It is worth reminding the members of the Council that the continued postponement of the adoption of specific measures will benefit only the policy of oppression and violence practised by the racist régime.

I should like now to refer to the report submitted by the Special Committee in which it is reaffirmed that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until such time as the Territory achieves self-determination and national independence, and reiterates its conviction that the South African apartheid régime is responsible for creating a situation that seriously threatens international peace and security as a result of its continued refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations its denial of the most fundamental human rights to the people of Namibia, including its right to independence, its use of repression and violence against the people of Namibia, its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States its attempts to impose an internal settlement on the Namibian people.

This gives us food for thought. It is imperative that this Organization maintain its credibility and firmly assume its basic responsibility and, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, grant independence to the people of Namibia which has placed its confidence in the United Nations.

Similarly, my delegation supports and endorses the Special Committee's rejection of all of South Africa's manoeuvres aimed at proclaiming spurious independence for Namibia through fraudulent constitutional and political plans aimed at the perpetuation of its colonial domination of Namibia and the more recent attempts by South Africa to impose an internal solution through the so-called Multi-Party Conference and the establishment of a provisional Government. In the

(Mrs. Carrasco, Bolivia)

view of my delegation, these measures not only represent serious obstacles to the course of action proposed by this Organization, but are also illegal and have no value whatsoever.

The protection and rational use of natural resources is a matter of continued concern to Bolivia. That is why we share the views of those countries which consider that only the people of Namibia have the right to administer and control the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, and request the Council for Namibia to implement Decree No. 1, concerning the protection of those resources. On the other hand, we find it unacceptable that foreign companies should benefit illegally from the non-renewable resources of that Territory at the expense of suffering and poverty.

I wish to place on record the gratitude of my delegation for the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which should be encouraged to pursue its efforts. In conclusion, I wish to reiterate that Bolivia supports the people of Namibia in its just and heroic struggle for independence. We still believe that the United Nations is responsible for the adoption of urgent and effective measures to put an end to the colonial administration of that Territory. Bolivia also expresses its sympathy and whole-hearted support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and remains convinced that the territorial integrity of Namibia should be preserved. Walvis Bay should be an integral part of Namibia. We express our strong condemnation of the South African acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries.

Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): As the international community, aspiring to universal peace and security, celebrates the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, and as this occasion also marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we find the question of Namibia still remains one of the burning issues awaiting peaceful settlement on the agenda of this body.



(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

Nineteen years have elapsed since 1966 when the General Assembly, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, assumed direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory of Namibia, with the intention of assisting the Namibian people to achieve the necessary peaceful transition to independence.

Despite this decision, the South African racist régime demonstrated its obstinate intention to remain in Namibia and has persistently refused to co-operate and to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

In fact, in spite of persistent international appeals and pressure, the racist régime of South Africa has consolidated its presence and imposed its oppressive administration by increasing its military and police forces in the Territory, thus preventing the Namibian people from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

As a result, the situation has deteriorated throughout the Territory as tension and confrontation have become the inevitable consequences of the tyrannical rule and administration of the racist régime.

No one can deny that the South African racist régime and its intransigent behaviour have demonstrated to the whole world how very dangerous its apartheid policy is to the efforts to maintain peace and security in southern Africa as well as in the whole region and beyond.

This dangerous policy holds hostage the great majority of black South Africans and the people of Namibia. Through it, the racist régime of South Africa continues its brutal repression of the people and attempts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia by imposing on the people an internal settlement through the so-called multi-party system and the establishment of the so-called interim government, which constitutes a clear contravention of the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and a defiance of its authority. It is also through this evil policy that the South African régime has compelled young Namibian males to join the army to fight against their own people and kill their own brothers.

The entrenched apartheid régime has shown no limits in perpetrating its aggression beyond the borders of Namibia and South Africa. The South African régime has used and still uses Namibian territory as a springboard for its military attacks and acts of destabilization directed against the neighbouring independent

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

sovereign African States to prevent and discourage them from giving support to the liberation movements in their struggle to dismantle the evil system of apartheid.

The racist régime of South Africa has refused to come to terms with the wishes of the peace-loving international community or to address itself to the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, thus isolating itself from the rest of the world, except Israel, with whom it has maintained a sinister collaboration in the political, economic, military and cultural fields.

