



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.86
22 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 21 November 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| <u>President:</u> | Mr. DE PINIÉS | (Spain) |
| later: | Mr. AGIUS (Vice-President) | (Malta) |

- Question of Namibia: [34] (continued)

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

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

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 34 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

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

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): More than 19 years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory by adopting resolution 2145 (XXI) on 27 October 1966. By resolution 2248 (S-V), of 19 May 1967, the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory as the sole, legal authority and to guide the people of Namibia towards achieving full independence.

After South Africa's racist colonialist régime arrogantly challenged the legality and validity of the above and subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly, an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice was sought, with a view to verifying whether or not the United Nations was legally and politically authorized to assume direct responsibility for the Territory by terminating South African's Mandate conferred upon it by the League of Nations. In its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 the Court stated, in unambiguous terms, that the decisions of the General Assembly taken by the adoption of resolutions 2145 (XXI), and 2248 (S-V) were in full conformity with the principles of the international legal system.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Over the years since then the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted scores of resolutions calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal by South Africa of its colonial administration and armed occupation forces from Namibian territory.

In order to put an end to the depletion of Namibia's rich natural resources by the colonial Power and the capitalist transnational monopolies, the United Nations Council for Namibia issued its Decree No. 1 on 27 September 1974.

Faced with the apartheid régime's stubborn refusal to abide by the United Nations resolutions, the Security Council adopted resolutions 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977, and 473 (1980) of 13 June 1980, imposing military sanctions against South Africa. Yet no meaningful and tangible step could be taken towards the implementation of those resolutions to bring closer the attainment of independence by Namibians. South Africa's colonial administration and armed forces still remain in Namibia; extensive economic and military assistance from imperialist countries continues to be rendered to the apartheid regime; oppression and repression of the Namibian people continue to increase; and the plundering of Namibia's natural and human resources by the colonial authorities and capitalist transnational monopolies continues to drain Namibia of whatever still remains in that unfortunate land. A cause of great concern is the fact that the international community seems to have no foreseeable chance of putting an end to this shameful and deplorable situation.

Obviously, the key party responsible for the continuation of the present situation in Namibia is the abhorrent racist régime of South Africa, which, relying on brute force and repression within Namibia and piratical acts of aggression and intimidation against the front-line States, particularly Angola, is out to perpetuate its colonial hold over Namibia. That cannot, however, mislead the

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

international community into ignoring some other detrimental factors, not in Namibia or in South Africa, but in the United States and some other imperialist countries.

Further evidence continues to surface proving beyond any reasonable doubt repeated violations of relevant United Nations resolutions, as well as Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, by some of the very countries that voted in favour of those resolutions.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The continued assistance of the United States and some of its European allies as well as international financial institutions dominated by them, to the racist régime of South Africa not only has failed to help the overwhelming majority of South Africans and Namibians but has ultimately resulted in the diversion of greater resources by the South African racist clique to the further arming of the oppressive, warmongering machine of apartheid. That is evident from the drastic increases in the military expenditure by the Pretoria régime in the past few years.

Apart from huge quantities of military and other related items acquired from certain imperialist countries and the Zionist régime of Israel, the South African racist, colonialist régime has been able, with the co-operation of its allies, to establish a large network of military industries.

Of serious and great concern are the reports, which are sufficiently credible, on South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability and its continuing plans for producing and perfecting chemical, biological (bacteriological) weapons. Should those reports prove to be consistent with the reality, the threat posed by the racist régime of South Africa to the security of the whole area would acquire a new and far-reaching dimension, which would inevitably result in the sharp deterioration of the international security climate. There is no doubt that those plans could not have materialized had it not been for the diplomatic, economic and military collaboration extended to the racist régime by some of its imperialist allies - at the top of the list the United States, which is engaged in its shameful and treacherous policy of so-called constructive engagement with the racist régime.

It is no wonder that the outlawed régime finds it possible to confront the overwhelming majority of mankind in total defiance of the verdict of the international community. The arrogant disregard for international public opinion by the Pretoria régime thus has its roots not only in the horrific, criminal nature of the apartheid system but also in the policy of those that have practically

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

identified themselves with the perpetrators of that system - namely, the United States and some of its imperialist allies.

If the present ominous trend continues unchecked, the international community will ultimately have to face a situation in which the achievement of a settlement will be far less possible than it may appear to be today.

The question of Namibia is, in the complete sense of the term, a decolonization problem. As such, the issue of Namibia is an issue between the people of Namibia, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the international community, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, on the one hand, and the racist régime of South Africa as the occupying Power, on the other. Trying to explain this issue in the context of East-West confrontation is a futile effort aimed at undermining the total applicability to Namibia of the principle of the rights of all nations to self-determination and independence.

On the basis of the Definition of Aggression, contained in resolution 3314 (XXIX), adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1974, the continued occupation of Namibia by South African forces constitutes a clear act of aggression. The people of Namibia are thus entitled to wage all forms of struggle, including armed struggle, to rid their territory of the occupation forces. At the same time, all patriotic elements that have been captured by the racist occupying Power in the course of this struggle must therefore enjoy the status of prisoners of war, in conformity with the 1949 Geneva Protocols.

The South West Africa People's Organization is the sole, legitimate and authentic representative of the people of Namibia and the vanguard of their struggle for national independence. Therefore, any attempt to win recognition and legitimacy for the subservient puppet local authorities in Windhoek totally violates provisions of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the only basis for the settlement of the Namibian problem. Any attempt by the so-called Western contact group or by any other quarter to qualify, modify or amend that resolution or introduce into it extraneous and irrelevant issues of so-called linkage, parallelism or reciprocity constitutes a grave violation of that resolution. The designs of the United States and South Africa to tie the Namibian settlement to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist contingent from Angola is in total defiance of that resolution and is aimed at delaying the achievement of a solution to the problem.

The United Nations Council for Namibia is the sole, legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Therefore, any attempt to deny the authority of the United Nations as the inheritor of the League of Nations, in order to alter the legal status of the Territory or portray the issue as a territorial or regional issue is contrary to the international legal system and provisions of the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Under Security Council resolution 432 (1978), of 27 July 1978, and General Assembly resolution S-9/2, of 3 May 1978, the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia unquestionably includes Walvis Bay and the Penguin and other offshore islands. Any effort to separate those areas from mainland Namibia are thus illegal and null and void.

