



General Assembly

UN LIBRARY

NO.

PROVISIONAL

MIN/SA COLLECTION

A/42/PV.57

11 November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 5 November 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)
later: Mr. MASRI (Vice-President) (Syrian Arab Republic)
later: Mr. LEGWAILA (Vice-President) (Botswana)
later: Mr. WIJewardane (Vice-President) (Sri Lanka)

- 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 Secretary-General
- (d) Report of the Fourth Committee
- (e) Draft resolutions

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/42/24)
- (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/42/23 (Part V); A/AC.109/916)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/596)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/42/698)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1, chap. I)

Mr. MANQOOSH (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): We meet today to discuss a question that should have been settled in 1966, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. That resolution was followed by several others which were adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Those two resolutions strongly condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations. To that we can add Article 77 of the Charter, which makes the United Nations responsible for that Territory as a Non-Self-Governing Territory. There is also General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), dated 18 May 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia to serve as the legal administering Authority of Namibia until its accession to independence. We therefore have a unique international consensus on the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and their own independent State within a peaceful framework based on the withdrawal of South African troops and the holding of free elections in which all sides and political parties in the region would participate. In addition to its being based on the principles of the

(Mr. Manqoosh, United Arab Emirates)

Charter which uphold the right of colonized peoples to independence and to the establishment of their free and independent States, this unanimity stems also from one of the ethical principles the international community deeply cherishes, namely, the principle which opposes racial discrimination in every shape or form. This is a principle that directly relates to human rights. Indeed, it is the corner-stone of the principles of human rights.

The South African régime is the practical and ideological antithesis of human rights as it is based on apartheid and is constantly trying to export that inhumane philosophy across its borders to the Territory of Namibia, which it illegally occupies.

In this respect the people of Namibia differ from the peoples of Asia and Africa who have suffered the vagaries of colonialism. The Namibian people does not only suffer the evils of occupation, plunder and exploitation but also suffer under the evils of apartheid, to which South Africa subjects their territory.

It is because of this that we have the international unanimity which is unprecedented in the history of collective peaceful initiatives, namely, the unanimity which calls for ending the military occupation of Namibia and, at the same time, calls for ending the philosophy of apartheid, upon which that occupation is based, and its practical manifestations.

On 30 October the Security Council adopted yet another resolution, namely 601 (1987), which reiterates the determination of the international community and embodies a practical method to pave the way towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as well as other United Nations resolutions on Namibia. As the said resolution states, one of the first steps that should be taken in that direction is the arrangement of a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as well as strict adherence to

(Mr. Mangoosh, United Arab Emirates)

that arrangement. SWAPO has declared its readiness to sign such an agreement and adhere to it.

My delegation supported that resolution in the hope that all Member States would do all that is necessary to enable the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire, as stipulated by the resolution. At the same time, we wish to stress the fact that a cease-fire is only one step towards the implementation of the resolutions of the international community with a view to enabling the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO.

The record of the apartheid Government gives us reason to believe that it will not bow to the behests of law, ethics and the international will unless it is forced to do so by the imposition of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. The people of Namibia, just as any other peoples in Asia and Africa, will achieve their independence and freedom through their just struggle. However, they need the concerted support of the international community because they are facing a unique form of colonialism, one which combines the evils of traditional colonialism and the scourge of an abhorrent philosophy that denies the very humanity of man, debases human values and threatens international peace and security.

In conclusion, we wish to declare our full support for the heroic struggle waged by the Namibian people under their legitimate representative, SWAPO, until the attainment of freedom and independence.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from

French): The international community will never tire, we are sure, of considering a problem as old and crucial as that of Namibia because it has to do with a fundamental question involving respect for human rights and the guarantee of their exercise, the inalienable rights of people to self-determination, freedom and independence. Moreover, ever since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia 21 years ago, the United Nations has exercised direct responsibility and authority over that international Territory. Need we recall that in 1971 the International Court of Justice also accorded it full legal validity. We are all aware that the General Assembly, the Security Council and the international community as a whole have done everything within their power to speed up the accession of that territory and its martyred people to self-determination, freedom and true independence.

In this context, when, in September 1978 the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, its action was hailed with joy by the whole of the international community. Unfortunately, however, we must note that the racist Pretoria régime, which is guilty of continued illegal occupation of Namibia, and its Western protectors, including the Power which practises the "constructive engagement" policy with regard to the diabolical apartheid régime, stubbornly oppose the strict implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in the spirit and the letter. These are the artificial obstacles that have been blocking the independence of Namibia.