The South African régime has been using every trick of the trade to gain time for its sinister manoeuvres and delaying tactics and to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people and further exploit and plunder the natural resources of the land.

The political, economic and military activities of this régime have undermined the efforts of the Namibian people to protect their territorial integrity and natural resources.

The whole world has for over a century been a witness of the spectacle of the legitimate rights of the Namibian people to freedom and justice being relentlessly trampled on.

We cry aloud that the independence of Namibia is long overdue.

That is why, we do not condone any policy of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa that may undermine the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people to freedom and national independence. That is also why we reject the policy of linking Namibian independence to any extraneous issues, as we believe that such a policy impedes the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) which is the only basis for a peaceful and lasting settlement of the Namibian question.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

For this reason also we reaffirm the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) - the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people - against the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, and call upon all States to increase their moral and material support to them.

The rightful struggle of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence has been recognized by both the General Assembly and the Security Council in their resolutions and decisions. Both have declared the occupation by South Africa of Namibian territory to be illegal, null and void.

In its resolution 566 (1985), adopted a few months ago, the Security Council condemned the installation of the so-called interim government in Windhoek and declared the action to be illegal, null and void. It also condemned South Africa's obstruction of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which embodied the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and strongly warned South Africa that failure to co-operate with the Council in compliance with its decision would compel it to adopt appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII.

We were gratified to think that the warning of the Security Council to South Africa would work and that the Council would discharge its primary responsibility by seeing to it that its resolutions and decisions are carried out.

Indeed, we expected that, in the event of South Africa's defiance, the Security Council would have no other choice but to impose appropriate measures against it under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Alas, the South African régime, as defiant as ever, continues its repressive apartheid practices against the defenceless people of Namibia, and the Security Council has incapacitated itself by its own action.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

We find a paradox in this situation: the Security Council, by the action of some of its principal members frustrates its responsibility to maintain peace and security by allowing the veto power to paralyse its own actions. By so doing, the Security Council has become insensitive to the intolerable miscarriage of justice perpetrated against the millions of Namibian people under the yoke of South Africa's colonial rule.

In this situation, we find that peace and security themselves become elusive.

Faced with this dilemma, the international community should not give up but should renew its appeal to the Security Council - the sole international instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security - to fulfil its promise of adopting appropriate measures if South Africa refuses to comply with its decisions.

We are convinced that the only way to oblige South Africa to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations with regard to Namibian independence, is to impose upon it comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, including an arms embargo, an oil embargo, economic sanctions, and other suitable means as contained in the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

Considering the blatant and persistent defiance of the Pretoria régime, we believe that the application of these sanctions will cause it to negotiate terms with the parties directly concerned.

In this connection we commend SWAPO's preparedness to co-operate with the United Nations Secretary-General and his Special Representative, as well as its readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa in implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

We have been pleased to learn that some Member States, agencies and organizations have carried out the commendable task of adopting various economic

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

and other measures against South Africa. We urge them to intensify these measures and call upon other Member States, agencies and organizations to join them in concerted efforts to bring about the downfall of the apartheid régime and to end the illegal occupation of Namibia.

Before I conclude my remarks, I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the competent leadership of Ambassador Lusaka of Zambia, has fulfilled the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly and has discharged its responsibility with diligence.

(Mr. Farah Dirar, Djibouti)

We commend the tireless efforts of the Council in mobilizing concerted international action to promote the Namibian cause and to bring to an end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We express our confidence that the ongoing endeavours of the Council will contribute effectively to the efforts in support of the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence.

Mr. AZZAROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset, on behalf of my delegation, to extend our heartfelt condolences to the people and Government of Colombia on the natural disaster which struck that country recently, claiming thousands of lives.

The General Assembly is once again reviewing the question of Namibia, at a time when the peoples of the world are celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twentieth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly in 1960 of resolution 1514 (XV), which included the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This occasion would have been happier had we been celebrating the end of colonialism and racism by welcoming here the representatives of the heroes who are struggling to achieve self-determination, independence and liberation and, as members this international community, contribute with all of us in achieving international peace and security. We should have been happier, when celebrating this fortieth anniversary and the passage of a quarter of a century since the adoption of the resolution on decolonization, if our brothers from Namibia had been occupying their seat among us as representatives of a free, independent, African Namibia, having rid themselves of colonialism, the racist intimidation practised by the apartheid régime of South Africa and the exploitation of the multinational corporations which plunder the wealth of Namibia.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The socialist people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya considers the question of Namibia and the continued occupation of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa as one of the major concerns at the national, regional and international levels. We attach the utmost importance to that question in our foreign policy, based on the principles of our great revolution of 1 September. We support peoples which struggle for freedom and independence under the slogan "Africa for the Africans". The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya watches closely the developments in Namibia and in southern Africa. It considers that the freedom of Africa is an integral whole and that the question of Namibia and its independence is linked to African dignity.