Since the Government of South Africa has consistently defied resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations and, by doing so, has violated the obligations it assumed under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council can and must, in our view, impose without any further delay comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that Government under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and set a timetable for implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan believes that the international community should allow no further time for the dilatory tactics of the racist régime of South Africa and its imperialist collaborators. All forms of assistance and co-operation should be extended to SWAPO, to the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and to the front-line States, particularly Angola, with a view to enabling them to intensify their struggle against the colonial rule of South Africa in Namibia, for the eradication of the inhuman apartheid system in South Africa and for the defence of their territories against the repeated acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated by that régime. In this context, we greatly welcome the growing awareness by world public opinion of the evil and disgusting nature of the apartheid system. We hail the dramatic upsurge in the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, and the people of South Africa and their vanguard, the ANC, against the racist, colonialist régime of South Africa.

In conclusion, we wish to put on record our gratitude to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the untiring efforts it is making on behalf of the international community to achieve early independence for Namibia and its people. We wish also to express our full support for the resolutions put forward in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in particular its call for the holding of a special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia before the Assembly's forty-first session.

Mr. KIILU (Kenya): Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960 relating to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the international community has gone a long way in the process of implementation of that Declaration. At present there are only a few countries and territories that still remain to be decolonized so that they may join the comity of independent nations. Among these, unfortunately, Namibia is one. Its advancement to independence has been made difficult by the delaying tactics of the racist white minority régime of South Africa.

Namibia, a Trust Territory of the United Nations, should have attained its independence at least 19 years ago, if not long before that. But South Africa has, by subterfuge and utter defiance of the decisions of the Security Council and resolutions of the General Assembly, refused to let the people of Namibia exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence. That refusal has been compounded by the racist régime through its illegal occupation of the Territory. It has flagrantly, defiantly and consistently refused to comply with the wish of the United Nations and the will of the international community.

The racist régime of South Africa, ever since the days of the League of Nations, has harboured evil designs to annex Namibia to the Republic of South Africa. These designs are still being pursued by the racist régime. Its refusal to accept and honour United Nations General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966 which revoked its Mandate to administer Namibia is one of the many manifestations of these intentions. The revocation of that Mandate required South Africa to evacuate Namibia forthwith. But the régime obstinately plunged into devious and dubious illegal activities designed to prevent the United Nations from assuming its legal responsibility to administer Namibia until independence. In this respect it should be recalled that the régime refused to allow the Council for Namibia to enter the Territory of Namibia to exercise the responsibility entrusted to it by the United Nations. Since then, the racist régime has occupied and ruled Namibia

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

illegally despite a worldwide appeal to South Africa to comply with the decisions and resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The international community is in agreement that South Africa has no business in Namibia and that its continued illegal occupation of the Territory must be brought to an end. Yet South Africa continues defiantly to occupy and rule Namibia. It is Kenya's strong conviction that the Security Council must now adopt and implement measures capable of forcing South Africa to end its intransigence and compelling it to evacuate Namibia. We feel that because the continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia and its refusal to evacuate the Territory present a serious threat to international peace and a challenge to the authority of the Security Council and the will of the international community.

We are conscious that the Security Council, through the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), made a genuine and determined effort to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to ensure that the Namibian people exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence without undue delay. We are aware that that Security Council resolution provided for an internationally acceptable plan which continues to be the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. But the racist régime has somehow succeeded in deflecting these efforts by introducing irrelevant and extraneous issues, thus reducing the momentum achieved in bringing independence to the people of Namibia. We strongly deplore the fact that these efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been thwarted, with encouragement from certain quarters, by the racist régime of Pretoria.

Since 1983 the Secretary-General has held consultations with South Africa pursuant to Security Council resolution 532 (1983) and has confirmed that all the outstanding issues relevant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved, with the exception of the choice of the electoral system to be used. We

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

consider agreement on the electoral system to be an important aspect in the implementation of the Council resolution. Our reason for doing so lies in the belief that agreements on the electoral system to be used in the elections for the Constituent Assembly, in terms of Council resolution 435 (1978) and under United Nations supervision and control, would clear the way for the Security Council to adopt an enabling resolution for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We regret that the racist régime has delayed action on the required response in respect of the electoral system and also that, during the intervening period, it installed an illegal interim government in Windhoek in an effort to circumvent this requirement.

The position adopted by South Africa throughout has been alarming and disturbing, and threatens to explode in a manner that will dangerously escalate tension and create instability in the region. Already, the neighbouring States of Angola, Botswana and other front-line States have become victims of South Africa's unprovoked attacks and wanton aggression. We condemn South Africa for its aggression against neighbouring States as well as for the use of Namibia as a springboard for military attacks and destabilization in the region.

We see the continued attacks against and destabilization of African States in the region as attempts on the part of the racist régime to create pretexts for delaying the implementation of Security Council resolutions. Pretexts of that nature were advanced previously - one example being the insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We reject these manoeuvres as irrelevant and incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We hold the firm view that the independence of Namibia should not be held hostage to the solution of issues that are extraneous and completely irrelevant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

The People's Republic of Angola has the sovereign right to conduct its internal and external affairs as it deems fit. It may invite to its Territory whomever it chooses to invite.

The racist régime in South Africa is clinging to Namibia in an attempt to secure and protect its evil system of apartheid. South Africa should know that the fate of its evil system of apartheid is doomed. We reject any extension of apartheid to Namibia and demand that any traces already introduced in Namibi be destroyed.

The racist régime of South Africa has defied the opinion of the international community, including the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council in respect of Namibia. That defiance calls for strength and firm resolve if the international community is to restore the credibility of this Organization and enable the people of Namibia to proceed to independence.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

My delegation cannot entertain any possibilities that might lead to erosion of the credibility of the United Nations and that would prolong the struggle of the people of Namibia to attain their independence in a united Namibia.

In this connection, we wish to reaffirm our continued commitment to give full support to the liberation struggle of the Namibian people against the illegal occupation of their Territory by the racist régime of South Africa. We pledge full support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic liberation movement of the people of Namibia.

We should like to recall that the Security Council, by its resolution 566 (1985) of June 1985, mandated the Secretary-General to resume immediate contacts with South Africa with a view to learning its choice of the electoral system to be used for the election under United Nations supervision and control of the constituent Assembly, in accordance with the terms of resolution 435 (1978). By the same resolution, the Council demanded that South Africa co-operate fully with the Security Council and the Secretary-General. We note that the racist régime of South Africa has now addressed a letter to the Secretary-General (S/17627) dated 12 November 1985. The contents of the letter make it abundantly clear to us that the South African Government is yet again trying, in a sinister move, to have the Security Council confer recognition on the so-called cabinet of the government of national unity in Windhoek. But the Council has already wisely pronounced itself on the so-called interim government by branding it null and void and therefore devoid of legitimacy as far as Namibia is concerned. It is a creation of the apartheid régime in Pretoria.

