



**General Assembly**

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.70  
20 November 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 13 November 1986, at 3 p.m.

<u>President:</u>	Mr. OSMAN (Vice-President)	(Somalia)
later:	Mr. AL-ANSI (Vice-President)	(Oman)
later:	Mr. HENAR (President)	(Suriname)
later:	Mr. THOMPSON (Vice-President)	(Fiji)

- Question of Namibia [36] (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 International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia
- (d) Report of the Secretary-General
- (e) Report of the Fourth Committee
- (f) 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.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Osman (Somalia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA:

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/41/24)
- (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/41/23 (Part V), (Part IX and Corr.1), A/AC.109/870)
- (c) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE IMMEDIATE INDEPENDENCE OF NAMIBIA (A/CONF.138/11 and Add.1)
- (d) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/41/614)
- (e) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/41/761)
- (f) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/41/24 (Part II and Corr.1), chapter I)

Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic): Twenty years have elapsed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and the Organization shouldered direct responsibility for the Territory's administration. Despite the fact that the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted many resolutions calling on the Pretoria régime to end its occupation and withdraw its administration and forces from Namibia, that régime continues to refuse to respond to those resolutions, and continues to occupy the Territory illegally and to engage in various kinds of intimidation and racial discrimination against, and economic exploitation of, the Territory and its people, who have suffered for a long time from oppression and aggression by the South African Government.

Therefore, the United Nations - the international instrument that has the task of bringing about decolonization and of dealing with aggression - bears a special responsibility for the people of Namibia until they achieve their full national

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

independence and until foreign aggression against them is brought to an end. It would be a tragedy if the worst form of colonialism persisted in that part of the African continent.

The international concern over the question of Namibia, and in particular the need to face the risks inherent in the continued occupation of that Territory by the racist régime, will not end until the people of Namibia achieve freedom and sovereignty. This year, which is coming to a close, has been the year of Namibia. Numerous international conferences have been held on the matter and have adopted resolutions and recommendations constituting a sound basis for a just, peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. In July, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia was held in Vienna, and in September the General Assembly devoted its fourteenth special session to Namibia. Shortly before that, in the same month, the Eighth Summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was held in Harare. All those conferences and meetings have adopted important resolutions in which the international community calls upon the South African régime to end its occupation of Namibia, withdraw its troops unconditionally and abolish the illegal administration it imposed on the Namibian people. The resolutions reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter and the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, foremost among them being Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

Nevertheless, despite the illegal nature of the occupation and its serious effects on the people of Namibia and the region, and despite the collective international protest, South Africa continues to maintain its illegal presence in Namibia, savagely plundering its riches and natural resources. Thus, the question of Namibia has reached a stalemate, because the racist régime continues to impede a peaceful settlement and attempts to solve the question in a neo-colonialist way through a so-called internal settlement - the establishment of a puppet régime dependent on Pretoria.

The Pretoria régime therefore established the so-called interim Government of 1985, which is simply a tool designed to tighten its grip on Namibia. As the Namibian people rejected that Government, the Pretoria leaders escalated their repressive acts and are continuing to tighten their grip on Namibia, its people, and all aspects of the cultural, economic and political life of that oppressed Territory in an attempt to thwart and repress the national resistance and national liberation movements of the Namibian people. One example was the imposition of the state of emergency and the declaration of martial law. We reject and denounce all these illegal acts, and condemn the determination of the South African authorities to continue their domination of Namibia.

South Africa has not confined itself to its illegal occupation of the territory of Namibia and the plunder of its natural resources, but has transformed the Territory into a springboard for its acts of aggression against the front-line States in an attempt to intimidate them and prevent them from maintaining their support for the Namibian people in their just struggle against the racist occupation of their country. The racist authorities have stepped up their aggression by occupying parts of the territory of some of the front-line States.

South Africa's racist character and colonialist tendencies have led it to occupy Namibia and carry out acts of aggression against its African neighbours.



(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

That aggression has inevitably led to more aggression, which could result in a steady deterioration of the situation in southern Africa, to such an extent as to threaten the security of the region and the whole world. It is therefore necessary to put an end to all military acts by the South African authorities against the African front-line States. Those States, which are subjected to blackmail and intimidation by South Africa because of their legitimate position of principle, must not feel that they are on their own; they must be assured of our moral and material support for their economic welfare and for their independence and sovereignty. We cannot accept South Africa's stratagems and manoeuvres aimed at linking Namibia's independence to extraneous matters. South Africa's intent is to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and to impose a *fait accompli*, thus delaying the Territory's independence and preventing the implementation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on the question of Namibia's independence.

It is clear that a just and lasting solution of the question of Namibia cannot be further delayed. A settlement must be reached on the basis of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as well as in relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, which remains the sole internationally-accepted basis for the settlement of the problem of the Territory. The Security Council must therefore play its role under the Charter and must be enabled to overcome the difficulties and hurdles that have prevented it in the past from adopting binding, practical resolutions leading to Namibia's immediate independence.

We believe that the international community must heed the appeal of the African States and other States that the Security Council should impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter. We call upon all States to abide by the United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia and to attempt to translate them into practice, so as to

(Mr. Salah, Jordan)

avoid the continuation of this grave situation and to maintain the role, effectiveness and prestige of the Organization.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): From 17 to 20 September this year the General Assembly held its fourteenth special session, devoted to the question of Namibia, and was preceded by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, from 5 to 11 July in Vienna. Those two important Conferences, in whose debates the representatives of many Member States took part, led to the adoption of General Assembly resolution S-14/1, the Declaration of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, its Programme of Action on Namibia and the appeal for the immediate independence of Namibia made on Wednesday, 9 July 1986, by the eminent persons participating in the Conference.

Despite all that, the General Assembly is now once again having to debate the question, in an attempt to adopt a fresh approach that may bring about a solution to the problem of Namibia's independence in southern Africa.

The Organization's renewed interest in the matter, demonstrated by the holding of the International Conference in Vienna and the fourteenth special session in New York, is sufficient proof of the determination of all Member States speedily to achieve a final settlement of the question. Twenty years have passed since the United Nations assumed responsibility for Namibia, after terminating South Africa's Mandate over the Territory. Consequently, South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia is of 20 years' standing.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

In 1978 the Security Council took up the matter again, adopting the United Nations plan for the independence of the Namibian people, set out in its resolution 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978, which is a universally-accepted basis for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. The Contact Group, set up under that resolution, took the initiative of holding talks with the South African authorities in an attempt to speed up Namibia's independence. But its efforts were in vain, and the diplomatic and political consequences of that failure are becoming increasingly harmful.

The Contact Group's approach to the racist South African authorities and its exertion of more pressure on them aroused a certain amount of hope when, in January 1982, an important meeting took place in Geneva of all the parties concerned in the Namibian question. Unfortunately, immediately after that meeting the racist South African authorities simply decided to disregard its conclusions, and have imposed two puppet régimes on Namibia since the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia's immediate independence.

Proof that the racist minority régime of South Africa balks at the transfer of power to the Namibian people has been clearly established. That régime is bending over backwards in its attempts to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan for the immediate independence of Namibia.

By setting up the so-called interim government on 17 June 1985, the minority racist Government of South Africa has used fraudulent constitutional and political means to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. This occupation is a violation of all the principles that the so-called civilized countries hold dear and seek to defend: self-determination, racial equality and social justice. The racist minority régime cares little about the dictates of morality and law, even though a number of their nationals come from countries with democratic traditions. The free elections which were to be held in Namibia under United Nations auspices have never taken place, because of the intransigence of this retrograde régime.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Instead of acting in accordance with operative paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which stipulates that all unilateral measures taken by the illegal administration in Namibia in relation to the electoral process, including unilateral registration of voters, or transfer of power, in contravention of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 431 (1978), are null and void, the racist minority régime of South Africa has done exactly the opposite by denying to the only national liberation movement recognized by the United Nations as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, namely, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the right to organize elections, or at least to participate in the organization of elections in Namibia, in conjunction with the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Since that time no noteworthy progress has been made towards any fresh proposals for implementing resolution 435 (1978), in particular operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of that resolution, which state:

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

"3. Decides to establish under its authority a United Nations Transition Assistance Group ... for a period of up to 12 months in order to assist [the Secretary-General's] Special Representative to carry out the mandate conferred upon him by the Security Council in paragraph 1 of its resolution 431 (1978), namely, to ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations;"

These provisions remain valid to this day, if the independence of Namibia is to be achieved.

My delegation believes that in keeping with Security Council resolution 431 of

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

27 July 1978, the Secretary-General should take the new step of appointing a special representative for Namibia; this should be done as soon as possible to ensure that the independence of Namibia can be achieved in the near future by means of free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

At the same time, the Security Council should re-examine the relevance of the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) with a view to considering fresh proposals on points: instilling new life into the Contact Group and encouraging its members to continue their mission within the framework of the United Nations settlement plan for the independence of Namibia, and bringing up to date resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, whereby the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.

My delegation believes that the present situation in Namibia requires the General Assembly to provide new guidelines and take a new approach in the light of the fact that although resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, ending South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, and Security Council resolution 435 (1978) of 29 July 1978, defining the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, remain valid to this day, no action has yet been taken to implement them.

Under Article 24 of the Charter, the Security Council is given the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations.

Consequently, all Member States should agree to pursue the irreversible process which they began by adopting Security Council resolution 566 (1985), which states that in the event of an unsatisfactory report by the Secretary-General and continuing intransigence on the part of South Africa, they would adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa under the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

The report of the Secretary-General does not indicate any further progress,

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

and a policy of destruction is being pursued by the racist minority régime of South Africa both internally, in Namibia, and towards all the independent neighbouring African countries. In view of those two facts, my delegation believes that the Security Council must review the implications of resolution 566 of 19 June 1985 with a view to its full complete implementation.

One of the representatives of the racist South African régime who was authorized to speak in the Security Council on 13 November 1985 stated:

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

(S/PV.2624, p. 42)

Perhaps the most fitting way to provide a retort to this arrogance of the representative of the racist régime of South Africa is to be found in the British proverb:

(spoke in English)

"Whose house is of glass, must not throw stones at another."

(continued in French)

Thus it is clear that in the eyes of the leaders of the South African racist régime, the situation is quite normal in Namibia and that there is no need for the Security Council to devote any time to it.

Zaire has been working very closely with all our front-line African countries which have been victims of South Africa's policies of aggression and destabilization, and we demand that the apartheid régime of South Africa immediately withdraw its unlawful administration, its occupation army and its police forces from Namibia, free all political prisoners in Namibia, and enable the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole Administering Authority for the Territory, to take immediate steps to set up its administration in Namibia in

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

accordance with resolutions 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 and 40/97 A of 13 December 1985.

Zaire endorses the right of the Namibian people to fight with all the means available to them, including armed struggle, to repulse South Africa's aggression and to attain self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namibia. We reject any argument that links the independence of Namibia to extraneous questions such as the presence of foreign troops in Angola.

On 6 November 1986 my delegation, speaking on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, proposed that the comprehensive mandatory sanctions which the Security Council is supposed to impose against the racist minority régime of South Africa in order to induce it to comply with the United Nations resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia, in keeping with operative paragraph 16 of resolution A/S-14/1 should, to be effective, be supplemented by harsher measures calculated to bring about a radical change in South Africa.

My delegation is convinced that if these measures are adopted then Namibia may soon join the United Nations and play its proper role like all other Member States. Consequently, my delegation supports all the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 36.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Some weeks ago the General Assembly, in a special session, considered the question of Namibia and adopted a resolution which complemented previous resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly to ensure the immediate independence of Namibia.

The people of Namibia has long struggled for freedom and independence and continues to face with unshakeable determination the forces of occupation and racism, as well as the policies of oppression and intimidation which are being perpetrated against its brave revolt for freedom.

We have witnessed this year a major international effort, within the framework of the Namibian question. An international conference was held in Paris to impose sanctions against South Africa, which was followed in July of this year by an international conference held in Vienna for the immediate independence of Namibia. In addition, a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Co-ordination Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement was held in New Delhi to consider the question of Namibia. Both the eighth summit Conference of the non-aligned Countries held in Harare last September and the summit Conference of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held in Addis Ababa, considered the question of Namibia, as did regional seminars and symposiums. Furthermore, the Committee of 24 on decolonization considered the question of Namibia and adopted a decision which shed light on all the dimensions of the question as well as the means of reaching a solution guaranteeing the immediate independence of Namibia, as is laid down in paragraph 13 of the Committee's report (A/41/23 (Part V)) of 29 August 1986, which I had the honour to introduce. The legitimate authority for Namibia, represented in the Council for Namibia, considered this issue and adopted recommendations which have been referred to the General Assembly, as laid down in document A/41/24 (Part II) of 29 October 1986.



(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

The situation in Namibia is becoming increasingly complex, due to the insistence of the racist régime in South Africa on perpetuating its illegal occupation of that Territory, as well as the dispersal of its people and its attempt to impose fraudulent political institutions on Namibia aimed at entrenching the occupation, on the one hand, and draining it of its wealth, on the other.

Despite the fact that 20 years have elapsed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, these acts continue. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), continues to be the decisive element for reaching a common objective, which is immediate independence for Namibia. It is regrettable indeed that this plan, which has been universally supported, continues to await implementation because of the procrastination and dilatory tactics of the racist Pretoria régime aimed at entrenching its occupation of Namibia and draining it of its natural resources in contravention of all legal, moral and humanitarian values, and in violation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, as well as of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia. However, the people of Namibia will not surrender to these conditions. It is waging a brave struggle for independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has been recognized by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

SWAPO and the Namibian people have not been alone in their struggle for freedom and independence. The international community has been behind them with its help and support. This, indeed, is what we have witnessed in the international conferences held this year which I just mentioned. This clearly shows the size,

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

level and insistence of international support for the legitimate rights of the Namibian people until its usurped legitimate rights are restored.

We call on the General Assembly to work for the immediate implementation of the conclusions reached by the international conferences on the question of Namibia. The international community has rejected, and indeed condemned, racist South Africa's occupation of Namibia. It has called upon it to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from the Territory. The international community has repeatedly expressed its support of the legitimate rights of the Namibian people, particularly its right to self-determination and control over its natural resources and wealth. This cannot be achieved other than by the immediate independence of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the independence plan.

Pretoria's policy of aggression is not limited to its illegal occupation of Namibia, or indeed to its racist practices and measures of oppression, massacres and acts of mass murder against its people, but now includes acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. The Pretoria régime resorts to different methods in this respect, including intimidation, aggression, terrorism, destabilization, the militarization of Namibia, and the use of that Territory as a base for launching acts of aggression and State terrorism. All these elements have led to an escalation of tension and instability in southern Africa and pose a threat to peace and security in the region as a whole.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

The responsibility for the deterioration in the situation and the escalation of terrorism in South Africa falls, in the first place, squarely on Pretoria, because of its aggressive policies, its practices of racial discrimination and apartheid, and its continuing occupation of Namibia. Secondly, that responsibility is shared by the States that support and collaborate with that racist régime in pursuit of its policy of racism and aggression.

The element that is the greatest help to the racist Pretoria régime in perpetuating its occupation of Namibia and carrying out its barbaric measures of repression against its militant people is the close co-operation between that régime and the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine in the economic, military, and nuclear fields, and the military and strategic co-ordination between them in thwarting the aspirations of the peoples of Namibia and Palestine and strengthening the apartheid régime in South Africa. Both régimes obtain help and support from the United States of America.

Pretoria's opposition to the United Nations plan under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes a flagrant challenge to the United Nations and international law. Pretoria sometimes resorts to manoeuvres to confer a false independence by means of deceptive plans aimed at entrenching its control over Namibia - for example, the Multiparty Conference, that group of collaborators, and before that the so-called interim government, which was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 566 (1985). At other times, with the support of the United States of America, racist South Africa resorts to linkage between Namibia's independence and issues extraneous to it, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Such attempts at linkage are transparent manoeuvres designed to prevent the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Furthermore, they are interference in the internal affairs of Angola, which has continually been the victim of aggression by the South African régime in Pretoria.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Security Council, the supreme international body entrusted under the United Nations Charter with the maintenance of international peace and security, faces a grave challenge, which it must take up by shouldering its responsibilities. For how much longer will the Security Council continue to meet, consider draft resolutions which are then shot down by the use of the veto, and then adjourn without achieving any positive results? Comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as laid down in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter must inevitably be imposed to force South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, which we consider to be an act of aggression, and to enable the Namibian people to enjoy fully its right to self-determination and national independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole legitimate representative.

Those that oppose the imposition of sanctions bear the responsibility for the deteriorating conditions in southern Africa. It is indeed painful that some Western States permanent members of the Security Council continue to insist on having recourse to their right of veto to protect colonialism and racism and encourage the régime's carrying out such policies in escalating measures of oppression and repression against peoples. This has hampered the Security Council in fulfilling its role, impeded the implementation of resolutions and generated an explosive situation in southern Africa which is a threat to international peace and security.

The people of South Africa is today making the supreme sacrifice in its just uprising against the Pretoria régime and its policies based on apartheid and designed to split the ranks of the African people and entrench the illegal occupation of Namibia.

The international community must take decisive measures to guarantee the immediate independence of Namibia, as the first step in supporting the people of

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

South Africa and liberating it from colonialism, racism and aggression. Meanwhile, it is incumbent on the international community to provide support and assistance of all kinds to the peoples of southern Africa and their liberation movements to enable them to continue their struggle by all the means available, in particular by armed struggle, until their lands are freed from the odious colonizers.

The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirms its support for the just struggle being waged by the Namibian people for its immediate independence. We once again pledge our assistance and support for the front-line African States in facing up to aggression.

#### PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make the following announcement with regard to the Assembly's programme of work for tomorrow.

Members will recall that the Assembly will take up agenda item 17 (d), "Election of the members of the International Law Commission". In accordance with the decision taken yesterday, the Assembly will also continue its consideration of the question of Namibia while ballots are being counted. Bearing in mind the heavy work programme, the President intends to declare the plenary meeting open punctually at 10 a.m. Therefore, I urge representatives to be in the Hall at that time.

Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia): This year 20 years will have passed since the United Nations General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate for the administration of Namibia and declared South Africa's presence in the Territory illegal. At the same time, the decision deprived Pretoria of the possibility of simply annexing Namibia.

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

In spite of that, the people of Namibia is still not free. The racist régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and the native population of that Territory is still exposed to brutal oppression and repressive policies.

Nobody has any doubt today about the pressing need to implement immediately the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and free development. We appreciate the fact that the voice of protest condemning the occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime has been heard again, becoming ever stronger, at this year's International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna, and at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on the question of Namibia.

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

Many United Nations documents and studies reveal that, in contravention of the relevant United Nations decisions, Namibia's natural resources continue to be plundered while its territory is being misused in the pursuit of the military ambitions of imperialism. Transnational monopolies ruthlessly exploit the cheap labour provided by Namibia's African population. For example, over 270,000 Namibians are forced to work in South African mines, virtually without any legal protection. A similar fate is shared by more than 56,000 people employed on white-owned farms as well as by other groups of Namibian Africans. The inhuman conditions, the system of reservations and the restrictions imposed on travel and residence are an exact copy of the bantustans in South Africa and the policy of apartheid pursued by its Government.

The present situation in Namibia is characterized by the fact that South Africa, when exploiting of the African population, has to draw to an ever greater extent on the strength of its occupying forces. There is one member of the regular military troops of South Africa for roughly every 10 citizens of Namibia. The costs of the maintenance of the South African occupying force in Namibia and the amounts expended in the struggle against the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) total 2 million rands annually. The need for the presence of such extensive power machinery confirms that the racist régime is also confronted on the territory of Namibia with ever stronger resistance on the part of the African population, headed by its sole legitimate representative - the South West Africa People's Organization.

Namibia supplies raw materials, including uranium and rare strategic metals, as well as unprocessed agricultural products, at low cost both to South Africa and to a number of Western countries.

Those countries also have a common interest in maintaining Namibia within the sphere of their military and political influence. The racists misuse the Territory

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

of Namibia as a huge military base for the testing of new weapons and for launching from Namibia aggressive attacks against the People's Republic of Angola. A major portion of the material assistance delivered to the band of mercenaries called UNITA, which assists the sub-imperialist centre in South Africa in the pursuit of its reactionary policies, goes through Namibia as well.

In order to safeguard its economic and political interests South Africa, with the support of some Western countries, does everything within its power to put off the inevitable termination of its colonial domination over Namibia. It therefore refuses to comply with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and other United Nations decisions in this respect. It continues to escalate acts of subversion and destruction against neighbouring countries.

The Pretoria régime continues to pursue its unjustifiable policy of linkage of the question of the immediate granting of independence to Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Regrettably, the United States agrees with Pretoria on this score as well; yet the Cuban internationalists are in Angola on the basis of a request from its Government, in order to secure the defence of that country against those very attacks carried out by the South African racists. The policy of linkage of two unrelated issues thus amounts to nothing but a flagrant and inadmissible interference on the part of South Africa in the internal affairs of a sovereign State - the People's Republic of Angola. It must be emphasized that the aggressive attacks by South Africa against Angola were made even before Angola requested Cuban assistance.

We regard the South African régime's declaration of readiness to proceed to the implementation of the United Nations plan if the Cubans are withdrawn from Angola as a transparent propaganda ploy. The objective of the South African racists has remained unchanged. Their intention is to exert new pressure on SWAPO,



(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

to calm down international public opinion and to impress the West. It is well known that the internal political and economic crisis in South Africa is growing deeper and wider. The racists are striving to reactivate the influx of foreign investments and they need postponement of the repayment of South African debts.

Pretoria is manoeuvring even inside Namibia. The people of Namibia have witnessed a number of attempts on the part of South Africa to impose puppet governments upon them. In the early seventies, it was the so-called Vorster consultative council; in 1975 a so-called constitutional conference, Turnhalle; in 1979 a so-called national assembly; in 1980 a puppet council of ministers; in 1983 the announcement of the establishment of a council of State; and, finally, on 17 June 1985 the formation of a puppet provisional government. All those attempts to impose puppet governments failed. In spite of that, South Africa continues its efforts to solve the problem of Namibia outside the United Nations and to the exclusion of SWAPO, which was just 10 years ago granted the status of observer by our Organization, representing before the United Nations the people of Namibia and their inalienable rights. This policy is aimed at enforcing a neo-colonialist option of so-called independence for Namibia.

Without broad all-round support from the United States, some other Western countries and Israel, the racist apartheid régime of South Africa could continue neither the illegal occupation of Namibia nor the policy of pressure, extortion, aggression and destabilization towards neighbouring independent African States.

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

The South African régime's closest allies verbally condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia and the policy of apartheid of South Africa, since it is, so to speak, good manners to do so. In point of fact, however, they fail to take any effective steps that might lead to the solution of the two problems. They disguise their attitude to those pressing issues beneath a policy of so-called constructive engagement, and they express support for the so-called democratization of apartheid and for new approaches to the solution of the Namibian problem. Thus those States assume in fact the position of guarantors for the régime of apartheid and aggression.