Based on our positions of principle and our commitment to defend the cause of freedom, the Jamahiriya has honoured all its obligations as an African State and provided all forms of support for the struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and to the front-line African States. The Jamahiriya considers itself one of those front-line States standing against the system of apartheid, for the Jamahiriya believes in the unity of struggle, destiny and common objectives.

The apartheid régime which occupies Namibia and practises intimidation against neighbouring African countries, pursuing a policy of racial discrimination in South Africa much like the Zionist racist régime in occupied Palestine, is faced by an African presence. Those two régimes - the racist régime in South Africa and the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine - are unified by a single racist ideology which denies human rights and defies the international community and the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya expresses its conviction that unless an end is put to those racist régimes, stripping them of their racist nature and tendencies, and



(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

unless the international community applies comprehensive mandatory sanctions against them, peace in the Arab and African regions, as well as in the world, will be in jeopardy.

There is no doubt that the material, physical and moral support provided to the racist régime of South Africa by some Western States, foremost among them the United States of America, which its natural ally, the policy of constructive engagement entered into by the two parties, the co-operation in all fields with the racist régime in South Africa, and the nuclear and military co-operation and collaboration between the two racist régimes - the régime of South Africa and that of Tel Aviv - have encouraged the Pretoria régime to continue its occupation of Namibia despite all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and have supported the régime in consecrating the policies of apartheid and aggression against neighbouring African States.

The apartheid régime of South Africa and the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine, with unlimited support from the United States and under several pretexts, are committing acts of aggression against African and Arab States, bombing cities and villages, displacing citizens and killing civilians, in open defiance of the international community. The latest examples of such acts of aggression are those against Angola by the racist régime in Pretoria and the act of aggression against Tunisia by the Zionist régime.

The United Nations assumed responsibility for Namibia 40 years ago and I do not think our delegation need remind the Assembly that 19 years have elapsed since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution which ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Nor is it necessary to remind the Assembly of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for Namibia. It is an open secret that despite all the resolutions adopted by the Security

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Council and the General Assembly since 1946, when they first took up the question of Namibia, the racist régime in South Africa still occupies Namibia and has installed a puppet government in defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council, particularly resolution 264 (1969), which called for the immediate withdrawal of Pretoria's administration from Namibia. It also defies the resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolution 2154 (XXI) of 1966, which terminated the South African Mandate over Namibia.

Despite the illegitimacy of the so-called interim government and the fact that it has never received any recognition, the Pretoria régime still defies the will of the international community by means of various manoeuvres, denying the legitimate national aspirations of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and ignoring demands to end occupation and apartheid and bring about independence and freedom for the brotherly people of Namibia.

It is clear from document A/AC.109/826 that foreign economic interests, particularly those of the United States and other Western States, represented by the multinational corporations, enjoy a very large measure of conspiracy with the Government of the apartheid régime with a view to perpetuating the occupation and the plundering of the natural resources of Namibia.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The international consensus, represented by the resolutions of the Security Council, and in particular resolution 566 (1985), declared the unilateral measures adopted by the racist régime in South Africa as illegal, null and void. The apartheid régime in South Africa is still manoeuvring to bypass the plan for the independence of Namibia as set out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Those manoeuvres, which have been rejected, can no longer deceive the international community. As everyone knows, those manoeuvres are designed to betray the true independence of Namibia through political and constitutional ploys directed to perpetuating the occupation of Namibia and delaying its independence. Attempts are being made by the racist régime in South Africa to impose a fait accompli in the form of an alternative to the United Nations plan on the independence of Namibia and implementing the so-called internal settlement through the establishment of certain structures given the name of the Council of State or the Multi-Party Conference, reinforcing the military presence in Namibia, recruiting a large number of mercenaries, forcibly drafting Namibians into its military machine, reinforcing its military bases in Namibia, continuing its refusal to recognize SWAPO as the genuine representative of the Namibian people, violating all international rules and conventions, continuing its repression and denial of basic human rights to the people; all those measures make it clear beyond all doubt that the racist régime in South Africa is still manoeuvring and prevaricating in its attempt to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have all taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia, in which the Secretary-General reports to the Security Council 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)".