In this reply, first, the racist régime refrains from directly making a choice of the electoral system. Secondly, the racist régime has communicated unacceptable views attributed to an entity whose status and legal standing have been rejected by the international community.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

We reject this attempt by the racist régime to legitimize what is illegitimate, and in so doing we reiterate that the said government of national unity remains illegitimate and null and void. We cannot accept attempts by South Africa to shift accountability for its illegal actions in Namibia to its illegally constituted so-called government of national unity, and we demand strict implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any modifications or prevarications.

It is therefore imperative that the Security Council take action in conformity with paragraph 13 of its resolution 566 (1985), by which it strongly warned South Africa, inter alia, that failure to co-operate fully with the Council and the Secretary-General would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith and consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the United Nations Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council. We regret, however, that during the last meeting of the Security Council on this issue, last week, it was not possible for the Council to take the action required by paragraph 13 of its resolution 566 (1985). Despite this setback, we consider that severe measures should now be taken against South Africa. We demand the imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter so as to exert maximum pressure on South Africa with a view to compelling it to comply with Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 435 (1978). We consider further that such sanctions, to be effective, must be comprehensive and mandatory, and that each nation must undertake not to allow itself, its nationals and bodies under its jurisdiction to be used as "sanction busters". Pending the adoption of those measures by the Security Council, my delegation welcomes with appreciation the fact that some countries have already imposed sanctions on the racist régime of South Africa. This is indeed a step in the right direction.

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): The fortieth session of the General Assembly is drawing to a close. Myriads of resolutions have been adopted, countless decisions have been taken. But for the people of Namibia history appears to be moving backwards, despite the best efforts of the front-line States in general and the People's Republic of Angola in particular.

I will not attempt to recount the history of Namibia's illegal military occupation by the racist mincrity régime in South Africa or of the painfully slow pace of negotiations in the past few years.

As we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations we shall soon be commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the date when the question of Namibia was first brought before the United Nations; we shall soon be commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia; we shall soon be commemorating the fifteenth anniversary of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice declaring illegal the continued South African presence in Namibia; and we shall soon be commemorating the eighth anniversary of the Security Council resolution in 1978 which was supposed to lead to Namibian independence within a few months. But, as Comrade Toivo ja Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) told the Security Council on 13 November 1985, all these dates are "already too late", and "enough is enough". (S/PV.2624, p. 29-30)

South Africa's intransigence, its racist apartheid policies, its brutal State terrorism, its domestic repression, its denial of basic human, civil, economic and political rights and the murder of its majority black inhabitants - over 900 massacred in the last year or so - need no further indictment.

South Africa has continued to deploy military, political, diplomatic and even semantic moves to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The claim of the Namibian people to full and genuine independence needs no justification.

The legitimacy of SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibian people, the vanguard of their struggle for liberation, needs no proving.

The inevitability of Namibian independence needs no prophecy.

The solid support of the international community behind SWAPO and the Namibian people needs no additional evidence.

The solidarity of the people, party and Government of Angola with the Namibian people, the Namibian cause and SWAPO is unquestionable.

And the ultimate dismantling of the apartheid structure in Pretoria is inevitable; it is simply a question of time. The independence of Namibia is equally inevitable; that too is a question of time.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

The blind and deaf minority, both within South Africa and abroad, can either choose to ignore the lessons of history and thus prolong the war both inside the borders of South Africa and in Namibia or it can opt to remove its blinkers and mufflers and help to write the chronicles of freedom and peace in southern Africa. But about the ultimate outcome there is no choice, no doubt: independence will come to Namibia, under the leadership of the people's chosen representative, SWAPO.

It is extremely short-sighted of those who veto moves that could shorten the distance between apartheid and colonialism and freedom and peace. The support shown by the peoples of the United States and Europe for the struggle against apartheid should be a clear message to their Governments to take equally specific, mandatory measures to force the racist Pretoria régime to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and not continue to violate United Nations resolutions and outrage the international community by obfuscatory measures, extraneous issues such as linkage and parallelism and military aggression against sovereign States in southern Africa.

Final victory belongs to the Namibians and until that time, the struggle continues.

(Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): The news has recently given us reason to harbour a certain degree of hope, though that is rather small, for example, the exceptional summit meeting between Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev in Geneva. The press and television have simultaneously, as it were, sent us commentaries and pictures and described in vivid terms the disaster in Colombia, the victim of a brutal and devastating volcanic eruption. Part of the territory of a State Member of the United Nations, and a friendly country, has been heavily stricken. The deep sense of emotion which ensued quite properly aroused in the international community an understandable mobilization of resources. Thus the first thought of the Congolese delegation, speaking through me in this discussion

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

on the question of Namibia, will be about Colombia and its sorely tried people, who are courageously attempting in a dignified way to overcome these serious misfortunes, and our thoughts will be with the Colombian delegation. I should like to reiterate to all of them our feelings of solidarity and profound sympathy. Resolution 40/13, recently adopted by the General Assembly with the solid support of my delegation, and, even more, the implementation of that resolution will, more than worthy and thoughtful statements, provide clear proof of our compassion.

I come now to the question of Namibia, the major political topic of the present debate, and the evolution of its colonial status, which is in a state of apathy because of the racist South African administration's continued occupation of Namibia. Under the authority of the Charter, despite its shortcomings, the international community has been remarkably successful in declaring colonialism to be illegal. I shall not say anything about the various stages through which the liberation struggle of the third world, which helped morally and juridically to remove the ambiguities of colonial policies, has proceeded. The decisive contribution proved to be the onslaught against the colonialist strongholds represented by the adoption in 1960 of resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. Today, when the sovereignty of nations has been strikingly confirmed, the assertion that colonialism is a threat to peace and international co-operation should be the logical culmination of the liberation process and it warrants, if need be, the application of Chapter VI or even Chapter VII of the Charter. However, history is marking time in Namibia, which is the only remaining colonial Territory of considerable extent - 824,292 square kilometres - in the African continent. Namibia, which used to be a German Protectorate, lives today between the colonialist and racist Caudine Forks of South Africa, deprived of its ability to enjoy its right to self-determination.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Since 1966, when the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and decided that Namibia should fall under the direct authority of this Organization, through the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal administering authority until it attained independence, although appeals repeatedly made by the main bodies of the United Nations - which decisions were furthermore upheld by an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971 - South Africa, heedless of the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, has continued its unacceptable and shameful domination of that Territory and has systematically prevented the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), from participating in the exercise of responsibilities.

The creation of sham political institutions in Windhoek, the growing militarization of Namibia, the creation of tribal armies or the use of mercenaries to oppress the Namibian people and perpetrate acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States, particularly Angola, are all challenges by South Africa to the international community.