Such an approach has to be ended. No more time should be lost. The United Nations has already given South Africa sufficient room and displayed a great measure of tolerance and patience, which is now bringing about a deterioration of the conditions for the peaceful attainment of the genuine decolonization of Namibia.

The history of the problem shows that the means applied so far to exert influence on South Africa are not bringing the desired results. Therefore it is no wonder that a coercive measure like comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa has met with broad international support. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic categorically denounces the vetoing in the Security Council of proposals to adopt this measure of coercion. The long-term obstructionist policy of certain United Nations Member States with regard to effective sanctions has actually brought the solution of the problem by peaceful means to a dead end. In this situation, the people of Namibia have no other choice but to wage a struggle for liberation, using all available means, including arms, against the self-appointed colonizers.

A considerable share of responsibility for the bloodshed lies with those who have just boycotted the adoption of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa

(Mr. Kulawiec, Czechoslovakia)

under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. This share of responsibility is not diminished in any major way by the tactical manoeuvring of the Governments of some Western States through selective sanctions, which they were compelled to declare this year when confronted with the fact that obstructionist policies were no longer tenable. No wonder, therefore, that their proclamation of limited measures against South Africa has not been received by the international community with enthusiasm. This half-hearted solution cannot lead to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to a speedy termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia. On the contrary, it will result in a further prolongation of the suffering of the Namibian people and in the maintenance and possibly even expansion of the dangerous hotbed of tension in the south of Africa.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic wishes to commend once again the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Its report this year demonstrates not only the grave nature of the situation in Namibia but also the fact that the Council is discharging its duties in a responsible manner. Therefore we express our full support for the Council in the implementation of its programme of work and for all measures designed to secure the exercise of the rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence.

We also reaffirm our readiness to continue to extend all-round support to the courageous struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO as their sole, legitimate and authentic representative.

Mr. THAPA (Nepal): My delegation is taking the floor to express our outrage at the fact that the people of Namibia continue to be denied their right to independence two full decades after the United Nations assumed direct responsibility over the Territory. Indeed, words fail to convey adequately our sense of frustration at the impotence of the international community to right this historic wrong. Is it not true that Namibia has been discussed in this world

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

Organization since 1946 or that, while scores of former colonies have advanced to freedom and self-determination since the 1960 United Nations Declaration on decolonization, Namibia is no closer to independence? The question that immediately leaps to mind is: why?

The answer is as clear as it is bitter. In a nutshell, it is this: the inability of the international community to force the apartheid régime of South Africa to release its tenacious colonial hold over the Territory. Thus, eight years after the Security Council endorsed a blueprint for the independence of Namibia based on South African withdrawal from the Territory followed by free elections under United Nations supervision, we are no closer to that long-delayed goal. Indeed, to judge from results on the ground, it would seem that not only is the racist South African régime continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia but it has extended its evil apartheid policy there and engages in systematic plunder of Namibia's mineral and other resources. To cap it all, the racist Pretoria régime uses Namibian territory to launch armed attacks against neighbouring southern African States, including Angola. Here another question arises: what is the source of South Africa's rabid intransigence and stubborn defiance of international opinion? In the view of my delegation, it can be traced, in great measure, to the discredited policy of a number of countries, including major Western States, to engage in profitable economic relations with the racist Pretoria régime. Another important factor contributing to Pretoria's open disregard of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on Namibian independence can be traced to its absurd linkage of Cuban forces in Angola and the withdrawal of its troops from Namibia.

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

Nepal rejects the linkage concept as a totally extraneous and fraudulent move to delay Namibian independence, as it has very rightly been rejected by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole legal representative of the Namibian nation-in-waiting. Apart from the fact that "linkage" is a subterfuge for delaying Namibian independence, my delegation rejects any attempt to camouflage the Namibian question as an East-West issue.

We are fully alive to and appreciative of the efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in seeking a negotiated solution to problems stemming from the long-delayed independence of Namibia. We, however, will recall that his negotiations with the concerned parties last November were scuttled by Pretoria's untenable insistence on linking the question of Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

If the root cause behind the delay in Namibian independence is well known, so, too, is what needs to be done. The prescription has been outlined many times in the past, in many international bodies and forums, including, as we have already noted, by the Security Council in 1978. The key is, of course, not what the contours of a plan for Namibian independence should be, but, rather, how to secure South Africa's compliance in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In Nepal's view, the only peaceful means that remains to force a defiant, racist Pretoria to comply is through the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions as envisaged in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Recently, this was endorsed by the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa in June 1986; by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia in July 1986; by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) summit in July 1986; by the Eighth Non-Aligned Summit Conference of September 1986; and, most recently, by the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, also in September 1986.

(Mr. Thapa, Nepal)

Though we are apprehensive that the racist South African régime may be in possession of nuclear weapons - and this calls for serious investigation by the international community - we are encouraged by the growth of the anti-apartheid movement, including the one in the major Western countries that engage in political and economic relations with South Africa. This is another indication that time is most certainly not on Pretoria's side. Neither is history. Indeed, a study of the decolonization process in Africa - from Algeria to Zimbabwe - indicates as much. It is therefore our hope that Pretoria realizes this, before the international community loses faith in a peaceful solution to Namibia's independence.

The South African holocaust that threateningly looms on the horizon must be averted at all costs. In our view, the immediate independence of Namibia - followed by the dismantling of the apparatus of apartheid in South Africa - would effectively help avert that dreadful alternative.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Once again the General Assembly has been called upon to consider the situation in Namibia and the impasse arrived at in the search for the independence of that Territory. Following very closely on the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, the present debate testifies to the importance attached by the international community to this urgent problem.

The deliberations of our Assembly leave no doubt as to the existence within the international community of a consensus with regard to all the fundamental questions relating to the independence of Namibia. The United Nations plan adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 of 29 September 1978 and accepted formally by South Africa is the universally agreed basis for a peaceful solution to the question. We all know that it is rare for the majority of the international community to agree on the terms of a settlement to an international conflict such as that of Namibia. It is clear, however, that South Africa is dragging its feet and that, for lack of effective international measures, the Namibian people has no

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

choice but to continue its determined struggle to dislodge the racist Pretoria régime from Namibia, which it is occupying illegally.

On this point, the Turkish nation has always expressed its solidarity with the Namibian people in its struggle for national independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which the General Assembly has recognized as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

Turkey has always admired the patience and wisdom displayed on various occasions by SWAPO. Turkey's support for the legitimate cause of the Namibian people is and remains unswerving.

Southern Africa will have no stability or true peace as long as the Namibian people does not enjoy its right to self-determination and independence and as long as South Africa continues blatantly to maintain its presence there, carrying out, as was recently the case, military activities and acts of aggression beyond the borders of Namibia and on the territories of neighbouring independent States.

Turkey strongly condemns South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia and its attacks against neighbouring countries. We cannot but condemn its relentless attempts to impose a so-called internal solution on Namibia by setting up an administration beholden to South Africa. Last year, after having set up that administration, South Africa, in fact, withdrew further from the negotiating process aimed at full implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Having agreed on the essential bases and principles relating to the independence of Namibia, the international community must now display imagination and show the necessary determination to find a way to compel South Africa to withdraw immediately from the Territory. In this connection, I should like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General of our Organization, whose efforts have made it possible to solve many problems relating to the implementation of Security Council

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

resolution 435 (1978). We thank the Secretary-General for his personal devotion to the cause of Namibia's independence and we support the diplomatic activities that he has undertaken in order to overcome the obstacles set up against a peaceful and equitable solution designed to implement the decisions of the Security Council.

It seems clearer than ever that developments in South Africa are a growing threat to stability in the region and have an increasing effect on international peace and security. We are convinced that the emergence of an independent Namibia would mark real progress in bringing peace to southern Africa. Since it is a decolonization matter, the Namibian problem is, in essence, unconnected with the question of apartheid. However, the two questions are closely interrelated and call for firm and determined pressure on the South African régime and the adoption of consistent policies by those who can and must exert such pressure.



(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

At this time, world public opinion is focused even more closely on the question of apartheid, and South Africa seems to have the impression that the question of Namibia has been pushed to the background - particularly owing to the absence of a consistent multilateral process that would convincingly and compellingly remind it of the need to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) immediately. South Africa's recalcitrance cannot but be strengthened by the support it received when it subsequently set conditions by which an unjustifiable link was established between the application of the Security Council resolution and irrelevant questions. It is clear that if South Africa maintains that attitude, favourable development towards a peaceful solution will not be possible. Distinct and separate problems should be the subject of separate negotiations and efforts.

We consider that the Security Council now has the responsibility of taking as quickly as possible a clear and unequivocal position. We sincerely hope that this time the Council, in keeping with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its fourteenth special session, will reach a consensus on the effective action to take and will unanimously and unambiguously call for the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It is only through a judicious combination of international pressure on the South African Government and a firm stance by the Security Council that it will be possible to achieve Namibia's independence.

Before concluding, I would repeat that the Turkish Government unreservedly supports the efforts to ensure Namibia's independence. To demonstrate its solidarity with Namibia's just cause, Turkey will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions before the Assembly. As a founding member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, my country will continue firmly to support all its efforts to fulfil the responsibilities entrusted to it as the legal Administering Authority in

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Namibia. The Council must continue to do everything possible to maintain the question of Namibia in the foreground of international attention.

A long struggle has been waged and won by the African countries that have rejected subjugation and foreign domination. Namibia is the last vestige of an anachronistic system. We understand very well the reasons why this problem has the highest political priority for the African continent. Turkey has faith in the final victory of the Namibian people's just cause.

Mr. AHMAD (Brunei Darussalam): Once again we are discussing this chronic question of Namibia. I would humbly offer this preface to my statement: We can continue informing and educating ourselves in the General Assembly, realizing that there is always another perspective while widening our own sense of truth and knowing that every voice counts and eventually affects the whole of things.

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, hundreds of millions of persons have achieved self-determination and independence, and their respective countries have joined the world community as independent and sovereign States. That, however, is not the case of Namibia. It has been 20 years since the United Nations, by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. In the same year, the United Nations Council for Namibia was established as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia. That decision by the General Assembly was later sustained by the Security Council, which unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978).\*

In that resolution, the Security Council in effect declared that the General Assembly had acted correctly in terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia was hence blatant defiance of the decision of the General Assembly and was in violation of the principles of

---

\* Mr. Al-Ansi (Oman), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Ahmad, Brunei Darussalam)

the United Nations Charter. It is thus under the obligation to withdraw its presence from Namibia.

The South African régime, in open defiance of the will of the Namibian people and the international community, continues to deny the Namibian people its independence. The question of Namibia therefore remains the most urgent problem of decolonization and is of the gravest concern to the international community. That was reflected at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, held from 17 to 20 September 1986 to consider the question of Namibia.

The United Nations plan therefore provides the only framework for a peaceful settlement to the Namibian question. Sadly, Namibian independence has not come into effect because of South Africa's stubbornness and defiance in regard to complying with its international obligations. Rather, the South African régime has used one pretext after another to delay the implementation of the resolution. It has insisted on linking the Namibian issue with an irrelevant and extraneous issue such as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola; and, instead of showing signs of leaving Namibia, the South African régime is obviously consolidating its presence in that Territory. On 17 June 1985 the South African régime installed in Namibia the so-called interim government, which is viewed internationally as illegal, null and void. The economic and natural resources of Namibia are illegally exploited. There has been a massive South African military build-up in Namibia, which is used as a base for perpetrating acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against front-line States, including Angola, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The world community is united in calling for the independence of Namibia, as is evident from the results of the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia; the Eighth Summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare in September 1986; and the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July 1986. In their Declaration, the Heads of State or

(Mr. Ahmad, Brunei Darussalam)

Government of the Non-Aligned Movement reaffirmed that the United Nations plan constituted the only basis for resolving the Namibian question. They also reaffirmed the direct responsibility of the United Nations to bring immediate independence to Namibia.

A number of countries and non-governmental organizations have adopted voluntary measures, such as the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, against South Africa to isolate the Government of South Africa in the political, economic, military and cultural fields. My delegation welcomes such measures, especially those described as having been taken by Member States in the report of the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia (A/41/614) of 20 September 1986, and believes that more collective and well-co-ordinated international action in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions should be taken in order to ensure an early and durable solution to the problem of Namibia.

My delegation endorses the full implementation, without any pre-conditions, of the United Nations plan for Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), of 30 January 1976, and 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978.

My delegation is encouraged by the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and congratulates it on its unceasing efforts in the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to it under the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Brunei Darussalam joins the international community in demanding that Namibian independence be achieved in accordance with the wishes of the Namibian people. We reaffirm that the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

The Namibian people have for long been denied their inalienable right to self-determination, independence and freedom. For this reason, we urge the international community to commit itself again to immediate action to achieve the objective of independence for Namibia.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Concern over Namibia's fate was amply demonstrated throughout the recently concluded fourteenth special session. With very few exceptions, we agreed that there are no valid grounds for delaying the Territory's independence or prolonging the suffering of its people.

Twenty years of continuing efforts by the Organization to bring about the liberation of Namibia do not seem to have been enough, even though those efforts have the substantial support of an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, a recurring majority in the General Assembly and compelling resolutions of the Security Council.

The obstruction of this process since 1978, when the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was enclosed, has produced a confrontation between the will of the majority of the international community and the selfish stubbornness of the racist régime of South Africa. As regards international order and security, the stagnation of the Namibian situation can lead only to a radicalization of the process and greater risks to peace.

Venezuela condemns the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, including its marine resources, as contrary to international law and, in particular, a violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Thanks to the persistent efforts of the Council, with the help of non-governmental organizations, international public opinion has gradually been mobilized in support of protection of the natural resources of the Territory. We note with interest and optimism the positive reaction in some countries to the declaration that such exploitation is illegal, a response that has resulted in executive, legislative and judicial measures designed to protect the legitimate interests of Namibia.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

In this context, I wish to draw attention to a provision of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 3281 (XXIX), of 12 December 1974, whose principles and purposes Venezuela particularly encloses. Article 16 provides that

"States which practise such coercive policies are economically responsible to the countries, territories and peoples affected for the restitution and full compensation for the exploitation and depletion of, and damages to, the natural and other resources of those countries, territories and peoples."

The next paragraph of the same article provides that:

"No State has the right to promote or encourage investments that may constitute an obstacle to the liberation of a territory occupied by force."

Those measures are important, but they cannot on their own do what is needed. The main task, Namibia's liberation, has yet to be accomplished. The implementation of resolution 1514 (XV), and in this case Security Council resolution 435 (1978), continues to depend on matters that are not directly connected with the question. The policy of so-called linkage is an obstacle to compliance with the will of the majority.

In the same context, there is no longer any valid excuse for continuing to block the enforcement measures whose use is provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter against States, such as South Africa, that do not respect the Organization's authority and endanger international peace and security. The application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions is possible from the legal point of view, is dictated by our conscience from the moral point of view and should be the will of all from the political point of view.

If the illegality of the occupation of the Territory of Namibia and the suffering of its people under the odious apartheid régime are not sufficient justification, how monstrous would a crime need to be to cause us to use the

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

means available to us to combat arbitrariness, injustice and failure to respect the international legal order.

I wish to express our appreciation of and support for the constant efforts of the Secretary-General to ensure the implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia, and especially everything relating to the plan for its independence under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

I do not wish to end without reaffirming Venezuela's solidarity with the people of Namibia in their noble cause and with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative, as stated in resolution 3111 (XXVIII). Our commitment will continue until the people of Namibia exercise their right to self-determination and attain independence and become a sovereign State, without infringement of their unity or territorial integrity.

Mr. NOORANI (Pakistan): The United Nations has lived with the Namibian question for more than four decades, covering the entire span of this Organization's life, and as yet the proverbial light at the end of the tunnel is not visible. The Namibian question has been debated during this long span of time not only during numerous General Assembly sessions but also at two special sessions, the latest of which immediately preceded the forty-first session of the General Assembly, being convened in New York from 19 to 21 September 1986.

Despite all the learned debates and innumerable resolutions calling for the exercise of the right of self-determination by the people of Namibia, the dark cloud of colonialism has not lifted from that suffering country, which remains poised to assume its rightful place among the ranks of the sovereign and independent countries Members of the United Nations.

As if this denial of their fundamental right to independence and sovereignty were not enough, the people of Namibia continue to suffer the pain and misery of brutal repression at the hands of a racist régime which remains impervious to the international community's insistent calls to end forthwith its illegal occupation of Namibia.

The fourteenth special session, on the question of Namibia, held in September this year, made important recommendations which, if implemented, could lead to a peaceful political settlement of the Namibian question. The special session also reiterated the call for the full implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence and for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

There is unfortunately no hopeful sign of any change in Pretoria's intransigent attitude. On the contrary, the activities of its special task force wreaking death and destruction on the Namibian people and its military deployment in Namibia, designed to terrorize not only the people of Namibia but also the



(Mr. Noorani, Pakistan)

entire region, are clear proof of Pretoria's determination to maintain its colonial stranglehold on Namibia in order to continue the plunder of its rich natural resources and the policy of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring front-line African States.

It is obvious that the Pretoria régime is not prepared to heed the call of the international community to implement the proposals to which it had itself agreed. The international community must now arrive at the natural conclusion that efforts to draw Pretoria into a meaningful dialogue should be abandoned in favour of an effective programme of action designed to secure the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by obliging South Africa to relinquish its illegal occupation of Namibia.

The successful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) depends upon the co-operation of the Pretoria régime. Although, according to the Secretary-General, the problem of Namibia is ripe for solution, it is now obvious that such a solution cannot be obtained merely by addressing appeals to the good sense of the Pretoria régime and calling upon it to abide by its commitment to implement without delay the United Nations plan. It is clearly time for the international community to evolve a programme which would ensure immediate compliance by the South African régime with the verdict of the international community.

In our statement at the fourteenth special session this September, we called for a deadline to be set for the full and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Noorani, Pakistan)

One of the major obstacles in the way of ending South Africa's colonial and tyrannical stranglehold on Namibia has been the attitude of some permanent members of the Security Council which, by vetoing proposals to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, have encouraged that régime to continue its inhuman policies and imperial designs. It is time that those countries accepted their full responsibility in this regard and offered now to co-operate in the efforts of the Security Council to take appropriate action against South Africa.

On the basis of such a co-operative effort, a programme of action for securing the full and immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia could be developed. Such a programme must contain the following principal elements: first, reaffirmation of the United Nations plan in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only acceptable basis for Namibia's independence; second, reiteration that Namibia's independence is a question of decolonization which cannot be linked with any aspect of East-West confrontation; third, the imposition of comprehensive sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and the taking of all steps necessary to isolate South Africa politically and economically; fourth, a commitment, particularly by the five Western States responsible for the elaboration of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, to exert firm pressure on Pretoria to oblige it to change its policies; fifth, a pledge to extend all possible assistance to enable the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to carry out its struggle against the illegal occupation of South Africa; sixth, agreement to extend maximum support to the front-line States directly as well as through the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference to mitigate the adverse consequences of South Africa's actions against these countries; and seventh, the setting of a deadline for Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Noorani, Pakistan)

The people of Pakistan await the dawn of independence for the freedom-loving people of Namibia as an inevitable historical event bearing a very special significance. We in Pakistan recall that we too were engaged in a similar struggle for independence 40 years ago. We recall with a measure of pride that when Pakistan was at the very threshold of its own independence the Muslim League, under the leadership of Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of our country, adopted a resolution endorsing the struggle of the people of South Africa for liberty and equality. Pakistan remains as determined as ever that the process of self-determination by which it achieved its own independence must not be denied to the heroic people of Namibia, who have struggled long and hard to eliminate colonialism and apartheid and to grasp the gift of freedom which is now within their reach.

The light at the end of the long tunnel of colonial darkness may not be clearly visible just yet, but the uplifting moment of its appearance is not far away. The freedom struggle in Namibia has covered a long distance towards its cherished goal under the proved and tested leadership of SWAPO. The South West Africa People's Organization has been effectively led and guided during a difficult period by Mr. Sam Nujoma. We acknowledge his historic contribution not only to the cause of independence in Namibia but to the very idea of freedom and liberty throughout the world of people seeking to overthrow colonialism and foreign domination.

Let this General Assembly pledge unflinching support to SWAPO and its leadership and resolve to travel with the valiant people of Namibia the last mile to their freedom.

Mr. HENAR (Suriname): The task of decolonization is well advanced, but still not complete. One of the most urgent remaining problems is certainly that of Namibia.

(Mr. Henar, Suriname)

A quarter of a century ago the United Nations adopted the Declaration on decolonization and approximately 20 years ago the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed responsibility for the Territory. The current session of the General Assembly marks the forty-first year that this issue has been on the international agenda. Nevertheless the stalemate over Namibia's independence remains even after the historic plan for Namibia's independence had already emerged in 1978 and was endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This plan provides for a peaceful transition to majority rule through full and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

My delegation notes with disgust and dismay the continued occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime and its exploitation of human and natural resources, in contravention of Decree No. 1 enacted by the Council for Namibia. That the independence of Namibia is still held hostage by the racist régime in Pretoria is due to the intransigence of the expansionist régime of South Africa. The international community is continually frustrated and angered by the obstinate and violent attitude of the Pretoria régime.

Preceding speakers have condemned outright South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States. My delegation fully endorses this position. In defiance of the United Nations, South Africa has in effect annexed the Territory and imposed apartheid policies on it, while indeed treating it as yet another bantustan. In the meantime, the international community is still witnessing the relentless plunder of Namibia's uranium, diamonds and fish.

The application by South Africa of racist policies in southern Africa is not just a case of the violence of a minority against a majority but amounts to utter contempt and lack of respect for the people living under this system and, not least, a clear expression of the economic exploitation of blacks in Namibia and

(Mr. Henar, Suriname)

South Africa. South Africa's condition, namely the withdrawal of Cuban troops from neighbouring Angola, for permitting the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is merely a pretext for not complying with that resolution. It must be viewed in the context of the delaying tactics employed by the South African Government to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and the imposition of a neo-colonial settlement on its people. In this course South Africa has been encouraged, unfortunately, by the policy of constructive engagement and the assertion that the withdrawal of Cuban forces is a legitimate quid pro quo for the Pretoria régime's retirement from Namibia. However, as long as the Angolan Government faces a serious military challenge from other forces which have derived military support from South Africa, the withdrawal of Cuban troops seems unlikely.

South Africa has made it abundantly clear that while international negotiations continue in search of a way out of this deadlock it will continue to engineer its own solution to the Namibian problem. South Africa's solution has been to devolve some power to a coalition Government which excludes the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

I should like to reaffirm that my delegation rejects any linkage policy, which it considers to be yet another excuse to block the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia. We reiterate our conviction that the only fair and just settlement of the Namibian question is one that falls within the framework of the United Nations settlement plan.