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

In view of the intransigence displayed by the Pretoria régime and its lack of respect for and defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, particularly with respect to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it has become imperative to adopt total boycott measures under Chapter VII of the Charter against the racist régime so as to compel that régime to comply with the will of the international community and to end its occupation of Namibia.

In view of the abus of the veto by the United States and the United Kingdom, it appears that the question of Namibia has reached a very dangerous turning point. That use of the veto can only result in encouraging the racist régime in South Africa to persist in its defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and, in particular, of those of the Security Council. I must call on the United Nations to assume its responsibilities to the people of Namibia and I call on the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions in accordance with the Charter, especially in view of the fact that we have seen that the spirit of responsibility displayed by SWAPO has always been met by more intransigence on the part of the racist régime in South Africa, on such flimsy pretexts as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, with a view to gaining time, perpetuating its occupation of Namibia, and using it as a springboard for sabotage and aggression against the front-line African States.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which considers the question of Namibia to be a question of the African continent, is confident that the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will continue its armed struggle against the racist régime's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and to liberate its territory. We shall continue to give them all types of political, military and physical support until the racist régime heeds the will of the international community and the liberty and independence of Namibia has been achieved.

(Mr. Azzarouk, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

Lastly, we should like to commend the United Nations Council for Namibia, which we consider to be the only legitimate authority responsible for the administration of Namibian territory, for its work on the question of Namibia and for the valuable recommendations contained in document A/40/24 (Part II), which we support.

Mr. ALAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should like first to extend my condolences to the Colombian delegation and to the people of Colombia who are in mourning as a result of the natural catastrophe which caused thousands of victims. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to take this opportunity to express again our full solidarity with the Colombian people in the hour of their terrible tragedy.

When we take up the question of Namibia, we cannot do so without reflecting upon the credibility of our Organization, which bears a special and historic responsibility for the Namibian people and for its liberation from the racist régime of South Africa. By virtue of resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 that the General Assembly put Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and it was by virtue of resolution 2248 (S-V) of 17 May 1967, that it entrusted the responsibility for administering the Territory until independence to the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Thus for 19 years the United Nations has been incapable of assuming its legal and political responsibility to Namibia, because South Africa, flouting the principles of the United Nations Charter and the values shared by the entire international community, refuses to leave a Territory which it is occupying completely illegally.

Inside Namibia, the minority régime continues to resort to arbitrary killings, police brutality, arrests and imprisonment, in order to perpetuate the occupation of the Territory and the implacable exploitation of its natural resources.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

Even worse, South Africa is pursuing the increasing militarization of the Namibian Territory, which it is as a base for committing acts of destabilization and aggression against the peaceful States of the region.

Despite its agreement to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), South Africa shows no desire to bring its illegal presence in that Territory to an end, thus challenging the authority of the United Nations and the international consensus.

Faced with the apparent impotence of the United Nations to implement the plan for Namibian independence, the Namibian people had every right to take up arms to wage its liberation struggle against the colonial Power and to receive moral and material support necessary to achieve its independence.

During the 40 years of the life of the United Nations, we have made hundreds of speeches and issued endless numerous appeals to South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and implement fully Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. Unfortunately, our appeals have gone unheeded by the South African Government.

In its search for a new excuse to delay Namibian independence, South Africa continues to link the application of the peace plan provided by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) with considerations which are quite irrelevant to it. In fact, the Pretoria régime is merely indulging in dilatory manoeuvres in order purely and simply to refuse to implement the decisions of the United Nations.

(Mr. Alaoui, Morocco)

But how long will the régime of South Africa continue to defy the international community? How long will it pursue with impunity its policy of apartheid and illegal occupation of Namibia?

Faced with the Pretoria régimes intransigence and its blatant contempt for the most sacred principles of our Organization, the determination and solidarity of the international community is more necessary and urgent than ever. It is high time to give serious consideration to the adoption of mandatory sanctions and to eschew all trade, military or other relations likely to encourage the adventurist designs of that racist and colonial system.