How can we fail to express our indignation at the continued intransigence of Pretoria which, in response to the recent approaches of the Secretary-General in an attempt to create proper conditions for the implementation of the settlement plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), has insisted on unacceptable and pointless conditions before Namibia attains independence. Thus we see that Member States have universally rejected the linkage which has been advocated by South Africa and its allies between the independence of Namibia and the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only valid basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and my delegation, like others, demands that it be immediately and unconditionally implemented.

We are aware that the true independence of Namibia cannot be brought about unless SWAPO is fully and completely involved in all these efforts.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The South African racist régime, on the other hand, is completely undeserving of the sympathy with which it is constantly surrounded by certain Members of this Organization, the decisions of which it always disregards.

As recently as last week, the Security Council was unable to adopt even selective mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime because of the negative votes cast by two permanent members of the Security Council. Those obvious signs of understanding, even of covert support, are, to say the least, quite clearly discerned by Pretoria, which is thus encouraged in its obstinate attempts to defy the international community.

These comments which the delegation of the Congo wished to make concerning its positive thoughts about the real international scandal of the case of Namibia, should actually not have been at all necessary in this year which marks the fortieth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations.

Forty years is also virtually the life span of the question of Namibia on our agenda. Whether we like it or not, this question is necessarily the yardstick by which today we can gauge the effectiveness, and some might even say the very justification, of our Organization.

There is every reason in this year 1985 to be astonished that no specific solution has been found to the Namibian problem. Everything is happening as if South Africa and some of the Western States that support it, have some option available other than self-determination and independence.

The challenge with which international public opinion is confronted is a major one, but we know that international opinion has on its side the force of the law or even force itself, provided it is willing to make use of it in order to make criminal South Africa heed the voice of reason.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The United Nations would be doing itself a disservice if it squandered its meagre resources and energy in apparently impossible negotiations with a partner who shows nothing but bad faith, and if it did not finally impose on that partner the measures required under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Mr. RABGYE (Bhutan): Since the time of the founding of the United Nations, the question of Namibia has been recognized as an important issue by this world body. It was addressed at the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946, and has been on the agenda of every regular session since. Yet, in spite of numerous Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the situation continues to worsen, causing a threat to world peace and an appalling cost in human lives.

The international community rightly holds South Africa to account for this ongoing bloody and increasingly violent tragedy. General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) in 1966 terminated South Africa's mandate over the Territory, then known as South West Africa, and in 1967 the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for South West Africa - later Namibia - to administer the Territory until independence. In this regard, I wish to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its efforts in laying the foundation for a stable, independent and economically sound Namibia.

The Kingdom of Bhutan recognizes the legitimate authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we support the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the national liberation movement of Namibia, as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. A little over a century has passed since the people began their struggle for freedom, and SWAPO now brings together the courageous freedom-fighters in this latest phase of the fight for national self-determination. The international community recognizes the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

(Mr. Rabgye, Bhutan)

South Africa's colonial occupation of the area is illegal and is tantamount to an act of aggression. We, therefore, call upon South Africa to abide by all Security Council resolutions, immediately and unconditionally, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for Namibia.

In violation of international norms and the United Nations Charter, South Africa has repeatedly invaded the neighbouring States. These acts of terror and aggression are indefensible, as are its attempts to complicate the issue of Namibia by insisting on "linkage" or "parallelism". Such insistence introduces extraneous and irrelevant issues, and constitutes gross interference in the internal affairs of Angola. We appeal to those States friendly to South Africa not to encourage it to inject such irrelevant matters into the negotiations, but instead to seek to persuade South Africa to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and those of the General Assembly.

Furthermore, we denounce all fraudulent constitutional and political schemes, including those involving the so-called Multi-Party Conference, as thinly disguised attempts to maintain the status quo, that is, the perpetuation of South Africa's colonial domination of Namibia, including the continuing enforced institution there of apartheid.

Emboldened by the policies of certain countries, the apartheid régime is engaged in a dangerous game. We deplore, in the strongest possible terms, the increasing militarization of Namibia. This takes the form of direct violence against the people: raids; arbitrary imprisonment; torture and murder of leaders, members and supporters of SWAPO; the forcible displacement of Namibians from their homes and other brutalities - on the one hand; and, on the other, it involves the imposition by the occupation régime of compulsory military service for all Namibian males of certain ages.

(Mr. Rabgye, Bhutan)

The racist régime is also out to deplete the resources of Namibia. The economy of a newly-emergent Namibia must not be hobbled from the start. For this reason, we call upon South Africa and all foreign economic interests operating in the Territory to abide by Decree No. 1 for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia.

We must all work together to eradicate every vestige of colonialism in the world. Colonialism is a brutal system of exploitation which degrades the oppressed and oppressor alike. It is a system which breeds violence and, in the case of Namibia, seeks to crush cultural identities and to extend its sphere to all aspects of life through the hateful policy of apartheid. This particular brand of colonialism, it must be added, is enforced by one soldier for every 12 Namibians.

South Africa must be made to see that the present situation is not in its own best interests. The cost is far too great in terms of men, money, and in relations with the rest of the world. South Africa must appreciate and respect the will of the international community and that, to bow to this, is the height of wisdom and in keeping with its own long-term interests.

The only way out of the present cycle of violence and terror is provided in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The United Nations plan remains our best hope for the solution of this difficult problem, and its unconditional implementation must be carried out as a concrete sign of respect for both the rule of law and the authority of the United Nations.

The United Nations has celebrated its fortieth anniversary. The question of Namibia has lingered on for just as many years, with the roots of the problem going further back. We urge all concerned to a renewed and determined effort to expedite implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), so that Namibia can take its rightful place as a Member of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that we were unable to begin this meeting until 10.55 a.m. owing to the lack of a quorum. Consequently, I inform representatives that, given the large number of speakers still waiting to make their statements on the question of Namibia, the conclusion of the debate on this question will be the first item at this afternoon's meeting.

I should appreciate it if representatives would make an effort to bear this problem in mind and make sure that one representative of each delegation is present when the meeting is due to begin so that we can start on time.

Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): Mr. President, permit me at the very outset to express through you and the delegation of Colombia my delegation's sympathies and condolences to the Colombian Government and people, as well as to the members of of bereaved families following the tragic loss of life and destruction of property in the aftermath of the volcano disaster. The mourning and untold misery that the survivors and people of Colombia as a whole are experiencing at the present time and must be shared by all of us and we sincerely believe that their tears will be wiped away by Almighty God. May the souls of the thousands that have passed away rest in peace.

The consideration of item 34, the question of Namibia, for more than the fortieth time in this very hall is a sad reminder of how humanity can be cruel, brutal and inhuman to humanity. It is difficult for us to comprehend, let alone imagine, how the entire world community can continue to talk for over 40 years about how the racist white minority Government of South Africa is brutalizing its people in South Africa and in Namibia while somehow South Africa gets away with it. How can over a billion people represented here by over 150 countries become so impotent and powerless against a mere two to four million race supremacists. Why is it that this minority is able to hold the whole world community to ransom? Indeed, for how long are we going to stand on this podium, in the Security Council and in other world forums crying out in one voice without tangible results.