It is our opinion that the time has come to replace complaints and lamentations by action in accordance with the Charter and the numerous resolutions on Namibia, in order finally to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by this despicable régime and by so doing restore to some extent the credibility of

(Mr. Henar, Suriname)

the international Organization. The time for warnings and preventive measures has long passed. It is now time for concrete measures to be taken without further delay.

The faith placed by the people of Namibia for all these years in the United Nations must not be betrayed. The people of Namibia should be given the opportunity to exercise the right to self-determination. We have heard many times of late that sanctions must not be imposed on South Africa because they will hurt the victims of South Africa. The victims themselves say, yes, it may be true that the sanctions will hurt, but apartheid kills.

(Mr. Henar, Suriname)

Let us not be under the illusion that the mere convening of conferences will deliver the goods. Together we must find a way out to redeem the pledges we made approximately 20 years ago. By imposing economic sanctions we would send a clear message to Pretoria that we are committed by deed as well as word to free Namibia and eliminate apartheid.

The Government of the Republic of Suriname remains deeply committed to the just struggle of the Namibian people. We condemn the activities of foreign economic interests which impede the application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to Namibia. My Government fully endorses the Declaration and Programme of Action of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, adopted at its 9th meeting on 11 July 1986, as well as the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its fourteenth special session devoted to the question of Namibia.

The Council for Namibia has done commendable work in enhancing public awareness, for which we pay tribute to it.

My delegation reaffirms its support for the heroic people of Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization, which is the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and to the African National Congress in their valiant struggle to bring freedom, justice and independence to their people and eradicate apartheid.

The people of Namibia have suffered long enough and time is running out for South Africa. My Government therefore anxiously looks forward to the day - which is not too distant - when Namibia will take its rightful place among the family of nations.

Mr. KOZKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The question of the immediate granting of independence to Namibia - of liberating it from colonial occupation by the racist régime of South Africa - is one of the central and urgent tasks of the United Nations in the course of the struggle for the speedy, full and final eradication of the vestiges of colonialism and racism from the planet.

Two decades have already passed since the United Nations decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia and to assume responsibility for the protection of the rights and interests of the Namibian people until such time as it had achieved genuine self-government and national independence.

Since then the international community, and in particular the United Nations, has made great efforts to end the colonial domination of the racist régime of Pretoria in Namibia and to protect the legitimate interests of the Namibian people and to realize their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The many relevant decisions of the United Nations, and above all of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as those of many other authoritative international forums have repeatedly and quite clearly made assessments of principle of the situation in and around Namibia and outlined a real political basis for a just solution to the Namibian question and Namibia's transition to independence.

At the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held only last year, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, and the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia, in whose work my delegation participated, it was again strongly emphasized that the presence of South Africa's administration and armed forces on the territory of Namibia violated generally-recognized norms of international law and the United Nations Charter, and should be unconditionally terminated. The



(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a clear challenge to United Nations decisions. The question of Namibia is one of decolonization, and any attempt to make out that it is something else is clearly aimed at blocking the search for a solution to this problem.

The national liberation struggle waged by the Namibian people using all means available to them, including armed struggle, is just and legitimate; it therefore deserves the wholehearted support of the United Nations, which bears special responsibility for the speedy achievement of Namibia's independence.

The misanthropic policy and application of the apartheid régime to the indigenous population of South Africa and Namibia and the increasing aggressiveness of the Pretoria racists against neighbouring sovereign States are the main sources of the explosive tension in that region and a serious threat to international peace and security that extends well beyond the limits of southern Africa.

The aforementioned representative forums of the United Nations system and the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-aligned Countries in Harare once again made it quite clear that the international community will not tolerate the illegal occupation of Namibia, expressed their indignation at the continuing violence perpetrated by aliens against the Namibian people, and stated that they are fully determined to achieve the unconditional granting of independence to the Namibian people.

It was stressed once again that real ways and means for a political settlement of the Namibian problem exist. The internationally-recognized basis for achieving the independence of Namibia is embodied in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and in other relevant United Nations decisions. The main task now

(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

is for all States of the world to exert constant, persistent and steadily-increasing pressure on both the Pretoria régime and its protectors to ensure that they implement those decisions fully. The urgent need for the immediate adoption of more effective measures to ensure the implementation of these decisions is explained by the extremist racist Pretoria régime's continuing cynical disregard of the clearly expressed will of the international community.

As is well known, the colonizers of South Africa are not simply stubbornly clinging to their desire to maintain their illegal presence in Namibia; they are also making feverish efforts to perpetuate the enslavement of its people. To that end, the racist Pretoria régime has been increasing its mass terror and violence against the indigenous African population and accelerating the build-up of its military potential of its occupation forces by recruiting foreign mercenaries, forcibly conscripting Namibians, and engaging in cunning manipulation by creating the so-called system of self-government in the occupied Territory.

South Africa's practice of using Namibian territory as a bridgehead for endless acts of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, particularly Angola, is particularly dangerous. It is indisputable that the South African apartheid régime could not behave so provocatively if it did not enjoy direct and indirect economic, military, political and other types of support from certain Western States, chiefly the United States and Israel.

(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

The convergence and intertwined nature of the economic, political and strategic interests of certain Western Powers and the racist régime of Pretoria and their complicity are among the main reasons for the continuing tragedy of the Namibian people. My delegation fully supports the decisions of the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence to Namibia and the fourteenth special session of the United Nations, on the question of Namibia.

We strongly condemn the policy of constructive engagement with the régime of Pretoria and of so-called linkages, which in fact encourage the racists to engage in violence and terrorism against the African population of South Africa and Namibia and to escalate acts of aggression against the front-line States, as well as to display intransigence on the question of the independence of Namibia and to sabotage the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, unswervingly following its policy of principle aimed at the total eradication, once and for all, of colonialism and racism in all its forms and manifestations, firmly and consistently supports the immediate and unconditional implementation of the Namibian people's inalienable right to self-determination and national independence in a united and territorially integral Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We are in favour of the immediate and complete withdrawal from the territory of all South Africa's troops and of its administration, and support the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

My delegation has been and remains on the side of the peoples of the front-line African States in their efforts to defend their national independence and territorial integrity against the aggressive encroachments of the South African

(Mr. Kozko, Byelorussian SSR)

colonizers. We fully support the firm demands of the international community for an unconditional and immediate halt to the criminal policy of State terrorism and violence pursued by the racist régime of South Africa.

The United Nations, and above all the Security Council, bears direct responsibility for ensuring the implementation of its decisions on Namibia and finding a just solution of the Namibian problem in the very near future. In this connection we support the steadily growing demands of the international community for the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African régime under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. It is high time that the Security Council should assume fully its principal responsibility of exercising effective and constant control over Namibia's achievement of genuine independence.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expresses the hope that the the United Nations General Assembly will adopt a decision on this item now under discussion likely to further mobilize the efforts of the international community to free Namibia and eliminate colonialism and racism from southern Africa once and for all.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): This is the fourth time in six months that the question of Namibia has been the subject of prestigious international meetings of States Members of the United Nations. The World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa held in Paris, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia held in Vienna, the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, and this present debate are all landmarks - this being the most recent - reflecting the wholehearted support of the overwhelming majority of nations for the independence of the people of Namibia by peaceful means as soon as possible. Mention should also be made in this respect of the twenty-second session of the Heads of State and

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Eighth Summit Conference of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare and the declarations of the Advisory Political Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty in 1985 and 1986.

Twenty years have passed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory. The inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence was thereby accorded international recognition.

The many resolutions - nearly 30 in the Security Council, more than 20 in the General Assembly and more than 10 resolutions, declarations and communiqués of the Organization of African Unity and the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement - adopted over the past 20 years on the question of Namibia eloquently illustrate the international community's general, unswerving and growing solidarity with the just struggle of the Namibian people for their freedom and national independence. The creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1967, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1971 and Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) have all established realistic plans, a legal basis and the organizational structure for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia.

The Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, thus committing an act of aggression against the Namibian people. It has nothing but scorn for all the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, and thereby displays unprecedented arrogance. The racist régime of South Africa has imposed on the Territory of Namibia the shameful régime of apartheid, which the international community has long condemned. Its police units and its army of over 100,000 are engaging in genocide and the

EH/td

A/41/PV.70  
69-70

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

widespread repression of the Namibian people. In flagrant violation of the provisions of Decree No.1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, approved by a General Assembly resolution, the Pretoria régime constantly plunders and lays waste the natural and human resources of the country in collaboration with the transnational corporations of the West. It uses the Territory of Namibia to commit untold acts of aggression and destabilization against the front-line countries, and above all against the People's Republic of Angola.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

By engaging in all kinds of manoeuvres against the United Nations Programme of Action, it is trying by means of palliative measures to impose its own internal solution. A recent example of this was its decision to establish what it called an interim Government by means of a so-called multipartite conference, the purpose of which was to divert attention and resist the pressure from the international community.

This state of affairs is due not only to Pretoria's refusal to give up a colony to be exploited. The absence of progress on the question of the granting of independence to Namibia is a result largely of the discredited United States policy of constructive engagement. That policy has been repeatedly condemned in General Assembly resolutions and in resolutions of other prestigious international bodies. The primary obstacle to the independence of Namibia is the political and economic support and increasing assistance that some Western countries are giving to racist South Africa. On the pretext that there is a link and a parallel between the independence of Namibia and the presence of Cuban forces in the People's Republic of Angola, South Africa and the United States are trying to delay and eventually defeat attempts to decolonize the Territory.

It is a well-known fact that in numerous resolutions, including resolution S-14/1 of the special session on Namibia, the General Assembly has rejected all these attempts, stating that they "encourage the racist régime of South Africa to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia". In this regard, I might also quote from Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which states that the Council rejects

"South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978)".

We should not overlook the attempts to deny the true nature of the problem of Namibia by portraying it as part of the world-wide antagonism between East and West. In the Programme of Action of the International Conference for the Immediate

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Independence of Namibia it is quite rightly noted that efforts to portray the problem in such a way are aimed at:

"diverting attention from the central issue of the decolonization of Namibia, to the detriment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence". (A/CONF.138/11, para. 168)

The question of Namibia is a question of decolonization and of the abolition of apartheid. Consequently there are only two parties to the conflict: the Namibian people fighting for independence and the South African occupation régime. The question of which side various States take is another matter.

In the context of the present international balance of power and in a particularly difficult situation, the Namibian people are pursuing within their country a heroic struggle under the leadership of their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO, for national liberation against the South African occupation régime. They have a right to fight for their independence by every means, including armed struggle. Standing by their side are all peoples attached to the ideals of the United Nations. I should stress here that the Bulgarian people, who fought for many years for their national independence, stand by the just and heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, and we shall continue to give them our full support.

The elimination of colonial domination and apartheid is not the only dimension of the question of Namibia, although it is the primary issue. The racist Pretoria régime is constantly engaging in military incursions from that Territory against the front-line countries and primarily against the People's Republic of Angola. Moreover, that régime finances and supports counterrevolutionary armed bands in neighbouring countries. Its purpose is politically and economically to destabilize those countries, to overthrow their legitimate Governments and subordinate them to



(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

imperialist and neo-colonialist interests. The People's Republic of Bulgaria strongly condemns the racist régime of Pretoria for these crimes. We believe that solidarity with and full support for the front-line countries are of paramount importance for the achievement of a just and lasting solution of the problem of Namibia.

Recent developments in southern Africa show unequivocally that the conflict in and around Namibia is reaching a critical stage. Regional and international peace and security are endangered. The Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia states:

"The Conference, considering that the fast deteriorating situation created by the racist régime of South Africa poses a grave danger to peace and security in the region and a growing and direct threat to international peace and security, calls for an immediate, effective and comprehensive response by the international community." (ibid)

The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty see in the situation in southern Africa one of the most dangerous sources of tension in the world today. That is why a settlement of this conflict would also make a concrete contribution to the achievement of a world-wide system of international security as proposed by the socialist countries.

The five international forums already mentioned reached similar conclusions. They formulated a series of proposals for immediate and decisive action to promote the granting of independence to Namibia, with the preservation of its territorial integrity. They insist that the Security Council exercise its mandate regarding implementation of its resolutions on the question of Namibia and act firmly against any illegal manoeuvres or delaying tactics by the South African régime in Namibia, by adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Nations Charter. They also call for the adoption by the Security Council of immediate measures, without conditions, for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and they call on all those countries that have not yet done so to sever relations with the racist régime and thus to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally. The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully approves of the implementation of these measures and will do its utmost to apply them.

It is our duty to recall here the historic role that the Security Council should play in the settlement of the question of Namibia. We have no doubt that the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will achieve their national independence. The overwhelming majority of Member States, the people of the world, justice, humanity and, last but not least, the prestige of the United Nations require that the long suffering of the Namibian people under the colonial yoke after 40 years under apartheid, which is a disgrace to the twentieth century, be brought to an end once and for all.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): The fact that in 1986 their rightful independence still eludes the people of Namibia is a disappointing commentary both on the ability of this Organization to enforce its decisions and on the intransigence of South Africa.

My delegation has already had the opportunity - at the Vienna Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, last July, and at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, in September - to set out its views on the subject of Namibia. Australia, however, feels a particular responsibility to the people of Namibia because of its membership of the United Nations Council for Namibia and for this reason has sought this opportunity to review briefly its attitude on the Namibian question.

The history of Namibia's century of colonial occupation has been characterized by the resistance of its people to foreign rule, firstly against the European colonizers and subsequently against the South Africans.

The Pretoria Government has remained in occupation of Namibia notwithstanding the clearest possible signs from the international community of the unacceptability of its continued presence. It has remained there also notwithstanding its own acknowledgement, at least in principle, of Namibia's right to independence and its qualified acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

That resolution is the key to Australia's approach. We support and pay a tribute to the Secretary-General's efforts in support of its implementation. It must be made effective without further delay or prevarication. Australia rejects any attempt to link Namibia's independence to separate and extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Australia considers that resolution 435 (1978) contains all the necessary elements for bringing Namibia to early

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

independence. Not only is there no need to go beyond resolution 435 (1978), but any such ideas run the grave risk of derailing the whole United Nations plan.

The insistence on linkage is not, of course, the only remaining obstacle to Namibia's independence. South Africa's continued support for the so-called interim administration in Windhoek and its aggression against neighbouring States are other negative factors. My delegation, however, feels sure that if the concept of linkage were to be abandoned it would then become possible to implement the United Nations plan and to end the suffering of the Namibian people.

Australia is not a party principal to the Namibian problem but we shall continue to do all in our limited power to bring about an early and satisfactory settlement. We have maintained our active and responsible participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia's work for the Namibian cause and people. We shall continue our voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. We shall maintain our willingness to provide an engineering contingent to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), to be established when resolution 435 (1978) is implemented.

It is, however, clear that national efforts are insufficient to force South Africa to withdraw from the Territory. It will not do so of its own volition and it has become increasingly necessary to apply sustained international pressure on Pretoria to that end. This year's International Conference in Vienna and the special session of the General Assembly in New York played such a role. Because of some of the language in the resolutions, the clear message which those meetings should have sent to Pretoria was diluted by some lack of unity among participants.

This debate should refocus the attention of all Members of this Organization on the need to establish a broader measure of agreement in order to give the Namibian cause the sustained support it deserves.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

Finally, if such international pressure on South Africa remains ineffective and Pretoria continues to defy and obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), it is our view that the Security Council should meet to consider the adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. While Australia remains a member of the Security Council, we shall continue to support such action in the Council.

Mr. KADHEM (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is once again considering item 36 of its agenda, on the question of Namibia. This question has become one of the most important and serious issues faced by the United Nations in the field of decolonization. In considering this question, which is fundamentally related to international peace and security and to the right of the people of the Territory of Namibia to self-determination, we must take a little time to recall the firm positions of principle that were clearly expressed during the special session in mid-September, when the General Assembly considered this question. We must then proceed to emphasize, beyond any doubt the relationship between the question of apartheid and racial discrimination and South Africa's expansionist occupation of Namibia, on the one hand, and the accompanying practices of displacement and oppression of the people of South Africa and the Territory of Namibia on the other. If this points to anything, it is to the fact that the situation in southern Africa has become more and more explosive and threatens to have grave repercussions not only for the future of Namibia but for southern Africa as a whole.

The continuance of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa, despite the fact that 20 years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted its resolution ending South Africa's Mandate over that Territory and transferring direct responsibility for the Territory to the United

(Mr. Kadhem, United Arab Emirates)

Nations, is an open challenge to the will of the international community and the purposes and principles of the Charter. First and foremost, it is a continuing aggression against the people of Namibia.

The international community has condemned the continuance of the occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the Pretoria régime and the usurpation of its resources, in collaboration with other foreign economic interests. The Namibian people has suffered and continues to suffer and make sacrifices for its freedom. It is therefore the duty of the international community to take decisive measures of all kinds to guarantee the freedom and independence of the Namibian people.

We reject the linking of Namibia's independence to any conditions extraneous to the issue of the right of the Namibian people to independence.

The obduracy of the South African régime and its continuing refusal to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and comply with General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), of December 1974, as well as to implement the resolutions adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity and other international bodies, are the result of the military and political support that the Government of South Africa obtains from some Western industrialized States which continue to have various economic interests in the country.

(Mr. Kadhem, United Arab Emirates)

My delegation is still convinced that the Government of the racist régime would not have rebelled against the international will had the international community forced that régime to renounce its colonialist policy. We believe that the only effective solution to the problem is to impose mandatory sanctions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

We appeal to those States which continue to hesitate to impose sanctions to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations so as to enable the international community to impose its will to free that Territory from the grip of racist colonialism and to enable the people of Namibia to determine its own future.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): It is certainly with regret and indignation that the international community is called upon once again to consider the pressing problem of Namibia. This painful problem should have been resolved in a peaceful and lasting way long ago, but we are obliged to note that obstacles will have to be overcome before we can witness the accession of this Territory and its martyr people to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence.

It is comforting to note that mobilization of international opinion in favour of the abolition of apartheid, a criminal policy pursued by the illegal racist régime of Pretoria in South Africa, which has been guilty of the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia for two decades, is now fully under way. During the debate on apartheid which concluded three days ago and in which my delegation participated, this Assembly was able to see that there is still massive support by the international community for the noble cause of the struggle of national liberation being waged at this time by the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia. We have been able to see clearly who persisted, against wind and tide, in taking up the cause of those responsible for this evil. It is truly regrettable

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

and sad that the international community stands powerless in face of the tragedy afflicting southern Africa where independent States are the victims of acts of aggression and political and economic destabilization committed by the racist Pretoria régime.

The year 1986 is of particular significance for the oppressed and subjugated Namibian people for, apart from the fact that it has been designated by the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the year of general mobilization and decisive action for final victory, it is also the twenty-sixth anniversary of the foundation of that Organization, the Namibian people's sole and genuine representative. This year also marks the twentieth anniversary of SWAPO's launching of its armed struggle and also the twentieth anniversary of the termination by the General Assembly of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, a Territory which has been placed since then under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. It is useful to recall that this exclusive responsibility of the United Nations was confirmed by the International Court of Justice 15 years ago. Showing total contempt for the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), regarding measures for the independence of Namibia, the illegal racist Pretoria régime has refused, and continues to refuse, to put an end to its illegal occupation of this international Territory.

The international community has long identified the major obstacles to the abolition of apartheid and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It lies partly in the obstinate refusal of the racist and colonialist Pretoria régime to comply with the injunctions of the United Nations contained in the relevant resolutions and, on the other hand, in the immoral and illegal collusion with Pretoria of which certain Western countries are guilty, including the Power which practises towards it a policy of so-called constructive engagement.



(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

It is no secret in fact that certain Western and other countries, including Israel, as I said in this forum last week during the debate on apartheid, maintain diplomatic, political, economic, military, nuclear and other links with South Africa. It goes without saying that those immoral and illegal links contribute actively to strengthening the war machine and police apparatus which Pretoria uses savagely to repress the black majority populations of South Africa and Namibia, and to attack and destabilize, politically and economically the front-line countries and other independent African countries.

Another major obstacle to Namibia's immediate accession to independence is the linkage - which Pretoria and its powerful protector obstinately defend - of the independence of Namibia to an irrelevant and extraneous element, that is, the withdrawal of the internationalist Cuban forces from Angola. Needless to say, the international community, particularly the General Assembly and the Security Council, have more than once rejected and strongly condemned this fraudulent manoeuvre aimed at delaying or postponing indefinitely the effective enjoyment by the oppressed Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determination, to independence and freedom in accordance with the spirit and letter of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We join in the international condemnation of another irregular action by Pretoria, namely, the establishment by South Africa in Windhoek in June last year of a puppet government, an action which the Security Council itself, in a meeting on 19 June of the same year, condemned and rejected as illegal, null and void. It is widely known that Pretoria to date has trampled underfoot all the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and has turned a deaf ear to the countless declarations and appeals from the forums of the Non-Aligned Movement, the

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

Organization of African Unity (OAU) and other international movements and organizations. The overwhelming majority of the members of the international community have been and continue to be unambiguously in favour of imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter against the illegal racist Pretoria régime, since it stubbornly refuses to abolish apartheid and to implement scrupulously the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) which is the universally accepted framework for a peaceful and lasting solution to this problem.

Unfortunately, we are obliged to note that two permanent members of the Security Council have so far, by their veto, prevented that United Nations organ from taking decisive and effective measures against Pretoria in order to force it to comply with the will of the international community.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

It is interesting to recall that on 15 November 1985, those two Western Powers permanent members of the Security Council blocked the adoption of a draft resolution that merely proposed selective mandatory sanctions against Pretoria. The facts are clear. It is not surprising, therefore, that Pretoria continues shamelessly to defy international public opinion as long as it can count on the blessing and immoral collusion of its protectors, arms suppliers and trading partners.

We do not agree at all with those that claim that mandatory sanctions would be useless because they would affect the legitimate interests of the black people of South Africa and Namibia and the peoples of neighbouring independent African countries. That is the neo-colonialist, imperialist argument adduced by those countries in an attempt to justify their systematic plunder of the human and natural resources of the Territory; it is an argument that the international community has constantly condemned.

Moreover, we reject and condemn all attempts to consider the Namibian problem in the context of the East-West confrontation rather than as purely a problem of decolonization the solution of which should be found in the context of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic pays a tribute to the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and other competent international organs to bring about the immediate independence of this international Territory, in conformity with the United Nations plan under Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

My Government endorses the appeals, final declarations and programmes of action adopted by many international conferences, including the United Nations

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, the eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, held last September in Harare, and the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to this question. It is highly desirable that the Powers protecting Pretoria, particularly those possessing the right of veto in the Security Council, should heed mankind's heartfelt call for wisdom, justice and reason and the voice of their own citizens.

The Government and people of the Lao People's Democratic Republic reaffirm yet again their solidarity with and unshakeable support for the oppressed people of Namibia, which, under the firm and enlightened leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole legitimate representative, is struggling bravely for genuine independence in a united Namibia, in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is our hope that the work of this session will contribute to bringing a glimmer of hope to all those throughout the world who are fighting tirelessly for the triumph of this noble cause.

Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): Consideration of the question of Namibia at the forty-first session of the General Assembly rounds off a series of important international meetings which throughout this year have kept the critical situation in the region of southern Africa as a whole under constant high-level review. In the past six months alone, the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa was held in Paris in June, followed by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July, and by the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, held in New York in September. Moreover, in the deliberations at the twenty-second summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held in Addis Ababa in July, and at the eighth summit of non-aligned countries, held in Harare in September, the questions of Namibia and of apartheid rightly occupied centre stage.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

At those meetings all delegations without exception stressed that it was totally unacceptable to the international community that, 20 years after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and eight years after the adoption by the Security Council of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the racist régime in South Africa should persist in its illegal occupation of Namibia. Indeed, it persists in the brutalization, terrorization and imprisonment of innocent Namibians; it persists in perpetuating in Namibia the obnoxious system of apartheid, a system declared by the United Nations to be a crime against humanity; it persists in its incessant resort to brute force to sustain the repressive structure of its illegal occupation, for which it deploys some 100,000 troops throughout the Territory.

Apart from its attempts to maintain and indeed intensify its stranglehold on Namibia, South Africa, with the connivance of foreign economic interests, has stepped up its plunder of the country's mineral, maritime and human resources, in violation of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia and relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. At the same time, the racist régime has not ceased its vain attempts to discredit and destroy the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic liberation movement of Namibia. Nor has it ceased using Namibia as a military launching-pad for its aggression and subversion against the front-line African States.

I need hardly go into further detail on South Africa's blatant violations of every norm of international law and every tenet of civilized behaviour, as they have been fully documented by the Council for Namibia and other competent organs of the United Nations. Suffice it to say that it should be abundantly clear to all by now that the Pretoria régime has no intention whatsoever of co-operating in good faith with the United Nations in the implementation of the letter and the spirit of the United Nations plan. Therefore, rather than dwell on the abject conditions in

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

Namibia or on the ploys and subterfuges that make up Pretoria's dismal record of colonialism and racism in Namibia, my delegation will confine its remarks to the immediate impasse that has frustrated all efforts to date to achieve Namibia's liberation.

At this juncture, my delegation cannot but express its profound forebodings and its doubts as to whether a peaceful settlement can still be achieved within the framework of the United Nations plan under Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). It was in December 1983 that the Secretary-General was able for the first time to report to the Security Council that all major outstanding issues under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved and that only South Africa's intransigence stood in the way of Namibian independence. None the less, three years later the Secretary-General has had to report again that

"All the conditions for implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia laid down by the Security Council have been met ... Yet, Namibia is still unjustly denied the right of self-determination because of illegal perpetuation of control by South Africa, which continues to insist on the extraneous linkage to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola".

(A/41/1, p. 10)

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

Time and again the Secretary-General has stated that a concerted effort needs to be made to gain the co-operation of South Africa in the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan. The fact of the matter is that the Secretary-General's unceasing and laudable efforts to make progress on the implementation of the United Nations plan have been consistently undercut and thwarted by the untenable opposition of certain permanent members of the Security Council to provide him with the necessary leverage to overcome South Africa's intransigence.

The vetoes cast in the Security Council last November by two of its permanent members effectively emasculated the thrust of its own unanimously adopted resolution 566 (1985), of June that year, in which South Africa was warned that failure to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of the United Nations plan would compel the Council to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII. Furthermore, on 18 June of this year vetoes by those same permanent members of the Security Council were again invoked to defeat a draft resolution that would have imposed limited sanctions against South Africa in response to its incessant acts of aggression against and continuing occupation of the sovereign territory of Angola.

The unconscionable abuse or threat of veto power, the insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the resolution of extraneous issues and the by now wholly discredited constructive engagement policy have become the major obstacles in the path of the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan. This is particularly deplorable at a time when the racist régime is confronted with an unprecedented level of resistance in South Africa, an intensification of the struggle in Namibia, as well as mounting international political and economic pressure, especially in the Western countries. For such misguided policies of

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

appeasement and obfuscation only send the wrong kind of signals to Pretoria and only serve to bolster it in its intransigence. The inescapable conclusion is that the purpose of such obstructionist tactics is to hold Namibia's independence hostage to issues totally irrelevant to what is essentially a question of decolonization and to recast it into an East-West context.

In attempting to cloak their true intentions, Pretoria's apologists have put forward a host of self-serving arguments against the imposition of sanctions. First, it is being claimed that sanctions hurt the oppressed black people of southern Africa most. In light of the tremendous suffering that they have had to endure for so long and the repeated affirmations by the black leaders themselves that they are prepared to shoulder additional burdens and deprivations, such an argument is not only fallacious but also unacceptably patronizing. Secondly, the claim that sanctions are rarely effective further exposes the hollowness of this contention. For sanctions have been advocated and unilaterally applied in other cases in the recent past by those who oppose them against South Africa, even when the international community was nowhere near the unanimity that exists on the question of South Africa. Thirdly, it is also being suggested that we should move cautiously and with restraint, lest sanctions exacerbate the situation further. That pusillanimous approach, however, has already proven to have had the opposite effect of buying more time for Pretoria and further emboldening it to step up its reign of terror in South Africa and Namibia.

Those are some of the incongruities that have defied rational explanation and have raised doubts as to the sincerity of certain States in their oft-repeated affirmations of opposition to and abhorrence of South African policies and practices. It is indeed the height of hypocrisy to hear the principal architects of the United Nations plan now preaching caution and urging encouragement to



(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

Pretoria's cosmetic gestures of reform. At this critical juncture it is imperative for South Africa's powerful friends to reassess their position and to act decisively in concert with the international community to secure the total isolation of the racist régime.

In this regard, it is our hope that the new opportunities created by the momentum of the Paris World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa and the Vienna International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia will further intensify the global campaign to compel the Pretoria régime forthwith to co-operate with the Secretary-General's efforts to achieve the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence.

Indonesia continues to believe, however, that ultimately the only means by which to assure South Africa's co-operation is for the Security Council to use all the means available under the United Nations Charter, specifically the provisions under Chapter VII. This would necessarily include meaningful and effective measures directed towards crippling South Africa's key economic and military sectors, particularly those that impact most directly on Pretoria's ability to continue its undeclared war against the people of Namibia and acts of aggression against its neighbours.

Such action would decisively raise the stakes in the international campaign to force South Africa's compliance with the terms of the United Nations plan. Let us also resolve to take concrete steps to provide greater assistance to the Namibian people's struggle, led by SWAPO, as well as to the front-line African States, to lessen their economic dependence on South Africa and to strengthen their defence capabilities. Without doubt, such a combination of intense pressure from without and from within will prove decisive in assuring Namibia's liberation.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

On its part, my Government wishes to reaffirm Indonesia's unflinching solidarity and commitment to the people of southern Africa in their legitimate quest for equality, justice and independence. Indonesia will not cease in its principled assistance to them as well as to all international efforts towards the immediate independence of Namibia and the eradication of apartheid.

Twenty years ago the United Nations made a solemn pledge before the people of Namibia that cannot and must not go unfulfilled. It is a unique responsibility that obligates all Member States to respond with all necessary means to compel South Africa to fulfil its commitments under the Charter and under the United Nations Plan for Namibian independence.

To this end, it is imperative for the Security Council to confront squarely Pretoria's intransigence with forceful and effective measures. The courageous people of Namibia expect and deserve no less from the international community than its total support for their righteous struggle to regain their inalienable right to freedom and independence in a united Namibia.

Mr. OULD BOYE (Mauritania) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to extend our congratulations once again to the President on his election to guide the work of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. I wish also, in addressing the question of Namibia, to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, and the United Nations Council on Namibia for their valiant efforts to mobilize world public opinion in favour of speeding up the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on the independence of Namibia.

The International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held this year in Vienna, the special session of the General Assembly in September on the same subject, the summit conference of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held in Addis Ababa, and the eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, held in Harare, were landmarks in the mobilization of world public opinion for the purpose of expediting the process to independence of Namibia. They also provided opportunities for the world to prove its support for the people of Namibia in their efforts to achieve full independence.

Mauritania, like all countries that cherish peace and justice, strongly condemns the crimes of racial discrimination perpetrated by the Pretoria régime in southern Africa and Namibia. We associate ourselves with the international community in condemning South Africa for persisting in its occupation of Namibia. We reaffirm the importance of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides for the full independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of the occupying forces from its territory. We reiterate our support for the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in their just struggle for freedom and independence. Finally, my country reaffirms the need to release all political detainees and prisoners and

Mr. Ould Boye, Mauritania)

to respect their personal rights in accordance with article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We are confident that the Namibian people, under their national leadership, with the support of all countries that cherish peace and justice, and with the help of God, will be able eventually to liberate their land and reconstruct their independent State.\*

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Twenty years ago the General Assembly, by its resolution 2149 (XXI), of 1966, terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. That action was taken not only to offer legal clarification of the status of the Territory but also to give expression to the international community's abhorrence of the policies and practices in the territory of the racist Pretoria régime. And yet, after two decades, the independence of Namibia is still far from realization. The United Nations Council for Namibia, which was established in 1967 as the legal Administering Authority for that Territory until independence, has been forced to operate in exile, so to speak. Also, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which embodies the United Nations blueprint for the independence of Namibia, has not been implemented despite its unanimous acceptance by the international community as the most plausible plan for Namibian independence.

In this situation of total frustration on the part of the international community, the racist régime of South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and its repression of the Namibian people and their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), by brutal force. South Africa has also used its occupation of Namibia as a springboard for launching action to subvert and destabilize the neighbouring sovereign States.

---

\* Mr. Henar (Suriname), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

At this juncture, the question we have to ask ourselves is why the Pretoria régime has been able to maintain for all these years its illegal occupation of Namibia and thereby frustrate the efforts of the international community.

The answer to this question is not hard to find. In brief, it is largely due to the strong and unfailing support which the Pretoria régime has received and continues to receive from its collaborators. The specifics of this support in the military, political, economic and cultural fields have been well documented and are well known to each and every one in this Hall and therefore need no elaboration. These countries have also used their veto power to impede the implementation of United Nations resolutions aimed at bringing pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa to dismantle its system of apartheid and thereby facilitate the independence of Namibia.

Thus, while the Territory and its people are illegally kept under the most brutal and unrelenting form of colonialism, South Africa and its friends and allies in the West are busy exploiting the mineral resources of the land in total disregard of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Indeed, such are the activities of the economic interests operating in the Territory that the attainment of independence is seriously in doubt.

The policy of so-called constructive engagement, which has failed as an initiative in southern African politics, and the continued insistence on the linkage factor, by which the independence of Namibia has been made contingent upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from sovereign Angola, are mere ploys to give the racist Pretoria régime an opportunity to pursue its exploitative, hegemonistic and repressive policies in the southern African region, thereby aggravating the already fragile political situation there. Hardly any delegation would deny that this situation poses a threat not only to the countries in the region but also to international peace and security.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

How can the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola be justified in the face of increasing external military support for the bandits of UNITA, and while South Africa's military occupation of Namibia and its subversion and aggression against neighbouring sovereign States continue with impunity? Indeed, to overlook these facts in the entangled politics of southern Africa is to ignore the stark realities of the region. What country in its right mind would want to commit political suicide?

And yet in the face of such irrational demands of South Africa and its Western allies, the Namibians, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), have shown maturity by being prepared to hold a dialogue with the South African authorities. Similarly, key parties in the area like Angola and Mozambique have also responded positively to calls to talk with the South Africans. Unfortunately, these contacts have only served to confirm the prevaricative nature of the racist Pretoria régime, whose real intention in proposing dialogue is to buy time for its illegal occupation of the Territory.

The most realistic approach is to implement United Nations resolution 435 (1978) without any conditions and without any further ado. In the view of my delegation, anything short of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is equal to an abdication of responsibility and therefore should not be countenanced.

The racist régime in South Africa has clearly indicated by its actions that it has no interest in the United Nations independence plan for Namibia and has therefore resorted to every irrelevant excuse to delay its implementation. By establishing an interim government in Namibia the racist régime in Pretoria has indicated its real purpose to circumvent Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But the United Nations should not allow Pretoria to get away with these delaying tactics. The Territory of Namibia and the future of the Namibians are the trust of the United Nations, and we must act in a manner that will not betray that

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

trust. The Organization should ensure that South Africa tackles the only real outstanding issue in the United Nations plan for Namibia, which is the choice of the electoral system to be used in bringing independence to the Territory. We should then move quickly to the implementation of the other parts of the resolution.

My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to appeal once again to those countries that still have relations with South Africa to refrain from wittingly or unwittingly lending support to the continued subjugation of Namibia and rather to send a clear signal to that régime by mustering the necessary political will and courage to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The people of Namibia and South Africa should no longer be held to ransom because of the selfish interests of a few powerful nations. The Charter mandates freedom for all, irrespective of a nation's size or a person's colour, and we must uphold that noble principle.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate my delegation's unflinching support for and solidarity with the Namibian people and their sole and authentic liberation movement, SWAPO. We have no doubt that victory will soon be won. We trust in the meantime that the international community will extend moral and material support to the Namibians in their fight for independence. My delegation also wishes to express its profound gratitude to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia as well as the entire membership of the Council for their indefatigable efforts to bring the bizarre situation in Namibia to public attention and also pave the way towards Namibia's independence.

Mr. KASIRYE (Uganda): I wish to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia on the extensive programme of work it has accomplished during the year and to pay particular tribute to the competence with which the Council organized and conducted the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of

(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

Namibia, held in Vienna in July. My delegation fully supports the programme of action on Namibia that was drawn up at the Conference and the decisions taken at the special General Assembly session on Namibia, and hopes that everything will be done to facilitate implementation of the programme.

For 20 years Pretoria has stubbornly defied the international community over Namibia. It has entrenched its abhorrent system of apartheid in Namibia. It has systematically plundered the country's natural resources. It has turned the country into a huge military garrison, from which it has launched unprovoked attacks on neighbouring countries.

The great hopes we had for a final solution to the Namibian question following the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council have been dashed. The decision by South Africa and the United States of America to link Namibia's independence under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola effectively halted progress towards a negotiated settlement and introduced the East-West conflict into a purely colonial issue.

My delegation is tempted to believe that this ploy was deliberately introduced to delay Namibia's independence in order to allow South Africa and its Western allies more time to continue with the relentless plunder of Namibia's natural resources. There can be no other explanation. South Africa and the United States of America know very well that as long as South African forces continue to occupy large parts of Angola, and as long as they both continue to finance and arm the UNITA rebels in Angola, it will not be possible for the Angolan Government to ask the Cuban troops to leave. Furthermore, South Africa cannot advance the military activities of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the reason for its continued occupation of Angolan territory because SWAPO has already indicated its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with the Pretoria régime as the first step in implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.



(Mr. Kasirye, Uganda)

Therefore, by linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops while at the same time doing everything possible to make their withdrawal impossible, South Africa and the United States of America are deliberately obstructing Namibia's independence.

I wish at this point to reiterate my Government's total rejection of the linkage policy, which is extraneous and irrelevant to the Namibian question. The question of Namibia is clearly a colonial issue while the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a bilateral arrangement legitimately entered into in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. In that connection, we urge the United States of America to reconsider its policy of constructive engagement with South Africa in general and its policy of linkage in particular, so as to facilitate Namibia's advance to its independence without any further delay. That appeal is made in light of the fact that, apart from the matter of linkage, total agreement has been reached by all parties on Namibia's independence. However, since appeals of this nature have in the past fallen on deaf ears, my Government will continue to support SWAPO's heroic armed struggle against the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist forces.

Once again Uganda calls for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa as a means of compelling it to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Those who are beneficiaries of the plunder of Namibia's natural resources and the high returns on investments in South Africa itself - enhanced by cheap slave labour - will, of course, try to convince themselves that sanctions do not work. They will plead with us to be patient while they engage South Africa in constructive and lucrative collaboration for the next 10, 20 or - who knows? - perhaps 100 years.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reiterate my Government's recognition of SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): As a country whose history is replete with accounts of a series of confrontations with colonial Powers throughout the centuries, and as one which had the historic obligation of presenting the case of Namibia to the International Court of Justice in conjunction with the sister State of Liberia, Ethiopia attaches particular importance to the issue under discussion today.

When the United Nations made the historic decision to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia two decades ago, all those who stood for justice expected that this action by the United Nations would soon lead the Territory to independence. To their utter dismay, however, independence has been delayed and to this day Namibians still languish under the brutal repression and exploitation of Pretoria, with the acquiescence of its allies in the West. All subsequent resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council declaring the illegality of the continued occupation of Namibia and demanding South Africa's co-operation in the peaceful transition to independence have been flouted with impunity and utter disregard for the will of the international community.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was initially supported by almost all the Members of the United Nations and which at the beginning raised the hopes of the international community for an imminent solution to the Namibian question, remains a dead letter as Pretoria and its collaborators engage in endless deceitful manoeuvres obstructing the resolution's implementation. Instead of genuinely applying the provisions contained in the resolution, the apartheid régime is attempting to impose a neo-colonial solution on the Namibian people with a view to continuing its plunder of the natural resources of the Territory, in clear violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

Pretoria is, furthermore, attempting to stifle the legitimate struggle for liberation waged by the valiant people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and authentic representative. Indeed, Pretoria and the United States are trying to link the independence of Namibia with irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as the presence of Cuban internationalists in Angola. This transparent attempt to delay the inevitable independence of Namibia has fortunately been rejected by the international community.

Since Namibia is the legal responsibility of the United Nations, that Territory's independence remains a test case of the efficacy and authority of the world body. In its failure to uphold the principles of the Charter and to carry out its obligations, the United Nations is nowhere more exposed to criticism than on the Namibian issue. Although the great majority of States Members of the United Nations emphatically maintain that the continued colonial occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa poses a grave threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council remains paralysed, unable to take appropriate measures against South Africa owing to the repeated use - or, rather, the abuse - of the veto power by the Western permanent members on resolutions demanding the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime.

As a result, the question of Namibia, which has been with the Organization ever since its inception 40 years ago, remains unsolved and the southern African region has gradually turned into a hotbed of tension. That the United Nations is rendered incapable of taking any effective measures against South Africa has further bolstered the racist régime's resolve to ignore the will of the international community and to carry on its colonial and racist policies with impunity. Indeed, today the racist régime not only has accelerated the process of colonial regimentation and racial segregation in both South Africa and Namibia, but has also intensified its campaign of destabilization against its neighbours.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

That obnoxious régime has carried out dastardly armed attacks on our sister States in the region, and it continues to violate Angola's territorial integrity by occupying part of it, in blatant breach of all the norms of international law. In fact, the racist régime of South Africa seems to have arrogated unto itself the right to control the movement of sea vessels that use the ports and harbours of Angola. The régime has, with characteristic arrogance, opened fire on vessels destined for Angolan ports, thus jeopardizing the maritime trade transactions of a sovereign State.

Given the intransigence of the apartheid régime and the abhorrent policies this odious régime continues to follow, the international community is left with no alternative but to assist the armed struggle waged by the people of Namibia. It is therefore incumbent upon each and every peace-loving State to render all necessary financial and material assistance to SWAPO, leader of that people, which has for the last 10 decades bravely confronted the armed forces of the occupying Power.

While Namibia's ultimate salvation from the yoke of apartheid and colonialism will very much depend on the armed struggle, the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on South Africa will undoubtedly weaken the ability of the apartheid regime to withstand the onslaught of the liberation struggle. In this field too, the role of the Members of the United Nations cannot be over-emphasized. While we see some value in the limited measures taken by some States to exert pressure on the South African régime, we continue to believe that more stringent measures should be taken. We would therefore like to take this opportunity to reiterate our conviction that immediate steps should be taken with a view to imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that lawless regime. We should also like to press for a comprehensive programme of assistance to the front-line States, which have at great cost sustained the liberation struggle in Namibia and South Africa.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

For its part, socialist Ethiopia will continue to render, within its limited means, all possible assistance to the liberation movements, until Namibia accedes to independence and apartheid is totally dismantled in southern Africa.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Many conferences and meetings on the question of Namibia have been held this year. They include the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna from 7 to 11 July; the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare in September, which issued a Special Appeal on Namibia; and the Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held in Addis Ababa in July.

If the resolutions and decisions adopted at those Conferences and at the special session had been implemented, the question of Namibia would not today be on our agenda as a separate item, to be discussed once more just as we have discussed it year after year. The important resolution adopted at the special session reaffirms the United Nations' direct responsibility for Namibia until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in terms of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations - in particular, Security Council resolution 435(1978) and General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248(S-V) of 19 May 1967.

In spite of the passage of two decades since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the racist Pretoria régime is still illegally occupying that Territory and applying a brutal, repressive policy against its struggling people. It is using the Territory as a springboard for aggression against the neighbouring African countries, the front-line States, to destabilize them, thus threatening international peace and

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

security. As a result, the international community has a historic responsibility to support the Namibian people in its just and legitimate struggle, which it is waging with all possible means under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and authentic representative. It is also imperative for all Governments, specialized agencies and international organizations to give full support to the efforts and activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority, working in close co-operation with SWAPO, in implementing the Council's mandate.

Namibia's natural resources belong to the Namibian people; they are God's gift to them and to succeeding generations. Those resources are being plundered by the racist régime of South Africa and by foreign economic interests. That plunder is going on in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Iraq condemns all the activities of foreign economic interests and others in Namibia, which are obstructing Namibia's independence.

Iraq's position with regard to the Namibian people was reaffirmed by our president, Mr. Saddam Hussein, in his message last month to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). That position is based on the principles of the United Nations and the right of the Namibian people to freedom, dignity and independence, under the leadership of SWAPO.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides the basic framework for the Territory's independence.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

In its advisory opinion on South Africa in 1950 the International Court of Justice stated that Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant affirmed two important basic principles - non-annexation, and the fact that the prosperity and development of peoples under a Mandate are a sacred trust of civilization. It also stated that those peoples had the right to sovereignty, citizenship and self-determination, which are the basis of modern international law. The advisory opinion of 1966 made it clear that South Africa's presence in Namibia constitutes an illegal occupation and that any co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa is an infringement of the commitments accepted under the United Nations Charter.

However, for the immediate independence of Namibia the immediate imposition of economic and military sanctions against Pretoria is necessary. It is also necessary that when we apply that economic and military embargo we take every precaution to ensure that the Pretoria régime is not able to bypass that embargo through the co-operation of certain other régimes, particularly the racist régime in Tel Aviv, which would offer the best loop-hole for this purpose. Therefore, we have to be careful to impose very strict control on those loop-holes through which Pretoria could invalidate the embargo.