The United Nations Council for Namibia has done a job worthy of our appreciation and encouragement. Its action has certainly led some countries to be more receptive to the legitimate cause of the Namibian people.

For his part, the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, has continued his tireless efforts to bring Namibia to independence within the framework of the United Nations plan. His last report to the Security Council, dated 6 September 1985, once again demonstrates South Africa's intransigence in so far as his recent talks with that régime concerning Namibia's future have shown no progress at all.

Of course, we agree with the analysis made by the Secretary-General on the situation prevailing in southern Africa, and more particularly the conclusion he reached, to the effect that the continuing delay undermines the credibility of the South African Government at a time when the world is watching with growing concern the increasingly tragic developments occurring in the area.

Indeed, it is a tragedy which is unfolding on our continent at the end of the twentieth century and which the international community, symbolized by the United

Nations, must immediately put to an end.

At this fortieth anniversary of our Organization, during which we have pleaded unanimously in favour of strengthening the United Nations role and its effectiveness in peace-keeping and safeguarding human rights and fundamental freedoms, the international community's attempts to hasten Namibia's independence is both a test and a trial; a test of our determination to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter and a trial of our loyalty to the human values which are our common heritage.

The Kingdom of Morocco takes this opportunity to reaffirm its total support of our brothers, the people of Namibia, in their heroic struggle for self-determination and independence. Such support is for us a sacred duty stemming from the history of our own liberation struggle and from the ideals of peace, freedom and concord for the achievement of which the United Nations was created.

Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): There is no doubt that the United Nations has played a constructive and decisive role in the area of decolonization. During the general debate at this session all of our delegations addressing the question of decolonization testified to this end. This clear exposition was also re-echoed at the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations in October this year. One need not look beyond the membership of the United Nations for further testimony of this. And the Organization has moved much closer to its ultimate goal of universality.

However, the question of Namibia's freedom continues to be confronted with the same grim reality. The prospect of an acceptable solution appears to be as remote as ever, while the prevailing explosive situation in southern Africa continues to pose a most serious threat to international peace and security.

The question of Namibia has been with the United Nations since its inception. Also, 25 years have elapsed since the historic 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted by the General Assembly,



(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

and Namibia is still occupied by the racist régime of South Africa which continues its brutality and repression of the Namibian people, while at the same time it proceeds with its acts of aggression against neighbouring States with the aim of intimidating them into accepting the status quo. Sadly, some of the members of our own Security Council and the United Nations in general seem to have given in to the racist régime and my delegation is disappointed that the Council was unable to adopt draft resolution S/17633 on Friday, 15 November 1985, which could have given the Namibian people the support they need so badly now.

Of all the colonial situations that exist in the world today, none is more abhorrent and evasive of a peaceful settlement than the question of Namibia. Twenty-five years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Namibia continues to suffer under the repulsive rule of the racist régime of South Africa. Nineteen years after Namibia was placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, South Africa continues to spurn with cynical impunity the authority of the world body. Eleven years after the enactment of Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, Namibia continues to be raped of its resources by South Africa and certain transnational corporations.

Yes, Papua New Guinea does acknowledge that the question of Namibia is complex. Yes, we also acknowledge that South Africa has been and continues to be an extremely difficult and intransigent adversary. However, Papua New Guinea also believes that no situation is too complex and no impasse too permanent if each and every Member State abides by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and fulfills the obligations it assumed under the Charter.

We are at a loss to understand why we, the States Members of the United Nations, have not been able to compel South Africa to grant Namibia its inalienable

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

right to self-determination and independence. Have not the people of Namibia suffered long enough? Have not their patience, tolerance and restraint been proved often enough? Have they not amply demonstrated their genuine willingness to implement resolution 435 (1978) without pre-conditions?

It has often been argued by certain States, States which have a greater ability than most of us to influence events in South Africa that isolation of South Africa was not the best way to deal with the problem, but rather "constructive engagement" would forge a positive change in the policies of South Africa towards Namibia. However, my delegation submits that the fact that South Africa has not modified its attitude is ample testimony that "constructive engagement" gives succour to the Pretoria régime as opposed to forging a positive change in South Africa. We believe that the time has now come for those States Members of the United Nations who advocate "constructive engagement" to be bold enough to replace that policy with the policy of "constructive disengagement".