My Government once again categorically rejects these obstacles and pre-conditions, such as the "linkage" between the granting of independence to Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist troops from Angola. The international community, has reaffirmed more than once, that the Namibian problem

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

is one of decolonization and that its solution should be found within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and People. We therefore condemn all attempts to have this problem considered in the context of East-West confrontation.

We are all aware that without the unconditional political, economic, military, or any other support given to it by certain Western countries, the illegal racist Pretoria régime would not have had the audacity to challenge the authority of the United Nations and the international community as a whole with impunity. Like it or not, those who thus support the apartheid régime are responsible for the untold sufferings endured every day by the martyred people of Namibia as a result of the most barbaric measures of oppression and repression imposed on them by the neo-fascist occupying Power. We are certain that the protectors and trade partners of Pretoria do not have a clear conscience if, as they claim they are champions of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of peoples. We also condemn the misuse of the veto by some of them in the Security Council when that august body is about to impose mandatory global sanctions against South Africa and compel it to apply strictly its resolution 435 (1978). Last April, for example, such a draft resolution was blocked in the Security Council through the use of the veto by two of its permanent members, who thereby sacrificed the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and its sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on the altar of their selfish and immoral strategic and economic interests. We would remind you of the systematic plundering of the natural and human resources of Namibia that is being carried out by the corporations of certain Western countries and others.

The Lao Government welcomes the patient and tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the legal

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

Administering Authority of this international Territory until its independence, and those of all the competent organs of the United Nations and the various non-governmental international organizations which have worked for the noble cause we are considering.

My Government also welcomes the adoption by the Security Council almost a week ago of a resolution authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO in order to take the steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia, pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We are all aware that SWAPO is prepared to sign the cease-fire. Pretoria must sincerely co-operate in the implementation of such a resolution. Any delaying tactics or duplicity on its part would be strongly condemned by the international community and by the Security Council itself, which would then at long last be moved to impose the most effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. In this context, we associate ourselves fully with the decisions taken by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 2 October this year when it met here in New York at the ministerial level. We cannot but commend the good will and sincerity with which the leaders of SWAPO have so far co-operated with a view to the implementation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, we must remember, constitutes the generally accepted framework for a peaceful and lasting settlement of the Namibian question.

The consistent position of my Government with regard to decolonization problems in general and to those of Namibia and apartheid in South Africa in particular, is well known to all. Our sympathy for their cause and our solidarity with them are only natural for, like the martyred Namibian people, we endured

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

untold sufferings in the past as a result of long wars of colonialist and imperialist aggression. Although our people is still suffering today from the devastating consequences of that tragedy, our Government recently decided to make a modest contribution to the AFRICA Fund - the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid Fund. This Fund, as we know, was recommended by the Eighth Summit Conference of non-aligned countries held at Harare last year.

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

Finally, my delegation wishes to reaffirm the unshakeable support of our Government and people for the heroic struggle of the martyred people of Namibia, under the resolute and inspired leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, for self-determination, freedom and true independence in a united Namibia. The peoples of the front-line States also continue to have our support and solidarity as they struggle courageously and effectively to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity against acts of aggression and political and economic destabilization committed by the criminal apartheid régime of South Africa, a régime whose elimination is becoming ever more necessary.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In recent days the attention of the world community has been focused on the extremely profound, complex and thought-provoking speech made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Gorbachev, at the solemn meeting of the Central Committee and the highest Soviet legislative bodies marking the seventieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

As well as giving a broad panorama of the historical process of the present century as a whole, Mikhail S. Gorbachev portrayed the general state of affairs and major trends in what are usually called "the developing countries". He stated that characteristic features of the situation in that part of the world are "the growth of political energy", "the genuine consolidation of national States", "grapes of wrath rooted in the soil of a glaring polarization of poverty and wealth", "the contrast between possibility and reality", and "the processes of inter-State consolidation of the developing countries" where "ever more clearly and actively we see the force of national uniqueness and self-sufficiency". Namibia is an integral

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

part of this developing world, but with the distinction - we note this with real regret - that so far it has not acceded to freedom and independence.

The Soviet delegation does not intend to dwell in detail on the policy of racist South Africa towards Namibia and the countries of the region as a whole. Such questions as the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria, the cruelty, terror and acts of oppression carried out by it in that Territory, the rapacious exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, acts of aggression by South Africa and subversive acts against neighbouring African States, the policy of linkage and so on have been set forth in detail in reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Special Committee on decolonization, documents prepared by the Secretariat and numerous statements by delegations of various countries and representatives of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) during the debates here, as well as by petitioners.