For the past few days my delegation has been pondering what it is that could be said to this Assembly, which we have not said before, but which could help us out of the present stalemate. The answer is that we have said it all. Speaker after speaker has rehashed the whole story from the League of Nations to the United Nations and its actions through the Security Council, the International Court of Justice and indeed, the General Assembly as well. Not only was the Mandate of

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

South Africa over Namibia terminated in 1966 by this Assembly in resolution 2145 (XXI), but we even formed the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legitimate caretaker Government of that Territory. We are all agreed that the Council has done a magnificent job under its very able Acting President, Ambassador Sinclair of Guyana, and the report before us speaks for itself. In 1978, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978), which many believed was a milestone, the beginning of an end. The Secretary-General's report to the Security Council in document S/17442, the events in the Security Council on Friday 15 November 1985, and the latest developments in Namibia brought about and perpetrated by South Africa show beyond doubt that Namibians and their Territory are far from liberation through legal and internationally accepted norms and practices. We do not even know whether even resolution 435 (1978) is still regarded by some Powers as the only basis for an acceptable solution.

What is ironic and disheartening about this situation is that all Members of this Organization say one thing, namely, that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia must cease and the people of that country must be granted their right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence. The question then is why there is no movement, and why is it that we continue to speak out time and again without end until we are red, blue, grey or black in the face.

The answer to this paradoxical question is simple. Those of us who are powerless have only one weapon, and that is to speak out against injustice and inhumanity, and we will continue to do so until those who are in control hear us. On the other hand, there are those who have power, whose chorus in response to our cries amounts to mere verbal utterances, because they refuse to live up to their historical responsibility and put an end to what has been described as unjust, inhuman and barbaric. It is these mighty and the powerful who are determined to frustrate the aspirations and yearnings not only of the Namibians, but of the world

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

community as a whole. They perceive the continuation of apartheid oppression in Namibia as the best guarantee of their economic and strategic interests. Their material interests far outweigh their interest in the betterment and emancipation from slavery and apartheid oppression of a human being called a Namibian.

It is an undeniable fact that it is this United Nations which has spearheaded and heralded the freedom of the majority of nations sitting here from colonialism and ushered them into political independence and statehood. We commend the architects of the historic 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted by this General Assembly. Were we justified in celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of this Declaration a few days ago? My answer is unfortunately no, because that anniversary was a grim reminder to us that Namibia was still toiling under the yoke of the worst form of colonial and foreign oppression, which allows racism and apartheid free rein. We must have all been moved, when Comrade Toivo ja Toivo narrated to us the reign of terror being perpetrated by South Africa against the Namibian people. The tragic situation of Namibia is that, unlike other colonies, Namibia was handed over to South Africa by this very Organization, and yet this very Organization is seemingly unable to undo what we all believe was a tragic mistake on the part of those who took the original decision. Indeed, one can say that the decision to grant South Africa a mandate to administer Namibia must be declared an unpardonable sin, because South Africa was already racist in outlook and practice.

As I have already said, I shall refrain from going over what I and many others have said before, but allow me to ask myself one question: what would I think if I were a Namibian? What answer could I find to this paradoxical question of Why us? Who would blame me if I were to find no answer except that the mighty and the powerful are doing this to me because of the colour of my skin. For if the colour of our skins were to be reversed I cannot imagine that we would be in this Hall,

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

talking as we are now. The liberation of the oppressed white majority in Namibia from occupation by a black minority Government of South Africa would not be conditioned to extraneous issues such as the removal of Cuban forces from Angola. The mighty and the powerful would not even wait for a United Nations force to be set up to intervene. They would have long marched in and we would be talking history of a fait accompli. Oh, yes, that would have been termed intolerable, barbaric and not one of us would sleep a single night without decisive action being taken.

In the circumstances, what options do the people of Namibia have, and what options do we, a powerless international community, have. We are told that South Africa must be persuaded to get out of Namibia and allow implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The question is who is going to persuade South Africa, because persuasion has failed for over 40 years: the Big Five have failed and have dispersed, and even the United States, with its constructive engagement policy has not moved South Africa an inch. On the contrary, South Africa has entrenched its domination over the Territory, because it never, from the very outset, intended to leave the Territory anyway, but has succeeded in getting the United States to focus its attention on Angola.

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

These days we hear about support for pro-Western forces in Angola and the removal of a Marxist Government there. Who are these pro-Western forces who may get \$27 million or even \$300 million to topple the legitimate Government of Angola? Those are the rebel forces who for over 10 years have been trained and supported, financially, militarily and otherwise, by the racist Government of South Africa. Thus we see a clear plan whereby South Africa is being encouraged and supported to reverse history and to recolonize and enslave neighbouring African countries. The white man is once again embarking on a mission of civilizing the African and saving him from himself - a sinister attitude and insulting to us, because it is assumed that we take certain stands because somebody else must have told us to do so. We are not for sale and we resent and reject those attitudes with contempt.

In these circumstances, the Namibians, under the heroic leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), have no alternative but to intensify their armed struggle. How can we view SWAPO other than as being the sole and authentic representative of the Namibians, because Namibians know no other enemy than that of the oppressive occupying forces? It is a pity that we the members of the international community can only on the one hand continue to voice our concern and hope that it will one day fall on the willing ears of the mighty and powerful, while on the other hand we continue to give SWAPO all the material and diplomatic assistance within our means.

I cannot conclude my remarks without appealing to this Body, particularly to the mighty and powerful, to see reason and realize that their interests will be better served by an independent and sovereign Namibia. Our concern is that South Africa's arrogant bullying is not confined to its territory and the Territory of Namibia. We in the region live in constant fear, and indeed we are constantly

(Mr. Makeka, Lesotho)

attacked and threatened by our powerful neighbour. The only sin we have committed is to be black neighbours and on the receiving end of the wrath of apartheid. We know as a fact that South Africa has put in place a contingency plan under which we would all be punished if effective international action was taken not only to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, but to abolish the abhorrent system of apartheid in South Africa itself. Apparently we may be spared the punishment if we were to stand up and say apartheid and occupation of Namibia is a good thing. What is ironical is that even before such effective measures are taken, and we saw on Friday that they are very unlikely to be taken, South Africa is going ahead to implement its contingency plan of sanctions bit by bit. It is clear, therefore, that unless members of this Organization treat the explosive situation unfolding in southern Africa with the seriousness it deserves, very soon we will be talking not only about the illegal occupation of Namibia and apartheid policies of South Africa, but the list will keep growing.