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

In this regard, we wish to note that the Commonwealth Accord on Southern Africa, adopted in the Bahamas recently, offers some viable starting points for everyone.

Papua New Guinea, of course, I am proud to state, has no dealings whatsoever with South Africa. We firmly believe that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) offers the most viable plan for the independence of Namibia. We therefore join others in demanding that it be implemented immediately.

Papua New Guinea is also extremely concerned that those in certain quarters within the world news media should see fit to portray the Namibian people's struggle for independence as "terrorist activities" and dub the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and legitimate representative, a "terrorist group". It is even more disquieting when Member States whose media perpetrate such distortions seemingly condone their behaviour. We believe that Member States of the United Nations have a responsibility to regulate, within the limits of their democratic political processes, the behaviour of their media representatives.

While mindful of the fiscal limitations within which the United Nations and its bodies have to work, we urge the United Nations, through the Special Committee of 24, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Office of the High Commissioner for Namibia and the United Nations Department of Public Information, as well as all those concerned, to intensify their efforts in waging a counter-media campaign to put right those serious distortions.

The extensive participation of delegations in this debate demonstrates the international community's strong support for the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence as envisaged in the United Nations plan for Namibia. Moreover, that strong, resolute support has not been translated into concrete action.

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

The Government of Papua New Guinea rejects South Africa's recent attempt to impose a so-called internal settlement and reiterates its conviction that a just and comprehensive solution can be brought about only by the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We recall and reaffirm our support for Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which nullified all such extraneous or irrelevant issues as the linkage of Cuban troops with Namibia's independence.

South Africa continues to reject scornfully the numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations so as to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. It continues to impose its inhumane and repressive policies against the will of the people of Namibia. We condemn the illegal detention of political prisoners and the introduction of conscription for Namibians to fight against their brothers and sisters.

The racist Government continues to exploit both the people and the rich mineral and other resources of the Territory. Moreover, it is particularly deplorable that some influential Member States are co-operating with the apartheid régime in the economic plundering of Namibia. Such collaborations can only give more weight to South Africa's intransigence. We therefore reiterate the call upon those States to cease henceforth all political, economic, social and military links with the racist Government of South Africa.

The increasing South African military build-up and operations in Namibia and the use of the territory as a launching-pad pose an immediate and serious threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the neighbouring front-line States of southern Africa. We support dialogue among interested Governments on security-related issues aimed at reducing tensions in the region.

I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate Papua New Guinea's support for the people of Namibia in their just struggle under the able leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

representative. We commend SWAPO's constructiveness and its continued co-operation with the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

My delegation expresses its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his continuing efforts towards a final resolution of the Namibian question. We wish to thank and support the Special Committee on decolonization for its reports and decisions to date. We pay a special tribute to the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administrating Authority of the Territory. We also support its report and recommendations (A/40/24 (Part II), chap. 1).

In conclusion, my delegation reiterates its call for the unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia and emphasizes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides the most comprehensive plan for the independence of Namibia. We urge the Security Council to consider taking one more logical action by imposing mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, as clearly foreseen in its resolution 566 (1985). Namibia's independence is inevitable and it cannot be delayed any longer. We urge all parties concerned to be constructive and consistent in their efforts towards that goal. The onus is on the Member States of the United Nations to act decisively and in unity to make a reality of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): At this session of the General Assembly, when landmarks in the history of the United Nations are very much in mind, the question of Namibia provides us with a number of sad anniversaries.

Last year we noted that Namibia and its people had suffered a century of colonial oppression. Next year will be the twentieth anniversary of the termination by the General Assembly of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. It is now seven years since the Security Council adopted a definitive plan for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

I need not go into the details of the history represented by those anniversaries; it is well known to us all. I must, however, reiterate my Government's indignation over the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, over the racist oppression of its people and over the brutal war being waged by South Africa against the liberation forces of the people of Namibia.

As an African State which achieved independence 25 years ago under the aegis of the United Nations, Somalia is deeply frustrated by the fact that Namibia remains under colonial rule in spite of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for its independence.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The Namibian stalemate is also difficult to accept because no political issue before the United Nations has resulted in a clearer international consensus, or been governed by more specific directives of the Security Council than the establishment of Namibia's independence.