Our position is well known to all. The Soviet Union categorically condemns the policy and practice of South Africa with regard to Namibia, and vigorously rejects the policy of delaying the granting of its independence. Today I wish to speak of the ways in which to resolve the Namibian problem, and the principles behind them, since the active search for a solution will determine whether the United Nations - the Security Council and the General Assembly - will be able in the near future to achieve implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other United Nations decisions on Namibia.

The Security Council met from 28 to 30 October this year to consider the question of Namibia. The discussion was extremely animated and sometimes became quite heated, which is fully understandable. The participants gave an alarming assessment of the situation in Namibia and the present state of affairs with regard to a settlement of the Namibian problem. The reasons for it were revealed and the

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

culprits - those guilty of the artificially created powerlessness of the United Nations to put its plan for Namibia into effect - were named.

There is cause for serious concern in the fact that the statement of the representative of South Africa linking the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was supported by the representative of the United States, who said that a pre-condition for the resolution's implementation was the achievement of an agreement ensuring security for both Angola and South Africa. What is that - a coincidence or a policy agreed on with South Africa for further application of the notorious policy of linkage, rejected by the United Nations? Most probably it is the latter, especially since, in addition to other factors, South Africa is demanding the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola at a time when subdivisions of the South African army are carrying out military operations on its territory, which is precisely what is threatening Angola's security.

Granting independence to Namibia would present no danger to South Africa. To argue otherwise is to tread the boards of the theatre of the absurd.

The Soviet Union believes that the time has long been ripe for shifting from a policy of linkage to a policy of solutions, to practical steps aimed at cutting through the Namibian knot and defusing the explosive situation in the southern part of the African continent. A just settlement in southern Africa can and must be achieved by political means, dialogue and collective efforts. However, for that to be done there must be a desire for a settlement.

We would like to believe that South Africa and its protectors abroad will finally understand in today's world universal values have acquired the highest significance. The interests of one State, however powerful it may seem, cannot determine regional or global policy. A balance of interests is needed. In

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

southern Africa it is not only the interests of South Africa that are in the balance. That must be understood and taken into account in political practice. If South Africa and its protectors sincerely intend to seek ways to resolve the problems of the region, they must adopt a new approach and fresh views. The problem is that all the signs are that they are not ready to do so.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Instead of developing relations with its African neighbours according to the criteria that govern normal international conduct, Pretoria is continuing to rely on force, thus creating a threat to their sovereignty and security and often violating both through its actions. The Soviet Union firmly believes that, in the context of international relations as a whole, security must be universal. The highest wisdom is not exclusive self-interest, particularly when it harms other countries. All must feel equally secure.

The welfare of each individual State depends upon the security of all. This was clearly stated at the twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and reaffirmed in the report presented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the solemn meeting held in observance of the seventieth anniversary of the Great October Revolution, and it is fully applicable to southern Africa and to each of its component elements, whether we are speaking of Angola, Mozambique, South Africa or any other country of the region. In the interests of ensuring the speedy independence of Namibia, the Soviet Union is in favour of the immediate stepping up of the role of the United Nations, the Security Council, the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for Namibia. In the report to which I have just referred, Comrade Gorbachev stated:

"We have come out resolutely for strengthening the prestige of the United Nations, for the full and effective use of the powers conferred upon it and its agencies by the international community. We are doing all in our power to see to it that the United Nations, this universal mechanism, can with full powers, discuss and ensure the collective search for a balance of the interests of all States and effectively carry out its peace-making functions."

This statement is fully applicable to the role of the United Nations with regard to southern Africa.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

The behaviour of those who are deliberately, constantly and stubbornly blocking the application of the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations against the racist occupiers of Namibia is regrettable. They are resorting to the use of the veto in the Security Council to block, against the expressed will of the international community, the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter designed to compel the Pretoria régime to carry out the resolutions adopted by the Security Council on the independence of Namibia. The Council's recent adoption of resolution 601 (1987) is an important practical step towards implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It opens the way for concrete measures towards implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. It is important that the initiative and impetus created at the meetings of the Security Council should be logically carried forward. We must do everything possible to see to it that the mission of the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) is crowned with success. All Members of the United Nations, and in particular the members of the Security Council, must actively promote this and assist the Secretary-General to open in southern Africa a constructive dialogue with all of the parties involved. In this connection, the Security Council, in our view, should consider reactivating its sub-committee on Namibia, which could follow the development of the situation in the Territory on a regular basis and report thereon to the Council, as well as search for ways and means to achieve the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

In an article entitled "Reality and safeguards for a secure world," published on the eve of the opening of the forty-second session of the General Assembly, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated our approach to the resolution of regional

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

conflicts, and he emphasized, in particular, the need for a more effective use of the capabilities of the United Nations. In our view, the ideas set forth in the article deserve attention with regard to a solution of the problems of southern Africa.