Mr. PIMENTEL (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. President, because this is the first time that it is my honour to address this Assembly, I wish to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf. There is no doubt that because of your great experience and ability, the work which you are guiding so ably will conclude very successfully for the benefit of all of us and for the benefit of the Organization.

Allow me before turning to the subject before the General Assembly today, the question of Namibia, to refer briefly to an equally painful situation for us. Consistent with the long-standing sympathies of the Dominican people, my delegation wishes to express our deep sense of mourning in the wake of the terrible tragedy which has struck the sister Republic of Colombia, following the eruption of the volcano, Nevada del Ruiz in Manizales, an event which has distressed the entire world.

(Mr. Pimentel, Dominican Republic)

We know that in every Colombian there is a spirit of love and a desire to build and we are sure that the area that has been affected by this tragedy, that country will arise from its ashes like the phoenix.

The simultaneous commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was not as splendid as it could have been because some States Members persist in their domination and exploitation of territories fighting for self-determination and independence. The situation in Namibia is a particularly painful example of this. Namibia is a special source of pain to us because there we see colonialism in its most brutal form.

In the sermon based on the theme "a voice crying in the wilderness" delivered by Brother Anton de Montesinos in 1511, which was the first demonstration in the New World, in favour of the freedom and equality of human beings, the international community heard that message for the first time. Today that message could be passed on to those who are illegally occupying Namibia and in their own territory maintaining the odious system of apartheid and discriminating against the majority of the population. Montesinos said:

"By what right have you waged those terrible wars against people living in peace and tranquillity, in which so many of them have been consumed by death and destruction? Why have you oppressed them and exploited them, not caring about the hardship or sickness caused by the excessive labour imposed upon them? In truth, you have worked them to death in order to extract their gold day by day."

Each and every resolution of the Security Council is imbued with the spirit of the message underlying that sermon and it is a cause for concern that the resolutions have remained ineffective. The preservation of the prestige of the

(Mr. Pimentel, Dominican Republic)

world Organization depends on balance and effectiveness, but it is also determined by unconditional compliance with the decisions of its bodies. For that reason my delegation reaffirms its unswerving support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which continues to be the only acceptable basis for the peaceful settlement of the conflict in Namibia.

We are particularly grateful for the hard work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia. We are also grateful to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for its heroic, just struggle for a sovereign, independent Namibia. We must redouble our efforts to achieve for Namibia one of the primary objectives of the free peoples of the world: complete independence based on its own development and self-determination. At the same time, we must work harder to eradicate apartheid and all forms of discrimination from the face of the Earth.

Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Haiti's position on the question of Namibia is quite clear. It stems from our constant natural commitment to peoples throughout the world struggling to free themselves from foreign domination, colonialism, racism and apartheid. Our position is all the firmer because it coincides with the purposes and principles of the Charter, a basic element of which is the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

Therefore, the question that we are considering seems to us to be very simple. It concerns the restoration to a people of its fundamental inalienable right to freedom, independence and justice, a task to which our Assembly has devoted itself. Having revoked South Africa's Mandate in 1966, and having tried to end a century of colonial oppression and exploitation of the courageous Namibian people, the United Nations has assumed a legal responsibility for nearly 20 years - 20 years of constant efforts to find a negotiated political solution. They have been thwarted by the arrogance, intransigence and stubbornness of Pretoria, which is determined to continue its illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia at all costs.

The General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted many recommendations and decisions, but, regrettably, they have not been implemented. It should be recalled that despite four years of patient, arduous and exhaustive negotiations the racist régime still persists in its obstinate refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) containing a plan for the settlement of the Namibian question accepted by everyone as the only basis for a genuine, peaceful solution. In that persistence, the régime has used all sorts of manoeuvres, each as fraudulent and unacceptable as the rest.

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

To its contempt for United Nations resolutions the régime has added its intensification of repression and its plunder of Namibia's natural resources, with the complicity of foreign economic interests, which therefore bear a share of the responsibility for the perpetuation of that unjust, criminal system, characterized by the use of terror and violence, elevated to State policy.

Today Namibia is a vast armed camp, where there is one soldier for every 12 adult inhabitants. The Territory is virtually under martial law, which allows the killing of innocent civilians, arbitrary arrests and detention, torture and so on to maintain the status quo.

At the same time, Pretoria is giving free rein to its hegemonistic designs throughout southern Africa, increasing its acts of aggression, often carried out from Namibian territory, against neighbouring States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola, Botswana and Mozambique. It is also, through a policy of systematic destabilization, attacking their efforts to achieve economic development. It goes without saying that that outrageous policy, pursued with impunity, in violation of international law and the Charter, is a serious threat to international peace and security.

In those circumstances, it is essential that the Organization, and particularly the Security Council, reassert their authority and responsibility with regard to Namibia. For that to be possible, the two permanent members of the Security Council that have often used their veto to prevent the adoption of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa - they did it again very recently - must give up their policy of so-called constructive engagement, whose effects so far have been particularly damaging for the black populations of Namibia and South Africa. There is no doubt that the application of that policy, springing above all from their desire to preserve their economic interests, among other

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

things, makes them as guilty as the racist régime of all the crimes that are characteristic of the occupation of Namibia and the apartheid system in South Africa. That is also true of all those who, because of the profit motive or for some other reason, have knowingly become the allies of Pretoria. That is clear from the report of the Special Committee of 24 on the activities of foreign economic interests that are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.*

The countries collaborating with Pretoria are well aware that they cannot, without being untrue to themselves, continue to ignore the following values and objectives: the right to self-determination, the elimination of racism in all its forms, respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms for all and so on. They must also realize that they must firmly stand by the international community and the Namibian people, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in their struggle, which has now entered a decisive stage. More than ever before, everyone's total commitment is needed to resolve the situation, which offends the moral conscience of mankind, threatens international peace and security and undermines the credibility of the United Nations.

The time has passed for procrastination, half-measures and warnings that are not followed up. Rather, it is time for decisive action, so ardently desired by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world. We believe that such action should take the following forms: first, adequate material support for SWAPO to

*Mr. Agius (Malta), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

allow it to continue its armed struggle in the best possible conditions; secondly, strict implementation of measures already adopted - notably, the embargo on arms and oil for South Africa; and, thirdly, the adoption of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, in accordance with Security Council resolution 566 (1985).

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

We remain convinced that a combination of those measures would, if scrupulously implemented, bring about a considerable change in the elements of the problem of Namibia. Similarly, we reject the argument of the defenders of Pretoria that sanctions would be ineffective, and we do so for the following reasons. First, if the sanctions are as ineffective as they claim, why are they so adamant in their use of the veto, even at the risk of displeasing world public opinion, when sanctions are clearly required by the circumstances? Secondly, why do they resort unhesitatingly to sanctions whenever they are defending their own interests? Thirdly, in regard to the negative effects of sanctions on the black population, how can they possibly claim to understand African interests better than the Africans themselves? The truth of the matter is that this is another case of duplicity that can produce a *fait accompli*.