It is not strange that foremost among those collaborating with the Pretoria régime is the régime in Tel Aviv. The reason for that co-operation is that the two régimes are based on the same racist, expansionist ideology and settler colonialism that led to the usurpation of the lands of others and the subjection of the peoples of those territories to military occupation, acts of aggression against and destabilization of neighbouring States, and threats to security so that those two racist régimes can impose their hegemony on the African continent and on the Middle East. The co-operation between Pretoria and Tel Aviv is part of an aggressive alliance that oppresses the real freedom of both the African and the Arab peoples.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

It also weakens the foundation for viable independence, depletes the means of economic, scientific and social progress and subverts the solidarity and close co-operation of those peoples.

Racist régimes are very similar in their conduct and aims, pursuing a policy of aggression, refusing to implement the resolutions of the Security Council and disregarding the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law. All these evils are represented in the practices adopted by the racist régime in South Africa, as they are in those adopted by the Zionist entity against the Arab countries and their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The right of the Namibian people to achieve independence must not be held hostage to the rivalry between East and West. All manoeuvres aimed at diverting attention from the basic fact that the Namibian people must achieve their independence and national unity should be rejected.

We also reject the policy of so-called constructive engagement and all other forms of so-called quiet diplomacy with the racist régime of Pretoria, adopted by certain countries, as well as the repeated use of the veto in the Security Council to prevent the imposition of mandatory sanctions against that régime for its violations of the most basic human rights.

At the same time we urge all States and Governments to refrain from extending to the régime in South Africa any kind of assistance, which only encourages that régime to persist in its military occupation of Namibia, the plunder of its natural resources and its policy of terrorism and aggression. We call for mandatory sanctions to isolate that régime as a blot on the conscience of mankind and a crime against justice. We call upon all States to end immediately all their political, economic, diplomatic, military, nuclear, cultural and other relations with the racist régime of Pretoria, in accordance with Security Council resolution 283 (1970). The need to adopt firm, effective measures in the face of the



(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

Intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa has become more clear than ever, since all diplomatic attempts to deter that régime from persisting in its aggressive policy and persuade it to renounce its racist ideology have failed. The response to that blatant challenge to the international community and human rights must be fully in accordance with the gravity of the situation in southern Africa, the threat to international peace and security caused by Pretoria's racist policy and the need to impose mandatory sanctions against that régime in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

To sum up Iraq's position on the Namibian question, Iraq has contributed and continues to contribute sincerely, through its membership of the Committee on decolonization, the efforts of the League of Arab States and joint African-Arab efforts, to bringing about the independence of Namibia. Iraq supports the struggle of the Namibian people to achieve freedom and the exercise of its right to self-determination and independence, in spite of the conditions of war imposed on us.

Finally, we reaffirm our unshakeable support for the efforts of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to achieve freedom, dignity and independence. We condemn strongly all racist, aggressive policies that obstruct the freedom and progress of peoples.

Mr. ONONAIYE (Nigeria): We are once again considering the question of Namibia. It is, in our view, an unacceptable affront to the United Nations and the international community that we have to indulge in such an exercise every year. It does not require much imagination or wisdom to appreciate that the attainment of freedom and genuine independence by the Namibian people will eliminate the need for this debate and contribute to the much desired savings on the operational costs of the United Nations.

The question of Namibia is well known. The issues are fresh in the memory of everyone. Between our last debate at the fortieth session and now, the

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

international community has remained seized of the matter. The catalogue of hope and disappointment, proposals and frustration, as well as appeals and wilful denials of the process of independence for the Namibian people, are well documented. It can no longer be doubted that the manoeuvres of the last 20 years represent perhaps the most cynical betrayal of a valiant people whose legitimate aspirations continue to be denied. Unfortunately, the perpetuation of the colonial domination of Namibia prolongs the exploitation of the human and natural resources of the Territory. We cannot but condemn those responsible for the situation.

The historic Security Council resolution 435 (1978), concerning the United Nations plan for the settlement of the Namibian problem, is now eight years old. There is still no solution in sight. The stalemate is most deplorable. Nigeria, however, remains fully committed to the earliest possible achievement of independence by the Namibian people. Our resolution to bring about the elimination of apartheid in South Africa remains unshakeable. We reject and will continue to reject the series of extraneous issues put forward by the racist South Africa and its allies to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for the settlement of the Namibian question.

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

One such flagrant example to scuttle the plan for Namibian independence is the proposal advanced by apartheid South Africa to the Secretary-General on 3 March 1986 setting 1 August 1986 as the commencement date for implementing the United Nations plan on the condition that a firm and satisfactory agreement was reached before that date on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We regard the linkage as irrelevant, extraneous and unacceptable and we reject it without reservation. The United Nations and the international community must not be held hostage by a pariah régime and its collaborators involved in the economic exploitation of the mineral wealth of Namibia.

We are constrained to ask: how long will the international community continue to tolerate the stubborn arrogance of power and challenge demonstrated by racist South Africa's acts of aggression and deliberate policy of destabilization of independent neighbouring African States?

Are we entitled to remain silent and seemingly unconcerned with the systematic infraction of the peace and stability of the southern Africa region by apartheid South Africa? What, one may ask, will it take before the Security Council recognizes and redresses the serious threat to international peace and security? How many leaders of Africa need to be sacrificed before the deteriorating situation is arrested?

My fellow citizen of our global village, is it justifiable and equitable that the mindless plundering of Namibian mineral and marine resources should continue indefinitely to the detriment of the Namibian people in defiance and deliberate contravention of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia?

We trust that everyone will seriously reflect on the questions posed and answer them in a manner not only to complement declarations of belief in the right of a people to self-determination but also to uphold collective responsibility for the freedom and independence of the Namibian people.

We cannot but take some consolation from the events of the last six months on

(Mr. Ononaiye, Nigeria)

the specific question of Namibia. The international community, through various bodies and forums, has tried to chart a new direction for the implementation of Security Council decisions and United Nations resolutions for the independence of Namibia. We wish to reiterate our support for the Declaration adopted at the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna, Austria, in July 1986. Similarly, we reaffirm unequivocally our support for the Final Document on Namibia of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in Harare, Zimbabwe, in September 1986. In the same vein, we renew our commitment to the resolution recently adopted at the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia. The consideration of this question at - and results of - these meetings have contributed significantly to the awareness of the international community of the urgent need for resolution of perhaps the most challenging colonial issue of our time.

The new and heightened political consciousness has generated, albeit in a limited way at present, its own beneficial impact in the form of progressive sanctions against racist South Africa. We call on all Member States, non-governmental organizations and all men and women of goodwill to redouble their efforts and join together, in one common expression of political will, to impose, under Chapter VII of the Charter, comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against apartheid South Africa in order to eliminate, once and for all, the crime against humanity which apartheid is universally adjudged to be.

We are convinced that the indomitable will of the Namibian people will prevail. The struggle against apartheid is morally just. The right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence is universally recognized. The moment for action to realize these worthy goals is at hand. Let us do everything to avoid the condemnation of history for inaction. It is the responsibility of this generation to assure the freedom of the Namibian people and the independence of the Territory.

Mr. JAAFAR (Malaysia): The question of Namibia has continued seriously to provoke the world's conscience. Numerous values have been set by the comity of nations, by those who cherish humanity and abhor the policies perpetrated by the Pretoria régime. Namibia is a burning issue of primary importance in the process of decolonization. It is an act of colonial domination in violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter. Very rightly, one can never overemphasize how very strongly the international community has repeatedly condemned the evil Pretoria régime.

It is highly deplorable that even 20 years after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and assumed direct responsibility over Namibia in order to enable the people to achieve their right to self-determination, South Africa still continues to usurp the Namibian people's power and occupy that country illegally. It has completely defied General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and all subsequent relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It is clear that the Pretoria régime has no intention of abandoning its policy of illegal occupation and colonization of Namibia.

The evidence for such a serious conclusion can easily be found in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/41/24, Part I). According to the report, the Pretoria régime has continued to employ every oppressive measure aimed at the total subjugation of the Namibian people. It has stepped up its acts of brutality and intimidation and its apartheid policies continue to be extended to all aspects of life of the Namibian people. Furthermore, the régime has stepped up the militarization of the Namibian Territory and the harassment of innocent civilians to the extent that disappearance and murders have become widespread. The régime has further shown its despicable policy by being so bold as to use Namibian Territory to launch aggression and subversion against the neighbouring countries, most recently Angola, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

(Mr. Jaafar, Malaysia)

In the face of Pretoria's increasing arrogance demonstrated, first, by its apartheid policy, Malaysia has revoked all forms of interaction with the régime since 1962. It is only logical that greater international pressure must be applied if we are to pursue a Namibian settlement. On the diplomatic and psychological fronts, it is noteworthy that the international community has pronounced with increasing strength its abhorrence of the Pretoria régime's policy on Namibia. We believe that the pursuit of various actions by the Council for Namibia, such as the convening of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia at Vienna in July 1986, the Valletta seminar in May 1986, and the consultations with Member States on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has generated some effect.

Such efforts and others which will contribute to denying any basis for comfort to the Pretoria régime will obviously need to be maintained. In this context we note the general rejection of the linkage formula by the countries which the Council for Namibia visited last May. However, we can see that a more categorical rejection of such an unjust formula can be impacted by the international community since the position adopted by some countries seems to be recalcitrant, in spite of the fact that the Security Council in its resolution 539 (1983) declared such a condition irrelevant and unacceptable. Increased efforts are therefore required to make it clear to South Africa that its tactical stand on the linkage formula does not hide its ugly designs on Namibia. Similarly it is also futile for anybody to think that a policy such as constructive engagement would serve any purpose. The fact that such a pretext will only prolong the injustice against, and the suffering of, the Namibian people is sufficiently serious and should be abandoned.

We consider it an important basis for action that in 1978 the plan for a peaceful settlement in southern Africa was accepted by all the parties involved,

(Mr. Jaafar, Malaysia)

namely, South Africa, the States bordering on Namibia, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and other political parties inside the Territory. This is the plan endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), which envisages a phased withdrawal of South African troops and the holding of general elections under United Nations supervision. We reiterate our support for resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only acceptable basis to settle the question of Namibia. Since it was adopted by the Security Council it is therefore incumbent upon the members of that body to exert every effort on the Pretoria régime to make it comply with the resolution. The United Nations has placed on the shoulders of the Security Council the very heavy and important responsibility of ensuring that its resolutions are implemented. This trust in the Council will continue, as evident in the report and draft resolutions before us.

I should like to quote the following. First, in paragraph 11 of the Special Committee's report in document A/41/23 (Part V), that body

"urges the Security Council to resume forthwith its consideration of further measures to give effect to [resolution 435 (1978)] and other Council resolutions ... as called for by the ... Movement of Non-Aligned Countries ... the Organization of African Unity (OAU)" and other international conferences.

Secondly, in paragraph 23 of the same report:

"The Committee strongly recommends that the Security Council ... respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the [Pretoria] régime under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter."

That recommendation was reinforced by the Vienna Conference, held last July, which made an appeal towards the same objective.

(Mr. Jaafar, Malaysia)

Thirdly, in the draft resolutions recommended by the Council for Namibia in document A/41/24 (Part II), no fewer than six operative paragraphs have specified the actions to be taken by the Security Council with the central objective of implementing resolution 435 (1978) by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

The parts of the report and the draft resolutions recommended by the Council for Namibia to which I have just referred constitute the spearhead of our diplomatic efforts. We should like to urge the Security Council to muster its collective political will effectively to pursue the actions envisaged. Only then could we hope that the series of actions and assistance by Member States and various United Nations bodies, as called for in the draft resolutions, will be effective. Only then can we say that there is concerted international pressure that can match the hard struggle being waged by SWAPO.

In this connection, my delegation also notes that in one of the preambular paragraphs of a draft resolution the Assembly would reaffirm its full support for the armed struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. We strongly support that principle, since it is natural and legitimate for any country or people fighting against foreign occupation, especially if backed by military force, to resort to any means possible to further such a cause. Any hesitation by this Assembly to endorse that principle would not do justice to the Namibian people and would again be an encouragement to Pretoria. I am sure that that is not what this Assembly would want to see happen.

Consistent with the need that the issues on this question must be tackled with greater firmness, I should like to reaffirm my delegation's total support of the decisions, recommendations and draft resolutions submitted by the Special Committee and the Council for Namibia. We appreciate the thoroughness with which this



(Mr. Jaafar, Malaysia)

question has been pursued, as reflected in the exhaustive list of actions required of the United Nations Secretary-General, the various United Nations bodies and specialized agencies, Member States and even business houses with interests in Namibia. We support all the specified actions but, as I stated earlier, we need the spearhead. Only then can we hope to persuade the Pretoria régime to realize that our efforts will not only endure but endure with strength and that it must come to terms with the reality that the people of Namibia will succeed in their noble cause.

Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): This is the second time in two months that the General Assembly has had to consider the question of Namibia. It stems from the fact that the Pretoria régime persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia in arrogant defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions and in disregard of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people. The General Assembly therefore has to take up this question once again in order to seek effective ways and means to remedy this unfortunate situation.

The obstacles to the peaceful resolution of the question of Namibia arise from the apartheid régime's continued intransigence and insistence on a series of irrelevant and unacceptable preconditions, such as the linkage of the Namibian question to the extraneous issue of Cuban troops in Angola. However, said linkage has been rejected by the Secretary-General and the overwhelming majority of the international community because it is incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Pretoria has also resorted to various tactics to scuttle the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The continued imposition of the so-called multi-party conference and interim government by the Pretoria régime is further evidence of its adamant response to the relevant United Nations decisions, in particular Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 566 (1985).

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

In view of what I have said, my delegation joins with the rest of the international community in condemning, in the strongest possible terms, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa as well as its various delaying tactics with a view to prolonging its illegal occupation of Namibia. We also denounce Pretoria's insistence on the linkage of the Namibian question to the extraneous issue of Cuban troops in Angola and its imposition of the so-called multi-party conference and the establishment of the so-called interim government on the Namibian people, which we regard as null and void ab initio. We are of the view that such tactics are designed merely to obfuscate the issue and confuse the international public. Moreover, my delegation strongly condemns the policy and practices of apartheid practised by the Pretoria régime in Namibia and in South Africa. We regard the apartheid system as an abomination and a disgrace to human civilization.

My delegation joins with the rest of the international community in condemning the continued use of Namibian territory by Pretoria for launching military attacks against, and invasions of, independent African States in the region, such as its invasions of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Those wrongful acts by the apartheid régime constitute a gross violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and pose a threat not only to peace and stability in the South African region but also to international peace and security.

My delegation also shares the deep concern of the international community over the growing depletion of Namibian resources, in contravention of Decree No. 1 enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The illegal exploitation of Namibia's natural resources may be regarded also as one of the obstacles to Namibian independence. It must therefore be brought to a speedy end, with just and adequate compensation. My delegation also takes note with great concern of the reports of increasing access to nuclear-weapon technology by South Africa, in

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

violation of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) on an arms embargo; therefore, it is our responsibility to renew our efforts to monitor the developments closely and to put an end to any such collaboration with Pretoria.

As a non-permanent member of the Security Council, my delegation has reiterated time and again, both in the Council and here in the General Assembly, its demand on South Africa to implement immediately and unconditionally the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. In view of Pretoria's persistent refusal to end its illegal occupation of Namibia, there seems to be no alternative to the armed struggle, under the sole and authentic representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in order to compel South Africa to end its illegal presence in Namibia. Furthermore, my delegation will continue its support of the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa; and until the attainment of independence by Namibia Thailand will continue to apply the voluntary trade embargo against South Africa which was initiated in 1978.

My delegation would like to reiterate once again our full support for the Namibian people in their quest for freedom and independence in a united Namibia. In a message addressed to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the week of solidarity with the people of Namibia and their liberation movement SWAPO, on 27 October 1986, His Excellency General Prem Tinsulanonda, Prime Minister of Thailand, stated, inter alia:

"I would like to reaffirm, on behalf of the Royal Thai Government and the people of Thailand, our full support for self-determination, freedom and national independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has been recognized as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people."

(Mr. Kasemsri, Thailand)

I should like to conclude by expressing my delegation's sincere felicitations to Mr. Peter Zuze, Permanent Representative of Zambia, on his unanimous election to the presidency of the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose report (A/41/22) is deeply appreciated. My delegation would like also to avail itself of this opportunity to place on record its profound appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its dedicated efforts on behalf of the Namibian people.

My delegation once again pledges that Thailand will stand with the Group of African States on this important issue, in order to ensure the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan and to achieve genuine freedom and independence for Namibia.

Mr. INGLES (Philippines): The issue of decolonization is dear to the hearts of the Filipino people. Like many countries represented here, the Philippines has its own long history of struggle for independence, spanning nearly four centuries of alien domination. Our people know how humiliating it is to be under foreign rule, however benevolent it is made to appear by the colonial Power. It is because of our historical experience that we have always identified ourselves with the aspiration for independence of all colonial countries and peoples.

During the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations, the Philippine delegation, representing a country which was then on the threshold of independence, fought very hard for the inclusion of the word "independence" in Article 76, paragraph (b), of the Charter establishing the international trusteeship system. Year after year, since the birth of the United Nations, we have taken pride in supporting the admission of new Member States and welcoming them into this family of independent and sovereign States.

We have supported the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people since the question was first taken up in the United Nations. This is not a mere platitude. I had the good fortune in 1950 to appear before the International Court of Justice

(Mr. Ingles, Philippines)

to argue the Philippine position on the General Assembly's request for an advisory opinion on the international status of the Territory of South-West Africa. The Court did not then immediately adopt the submission of the Philippine delegation that the international community, personified by the United Nations, had the right and the duty to revoke the Mandate of South Africa, that was decided later by the Court with a changed membership.

Decolonization is indeed one field where the United Nations has achieved remarkable progress. However, 20 years after this Assembly decided to terminate the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory of Namibia and place it under this Organization's direct responsibility, Namibia has yet to take its rightful place in this Assembly as a fully-fledged Member State. The Namibian people are still fighting against the racist régime of South Africa to gain their freedom and genuine independence.

(Mr. Ingles, Philippines)

The question of Namibia's independence may well serve as the litmus test for the will and competence of our Organization to carry out the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The record of South Africa's atrocious and barbaric acts against the people of Namibia and its defiance of the universal will of the international community is well known to all of us. South Africa betrayed the trust of the League of Nations when it attempted to annex the Territory, which had been placed under its Mandate. When the United Nations was established in 1945, South Africa refused to place Namibia within the Trusteeship System as envisaged in the United Nations Charter.

Despite repeated calls from Member States of the United Nations urging South Africa to place the Territory of Namibia within the Trusteeship System and to implement plans for its independence, South Africa remained firmly entrenched on Namibian soil. Instead of promoting the material and moral well-being and social progress of the Namibian people, as ordained in the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations, the racist régime of South Africa put into effect discriminatory laws and regulations against the so-called natives.

Neither the historic decision of this Assembly in October 1966 terminating the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory of Namibia nor the rulings and decisions of the International Court of Justice and the Security Council on the illegality of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia has moved the racist Pretoria régime. The western approach of so-called constructive dialogue has only encouraged the recalcitrant Pretoria régime to pursue a policy of attrition.

South Africa's response to the repeated appeals of the international community is its persistent and blatant violation of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people; its extension of the evil policy and practice of apartheid to Namibia; its plunder of Namibia's natural resources; its massive militarization of the Territory; its acts of aggression and destabilization against the independent

(Mr. Ingles, Philippines)

States bordering on Namibia; and its imposition of the so-called interim government, which is designed merely to perpetuate racist domination of Namibia. The whole world has strongly condemned these deplorable acts of the racist régime and demanded the immediate independence of Namibia.

My delegation believes that our Organization still has the means and the authority under its Charter to secure Namibia's independence. Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which outline the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, must be implemented without further delay. The Secretary-General has reported that all outstanding issues pertaining to the implementation of the plan had been finally resolved when agreement was reached on the electoral system. However, the racist South African régime insists that the implementation of the plan be linked to an extraneous issue: that of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The Namibian people are now being held hostage to an issue which is definitely alien to the principle of self-determination. These are two different issues which should be dealt with separately. Rightly, this subterfuge has been roundly condemned and rejected by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

It is clear from its actions and activities that racist South Africa has no intention of leaving Namibia. The United Nations should not accept this situation or allow it to continue. The United Nations, in fulfilment of the sacred trust of civilization, has an inescapable moral and legal responsibility to the people of Namibia. While the armed struggle against South Africa's domination is being heroically waged by the Namibian people themselves, under the leadership of SWAPO, the United Nations is nevertheless under an obligation to compel South Africa to leave Namibia and allow its people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination.

(Mr. Ingles, Philippines)

In the face of South Africa's continued intransigence and its efforts to thwart the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), the United Nations is left with no other option but to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. There is no question that the acts of the racist Pretoria régime are a threat to international peace and security. My delegation, therefore, appeals to the Security Council to fulfil its clear duty to take enforcement measures under the Charter.

The International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which was held in Vienna last July, adopted a Programme of Action. The Philippine delegation appeals to the whole membership of this Assembly to give its wholehearted support to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. It is imperative that Member States of the United Nations stand firmly committed to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the Organization. The people of Namibia are waiting, and looking to us for decisive action now. Can we afford to fail them?

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia on its very comprehensive report, which outlines the many activities it has undertaken during the year under review, in compliance with the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to express my delegation's deep gratitude to the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his relentless efforts and untiring dedication to the immediate resolution of the question of Namibia. To the struggling people of Namibia and the courageous front-line States I reaffirm, on behalf of the new Government of the Philippines, our continued and unswerving support. We look forward to welcoming soon an independent and sovereign Namibia as a full-fledged Member of our Organization.



Mr. KASINA (Kenya): It is now 20 years since the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. At that time 20 years ago one could not have expected that so many years would have to elapse before Namibia attained its independence. That view, however, has been brought to naught by the racist régime of South Africa, which is illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia. This is so despite the fact that the Namibian patriots have put up a heroic fight for more than a century against the brutal colonialism of the racist régime, and its domination and exploitation, which currently characterize the situation in Namibia.

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

In spite of the passage of so many years of patriotic struggle for the independence of the Territory and notwithstanding the efforts of the United Nations towards the achievement of Namibian independence, racist South Africa defiantly persists in keeping intact its illegal occupation of the Territory. It has been able by dubious means to hoodwink certain members of the international community into engaging in duplicity by which selfish economic and ideological interests have attained paramount importance, thus pushing into the background the primary and urgent need for the realization of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. This is utterly unacceptable and we must restore the proper priorities regardless of the procrastinations of the racist régime.

The heinous and flagrant refusal by the racist régime of South Africa to let the people of Namibia freely exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence and the continued illegal occupation of the Territory are in contempt of the will of the international community and deserve a firm response lest the entire southern African region be plunged into unending turmoil. We should pause and take a serious look at the fact that the struggle of the people of Namibia and of South Africa, the success of which has been delayed by the pursuit of archaic dogmas of racial superiority and the selfish economic interests of some Member States of our Organization, has now reached the point of no return. To be realistic, the present rapidly deteriorating situation constitutes a grave danger to international peace and security and the ramifications of that cannot be confined solely to the region. Such ramifications immediately bring to mind the circumstances that have twice in our lifetime plunged the world into the abyss of war, the prevention of which is a primary duty of this Organization, which stands as a vivid reminder of the unacceptability of the atrocities committed then. We wish for no repetition of that.