The position of the Soviet Union with regard to the question of Namibia is clear and unequivocal: the USSR unswervingly favours the speedy exercise by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence on the basis of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and other relevant United Nations decisions. Our country supports the decisions taken by the United Nations and other international forums on Namibia that call for the rendering of comprehensive material and moral support and assistance to the anti-colonial and anti-racist struggle of oppressed peoples.

In accordance with those decisions, we continue to lend our full support to the just struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation, self-determination and independence which it is waging under the leadership of SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. In connection with the development of the ties between the Soviet Union and SWAPO, it is my pleasure to report a notable recent event: on 14 October of this year, the first head of the mission of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Nangolo Philemon Malema, accredited to the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa, presented his credentials at Moscow. This is further testimony to the strengthening of our relationship with and support for SWAPO.

The Soviet Union has no special interests in southern Africa aside from the wish that the peoples and countries of that region may finally be allowed to take their own sovereign decisions on questions of their development and their domestic and foreign affairs in peace and stability. The Soviet Union believes that the

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, bears the major responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia. Within the United Nations we have consistently supported resolutions on Namibia and worked for their implementation.

The developing world, of which Namibia is a part, has become a significant factor in world policy. It is seeking organizational forms that will enable it to participate actively and on an equal footing in the solution of problems that affect all of mankind. It is already clear that its impact on world policy will grow, as will its regional role in shaping the world's economic future. We are convinced that a strengthening of this factor and its influence on the international community will speed the solution of the Namibian problem. This is a prospect that we greet with optimism. We are convinced that transnational capital, in spite of its great power, is not destined to determine the future path of the third world. Rather, it will be forced to adapt to the independent choice that has been made or will be made by the peoples of the third world themselves. In this instance, it will be the choice of the people of Namibia, to which we most sincerely wish a speedy accession to freedom and independence.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Since the last session of the General Assembly considered the Namibian question, renewed efforts have been made by the international community for the early independence of Namibia. In this connection, as we all know, the United Nations Security Council convened twice, both in last April and in October, for the urgent examination of the situation in Namibia. Last May, the United Nations Council for Namibia held extraordinary plenary meetings at Luanda, the capital of Angola, a front-line State, which were followed by its first Ministerial Meeting on 2 October. The twenty-third ordinary session of the Organization of African Unity Assembly of Heads of State and Government and the Ministerial Meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held this year have both taken up the Namibian question as an important agenda item. All these meetings unanimously condemned the South African authorities for their continued illegal occupation of Namibia and strongly demanded that they should implement immediately and unconditionally the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, so as to enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. However, in defiance of the just demand of the international community, the South African régime has not only refused to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions but intensified its efforts to carry out its colonialist and racist policy, thus further worsening the situation in Namibia.

Over the past year, the South African occupying authorities have exacerbated their bloody suppression of the Namibian people. The South African military and police forces have wilfully detained, tortured and murdered SWAPO leaders, as well as its members, supporters and sympathizers, brutally beaten and killed women, children and the elderly, blown up schools and clinics and attacked churches and workers' compounds in an attempt to stamp out by brutal violence the Namibian people's struggle for independence. At the same time, the Pretoria régime has

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

stepped up its efforts to consolidate the so-called interim government it has knocked together, formulate a so-called constitution and scheme "local elections". It is trying to circumvent the United Nations and impose its own proxy régime on the Namibian people through an "internal settlement".

The prolonged illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African authorities has not only brought untold suffering to the local people but also posed a grave threat to the security and stability of the neighbouring countries. The South African authorities have turned Namibia into a base for aggression against its neighbours and a training camp for the rebel forces in those countries. From Namibia, they have time and again launched armed invasions and perpetrated subversion against Angola, Zambia and Botswana and other front-line States, thus undermining the stability of the entire southern African region and endangering international peace and security.

In the world of the 1980s, no one could in good conscience allow the apartheid régime of South Africa to continue to subject more than 1 million Namibian people to its colonial rule. To help the Namibian people rid itself of the colonialist and racist shackles of South Africa and stand up as the master of its own country has become an imperative task for the international community. The United Nations must discharge its responsibility by taking prompt actions to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and bring about Namibian independence. The Chinese delegation is ready, together with other delegations, to make its efforts in seeking practical steps towards a settlement of the Namibian question.