Experience has proved that the Pretoria régime is unlikely to undergo a magical change of heart. We are more convinced today than ever before that only increased mobilization of the international community in support of the struggle of the Namibian people will finally create the conditions required to induce Pretoria to end its illegal occupation and enable the Namibian people to enjoy its legitimate rights to self-determination, freedom and independence.

That, indeed, is the purpose of the draft resolutions put forward by the United Nations Council for Namibia. We welcome those draft resolutions and my delegation will fully support them.

Mr. YANE (Botswana): As the United Nations celebrates its fortieth anniversary it still finds itself confronted with the case of Namibia, which has been its ward for the past 39 years. When we reflect upon the efforts that have been exerted over the years in an attempt to secure independence for the Territory

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

of Namibia, we cannot help but feel frustrated by our failure to resolve what has become the most intractable decolonization question of our times.

The General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia some 19 years ago and, following that action, it was the expectation of the world community that South Africa would withdraw from the Territory and that the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was established a year later as its legal Administering Authority, would perform the simple task of guiding the Territory to independence. The events that followed are too well known to all of us here to merit repetition. South Africa still maintains, to this day, its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and indeed in defiance of international public opinion.

Over the years, we have witnessed the deliberate transformation of Namibia into a satellite appendage of apartheid South Africa. We have witnessed the most vulgar brutalization of the people of Namibia, in the form of torture, incarceration without trial, murder and other practices that should boggle the minds of all those who claim to belong to the civilized world. We have witnessed the systematic plunder of the resources of the Territory despite the enactment in 1974 of Decree No. 1, which was endorsed by this Assembly as an instrument that would ensure that the people of Namibia were not robbed of their wealth. We have witnessed the regular use of Namibian territory as a launching pad for South Africa's acts of aggression against independent States in the southern African region. We have also witnessed all sorts of manoeuvres being employed by the racist South African régime in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

The sum total of what we have witnessed in relation to the question of Namibia should raise one paramount question in our minds: If the world was prepared to act in unison against the threat of nazism, why should we find ourselves impotent in the case of apartheid? The answer to that question is in the custody of South Africa's friends, who refuse to accept the fact that the liberation of a people should take precedence over their economic interests. To them we say: the blood of innocent Namibians that drips from the hands of those who are in power in South Africa drips from their hands as well. There can be no excuse for being party to the actions of a régime that has demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that it is totally evil.

When Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted some seven years ago it gave us all the hope - which proved to be false - that at last there was some movement towards the resolution of the question of Namibia. That was so because the plan that accompanied it was the brain-child of South Africa's closest and powerful friends. Today the plan remains unimplemented despite the fact that it has been accepted all round as the only viable instrument for the peaceful resolution of the Namibian question.

What is ironic is that all impediments to its implementation are attributable to the attitude of some members of the very group that spearheaded its evolution. The linkage of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola to the resolution of the question of Namibia is clearly a red herring that has been introduced for the sole purpose of frustrating efforts to bring independence to Namibia. The claims that the United Nations cannot act impartially in dealing with the case of Namibia are far-fetched and should also be dismissed with the contempt they deserve.

In the long and arduous struggle for the independence of Namibia, it is fitting that we should pay a tribute to the South West Africa People's Organization

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

(SWAPO) for the statesmanship its leadership has demonstrated at various meetings which have been held in an effort to resolve this question. The fact that, at times, they have even bent over backwards to accommodate South Africa's demands bears testimony to this. SWAPO has offered on numerous occasions to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa in an effort to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan. It has offered to co-operate fully in this effort.

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

The role of the Security Council is central to this issue. It is therefore with profound disappointment that we view its continued failure to take effective action against South Africa. The position that some members of the Council have adopted whenever firm action is called for has emboldened the régime to ignore the United Nations; it has emboldened it to speak with arrogance before the Council and to act very much as it likes, to the extent of dictating what the Council can and cannot do. To be blunt, the performance of the Council with regard to the case of Namibia calls in question the high regard and confidence it enjoys from the Member States of this Organization. Its inaction will go down as the biggest blot on the history of our time.

Now that, as we understand, South Africa has decided on the electoral system it prefers, pressure must be brought to bear on that Government to ensure that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is implemented without delay or variation. The people of Namibia are not demanding the impossible. They simply want their independence, to live in dignity in their own country and to determine their own destiny. That is not an unreasonable demand by any stretch of imagination. South Africa has no right to deny them what is rightfully theirs.

The fate of Namibia and of South Africa itself is intertwined with that of the whole of the southern African sub-region. The longer the independence of Namibia is delayed the more are chances for peace and security in the whole sub-region compromised. It is imperative that those who have the power to influence events in our area act before the whole sub-region is plunged into total chaos.

The Council for Namibia, which was designated by this Assembly as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, has done a commendable job considering the obstacles with which it has been confronted over the years. Thanks to its dedication and resourcefulness, the world community is now more enlightened about

(Mr. Yane, Botswana)

the cause of Namibia than it was before its creation. We hope it will not be long before the Council assumes its rightful place inside the Territory to perform the final tasks connected with its mandate.

Our special thanks go to the President of the Council, Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia and the Acting President, Ambassador Sinclair of Guyana, for their indomitable spirit of dedication to the work of the Council and to the cause of Namibia.

Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Firstly, on behalf of my delegation, may I convey to the Colombian delegation our profound sympathy and condolences in connection with the volcanic catastrophe which has plunged the Colombian nation into mourning.

Like the entire international community, the Government of Burundi is concerned over the deteriorating situation throughout southern Africa. The root cause of this is the system of apartheid, which is a source of instability, repeated acts of aggression, permanent tension and conflict in the region.

Within South Africa itself, while Nelson Mandela and other nationalists have been unjustly languishing in prison for a quarter of a century, the deterioration in the situation is reflected in the state of emergency which was imposed by the minority and racist régime of Pretoria, and which was followed by the mass arrest, arbitrary detention, torture and massacre of the black population.

Despite the wave of violence and brutality which it has experienced, the South African people, mobilized in support of the African National Congress (ANC), is organizing and developing national resistance. It has learned its lesson from the events of the past: apartheid is not capable of being reformed or adapted to the present day.

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

In the front-line countries of southern Africa, Pretoria continues to pursue its policy of terrorism, destabilization and repeated acts of aggression against independent States in the region. The murderous air raids by the apartheid régime on neighbouring countries, and particularly Botswana, Lesotho and Angola, are bitter illustrations of that.