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

The United Nations, which bears a direct responsibility for ensuring that Namibia moves to independence in the same way as have other Trust Territories in the past and which considers apartheid to be a crime against humanity, cannot but take immediate, effective and comprehensive measures to respond to the situation, in order to prevent the escalation of this increasing threat to international peace and security. In my delegation's view, the conflict in Namibia and South Africa should not be seen as an East-West confrontation; the conflict has everything to do with, and must be seen as one which directly requires responses pertinent only to, decolonization and the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence, on the one hand, and the destruction and elimination of apartheid, on the other.

In this respect, therefore, we insist on full implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as the only response that is required from the United Nations for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, and reject totally the irrelevant insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition of the independence of that Territory. Once this step is accomplished, a significant obstacle will have been removed and the march can begin towards the total eradication of the crime of apartheid that is daily being committed by the racist régime in Pretoria.

We urge that in the struggle for the attainment of Namibian independence all Governments, organizations and individuals exert maximum pressure for the withdrawal from Namibia of the trigger-happy troops and administration of the racist régime. We reiterate the call to all Governments to refrain from taking measures that may encourage the intransigence of the racist régime and for the abandonment of the policies of so-called constructive engagement. We reject the imposition by South Africa of the so-called internal settlement, which, we are convinced, is meant to institutionalize a puppet régime in Namibia and circumvent

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We stand in favour of the non-fragmentation of the Territory of Namibia and reiterate our strong view that Walvis Bay is an integral part of the Territory of Namibia.

Reviewing the situation in Namibia since the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of that Territory, it is apparent that the United Nations has been frustrated, in effect held back, in its efforts to bring to an end the illegal occupation of the Territory by the illegitimate and odious apartheid régime of South Africa. Although negotiations on Namibia's freedom, with the full participation of all the parties directly concerned, were completed more than eight years ago and all outstanding issues relevant to resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved by November 1985, South Africa, as one of the parties, has continued to engage in transparent delaying tactics calculated to deflate pressure for action by the United Nations, while it does nothing to bring to an end its own illegal occupation of the Territory. Indeed, it has continued its attempts to rally the support of its puppets and stooges in the Territory in creating institutions with which it hopes to direct the affairs of Namibia and exploit its resources after conjuring up an illusion, a semblance, of withdrawal.

These manoeuvres must be strongly rejected and measures must be taken to prevent any further deceitful attempts in that direction. The measures to be taken must include concrete, action-oriented programmes to overcome the persistent South African defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations, the brutal suppression and repression of Namibians and South African people, the repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring States and the policies of destabilization of the whole region of southern Africa. Most important of all, the measures must aim at the complete eradication of the diabolical policies of apartheid, for such policies constitute the core of the problem in the region.

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

In July of this year, the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia was held in Vienna, Austria, following the decision of the United Nations General Assembly embodied in paragraph 20 of its resolution 40/97C of 13 December 1985. Kenya participated fully in this Conference which, it should be recalled coincided with the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's Mandate and the assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility for Namibia. It should also be recalled that the purpose of the Conference, among other things, was to identify obstacles to Namibia's independence and consider concrete proposals to eliminate them. Such concrete proposals were, in fact, considered by the Conference. The fourteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly held in September also adopted the recommendations of the Conference. The recommendations of the Conference and the decisions of the fourteenth special session express the conviction that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter offered the only peaceful means available to the United Nations by which it could compel South Africa to accept a just settlement of the question of Namibia, as well as peaceful change in South Africa itself. Such imposition of sanctions would supplement measures already taken by various Governments, organizations, the public and individuals to isolate the racist régime of South Africa. Kenya has all along advocated and fully accepts the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa in view of the régime's racial policies of discrimination and its illegal occupation of Namibia. We feel it is the duty of the international community to reiterate that position once again, and request the Security Council not only to consider the situation in Namibia and South Africa, but to adopt and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. This action should not be

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

considered as a punitive measure, rather as a measure imposed to cure and heal that one nation, South Africa, afflicted by the evil demons of apartheid, of its intransigence towards all the peoples of the world, as represented in this world body.

At this stage, I wish to repeat the various appeals made to certain countries, which have thus far prevented the Security Council from acting effectively, to reconsider their position in the light of the grave situation in South Africa and the imperative need to employ the most effective means to force South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia. Pending the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, my delegation would like to see strict compliance with the arms embargo against South Africa by all States. We would also like to see, and will support, all measures aimed at further isolating South Africa by severing all dealings with the racist régime in the political, economic, trade, diplomatic, military, scientific, cultural, sports and other fields. We similarly urge all States to refrain from rendering any type of assistance to South Africa that might encourage it to continue its policy of State terrorism and systematic acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring independent countries.

The validity of the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people to attain freedom and independence led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, is beyond any doubt and my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its full support to SWAPO and call upon all Governments and organizations to render sustained and increased moral and political support, as well as material assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization in its legitimate struggle for the liberation of Namibia. In this connection, Kenya condemns the continuing imprisonment and detention of the leaders and supporters of SWAPO and

(Mr. Kasina, Kenya)

the killings, torture and murder of innocent Namibians, as well as other inhuman measures taken by the régime in Namibia meant to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for its informative and factual report, and wishes to reaffirm Kenya's full support for the Council as it continues to discharge its responsibility as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence is achieved. We support the role of the Council as the major policy-making organ of the United Nations and will support the various recommendations that the Council has made in respect of Namibia.

Mr. FARES (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to say how pleased my delegation is at the interest in and understanding of the cause of the Namibian people shown by the international community. The liveliness of this general debate in the General Assembly reflects the continuing international support for the struggle of the people of Namibia for their freedom and independence.

Some weeks ago now, my country had the honour of being among the Asian countries which were instructed by the Movement of Non-aligned Countries to speak before the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly on Namibia. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country stated:

"we salute the growing popular resistance of the peoples of southern Africa against the policy of apartheid, and express our deep appreciation for their great sacrifices in human life. We are certain that these sacrifices will not be in vain; rather, they demonstrate that the will of peoples cannot be broken by any war machine, regardless of its power and brutality."

(A/S-14/PV.6, p. 47)

(Mr. Fares, Democratic Yemen)

Two decades ago now, in 1966, the United Nations put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for that Territory. Since then the South African régime has refused to heed the will of the international community, continues its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and imposes its base policy of apartheid, at the same time plundering the natural resources of that Territory.\*

---

\* Mr. Thompson (Fiji) Vice-President, took the Chair.



(Mr. Fares, Democratic Yemen)

That has not prevented the people of Namibia from continuing their just struggle for independence and freedom. On the contrary, it has strengthened their conviction in the justice of their cause: the defence of freedom, unity and integrity.

It has been 20 years since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated. We appreciate the growing international awareness of the situation, and witness the weakness of the police and military machine in the face of the courageous position adopted by the Namibian people.

We take this opportunity to recall the many Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and decisions aimed at ending apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia. We would also recall the decision of the International Court of Justice to the effect that the occupation of Namibia is illegal and a violation of international law. There is a long list of such resolutions and decisions. Many international organs, conferences and other forums continue to adopt decisions reiterating the international community's desire that apartheid should be eliminated from southern Africa and that Namibia should gain its independence. In that connection, I would single out Security Council resolution 435 (1978), on the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

International efforts in line with that and other decisions have been thwarted owing to the intransigence and stubbornness of the Pretoria régime, which has defied the international community, relying on its collusion with the United States, certain other Western countries and Israel to perpetuate the apartheid system in southern Africa and to continue its occupation of Namibia. The policies of constructive engagement and linkage, rejected by the international community, are part and parcel of that general line of conduct. It is clear that neither of the racist régimes - in Pretoria and in Tel Aviv - could adopt that arrogant and

(Mr. Fares, Democratic Yemen)

defiant position in the face of the wishes of the international community without the support of imperialist forces, and particularly United States imperialism.

The Pretoria régime's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its policy of apartheid and its terrorist practices against neighbouring African countries, especially Angola, constitute flagrant defiance of the United Nations Charter and of the international community. Efforts to enable the Security Council to shoulder its historic responsibility with regard to the Namibian people and to force the Pretoria régime to bow to the will of the international community and respect its wishes have failed owing to the position adopted by the United States and the United Kingdom, which has made it impossible for the Security Council to act effectively and impose sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. That would be the most effective peaceful way to end apartheid and the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia.

The analysis contained in the appeal issued by the participants at the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia was extremely eloquent. The participants called for comprehensive economic sanctions against the South African régime in response to that country's defiance of the United Nations and its aggressive, repressive behaviour in Namibia in total disregard of human rights.

On behalf of Democratic Yemen I warmly salute the Namibian people. We reiterate our support for their just struggle under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole authentic representative. We shall do all we can to strengthen their struggle for independence and to help ensure their victory over the forces of racism and colonialism.

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of Namibia continues to be one of the most important matters that the United Nations is called upon to consider and take action on. Although the highest international

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

organ has adopted unequivocal decisions, the Pretoria Government continues its illegal occupation of the Territory and to impede the process of the decolonization and independence of that Territory. The persistence of the situation poses a threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

The vast majority of the international community has pressed for the immediate and total implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to enable the people of Namibia freely and properly to exercise their right to self-determination, national independence and territorial integrity.

The General Assembly has firmly and unequivocally maintained that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) provide the only basis for a peaceful solution of the problem of Namibia, and that the independence of that Territory cannot be contingent upon the fulfilment of conditions not envisaged in the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and affecting the sovereignty of independent States of southern Africa. The General Assembly has likewise unswervingly upheld the heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to establish a just and democratic society in their country.

Apartheid and the illegal occupation of Namibia constitute a clear challenge to the credibility and effectiveness of our Organization and of an international order based on the maintenance of peace and security, on respect for the law and on the promotion of human dignity.

For 40 years now South Africa has been violating with impunity the fundamental principles and specific provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. That situation jeopardizes the moral authority of the Organization. Consequently, the international community has a clear interest in South Africa ending its present attitude.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

It must be recognized that the possibility of Pretoria voluntarily mending its ways is extremely remote. As confirmed by the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Pretoria régime has not only failed to take the steps necessary to promote independence but, on the contrary, has continued to step up internal repression against the people of Namibia, intensifying its persecution of leaders and members of the South West Africa People's Organization. The senseless economic system which has been imposed has not changed and the military bases and installations which have made possible acts of aggression and pressure against neighbouring countries remain in operation.

At the eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, held in Harare, the Heads of State or Government set out forcefully and in no uncertain terms the traditional position of the Movement on this subject. The paragraphs of the Final Declaration dedicated to Namibia are a vivid reflection of the serious concern of the Non-Aligned Movement at the increasing deterioration of the situation in that part of the world and can thus be seen as an urgent appeal for effective joint action by the international community against South Africa.

The special attention devoted by the eighth summit Conference to the question of Namibia serves only to stress once again the urgency and the priority of this topic on the international agenda. An appropriate and prompt settlement of this serious conflict in accordance with the Charter and the relevant General Assembly resolution is thus a prerequisite for the restoration of morality, peace and security to southern Africa.

Argentina shares fully the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. The people and Government of Argentina are convinced, in total agreement with the overwhelming majority of the international community, that Namibia's accession to independence is possible only if Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is implemented immediately and fully. Pretoria's persistent refusal to

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

comply with that binding decision fully warrants the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. My country supports the implementation of such measures.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the full solidarity of the people and Government of Argentina with the peoples in South Africa and Namibia that are striving for their self-determination, freedom and national independence.

Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): Namibia has become the litmus test of the values of our generation. Our success or failure on this issue will show whether reason and justice will guide human actions on crucial matters in contemporary times, or whether we shall allow ourselves to be held hostage to the irrational intransigence of a mindless régime, and thus stand accused before the judgement of posterity. It is time the global community took a firm decision. We have awaited it far too long.

Throughout four decades and three special sessions we have debated and deliberated upon this item. For over 20 years the United Nations has had direct responsibility for ensuring justice and freedom for the Namibians. Despite our relentless endeavours in this respect, we have drawn a blank because an odious régime, abhorred by the overwhelming majority of its own people and condemned by the world, has been able to spurn with impunity not only global public opinion but also specific resolutions of the United Nations. How long shall we allow this to continue?

The arrogance of Pretoria in pursuing the reprehensible policy of apartheid at home has earned for it international opprobrium. Not only has the racist régime been perpetrating that hateful system at home, but beyond its State frontiers it has continued its machinations to keep an entire nation suppressed and subjugated. This is not just aggression against a whole people; it is perhaps one of the gravest affronts to the human conscience and to civilized norms of State behaviour in this century.

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

The arrogance of Pretoria in pursuing the reprehensible policy of apartheid at home has earned for it international opprobrium. Not only has this racist régime perpetrating this hateful system at home, but also beyond its State frontiers, where it has continued its machinations to keep an entire nation suppressed and subjugated. This is not just aggression against a whole people; it is perhaps one of the gravest affronts to human conscience and the civilized norms of State behaviour in this century.

Pretoria must be compelled to withdraw from territories to which it has no right. The South African Government must be forced to abide by the judgement of the global community. That régime must be made to act in accordance with the dictates of reason and logic. If we are to succeed in this aim, the global community will need to act in concert.

The South African Government has tried to hoodwink the world by installing a puppet government in Windhoek. It has defied the stipulations of Decree No. 1 by continuing its depredations of precious Namibian resources. It has stolen not only the lands of the Namibian people, but also their limbs. It has made forced labour a corollary of its illegal occupation.

My country has sought ceaselessly to alleviate the sufferings of the Namibians. Our hearts and minds have always been with the brave Namibian people. We support them in their valiant struggle. We salute the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Their independence is a cause that every Bangladeshi holds dear. That is why we have made every effort to advance their cause as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

My delegation firmly believes that in order to force the hand of Pretoria there is need to isolate South Africa politically, economically and militarily by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

For Namibia, the only path to its independence lies through the application of the United Nations plan, which contains the principles embodied in the relevant United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). My delegation asserts that Walvis Bay and the offshore islands constitute inalienable parts of Namibia. The international community must act in concert to foil the attempts of the racist Pretoria régime to link the independence of Namibia to certain extraneous and irrelevant issues. We must set a definite time-frame for Namibian independence.

If Namibia is shrouded in darkness today, the dawn is inevitable. Pretoria cannot for ever defy the fundamental impulses of the freedom-loving Namibians. Justice and liberty for the Namibians will be relentlessly pursued until they are obtained. The wise felt the winds of change blowing across Africa in the late 1960s. Today the winds are transformed into a gathering gale of gargantuan proportions. Let the world take note and pay heed.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): Logic and common sense would have it that any people under foreign occupation and domination would expect that, with the passing of time, their aspirations to freedom and national independence would be realized. Yet, for the people of Namibia, racist South Africa has employed every trick in the book to cause great frustration and anxiety among the freedom fighters and the general public in the Territory.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

South Africa has continued to experiment with one internal government after another, while the friends of the régime have continued to deceive the world that independence is within reach. Despite the increased international focus on South Africa, the stalemate over negotiations on a just settlement in Namibia continues. The once active contact group has faded into inaction and the United Kingdom appears to be passively backing American diplomatic initiatives. Despite President Botha's announced deadline of 1 August 1986 for beginning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the artificial barrier of linkage with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola remains a major stumbling-block. The prospect of Namibia's attaining internationally recognized independence is still bleak.

South Africa's evasion of United Nations control on this issue lies at the heart of the political deadlock over Namibia's independence. Other States with substantial economic interests in South Africa have lacked sufficient political will to enforce the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Although the United Nations and the other contact group States declared that linkage was irrelevant to the implementation of that resolution, the United States has continued to promote it as a key condition of Namibian independence. France resigned from the contact group in protest over the introduction of linkage.

The sad fact is that, two decades after the General Assembly ordered South Africa to withdraw, Namibia remains the last country in Africa under white colonial rule. It is important to note in this scenario that, while the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has agreed to co-operate with the United Nations, South Africa's attitude has been one of prevarication.

We in Zambia remember quite vividly how racist South Africa wrecked the pre-implementation talks in Geneva in 1981. The régime's pretexts ranged from accusing the United Nations of being partial to SWAPO to the choice of the electoral system to be adopted.



(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The world is tired of apartheid. The international community is fed up with South Africa's domination of the game of chess to buy time. The time for experiments has long passed. The puppet régime which South Africa has continued to promote will not be acceptable to the international community. These régimes are an affront to the wishes of the majority in Namibia and almost an embarrassment to South Africa's Western allies.

The occupation force in Namibia poses a grave danger to the front-line States. South Africa maintains a large number of forward military bases in northern Namibia from which it launches attacks on neighbouring States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola. South African troops have not only been engaged in military operations in Angola, but have also provided military assistance to the UNITA bandits of Jonas Savimbi, who is fighting to overthrow the legitimate Government of Angola. Savimbi, who has been given a red-carpet welcome in the United States and now in France, is not a freedom fighter, but a pawn in the game of chess and a buffer for South Africa's interests in Angola. The action of the United States Administration in rendering military assistance to UNITA bandits is unfortunate and preposterous. This assistance has placed the United States on the side of racist South Africa against independent Africa. How can a country which prides itself on human rights and democratic values align itself with a racist and insensitive régime?

We have now seen South Africa's opinion of dialogue. At the time members of the Eminent Persons Group were preparing for discussions with South Africa's Government officials, South Africa's air force combat aircraft were being armed and fuelled for action against Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana. And when the European Community envoy, Sir Geoffrey Howe, embarked on a similar exercise, President Botha was declaring the third state of emergency. So much for dialogue.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

The challenge facing the world is clear. There is now an urgent need to consider new measures to secure Namibia's unconditional independence, to relieve the poverty, distress and suffering of the Namibian people. The United Nations has a great responsibility, to bring independence to Namibia. My brother and colleague, the Secretary of Foreign Relations of SWAPO, asked a pertinent question in his inspiring and important statement in the Assembly yesterday. He asked why the people of Namibia should have to lose faith in the United Nations. We have to do all we can to fulfil the obligation of the United Nations to compel South Africa to withdraw unconditionally from Namibia and to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the régime. It is the only effective and peaceful way of securing South Africa's co-operation.

We in Zambia are convinced that the United Nations has more powerful means than rhetoric to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. The people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, deserve every assistance from the international community in their just struggle against the repressive régime. Let us not waste time by seeking to separate armed struggle from the Namibian struggle for independence. There has never been any genuine independence won without armed struggle. Namibians have a right to fight for their independence by every means at their disposal, including armed struggle.

There are those of us who feel that there are already some encouraging signs in the South African saga. The trading world now sees clearly that black South Africa is their biggest customer - certainly bigger than South Africa. The South African Government is removing some superficial and seemingly more insulting aspects of apartheid, and some black trade unions are being formed. The Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa no longer insists that separateness has a biblical basis. But these are yet small signs against the monumental tasks of uprooting the apartheid system and implementing resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. OGOUMA (Benin) (interpretation from French): Without a doubt, one of the most acute and urgent problems now facing the United Nations is the decolonization and accession to national independence of Namibia.

It is 20 years since the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, took over the administration of that country until it achieved independence.

Since then, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice and the United Nations Council for Namibia have adopted resolutions, decisions and recommendations all intended to create the necessary conditions for the Namibian people's accession to independence.

Thus, among other things, we confirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and recognized the legitimacy of its struggle under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole authentic representative, and granted that organization observer status in the United Nations.

Likewise, we demanded respect for the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, as well as protection of its natural resources.

Last but not least, the Security Council adopted, in its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence after it had been negotiated and accepted by all parties.

In the light of all those resolutions and pertinent decisions of the various forums of our Organization, what have we witnessed by way of outcome?

We have witnessed the continued occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa, which has thus scorned the relevant decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council as well as those of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

The Pretoria régime has stepped up its plunder of the country's resources with the co-operation and support of other foreign economic interests through transnational corporations in violation of the relevant decisions of the United Nations.

It has intensified the militarization of Namibia through the forced conscription of young people into the colonial army, the deployment of more than 100,000 South African troops and the creation of several dozen military bases throughout the country, its purpose being to continue escalating its repression against the Namibian people and to carry out acts of aggression beyond its borders.

The Pretoria régime has continued its attempts to impose an internal settlement through a so-called interim government, a puppet government unanimously condemned and rejected by the international community.

We have witnessed the continuation and dangerous growth of the policy of continuous armed aggression and the subversion and destabilization of neighbouring States practised by the racist régime of Pretoria.

Pretoria's repeated acts of aggression against its neighbours - particularly Angola, Botswana and Lesotho - and the recruitment and training of mercenaries and their dispatch to Mozambique to destabilize that country are specific ways in which the policy of regional imperialism has been pursued with the intent of disrupting the natural and active solidarity among all the militant people of Namibia, South Africa and other independent States of southern Africa. This policy of regional imperialism is intended to impose a neo-colonial solution in Namibia and through intimidation and terror to preserve the racist system in South Africa; it is intended also to establish and develop through intimidation and terror a climate of instability, neo-colonial dependency and destabilization in southern Africa.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

Finally, we have seen the continuing connivance and complicity and even active support offered by certain Powers to the Pretoria régime, which is nothing more nor less than a policy designed to set it up as an imperialist regional power in order to maintain the apartheid system.

How else can we interpret the continued supply by some Powers of assistance and valuable military technology to the war industry of the Pretoria régime in violation of resolution 418 (1977), which decreed a mandatory embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa?

How can we interpret Pretoria's repeated aggressions against its neighbours as anything other than an attempt to impose neo-colonial domination on all the countries of that region?

How can we construe the whole question of linkage and the policy of so-called constructive engagement advocated by some as other than an attempt to do everything possible to help the Pretoria régime to achieve subregional mastery and above all to act as a bridgehead for international imperialism?

How can we interpret the stranglehold maintained by the Pretoria régime and foreign economic interests over two thirds of the mines and fertile soil of Namibia as anything but an attempt to plunder the Territory for the benefit of certain Western metropolitan countries in violation of Decree No. 1 on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia, promulgated on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 23 June 1971?

How can we interpret the support given the armed bands of UNITA other than as assistance in the destabilization of Angola?

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

That is why my delegation believes that the persistent defiance and arrogance displayed by South Africa in response to the pertinent decisions of the United Nations and other international bodies and its obstinate illegal occupation of Namibia clearly indicate that the Pretoria régime does not stand alone but that it enjoys the active support of certain Powers whose presence in Namibia is manifest. We cannot place any interpretation on the persistent refusal of certain members of the Security Council to exert real and decisive pressure on South Africa to force it to withdraw from Namibia.