The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) will lead to a just and reasonable settlement of the Namibian question. The steps envisaged in the plan for the independence of Namibia approved by this resolution - cease-fire, withdrawal of South African troops and achievement of independence through elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations - will, if

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

implemented in real earnest, ensure the Namibian people's free exercise of its right to self-determination and fulfil the ardent aspiration of people the world over for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. However, nine years have passed and no progress has been registered in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), owing to obstruction by the South African authorities.

For nine years, the South African authorities have kept playing double-faced tactics. On the one hand, they have pretended to agree to resolution 435 (1978), while on the other, they have frequently gone back on their word and set up one obstacle after another to its implementation by raising irrelevant side-issues. In November 1985, in reply to the United Nations Secretary-General, the South African Foreign Minister agreed to the system of proportional representation for the election envisaged by resolution 435 (1978). Consequently, all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved. What should have been done then was the immediate fixing of a date at which the implementation of the resolution should commence. To our disappointment, the South African authorities chose to continue to obstruct the settlement under the excuse of "linkage" contrived by them in 1982. As everyone knows, the so-called linkage is designed to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, a question different in nature. It is not only opposed resolutely by SWAPO and the front-line States but also repudiated by the international community. The relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions have emphasized that "linkage" is irrelevant to resolution 435 (1978) and constitutes an obstacle to the achievement of Namibia's independence. By clinging to "linkage", the South African authorities have exposed their own sinister intention to use it as a pretext in order to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan, perpetuate their occupation of Namibia and use the territory as a buffer zone for the protection of their apartheid system.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

In the view of the Chinese delegation, the international community should no longer tolerate this unreasonable attitude of the South African authorities, nor allow them to go on delaying endlessly the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It is time for the international community to take immediate mandatory actions against them. To this end, we propose the following:

First, strongly demand that the South African authorities should co-operate with the Secretary-General for the prompt implementation of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) adopted a few days ago. If they remain intransigent on "linkage" and continue to defy United Nations resolutions, the Security Council should immediately adopt mandatory sanction measures against them in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Secondly, urge the major Power which supports "linkage" to change its unreasonable position, so as to remove the obstacle in the way of implementing the United Nations plan.

Thirdly, urge the major Powers that are influential with South Africa to take concrete and effective measures to bring pressure to bear on South Africa and force it to implement resolution 435 (1978) at an early date.

The Chinese people, who shared a similar experience in the past, deeply sympathize with the Namibian people's suffering. We view it as the common cause of the people of the world to eradicate the remaining colonial stronghold and achieve Namibia's independence. I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that the Chinese Government and people will, as always, resolutely support the Namibian people in its struggle for national liberation and independence under the leadership of SWAPO, as well as support the struggle of the front-line States to maintain their independence and territorial integrity and the struggle of the South African people against apartheid, until their final victory.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which covers a period of one year, reflects the concerted activities of various bodies of the Organization relating to the immediate granting of independence to the Namibian people. The Council for Namibia has centred its work on the implementation of initiatives designed to eliminate the obstacles to the political independence of Namibia. To that end, the Council for Namibia has made enormous efforts to mobilize the most important organs of the United Nations and world public opinion.

The General Assembly held its fourteenth special session in September last year. That special session dealt with the question of Namibia. Resolution S-14/1, adopted at the end of the session, highlighted once again the main causes of the situation that existed then and still exists in Namibia and indicated the measures likely to ensure the best possible conditions for a prompt solution to the question.

In implementation of the special session's decisions, the African Group requested the Security Council in April last to take up the situation in and around Namibia and to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to force it to comply with the United Nations plan for the granting of independence to the Territory contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We cannot but express our deep regret that, because of the negative vote of one of the permanent members of the Council, it was not able to fulfil the hopes that had been placed in it.

On 2 October last, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a Ministerial Meeting which undertook a thorough analysis of the situation in and around Namibia and confirmed that the measures previously taken in other forums were correct and urgent. Many important initiatives were proposed in the final communiqué adopted

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

at the end of that Meeting. The carrying out of those initiatives would guarantee the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

Less than a week ago - from 28 to 30 October - the Security Council was once again seized of the question of Namibia by the African Group. The marked worsening of the situation in the Territory and the lack of progress towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) were the reasons for convening those meetings of the Council. The discussion unequivocally showed that the international community firmly insists that practical initiatives be taken to implement the plan for the granting of independence to Namibia. We are encouraged by the adoption of resolution 601 (1987) at the end of that discussion. For the first time, the Council affirmed that all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved. On that basis, it authorized the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa, in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We hope that the Secretary-General will receive appropriate support from all the countries concerned, in order that these decisions may be implemented, setting in train the process of Namibia's immediate accession to independence. In that connection, the Bulgarian delegation welcomes the fact that SWAPO stated during the meetings of the Security Council that it was prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement.