In Namibia, the creation of a puppet interim Government in Windhoek on 17 June is a further masquerade, yet another affront to the international community and, at the same time, a delaying tactic on the part of the racist régime to prevent the implementation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which call for Namibia's accession to independence.

The question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1946. It has been dealt with at special sessions of the General Assembly, international conferences, talks and seminars. Countless decisions have been taken by the international community in an attempt to find a solution to it in keeping with international law. I should like to refer to some of these decisions to illustrate the contempt shown by the Pretoria régime for the United Nations.

The opinion of the International Court of Justice, handed down on 21 June 1971 in connection with South Africa's occupation of Namibia, is unequivocal, and states:

"the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory".

The Opinion of the Court thus confirmed resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted in 1966, in which the General Assembly ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, as well as that of the Security Council which, in 1969, called for the immediate withdrawal of the South African administration from the Territory. The United Nations bears direct responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia because

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

after South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was withdrawn, the General Assembly in 1967 set up the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory. South Africa, in defiance of the United Nations decision, refused to allow the United Nations Council for Namibia to enter Namibia. In view of this categorical refusal by South Africa to comply with the decisions of the international community, the Security Council in January 1976, adopted resolution 385, which once again demanded that South Africa withdraw its illegal administration and called for free elections under United Nations supervision and control. Similarly, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which defines an internationally acceptable formula for Namibia's accession to independence.

My Government has always supported and will continue to support the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia set out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My delegation condemns South Africa for its obstruction of the implementation of that resolution for its illegal presence in Namibia, for its installation of a so-called interim Government in Namibia, as well as for its unbridled plundering of Namibia's natural resources.

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

As specific facts confirm, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia has made it possible for the racist régime to gain control of all the natural resources of that Territory, in direct collusion with foreign economic, financial and other interests. The exploitation of those resources, which for several years has been carried out by South Africa and a number of transnational corporations, is taking on increasingly disquieting dimensions. The international community should put an end to this systematic plunder of the wealth of Namibia which is being pursued in violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the context of the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, as well as other pertinent resolutions of the United Nations.

These economic operations would not have been very successful without the military umbrella which serves as protection for the acts of plunder carried out by transnational corporations with the co-operation of the racist régime of South Africa, which day by day is stepping up the militarization of Namibia.

A number of units of South African troops have been deployed in various parts of the Namibian territory. Apart from the units from Pretoria, South Africa has had to strengthen its military presence in Namibia by recruiting mercenaries from foreign countries. It has been using them not only to carry out acts of repression within the country but also for commando operations and aggressive missions against the front-line States.

This year we are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and, far from being a token gesture, this provides an opportunity for Member States to reaffirm their commitment to the aims and purposes of the Charter. We are also celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Unfortunately, despite the progress which has been made by the United Nations in the field of decolonization, Namibia continues to be the last stronghold of colonialism in its most extreme form and of inhuman racism.

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

Despite its continued efforts, patiently pursued, to speed up the process of the decolonization of Namibia, the international community is encountering the thinly disguised scorn of the apartheid régime. That régime constantly thwarts the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

In June the Security Council, after a lengthy debate, adopted resolution 566 (1985), which condemned South Africa for the way it has been obstructing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and for its installation of a so-called interim government in Windhoek, which the international community has refused to recognize as having any legitimacy. In the same resolution the Security Council urged Member States of the Organization that had not yet done so to consider taking appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa.

We should like to pay a tribute to those States and organizations which have acted in conformity with the Security Council resolution, thus contributing to dismantling the system of apartheid.

As indicated by the recent report of the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia, no progress has yet been made in implementing the plan for the independence of Namibia. My delegation greatly values the efforts made by the Secretary-General to bring about the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

While the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, is demonstrating moderation and restraint and co-operating with the United Nations in order to find a political solution, South Africa is pursuing its policy of obstructionism and sabotage of the plan for the decolonization of Namibian.

The attitude taken by South Africa in the recent debate on the question of Namibia in the Security Council, which took place from 13 to 15 November, remained negative. It was an affront to the Security Council by the racist régime to have issued as an official Council document a statement in which the so-called interim

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

government made known its choice of an electoral system. South Africa is still pressing its demand that the independence of Namibia continue to be conditional upon the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The Government of Burundi has rejected and continues to reject categorically any linkage between the two matters, which are quite separate.

My delegation regrets that the draft resolution which was before the Security Council a few days ago at the conclusion of its debate on the question of Namibia was not adopted, since it would have made it possible to put an end to the obstruction by South Africa of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

Any reluctance shown by the Security Council to force the Pretoria régime to implement the plan for the independence of Namibia has a heartening effect on that régime and encourages it in its illegal activities in Namibia. The authority of the Security Council and the credibility of the United Nations are at stake.

We cannot remain indifferent to the deterioration of the political, economic and social situation in Namibia. For that reason, the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries held in Luanda from 4 to 8 September 1985 requested the Security Council to meet once again to consider the question of Namibia, and reiterated its appeal for the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa pursuant to the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Although the Security Council did not accede to the request of the non-aligned countries, it did identify the sanctions that should be adopted as a matter of urgency.

Comprehensive and mandatory sanctions are necessary because the actions of South Africa in southern Africa generally and in Namibia in particular are a grave threat to peace in that region and to international peace and security.

My delegation is convinced that if appropriate action is not taken as a matter of urgency to force South Africa to withdraw from Namibia, Pretoria may well take

(Mr. Bwakira, Burundi)

the international community unawares and confront it with a fait accompli by unilaterally proclaiming the independence of Namibia South African style. Such an eventuality must be forestalled. We have reached a stage now at which there can be no alternative to comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The internationally community should meet the challenge placed before it with unparalleled effrontery by the apartheid régime. Its action should be commensurate with the seriousness of the situation in southern Africa. Such action, we are quite convinced, would contribute to speeding up the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In parallel with that action the people of Namibia should continue and, indeed, intensify their liberation struggle. In this connection, we wish first to pay a tribute to those countries that have given their unconditional support to SWAPO. Today it is more than ever necessary that their support should not only continue but be stepped up to make it possible for the Namibian people to regain their rights, under the aegis of their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO.

We are likewise persuaded that, thanks to the mobilization of world public opinion against apartheid and its crimes and to the legitimate struggle of the South African and Namibian peoples, the liberation of the Namibian people is inevitable. It is the duty of the international community to support the efforts of the Secretary-General to find a solution to the Namibia tragedy. The United Nations Council for Namibia, of which my country is honoured to be a member, has spared no effort to draw the attention of Governments, and governmental and non-governmental organizations to the cause of the Namibian people. Its activities will continue in the future, under the very skilful leadership of its Acting President, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.