The Pretoria apartheid régime's refusal to implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, and to grant the Namibian people the most fundamental of human rights, including the inalienable right to self-determination and independence, the apartheid régime's recourse to violent and merciless repression against the Namibian people, as well as the policies of aggression, subversion and destabilization practised by that régime against neighbouring States, are all crimes which have created a particularly perilous situation in southern Africa. That situation represents a serious threat to international peace and security, an area in which the Security Council, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, has specific authority enabling it to fulfil its principal duty, that of maintaining international peace and security.

Certain members of the Security Council have shown a lack of political will to take any prompt and decisive action at a time when international peace and security are seriously threatened in certain regions.

The peoples of the world have not been taken in. By firmly supporting the struggle of the Namibian people, under the enlightened guidance of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, the peace-loving peoples throughout the world are rising up to demand the isolation of racist South Africa and the imposition of economic sanctions on the apartheid Pretoria régime in order to enable Namibia to become free and independent.

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

The International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia held in Vienna from 7 to 11 July 1986 confirmed those legitimate demands by all peace-loving peoples.

The international community can no longer tolerate the ceaseless arrogance and defiance displayed by the apartheid régime. The time has come to put an end to this vast conspiracy. The time has come to put an end to the enslavement and exploitation of the Namibian people. It is in this context that, during the twenty-second session of the Summit Conference in July 1986, held in Addis Ababa, the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) clearly:

"Reaffirms that the United Nations Plan for Namibia's Independence contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) remains the only accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, and reiterates its call for its immediate and unconditional implementation".

(A/41/654, p. 28)

The Heads of State and Government of the OAU furthermore:

"Calls upon the Security Council of the United Nations to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, against South Africa in order to force the racist régime to relinquish its illegal occupation of Namibia". (p. 29)

The eighth Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries confirmed those decisions.

The Namibian people and its national liberation movements under the leadership of SWAPO have no other option but to continue and to intensify their heroic struggle to rid themselves once and for all of the oppressive régime of the South African colonialists.

We are convinced that the United Nations will continue to mobilize the

(Mr. Ogouma, Benin)

international community which is seriously concerned about the illegal occupation of Namibia, and the brazen plundering of its resources, as well as the escalation of military repression, and will demand the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid Pretoria régime and the provision to the people of Namibia and SWAPO of all the necessary unwavering support to speed up the immediate independence of Namibia.

My delegation would like to congratulate SWAPO and its military branch, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia for the successes they have achieved in the arduous and heroic struggle which they have so courageously waged against the fascist Pretoria régime.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for presenting us with such a meaningful and thorough report, consisting of two parts, in document A/41/24, as well as the Special Committee to Study the Situation with Respect to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, for its extremely useful report in document A/41/23.

Finally, I should like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his efforts among the parties to ensure that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) does not remain a dead letter.

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): The peaceful decolonization of Namibia envisaged under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has remained elusive. Namibia remains an occupied country. Its people remain in the merciless clutches of a brutal and racist colonial régime, and the clutches are tightening.

The past two years have witnessed the waning of active interest in the Namibian question, the consequence of a long period of stalemate in the negotiations for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), exacerbated by the growing crisis in South Africa. Active agitation for the



(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

implementation of resolution 435 (1978) seems to have been replaced by sullen exasperation over the intractability of the linkage issue and by heightened fear and anxiety over the impending conflagration in South Africa.

We do not know what has become of the negotiations for the repatriation of foreign troops from the People's Republic of Angola. There is so much silence that we are forced to wonder whether we have all reached the end of our tether and can do no more for the people of Namibia and their struggle for freedom. The people of Namibia still want and deserve their freedom. We owe it to them, and to ourselves as the United Nations, for until the independence of their country we remain the legal custodians of their aspirations. We cannot therefore abandon them to their own devices even though we have not the slightest doubt that they are capable of liberating themselves in time under the leadership of their national liberation movement, SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Nevertheless, the onus is on us to pay them our debt of honour, and we can only do so by pursuing with renewed vigour and determination the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The crisis in South Africa has its own life and its own logic, just as we have always insisted that the Namibian question be allowed to stand on its own, unencumbered by extraneous considerations or intrusions. For not only do we continue to oppose the linking of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to the removal of Cuban troops from the People's Republic of Angola; we are also opposed to the concentration of international attention and effort on the crisis in South Africa at the expense of the struggle in Namibia, where the United Nations debt of honour remains to be paid. We therefore insist that the crisis in South Africa, and the efforts we must continue to exert to effect the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) deserve our commitment and dedication in equal measure.

Namibia has been knocking at the door of independence and freedom since 1978, when the two parties to the conflict there, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa, accepted the United Nations blueprint for the decolonization of the Territory. It is eight years since the blueprint was accepted, and yet today it is as if such a blueprint had never existed. Too many irrelevancies have confused the blueprint, and are even endangering its very existence. But still it exists, though in a confused and adulterated state, and it must be implemented without any further delay.

Once again we appeal to the authors, and the open and private supporters, of the linkage argument to think again. We appeal to them to pause and calculate the cost in terms of the precious human lives of Namibians and of young South Africans, both white and black, who have been sent to the northern frontier of Namibia and into the southern region of the front-line State of Angola to fight and die needlessly in a war that should have ended eight years ago.

The authors and supporters of the linkage argument cannot escape responsibility for that wasteful war that is consuming so many lives in Namibia and

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Angola, and consuming them needlessly, consuming them simply because it is not in the interest - the selfish interest, that is - of Pretoria's friends and apologists that Namibia and its people should achieve their freedom and independence on their own terms.

Even more, we hold the authors and supporters of the linkage argument responsible for the deterioration of the security of our region. The intrusion of the linkage issue into the Namibian question has contributed immensely to the prolongation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia by obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has emboldened South Africa to commit various acts of aggression against its neighbours, secure in the knowledge that there can be no punitive reaction from its Western friends to its murderous cavortings all over the region. South Africa has with callous abandon infringed the borders of its neighbours and spawned, financed, armed and infiltrated criminal bandits to perpetrate a reign of terror, murder and destruction - all in the name of defending Western civilization.

Our region has thus become a playground for South African commandos, the storm-troopers of Western civilization, with the ready connivance of those in the Western world who are given to accepting at face value, with indecent haste, South Africa's hypocritical crusade against communism. The fact that the perpetuation of racial tyranny in South Africa, with its attendant tragedies, and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia are solely responsible for the creation of conditions for the "introduction of communism" in southern Africa is totally ignored. Instead it is suggested that those who are fighting for their freedom in Namibia and South Africa are communist-inspired, as if Namibians and South Africans have to be communist-inspired to know and appreciate the difference between oppression and freedom.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

What we want in southern Africa is freedom, not communist or capitalist influence and subjugation. SWAPO is fighting for independence and freedom in Namibia, and has no time or energy to waste on a parallel struggle, an ideological struggle, in occupied Namibia. The freedom of Namibians and the independence of their country is their first and overriding priority.

There is therefore no justification whatsoever for the injection of super-Power ideological rivalries into the liberation struggles in southern Africa. That is why we are opposed to the introduction of Stinger missiles in our region. We do not want our region to become a cockpit of super-Power conflict. We are opposed to the arming of bandit gangs by any country, particularly the super-Powers, whose ideological quarrels we are very happy to keep out of our region and continent.

And so we regard as extremely dangerous the arming of the UNITA bandits with the Stinger missiles of a super-Power. These missiles cannot serve any useful purpose. On the contrary, they have already pierced the heart of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in addition to aggravating the bloody strife in the southern part of the front-line State of Angola. These missiles, and not the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, have contributed in no small measure to the worsening stalemate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in addition to posing a serious threat to the security of the region. These missiles must be removed so that we can all get down to the business of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Southern Africa has had more than enough of the bloodshed, the strife and the instability resulting from the failure to find solutions to the problems of South Africa and Namibia. The region has been pushed to the edge of a dangerous precipice from which it may never return. And yet all we need do to alter this

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

dangerous state of affairs is to force the white minority régime in Pretoria to abandon apartheid, negotiate a democratic dispensation with its people and co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). What we do not need are Western apologies for the murderous activities of the régime. We do not need Stinger missiles for their murderous agents in the neighbouring States. We do not need the introduction of the cold war into our region.

The front-line States and Africa as a whole want nothing more than, first, the victory of reason in South Africa - that is, the abolition of apartheid and the creation of a democratic political order in that country; secondly, the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); thirdly, the termination of South Africa's occupation of southern Angola and its use of Namibia as a launching pad, and an end to support for the UNITA bandits; fourthly, an end to the destabilization of the front-line States, particularly Angola and Mozambique, and other neighbouring States; and, fifthly, an end to Western encouragement for South Africa's intransigence and arrogance.

These are legitimate demands whose fulfilment is crucial for peace in southern Africa. We are convinced that with the sincere help of the West we can stop the bloody carnage in South Africa and save that tormented country, for the enjoyment of all its people. We can pay our debt of honour to the Namibian people by forcing South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and by abandoning the questionable linkage of the realization of Namibia's right to self-determination to the fulfilment of irrelevant conditions.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

When these demands are met there will be no pretext for Pretoria's campaign of terror, murder and destruction in southern Africa, for the root cause of it all is the evil policies of apartheid and the bloody-minded fanaticism with which they are defended and enforced.

Let me reiterate again our anxiety about what we fear may be a growing tendency in the world today to regard the situation in South Africa - that is, the daily police atrocities on the streets of Soweto and other places - as so demanding of our attention as to diminish our concern about similar atrocities in Namibia committed by the agents of the same régime. We cannot and must not overlook the very painful fact that Namibia's independence is overdue by at least eight years. A viable internationally acceptable plan for the achievement of the Territory's independence has been in existence since September 1978. The onus is upon us to redouble our efforts and renew our determination to implement that plan, not kill it by neglect.

Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again, the General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia, whose people continues to languish under the rule of the racist régime of South Africa even though 20 years have passed since the General Assembly adopted a resolution terminating the racist régime's Mandate over Namibia. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime is a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and an open challenge to the will of the international community; it therefore endangers international peace and security.

The situation in Namibia grows worse daily. Oppression, persecution, detention and murder are the daily practice of the racist régime of South Africa against the black citizens of Namibia, depriving them of the fundamental rights. Despite those brutal acts, the Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole,

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), has continued in its heroic, legitimate struggle to achieve self-determination and independence.

The racist régime of Pretoria is not only illegally occupying Namibia, but is also using its territory as a springboard for launching repeated, brutal acts of aggression against the front-line African States, particularly Angola, which is subjected to constant acts of brutal aggression and subversion. The barbaric raids carried out last May by the racist Pretoria régime against several front-line African States are testimony to that brutality and the racist policy it bolsters. In this connection, my delegation wishes to stress its support for the front-line African States and its policy of providing all possible material and moral assistance to them to deter the barbaric aggression to which those countries are constantly subjected by South Africa, which trains mercenaries and puppet agents and infringes the sovereignty of those States in an attempt to destabilize them.

My delegation reaffirms that the independence of Namibia should be brought about on the basis of the immediate, strict implementation, without modification, of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This would guarantee full independence and sovereignty for the people of Namibia in all Namibian territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We totally reject the linkage of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which constitutes interference in the internal affairs of an independent State, which has a sovereign right to protect its territory with the assistance of any country it chooses.

In this connection we support the Declaration of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July 1986. That Declaration stresses the inalienable right of the Namibian people to

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. It calls on the South African régime to withdraw forthwith from Namibia, including the offshore islands.

The intransigence of the South African racist régime and its defiance of the international community's demand that it end its obnoxious racist policies and its stubborn occupation of Namibia could not continue without the support given to that régime by certain Western countries, in particular the United States of America, whose policy of constructive engagement with the racist Pretoria régime is intended to ensure continued exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by its transnational corporations.

Part I of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/41/24) states that 60 per cent of Namibia's gross national product is exported in the form of profits of transnational corporations and that of the remainder some 40 per cent is used for the operating expenses of foreign economic interests in Namibia. This ramified system of foreign interests in Namibia enables the racist Pretoria régime to develop its military machine, sustain its oppressive policies in Namibia and persist in its illegal occupation of the Territory.



(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The exploitation of the resources of Namibia and the plundering of its natural wealth is a breach of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Those resolutions provide for the protection of the natural resources of that Territory. The claims made by some Western countries that the imposition of sanctions on the racist Pretoria régime will harm the black population in South Africa and Namibia, as well as in neighbouring States, are groundless. It would be more appropriate to avoid lame excuses and to say that sanctions will inflict damage on the interests of the transnational corporations operating in South Africa and Namibia, thus perpetuating their exploitation of the natural and human resources in the southern African region.

The World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa held in Paris last June called for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the racist Pretoria régime in order to bring pressure to bear on it and to put an end to its occupation of Namibia. While supporting this recommendation, we reiterate our condemnation of the existing co-operation between some Western countries and the racist régime in Pretoria. We stress the need for the Security Council to adopt a resolution imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the racist Pretoria régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

The United States of America and the United Kingdom have used the right of the veto in the Security Council to obstruct the imposition of those sanctions. They should heed the will of the international community and collaborate with it to compel the racist régime to abandon its racist policies and put an end to its occupation of Namibia.

The military and nuclear as well as political and economic co-operation between the racist régimes, that is, the one in Pretoria and the other in occupied Palestine, is obvious to the international community and cannot be concealed or

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

swept under the carpet. The reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid have confirmed this, as well as a number of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and other international and regional organizations. The similarity between the two racist régimes and their aggressive nature has led them to foster mutual co-operation in order to oppress the Arab and African peoples. The international community must impose mandatory comprehensive sanctions on those racist régimes so that peace may prevail in the African and the Arab regions.

In conclusion, we commend the United Nations Council for Namibia which we consider to be the sole responsible legal administering authority for the Territory of Namibia. We commend the Council for its efforts to follow up the question of Namibia and we confirm our unlimited support for the heroic struggle waged by the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, led by their recognized liberation movements.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): The item on Namibia continues to draw on the emotions and frustrations of the Cameroonian Government and people. We had occasion to address the special session at length on our perspectives. We addressed not only the stage reached in this generation's effort - or lack of effort - to liberate our brothers and sisters in Namibia from the horrors of inhumanity which characterize the occupation forces from South Africa, but also the nature of our different individual attitudes which seem to encourage the enemies of sanity and justice to persist in the joys of satanic living.

Once again almost every delegation to the current session has rushed to this rostrum to decry the situation in Namibia. We have heard some of the products of intellectual brilliance and manifestations of the finest in the human mind. We have heard the voice of those who suffer the indignities, the hardships, the deprivations, the deaths. We have all heard our brother Guribab of the Foreign Relations Department of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) tell us

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

once again what we have been told again and again, as if we needed to convince ourselves of our capacity for hypocrisy and human evil.

No, the Cameroon delegation does not believe that this item presents yet another opportunity for speech-making. We should not any longer waste valuable time with repetitive narratives set to old themes, old excuses, old side quarrels on the phraseology of the unproductive resolutions we have adopted in the past. We need to address the scope of the slur on this Organization's reputation and credibility that the situation in Namibia constitutes for our generation.

Even that stock-taking is not enough, for we shall not be judged by history on the expertise we demonstrated in our analysis and apportioning of blame but on what action we took, universally, to assist Africa, its dying and oppressed sons and daughters, to get out of their present predicament. It will be remembered that, while we condemned and talked of isolating the archdeacons of apartheid, many nations continue not only to collaborate with them through profit-oriented activities but actually in some instances to accord access by that diabolical leadership to the land of people who claim to have made clear their abhorrence of the apartheid system.

We repeat the view that what the peoples of Namibia need and deserve is not the tranquilizers which our repetitive resolutions here attempt to provide. They see them as a consistent source of comfort to the sadists in South Africa who continue to snore while history writes the decrees of their doom. What the Namibian people want is the concerted endeavours of the international community to bring an end to their sufferings. They want the intervention of those in whose power lies, at this moment in time, accelerated change from injustice to justice, from war to peace, from deprivation to the opportunity to make their contribution to international peace, security and development.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

There is room in South Africa for black, white and any other colour of human pigmentation one may wish to choose. Let us not encourage indolence which might bequeathe to the children, grandchildren and future generations in South Africa the rudiments of a cruel and painful existence.

At a moment when we are discussing the financial malaise of the United Nations and its performance of its historic role in ensuring universal peace, let us give Namibia and its peoples the freedom that will reduce our agenda, and the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, by one item that costs millions of United States dollars.

Reference has been made to the programme adopted and not implemented under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We need more than reference to it; we need the political will, not of the recalcitrant régime in Pretoria - because those people are impervious to change and choose to live in halls and hamlets where they are cut off from the mainstream of civilization - but of the permanent members of the Security Council, because it is in their hands today that the power lies to cause change. We shall continue to call on the United States of America and the Soviet Union, these great Powers that were born in revolution and that tend to lead the world today wherever it goes, to give that leadership in a good cause. We call on others - on France, the United Kingdom and other economic and political giants of this age - to claim the privilege of strength and influence accorded them by history to save mankind the horror of immorality and injustice.

History is on our side. The Namibian people will one day - sooner rather than later - win their legitimate rights and freedoms. That is indisputable; that is sure. It is better that all those involved should show themselves concerned as they should be. Southern Africa will emerge some day as a great force; that also is a truth which must be recognized. It were better that the future leadership of Africans - black, white and others - did not look back to this period with hatred

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

and remorse. Shakespeare's lamentable prophecies ought to haunt all of us, great and small nations alike, as we watch events on the news media. If I may, I will recall again what that lament was:

"A curse shall light upon the limbs of men;

Domestic fury and fierce civil strife

Shall cumber all the parts of Italy" - we could well say here "the streets of South Africa" -

"Blood and destruction shall be so in use,

And dreadful objects so familiar,

That mothers shall but smile when they behold

Their infants quartered with the hands of war". (Julius Caesar, III, 1)

We only need to look at the television films to see how mothers as well as their children are smiling when their children are "quartered with the hands of war."

We have had dreadful wars. We created the United Nations to improve on the belligerencies of the past and to design a world of peace, security and development for all. Let us not convert southern Africa into an even greater tragedy waiting to happen. The region is strong in human and natural resources. It now possesses nuclear weapons. We should address the launching of a nation that will make contributions to peace, not to war. Our solidarity with SWAPO and the fraternal Namibian people remains unflinching and strong. We do not need to make a lengthy statement in order to reassure them on this issue. We would like to give the same assurance to our brothers and sisters of Angola, who remain threatened by the irresponsibilities of unthinking foreigners. We sincerely hope that from this year forward we shall begin to reconsider what actions and attitudes we should take to end this malaise of our people in Namibia. We can no longer afford to come here merely to express views and to adopt resolutions. We must come here determined to

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

take the type of actions that we need to take to save ourselves from the blame of history and to stop the bloodshed that is continuing to deprive our peoples in Namibia of the right to self-determination.

Mr. MATTURI (Sierra Leone): The history of Namibia is not unlike that of many former colonial territories, whose destinies were forged and shaped by the winds of war and foreign conquest. Few peoples have endured the worst excesses of colonial domination with such spirit and fortitude as have the Namibians. Even today, the unremitting oppression that is visited upon the Territory and its people can be traced to the nineteenth century when, at least in the eyes of the then world Powers, the "age of colonialism" flourished; for it blossomed, not to the advantage of the subject peoples, but to their wrack and ruin. In the case of Namibia, the atrocities that were committed against the Herero, Nama and Damara peoples by Imperial Germany at the turn of this century, though understandably never headlines in their day, were to become a chilling presage of South Africa's stranglehold.

In an age when ravaging a land and decimating entire populations were embraced by so-called civilized nations as acceptable measures to enforcing control over non-white "savages", the fate of the Herero, Nama and Damara peoples became but one more episode in the discharge of the "white man's burden".

No doubt what is taking place today in Namibia has to be understood against this background: for colonial situations deviate, not in their harshness, but only in their propensity for devising new forms of oppression. In Namibia's case, a conjunction of events was to determine the Territory's future. The actions of the Versailles power-brokers were later to form the basis for South Africa's claim to legal status in the Territory's affairs. For, in awarding Namibia to South Africa as a class "C" Mandate under the supervision of the League of Nations, the stage was set for Namibia's illegal occupation. Notwithstanding the Mandate obligations imposed on South Africa, namely, "to promote to the utmost the material and moral

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory", the understanding that the Territory was to be administered as an integral part of South Africa served to defeat the genuine discharge of that obligation.

Public utterances by South African leaders reinforce this view: in the early part of this century General Jan Christian Smuts was to remark on two separate occasions about the Mandates System that "the Mandate over South West Africa was nothing else but annexation" and also "it gives the Union [of South Africa] such complete sovereignty, not only administrative but legislative, that we need not ask for anything more".

From misguided intentions were to grow a monolith of savage exploitation and oppression. The world was to be told repeatedly over the ensuing years that the "status quo" established by the Mandates System could not be altered.

This historical evaluation has to be undertaken so that we can have a clear perception of a situation that has become a nightmare for the international community. Only such clarity makes it possible to understand fully the reluctance of certain nations in working positively towards a solution.

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

For many of our nations whose numbers have today swelled the ranks of the United Nations the colonial experience lies heavily on our minds, not simply because of the inequalities that typified such an experience, but primarily because we recognize in every colonial situation our own past of subservience and subjugation to a foreign authority - a past that is hauntingly familiar in Namibia.

That is why the majority of our countries continue to believe that the United Nations, whose activities were crucial in securing our own freedom, is the only forum through which the Namibian situation can be resolved, despite the frustration that has been experienced in securing South Africa's compliance with its numerous resolutions and decisions. In fact, we maintain that faith because we respect international obligations and abide by the rules and norms that govern the conduct of States, but not so South Africa. That country's contempt for this Organization's decisions has, in itself, a long history. This also bears close examination, because, since the founding of the United Nations in 1945, the racial policies of South Africa and the international responsibilities of South Africa with respect to Namibia have remained permanent action items on the agenda of the General Assembly. The rest is now far too familiar a story for repetition to diminish the poignancy of the tragedy.

In 1946 the General Assembly recommended that South Africa place the then Territory of South West Africa under the United Nations Trusteeship System. This recommendation was rejected outright by South Africa, which challenged the right of succession of the United Nations to the League of Nations Mandate System. This fallacy was eventually disposed of when the International Court of Justice stated in that memorable advisory opinion requested by the General Assembly that, in addition to South Africa's continuing to have international obligations regarding the Territory, the United Nations should exercise the supervisory functions which the League of Nations had exercised over the administration of the Territory.



(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

It is now over 35 years since that opinion was given and what was seen as the sacred trust of civilization that should have been discharged by South Africa in promoting the well-being and social progress of the Namibians is now a record of illegal occupation and brutal oppression. The history of Namibia is not short in anniversaries. A few months ago occurred the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the historic resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the General Assembly terminated the Mandate over Namibia, declared to the world that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations devolving from that Mandate, and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory.