Supplementing the activities in those important forums, the Council for Namibia held some extraordinary plenary meetings last May in Luanda, People's

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Republic of Angola, at which it adopted a Declaration and Programme of Action. Those documents play an important part in rallying, mobilizing and harmonizing the efforts by the Organization and world public opinion in support of the immediate liberation of Namibia.

The fact that South Africa has not implemented the many decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia compels the General Assembly once again to take up the situation that has thus been created and once again to point out and highlight the causes of the obstacles to Namibia's accession to independence, as well as to confirm the measures likely to attain that final objective.

In flagrant contradiction with the clearly, unambiguously expressed will of the international community and with the United Nations resolutions and decisions on this question, racist South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia - occupation which constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people. Furthermore, it has put into effect in the Territory its infamous apartheid system, repeatedly condemned by the international community. The policy of massive repression and genocide pursued by the 100,000-man-strong army of the occupier and its police units, is assuming ever-more-monstrous dimensions.

During the past year we have witnessed a rapid worsening of the situation in Namibia. That is the result of the increasingly brutal repression of the people of Namibia by South Africa, including massacres of children and adults, bombing, attacks on townships and churches, and arrests and torture of leaders and members of, and sympathizers with, SWAPO. This has evoked the strong condemnation of the régime by the international community as a whole.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Another aspect of the situation in Namibia is the continued ferocious exploitation and plundering of the Territory's natural wealth, in flagrant violation of the provisions of Decree No. 1, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia and confirmed in a General Assembly resolution, concerning Namibia's natural resources. In this plundering of the Territory's resources, the transnational corporations of some Western countries act in concert with the Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The territory of Namibia is further used as a staging ground for carrying out innumerable and continuous acts of aggression, sabotage and destruction against independent neighbouring African States and, first and foremost, against the People's Republic of Angola. As mentioned in the final communiqué of the meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held at ministerial level,

"those criminal policies of racist South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security". (A/42/631, para. 11)

We express our full solidarity with the front-line States and believe that the multifaceted support given to those countries will be of great importance in terms of a solution to the Namibian question and in terms of their peaceful development along the path they have themselves chosen.

Despite the many resolutions and decisions of the United Nations which pave the way to an immediate solution of the Namibian question through peaceful means, racist South Africa is attempting to impose a so-called internal solution of the question. That is the goal of its attempts to establish a provisional puppet government by means of a pluralistic conference. We have witnessed in recent times the preparation by the racist puppets of a constitution which, in effect, tends formally to legalize that neo-colonial decision. We strongly reject such designs by the racist régime as null and void.

The main bogus argument for Pretoria's refusal to implement United Nations resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia is the linkage pre-condition between the granting of independence to the Territory and the presence of Cuban troops in the People's Republic of Angola. That linkage pre-condition has not been recognized by the General Assembly or the Security Council which, in its resolution 539 (1983), rejected the request to link the independence of Namibia to questions that were inappropriate, not germane, and not in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The lack of grounds for such an argument is more than

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

obvious. The People's Republic of Bulgaria categorically rejects this artificial excuse. Furthermore, it is precisely the policy of constructive co-operation with racist South Africa that finds expression in the granting of military, economic and political assistance to the régime that constitutes for that régime the necessary support to enable it to disregard the aspirations of the people of Namibia to national independence, and its constant challenge of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations on that question.

We strongly reject all attempts to change the nature of the question of Namibia by presenting it as being part of the East-West confrontation. The question of Namibia is a question of decolonization and of the struggle against apartheid, and consequently there are two parties to the conflict - the people of Namibia fighting for their independence and the South African régime of occupation.

In a situation that will necessarily worsen in the Territory, the people of Namibia for decades have been waging a heroic struggle for their national independence under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). It is their legitimate and inalienable right to fight by all means, including military means, against the aggressor and occupier, exercising the principle embodied in the United Nations Charter of self-determination of peoples. All peoples and States which cherish the ideals of the United Nations are together standing by the Namibian people. The people of Bulgaria stand in full solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. We will continue in future to give them support in many areas in the struggle for their national independence.