The reasons for this unfortunate situation are clear. The history of negotiations with South Africa over Namibia - a history which extends over the lifetime of the United Nations - has been marked by South Africa's stalling tactics or outright intransigence and by the Security Council's ineffective response to South Africa. Indeed, over the past seven years it has become glaringly apparent that the United Nations has been subjected to a humiliating game of cat-and-mouse by South Africa, and has passively acquiesced in that game.

African States have never had any illusions about South Africa's intentions towards Namibia, but they had gone along with the diplomatic initiatives of the Western nations in the hope that their influence could be effective. That hope has proved to be vain. The world community has seen talks and negotiations break down time after time because of South Africa's bad faith. A realistic approach must now be adopted to the Namibian stalemate.

A key element of the stalemate is the failure of the Security Council to act on its own warnings that it would take action against South Africa for its non-compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution stands, of course, as the only legal and valid basis for Namibia's independence. Each failure of the Security Council to impose enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter has further emboldened the Pretoria régime to continue on its intransigent course.

In view of the current turmoil and violence in southern Africa, and of the history of the Namibian question, we deeply regret that only last week a resolution

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

calling for selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa was vetoed in the Security Council. The proposed sanctions would simply have developed earlier resolutions dealing with the arms embargo and with sanctions voluntarily adopted by the United States, the European Economic Community and the Scandinavian countries. A welcome result of the Security Council debate was the evidence it gave of wide recognition among the developed countries of the need for significant action. However, the veto of that limited response to South Africa's persistent violations of international law can only give comfort and support to the Pretoria régime.

It is often claimed that sanctions would harm only the oppressed people of Namibia and South Africa and the people of the front-line States. But it is more than ever apparent today that the cost of sanctions in terms of possible hardship for those people is less than the cost of the violence, subversion and military aggression rampant in southern Africa. Furthermore, the leaders of the oppressed majorities in Namibia and South Africa and of the front-line States have all declared that sanctions are a lesser evil, and that they are prepared to make the sacrifices involved. They look to the international community for decisive action in support of their liberation.

It has also been argued that economic sanctions against South Africa would not work. That is not so. Who can doubt today that external economic and financial pressures have done much to change the attitude of South Africa's business community? The approaches made to exiled leaders of the African National Congress and attempts to persuade the South African régime to take steps to end apartheid show an extreme sensitivity to the mere threat that sanctions might be strictly imposed. The divestment movement and the limited but concrete sanctions imposed by some of South Africa's trading partners have made the possibility of



(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

comprehensive sanctions seem real for the first time. Consequently, we have seen developments that would not have been dreamt of a short time ago. We believe that the argument that sanctions would not work has been very much discredited in the international arena.

Over the past seven years the hopes of the Namibian people and of their legitimate leadership, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for an orderly and peaceful transition from colonial rule to independent status have steadily receded. While they are prepared to carry on their legitimate armed struggle, their best interests and the interests of world peace and security demand a peaceful process. Somalia has long called for comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa, including an oil embargo, as the only course of non-violent action likely to bring results. Such action is called for because international peace and security are seriously threatened by South Africa's aggression against the Namibian people and against neighbouring States, and by the cruel effects of the policies of apartheid, which have been universally condemned as a crime against humanity.

As we are all aware, the killing, brutalizing, dispossession and imprisonment of people who simply wish to be free of racist oppression continue relentlessly in South Africa and Namibia. The Namibian people and the Member States of the world Organization are entitled to ask how long the farcical charade of South Africa's machinations and Security Council inaction will continue.

South Africa's latest attempt to deceive the world community was well timed to coincide with the recent Security Council debate on Namibia. I am sure, however, that no one will be taken in by the attempt to give international credence to the opinion of a puppet body whose validity has been negated by the Security Council. This questionable development has been further discredited by South Africa's continued insistence on linking Namibia's independence to extraneous issues.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The Namibian people have suffered enough. The United Nations has been humiliated enough. The Security Council has a grave responsibility to make good the promise it has repeatedly made and repeatedly failed to keep. It is high time for it to adopt the strongest peaceful enforcement measures possible under the Charter, and to bring to an end South Africa's illegal and oppressive occupation of Namibia. We hope that the political will to carry out this responsibility can be found.

We fully support the legitimate cause of the valiant people of Namibia and reaffirm their inalienable right to justice and freedom. We in the Assembly will not waver in our sacred duty nor shirk our responsibilities in actively assisting the oppressed Namibian people until they attain the noble goal of liberty and independence in dignity and honour.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.