The result is, of course, well known: South Africa's refusal to comply would later be the subject of another advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice when, on 21 June 1971, the Court declared that the continued presence of South Africa was illegal and that South Africa was under obligation to withdraw from the Territory.

These anniversaries all bear testimony to the continued illegality of the apartheid régime's activities in Namibia, as well as provide incontrovertible proof that that régime is an international renegade. But renegades rarely do their foul deeds alone, and South Africa is not without its own accomplices. How else can we describe those that, in spite of the firm and indubitable establishment of that régime's real intentions in the Territory, continue to engage actively in aiding and abetting the plunder of the Territory's resources? Should they not also be viewed as moral apologists? To strive to maintain in a foreign land intolerable economic and social conditions that would never be accepted within one's own borders, and, furthermore, to pretend that these are the best of available options, is to assail the foundations on which these very societies are built. It also ridicules the intellectual heritage of the Age of Enlightenment that created the mainstream of the philosophical thinking and social conduct of those societies.

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

But undoubtedly the evidence speaks for itself. It has been clearly established that the foreign economic interests involved in exploiting the Territory's resources include some of the world's largest corporations not only from South Africa but also from Western Europe and North America, accounting for about 95 per cent of the mineral production and export, as well as controlling 80 per cent of the Territory's mineral assets. In addition, an examination of the transnational corporations operating in Namibia proves disquieting: of the total of a little over 300 affiliated corporations, those from Western Europe and North America make up more than one third. This is in outright violation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was subsequently approved by General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX), of 1974, and which was promulgated specifically to stop the plunder of Namibia's resources and conserve them for the Territory's inhabitants.

The net result continues to be the threat that such foreign activities pose to the eventual enjoyment of the Territory's natural resources by its rightful peoples. A grim indicator is to be seen in the fishing sector, where by the late 1970s, as a result of wholesale plunder by South African and other foreign economic interests, the pilchard population had been depleted to a mere 7 to 8 per cent of its mid-1960s level.

This picture in itself is a telling indictment of the open conspiracy between South Africa and its accomplices. But the entire story cannot be fully illustrated by one or two examples. The Territory's unbalanced economic structure testify to its colonial character as clearly as its deplorable social inequalities attest to the degrading effects of apartheid.

Income distribution in Namibia has been described as among the most inequitable in the world, with the disparity ratio of white to black per capita income standing at 24 to 1. To this must be added the fact that Namibian workers

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

are not protected by labour legislation, are deprived of job security and are exposed to discriminatory practices, which include separation from their families. Apartheid determines where and under what conditions workers live as well as how long they can be employed.

If the economic conditions under which Namibians live are so bad, their social situation is hardly better. The majority of the population is confined to clearly designated security districts where they are subjected to the harshest penalties of martial law. Widespread arrests, preventive detention, violent break-up of meetings and other abuses of the fundamental rights of the Namibians are some of the repressive measures used by the apartheid régime to maintain its illegal occupation of the Territory and suppress the people's resistance, spearheaded by SWAPO.

Also, in an effort to tighten its grip on Namibia, the apartheid régime has periodically embarked, albeit unsuccessfully, on creating political conditions to its own liking in the Territory, thus ensuring a client régime dependent on South Africa's military support - from the establishment of the disgraceful Democratic Turnhalle Alliance to the recent installation of the so-called interim government at Windhoek last year, all of which stratagems have been universally condemned and declared to be without any legal effect.

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

The installation of puppet régimes in colonial situations is not an unknown practice. Similarly, precedents abound of attempts by colonialists to foist on colonial territories arrangements bereft of both support and acceptance. In the case of Namibia it has been repeatedly made clear that there can be no alternative to the United Nations plan for the independence of the Territory under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This resolution contains the only conditions on which the future of the Territory and its people can be assured. Failure in realizing the objectives laid down in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) can only be attributed to the distracting elements and negative influence that have been put forward from time to time as viable alternatives. In particular, the so-called policy of constructive engagement and the question of linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola have not only resulted in setbacks on the whole but also have succeeded in granting legitimacy to an illegal régime.

Few will deny that South Africa's intransigence is in large measure due to the economic and military set-up in the Territory. It hardly needs to be restated that one cannot legalize the benefits that result from an illegal situation. It has already been proved that the economic and technical ties existing between the apartheid régime and a number of countries contribute to the activities of the occupation forces in Namibia whose primary functions are to enforce the abhorrent policies of apartheid and create conditions favourable to the continued plundering of the Territory's resources. Our concern and commitment, therefore, should be dictated by the realization that we cannot, whether by collaboration with

(Mr. Matturi, Sierra Leone)

oppressors, callous indifference to legal obligations or neglect of moral principles, continue to deny peoples, whoever they are or wherever they may be, their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

What is required is a clear and unequivocal signal to the apartheid régime that its persistent refusal to implement the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on Namibia can no longer continue to be tolerated. The disarray in the ranks of the international community resulting from the unco-operative attitude of some countries has to be repaired. This world body cannot continue to retain its credibility if a significant and influential minority persists in maintaining that which is indefensible.

The situation in Namibia has been with us for more years than we may care to remember and during that time no significant progress has been registered in terms of a solution. On the contrary, we have witnessed an escalation in violence and loss of lives; we have seen Namibia used as a launching pad for outright aggression by South Africa against neighbouring independent States; we have experienced an increase in tension in southern Africa as a result of the policies of the apartheid régime. In addition, the economic future of an independent Namibia continues to be seriously threatened. But the time has come for all freedom-loving nations to work together to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Let this coalition of nations in defence of international peace and justice have the faith and courage to put an end to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and ensure that that country takes its rightful place among sovereign and independent nations. Let us have faith that right is might and in that faith dare to do our duty to the people of Namibia.

Mr. DIAKENG SERAO (Angola) (interpretation from French): Once again the General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia. In recent years the general debate has consistently been marked by expressions of the international

(Mr. Diakenga Serao, Angola)

community's apprehension at the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia. These apprehensions are unfortunately growing ever greater and dictate the need for immediate action. The question of Namibia is one of the burning issues of our time which the United Nations has often tackled, without managing to achieve a final settlement of the problem. I concede, however, that this is not due to a lack of imaginative thinking by Member States.

The consensus arrived at in the Security Council in 1978, which led to the adoption of the Council's resolution 435 (1978) concerning the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, gave rise at the time to legitimate hopes in the international community of a final and negotiated settlement of the Namibian conflict. However, the South African racist régime has since then resorted to frequent juggling of the facts, ploys, empty promises to the United Nations and false assurances to the international community. It remained intransigent while reinforcing its military presence in Namibia and developing its nuclear capability.

If one casts an impartial eye on the question of the independence of Namibia one sees that the racist régime in South Africa has often raised problems merely to gain time, and that when pending questions have been settled Pretoria has created new ones.

My delegation does not believe that the apartheid régime is prepared to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia unless the international community forces it to do so. South Africa's behaviour is aimed at deliberately eschewing just and equitable solutions to the problems caused by the system of apartheid in the region.

The colonialism of the racist Pretoria régime is not confined within the borders of its own national territory, nor in Namibia, which it occupies. The sovereign States of southern Africa have repeatedly been threatened and attacked by Pretoria's racist forces. For more than five years now the South African armed

(Mr. Diakenga Serao, Angola)

forces have held some parts of Angolan territory under brutal military occupation. They have massacred defenceless people and destroyed property there. South Africa is using Namibian territory as a launching pad for attacks against Angola. The South African military bases in the north of Namibia are used to train puppets and mercenaries to infiltrate our territory.

It is from those same bases that South African troops carry out incursions against our country and provide military support to armed bands operating under their orders in Angola.

The countries of the region are today witnessing an escalation of acts of aggression and destabilization by the racist régime in South Africa. Since independence, however, the Angolan Government has spared no effort aimed at creating a favourable climate conducive to settlement of the Namibian problem. Thus, aware of the complexity of the international situation and desirous of breaking out of the impasse created by South Africa and by the Administration of the United States with respect to implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the Government of the People's Republic of Angola submitted, on 17 November 1984, a package of proposals contained in a letter from President Jose Eduardo dos Santos to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar. The Angolan proposals are as realistic as they are topical today.

(Mr. Diakenga Serao, Angola)

But the racist régime not only turned a deaf ear to those proposals, but even stepped up its aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. That policy of the apartheid régime, unfortunately, has the open support of certain Western countries. The improper attempts of certain Western Governments to inject extraneous factors into the question of Namibia, and the collusion of those Governments with the apartheid régime in supporting puppets trained and commanded by South Africa, have constituted a further element in the escalation of tension in the region and the blocking of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It bears repeating that the so-called linkage between the presence in Angola of Cuban internationalist forces and the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is nothing more than a pretext employed by the racist régime of South Africa and the United States Administration to bar the way to Namibia's independence. Cuban forces are present in Angola under the terms of a joint agreement between the Governments of the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Cuba. Consequently, their departure is a matter for those Governments alone.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola therefore rejects once more the attempt by the racist régime of Pretoria and its ally to establish a linkage between the independence of Namibia and any other element extraneous to that question. Thus far no Angolan soldier, or any other soldier on Angolan soil, has crossed Angola's national frontier. However, mercenaries and regular South African troops are occupying a part of Angolan territory in flagrant violation of the rules of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter.

South Africa's presence in the Territory of Namibia prevents the application of the noble principle of the self-determination of peoples. Its presence is a violation of the rules of international law and of the principles of the Charter of



(Mr. Diakenga Serao, Angola)

the United Nations - of which South Africa is a Member. Finally, its presence is illegal, and the international community must redress the situation.

The people, party and Government of Angola stand in solidarity with the Namibian people and with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The People's Republic of Angola supports the realization by the Namibian people of its legitimate aspiration to independence and self-determination. The Angolan Government fully supports United Nations efforts to that end. We believe that the United Nations and the international community have an overriding duty to meet the challenge posed in relation to the question of Namibia. The international community must act before the Namibian tragedy becomes a world tragedy.

The struggle continues; victory is certain.

Mr. TILLET (Belize): On 14 December 1960, in its resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly declared, inter alia, that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that all steps should be taken to transfer all powers to them "without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire" (resolution 1514 (XV), para. 5)

Since then this Assembly has consistently adopted resolutions and decisions aimed at achieving the goal of ensuring the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and as recognized in the resolution I have just cited.

Twenty years ago, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. The question of Namibia is older than many of us here today. It is older also than many of the nations represented in this General Assembly. Yet today we are again confronted with that issue and with the question of what to do about the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

As we debate the question of Namibia it is important for us to keep in mind the total picture. We are looking at three different subjects when we discuss the independence of Namibia. We are looking, first, at colonization at its worst; secondly, we are looking at the motive of that colonization, which is profit; and thirdly, we are looking at the method or means of colonization, which is apartheid or white supremacy.

Webster defines apartheid as

"the policy of strict racial segregation and discrimination against the native Negroes and other colored peoples as practiced in South Africa". (Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary, second edition, 1977, p. 84)

It seems to me that a simpler and more accurate definition would be "white supremacy".

If any peaceful solution to the question of Namibia is to be possible, South Africa's policy of apartheid must end immediately. Once apartheid is dismantled, the independence of Namibia will follow as night follows day. The international community has concentrated on this subject as it has concentrated on no other. It is a credit to the peoples of the world that the plight of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa has occupied their attention for so long. If only the plight of those peoples would reach into our hearts and our consciences as well. Then we would get the needed action to bring liberty and freedom to the people of Namibia.

Much has been done with a view to dismantling apartheid and bringing Namibia to independence. In 1978, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), setting out the acceptable basis for bringing Namibia to independence. But that was not enough for South Africa.

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

In October 1985, the Commonwealth Heads of Government, meeting in the Bahamas, issued the Commonwealth Accord on southern Africa, in which they committed themselves to a broad range of sanctions against South Africa. The Communiqué issued at that conference stated that

"Heads of Government were gravely concerned that Namibia's independence had been further delayed. They considered the establishment of the so-called interim administration as null and void and renewed their call for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) which they reaffirmed as the only acceptable basis for bringing Namibia to independence. In accordance with this position, they again rejected attempts to delay Namibia's freedom by linking it to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. They also stressed that the policy of 'constructive engagement' had failed to end South Africa's intransigence over Namibia as well as over apartheid." (A/40/817, p. 13)

But that was not enough for South Africa.

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

On 15 November 1985 the Security Council, aware of the urgency of apartheid and Namibian independence, concluded a debate on a draft resolution calling for the imposition of mandatory selective sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and the adoption of enforcement measures, which included, first, ending all export credit guarantees for exports to South Africa and Namibia; secondly, prohibition of importation or enrichment of Namibian and South African uranium, supply of technology, equipment and licences for nuclear plants in South Africa; thirdly, imposition of an oil and arms embargo against South Africa; and fourthly, prohibition of all new investments in South Africa and Namibia.

Although 12 of the 15 members of the Security Council voted in favour of that draft resolution, it was not adopted because it was vetoed by two of its permanent members. That also was not enough for South Africa.

In September 1986, at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, those Heads of State or Government pledged their support to the independence of Namibia and the eradication of apartheid.

The Eighth Summit Conference ended its appeal for immediate independence of Namibia with these words:

"The time for Namibian independence is long past. To delay it any longer is immoral. We, therefore, appeal to all men and women of goodwill firmly to oppose any delay, for any reason and under any circumstances ..."

(A/41/697, p. 156)

Still South Africa did not think that was enough.

The European Economic Community is to be commended for the positive steps on sanctions it took on 15 September 1986. While the Belize delegation is encouraged by this new development, we urge them to implement more meaningful sanctions at an early date. For that too was not enough for South Africa.

(Mr. Tillett, Belize)

Most recently, we welcome the action of the United States Congress to impose sanctions on South Africa, and are encouraged by their determination to pursue this course of action in relation to South Africa. For South Africa still does not see that action as enough to deter it from its policies of apartheid or reason enough to grant Namibia its independence.

This combined world effort has had little effect on dismantling apartheid or granting independence to Namibia.

So we come to this forty-first session of the General Assembly with the draft resolutions contained in document A/41/24, Part II. Our hope is that these draft resolutions will gain the support of all nations and become the final thrust to bring about the dismantling of apartheid and the independence of Namibia.

Over 2,000 years ago, King Solomon said, "Hope deferred makes the heart sick". Each time hope is deferred for the independence of Namibia, it makes our hearts sick, but even more so, it makes the hearts of the Namibian people sick. Each day that goes by with apartheid reigning as king in Namibia makes it that more difficult to establish a moderate leadership for independent Namibia. It is in the political, economic and humanitarian interest of all concerned immediately to dismantle apartheid and bring Namibia to independence.

Among other things, the draft resolutions before us strongly urge the Security Council, in view of the persistent refusal by the racist régime of South Africa to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia ... and, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that régime, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

A significant number of States here have said they do not believe it is time for such a drastic measure. When is it going to be the right time? Are we waiting

(Mr. Tillet, Belize)

until Namibia has no more natural resources before saying it is time to impose mandatory sanctions? Then in the year 2010 we can come back to discuss a new item on the agenda of the session of the General Assembly for that year.

That item could very well be the critical economic situation in Namibia. Then the same nations which now protest and refuse to give full support to Namibia's independence will no doubt say that bad management and outdated policies and graft in government created this situation.

When will it be time? If the situation were reversed and a black minority were treating a white majority in the manner that the white minority now treat the black majority, do you suppose it would be time for comprehensive mandatory sanctions? If the black majority in the front-line States did to their white population what the South African Government does to its black population, would it be time then for comprehensive mandatory sanctions?

It is an ugly picture, but we are dealing with the ugly face of apartheid. Nations and peoples must search their souls in tune with the hymn which pleads: "Teach us to love with strength of heart and mind.

Everyone, all mankind.

Break down old walls of prejudice and hate.

Leave us not to our fate.

As thou hast loved and given thy life

To end hostility and strife,

Oh, share thy grace from heaven above

Teach us, Lord, how to love."

(Mr. Tillet, Belize)

Finally, I refer to a story which came from the civil rights movement during the 1960s, when the blacks in the United States of America sought their own freedom. A song emerged that will help us to focus the problem properly, and I hope that we shall consider the words of this song as we vote on these draft resolutions. Its words are simple and true:

As a little boy went to bed one night, he said to his father, before he fell asleep, "Tell me, Daddy, what colour is God's skin?"

The father replied, "It's black, it's brown, it's yellow, it's red and it's white, for everyone's the same in the good Lord's sight".

Apartheid will be defeated, Namibia will be independent.

Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): The year is 1986, and for 40 years now the question of Namibia has been uninterruptedly before this Organization. It is now 40 years since the time when, at the end of the Second World War, the colonized peoples of southern Africa, and in particular, of Namibia, should, like the other colonies of that time in Africa, including my own country, have progressed normally towards self-determination and complete independence.

Yet, for 40 years the heroic peoples of southern Africa, and of Namibia in particular, have been struggling to emerge from a huge, atrocious prison. Their gaoler is the repulsive neo-Nazi racist régime of Pretoria; and its allies have enjoyed a wretched notoriety for many years: they are, in particular, the Western Powers, headed by the United States and Great Britain.

It should be noted that the international community has made some noteworthy efforts to remedy the continuing tragedy of the Namibian people. Since 1966 the United Nations, tiring of Pretoria's procrastination, decided to end South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in the most formal manner possible and to strip it of all its rights to administer the Territory.

It is particularly distressing to note that the only constancy shown by the Pretoria racists has been their systematic rejection of the wishes of the United Nations and the international community.

In 1966 South Africa responded to the United Nations' decision to terminate its Mandate over Namibia by a refusal to recognize that decision, and it illegally maintained its presence in the Territory. Soon after it likewise rejected Security Council 276 (1970), which confirmed the illegal nature of South Africa's presence. It also rejected the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which, in 1971 declared that "South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory".



(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

It would be possible to draw up an exhaustive catalogue of all of the incidences in which the United Nations has thus been snubbed. They are so numerous, so revolting and so humiliating, that it is better not to list them. But I must refer to what we regard as the most significant among them.

In resolution 385 (1976), the Security Council affirmed the right of the Namibian people freely to define its own future and, in paragraph 7, stated: "... it is imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity". Two years later, in 1978, the way seemed to be opening for the implementation of that resolution, through the proposal made in the Security Council by five of its Western members, a proposal which led to the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and drawing up of the United Nations plan of action, which provides for a cease fire, elections supervised by the United Nations and the establishment of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

Although the racist régime had agreed in principle to this move and SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, had done likewise, the racist régime went to the Geneva meeting even more determined to defy the virtually unanimous wishes of nations of the world. Strengthened by the active support of its principal ally, the United States, it raised a new obstacle: the linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola.

Other misdeeds, some very significant, were to follow: the establishment of a so-called interim government in Windhoek on 17 June 1985; the stepping up of repression in South Africa itself and the systematization of State terrorism with the neighbouring countries as its daily victims together with the establishment of powerfully armed groups whose acts of outright banditry have been eagerly acclaimed in the media of the allies; and the shameless and headlong plunder of the natural

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

wealth of the Territory of Namibia. This state of affairs has reached a pitch at which certain countries do not hesitate to welcome visits from the sinister Mr. Botha with open arms.

Despite the mass imprisonments, torture, and assassinations, whether summary or disguised as plane crashes, despite the great damage done to the fragile economies of the front-line countries, despite the attempts to make Namibia a second home for apartheid, SWAPO has been urged to be patient and still to be patient; and we have all been urged to remain silent. It is surprising, for example, that those responsible for actions that are supposed to bring happiness to the distressed peoples of southern Africa have been insisting for some time on their identity remaining a secret. Each man should stand up to be counted in the pages of history.

The settlement of the Namibian question can no longer be postponed. Our Organization must make a decisive extra effort, bearing in mind the relevant reports 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 and the United Nations Council for Namibia. In this respect, we have noted with particular interest the statements made by the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Hector Oramas, and the President of the Council, Mr. Zuze. My delegation wishes to pay a sincere tribute to all the members of these United Nations organs, who have performed remarkably well in fulfilment of their mandate. We also highly commend the final documents and the work of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July of this year, and also the special session of the General Assembly on Namibia last September.

The collective intelligence of the nations, which has been aroused to the plight of the Namibian people, demands the immediate imposition of sanctions

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

against the illegal presence in Namibia of the neo-Nazi racist régime of Pretoria - not timid, selective sanctions, but comprehensive mandatory sanctions, which are the only non-violent means now available to make any dent in the continuing sinister policies of South Africa.

The Security Council has a primary role in this regard. It is only natural that this should be so in the light of resolutions 435 (1978) and 566 (1985), in which the Council rejected demands to link Namibian independence to extraneous issues. Moreover, the need for the United Nations to adopt decisive measures to end the illegal occupation of Namibia derives from the fact that it is in fact the United Nations which must assume effective and direct responsibility for the Territory until its genuine independence.

The Security Council should no longer tolerate the prevailing situation in Namibia, especially as it clearly constitutes at once a threat to peace, a breach of the peace and an act of aggression within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter. It is high time for the Council to cease waiting, with a passivity amounting to complicity, until Pretoria's misdeeds force it to react.

The position of my country on "linkage" is well known. Burkina Faso has always rejected this tactical attempt by South Africa to establish a link between completely unrelated situations, with the assistance of the United States in this fraudulent and delaying pretext.

We also feel that it is above all the Namibian people that will decide its own future history by wresting its total independence from its oppressors by fighting its own battle.

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

It is only logical that South Africa, a monster that oppresses the overwhelming majority of own its people, should oppress other peoples beyond its borders. A régime that denies its own people their most basic rights will not grant those rights to other peoples. But the course of history will proceed; freedom and the right of peoples to self-determination will prevail in and around South Africa.

We wonder whether the Security Council - specifically those of its members responsible for a succession of vetoes on this subject - wishes to stand on the side of history or whether it wants to row against the tide of history. That is the only question before us in this, the fortieth year of the martyrdom of the Namibian people.

Burkina Faso is convinced that the obstacles still encountered in the process of the decolonization of Namibia will not alter the evolution of that process or its ultimate outcome: the victory of the liberation struggle being waged so courageously by the Namibian people under the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole authentic representative. We are convinced also that victory can be hastened through the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

With that in mind, we appeal again to all those who only recently were impeding progress to cease their opposition to the adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We repeat our appeal not only so that authentic independence may come quickly to Namibia, but also, and above all, so that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will no longer be held in contempt anywhere in the world.

(Mr. Ouedraogo, Burkina Faso)

Burkina Faso is pleased to see the question of Namibia going beyond the narrow framework of national administrations and gaining greater commitment and political support on the part of public opinion, especially in countries whose policies and practices have not always been in line with the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions. In our view, that is extremely important, and confirms the truth that the struggles of peoples everywhere are always mutually supportive. We are convinced that, sooner than some may think, Namibia will, willy-nilly, become the great and peaceful homeland of a free and dignified people.

Homeland or death: We shall overcome!

The meeting rose at 10.35 p.m.