The conflict in and around Namibia has entered a critical stage. Not only is international peace and security in southern Africa at stake. In this context, the United Nations is called upon to implement appropriate peaceful means to guarantee

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

an immediate global settlement of the question of Namibia. The settlement of that dangerous situation through peaceful means would be a concrete contribution to the implementation of the general system of international security proposed at the forty-first session of the General Assembly by the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The documents adopted by many international, intergovernmental and governmental forums this year and in 1986, unequivocally show that Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter provides for effective peaceful procedures, namely, comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. Here we must underscore the historic responsibility that the world Organization bears in the settlement of the Namibian question. It will in this way make a major contribution to the positive process which recently has made itself felt in international relations, promoting also new and effective approaches to a just and durable settlement of the question of Namibia and of all other problems facing mankind as a whole. The present debate gives us confidence.

Mr. SARRE (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Only a few days ago the international community marked in a wholehearted surge of solidarity and spirit of consensus the Week of Solidarity with the Namibian people and their sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

In the message which he sent in that regard to the Secretary-General on 28 October last, the President of the Republic of Senegal, His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, indicated:

"It is inadmissible for the international community and its principal body the United Nations to continue in our time to remain powerless and inactive watching the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist and colonialist South African régime, which has stepped up its repression of the Namibian people and the militarization of the Territory."

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

He stressed that that event

"should mark the time for stock-taking and action".

In fact, today to engage in stock-taking when considering the question of Namibia, we can only be surprised, not to say concerned, at the disproportionate gap existing between, on the one hand, the magnitude of everything which should have been said, proclaimed and resolved by the international community to settle the problem, and on the other hand the insufficiency and lack of real political will to translate those resolutions and decisions into concrete and tangible actions.

We can no longer even count the number of international conferences, meetings, resolutions and decisions of which the question of Namibia has been the subject. The international community pondered the matter in particular during the International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights, held in Dakar, Senegal, in January 1976, during which my country proposed the institutionalization of the yearly celebration of the above-mentioned Week of Solidarity; the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, held in September 1980 in Paris; the Nordic Conference on Namibia, held in 1981 in Helsinki; the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April 1983; the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which met in Vienna in July 1986; and, finally, the Brussels International Conference on Namibia of 1986.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

For its part, the United Nations, having succeeded the League of Nations in 1945, has never since that time ceased to be concerned over the Namibian question and has regularly had it considered by its major bodies, namely, the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as by several specialized or subsidiary bodies.

Thus, since 1946, our Assembly has been informed every year of this case, which is on the agenda of all its regular sessions and it has devoted three of its special sessions to it, namely, the fifth, ninth and fourteenth, as well as an emergency special session in 1981. Moreover, it had entrusted a technical study of it to a number of ad hoc bodies such as the Committee on decolonization, and above all to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was set up in 1967 to administer the Territory and to prepare the inhabitants for the exercise of international sovereignty.

In the same way, the Security Council, the main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, has had to deal with this question and it has already adopted a dozen resolutions on it, in particular resolution 435 (1978) containing the United Nations plan for the independence for Namibia, a plan which has been internationally accepted, and that acceptance includes the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the South African Government.

For his part, the Secretary-General of our Organization, to whom I should once again like to pay a tribute, has worked tirelessly to fulfil the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council, namely to prepare the conditions necessary for the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan set forth in its resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

Other international forums and bodies such as the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and, above all, the Organization of African Unity deal with the Namibian problem regularly.

The numerous conclusions and relevant decisions that have emerged from all these international forums are well known to our Assembly and to all delegations, so there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice it to say that they have allowed us to grasp the scope of the Namibian question, while keeping in view the only just solution, namely, pure and simple decolonization. They have in particular served, first, to establish and reconfirm the legal responsibility of the United Nations in this Territory, as well as the illegality of its occupation by South Africa; secondly, to identify the question as a problem of decolonization to be implemented in the spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples set forth in resolution 1514 (XV); thirdly, to outline the framework and the process to be followed and to enunciate the ways and means required to bring about the decolonization of the Territory; and finally, to prepare all the conditions necessary for the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

If then everything is at last ready, at least on paper, for the achievement of the decolonization of the Territory, why is Namibia still not independent? Why has the South African grip tightened 21 years after the termination of its Mandate on the Territory and nine years after the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of the United Nations settlement plan?

That question is asked by the Namibian people, daily battered in body and spirit. It is asked also by Africa, which is struggling against the racist régime of Pretoria. It is asked also by the whole of humanity, which is a victim of the crime of apartheid.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

The answer lies first and foremost in the blind stubbornness of the South African régime in wishing to go against history by clinging to its racist and inhuman creed, that of apartheid, which it is desperately trying to save by trying to gain time by insisting on illegally occupying Namibia. For the illegal and prolonged occupation of Namibia by South Africa is one of the manifestations of the policy of apartheid of Pretoria, which thus believes that it can serve as a diversion in the illusory hope of indefinitely delaying the dismantling of apartheid.

That is why for more than 20 years now the South African régime has been using and abusing subterfuges and delaying tactics in order to perpetuate its colonial stranglehold on Namibia. Its attempts to submerge the problem of decolonization in the East-West confrontation, to link it to the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola, and to impose an internal solution through the setting up of a so-called interim government: all derive from this logic.

Fortunately, the vigilance of the international community has allowed for the thwarting of all these manoeuvres, which have been declared null and void by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity, as well as by the General Assembly and by the Security Council, which in its resolution 566 (1985) referred to its resolution 535 (1983) and declared that:

"the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are alien to Security Council resolution 435 (1978)". (paragraph 8)

But the fact remains that Namibia is still not independent and that its inhabitants are still crushed under the racist and colonial yoke of Pretoria, which flouts and violates their human rights while engaging in large-scale exploitation of the precious resources of the Territory.

It is because the South African Government wrongly feels itself, if not supported, at least tolerated in its odious actions by those on whom history and

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

the Charter of our Organization have conferred special responsibility with regard to Namibia. Short-term economic and strategic considerations play a part in this state of affairs, but the countries in question must realize that as soon as Namibia accedes to independence, the greater and more sure will be their chances of seeing their interests taken into consideration by the Namibian people which, sooner or later, will set itself free and will know how to evaluate the actions of others.

Thus our Assembly should call on the Security Council and primarily on its permanent members to make use of the means made available to them by the United Nations Charter to bring Pretoria to its senses and get it to agree on the immediate implementation of the settlement plan set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Senegal considers resolution 601 (1987) adopted by the Security Council on 29 October last a step in the right direction. In it the Council, inter alia:

"Affirms that all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved ..."

and

"Decides to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group".

But the statements of the representative of Pretoria during the most recent debates in the Security Council do not inspire us with much optimism. Moreover, the day after the adoption of that very resolution, South African troops made an incursion into Angolan territory, killing civilians, whom they claimed to be SWAPO combatants.

(Mr. Sarre, Senegal)

Is this not another demonstration of the arrogance and defiance of Pretoria towards our Organization and its decisions and resolutions? The delegation of Senegal therefore believes that the only consistent and decisive answer the Security Council of the United Nations can give is the imposition of mandatory and global economic sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

Senegal for its part is more than ever determined to embark on that path in co-operation with all countries and peoples who believe in liberty, dignity, human values and human rights.

Here the leaders of SWAPO - the sole, authentic representatives of the Namibian people - have once again demonstrated a spirit of openness and initiative, a realism and sense of responsibility worthy of admiration. I should like, here, to express once again the active support and solidarity of Senegal for their heroic and legitimate struggle.

I should like in conclusion to pay a heartfelt tribute, on behalf of His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General of our Organization, for his constant readiness and continued action on behalf of the Namibian people, and at the same time to express to all the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia our appreciation of their dedication to the cause of Namibia.

Through our concerted and vigorous efforts, may the dawn come at last for the martyred people of Namibia, heralding a new era of full freedom and true independence.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): I have the honour to convey to you,

Mr. President, the appreciation of the delegation of Viet Nam for the very efficient and skilful way in which you have been guiding the work of the forty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly. You represent a country which for a very long time has been associated with African countries in their struggle for national independence and development; therefore it is most appropriate that you are now presiding over the deliberations on the question of Namibia. We are confident that they will lead to a successful outcome.

Twenty-one years after the revocation of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia the Territory is still under fire and its children are still dying, because Pretoria stubbornly refuses to end its illegal occupation. Certain Western countries continue unabated their selfish economic and strategic pursuits, and abuse of the veto prevents implementation of the important Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which has been accepted as the basis for the independence of Namibia. We are entering the tenth year of existence of that resolution, but the Namibian people are still denied their right to self-determination. The occupied Territory is still being used as a springboard for acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring countries. Furthermore, there is now the danger of its being turned into a neo-colony by the racist Pretoria régime. The unresolved question of Namibia is correctly characterized as the main cause of the worsening situation in southern Africa, and a threat to peace and security in the region and the world at large.

Who, then, is responsible for this? First of all, it is the intransigent racist Pretoria régime. Like any other colonial Power, South Africa tries hard to cling to its colony, particularly when its bastion of power is crumbling. The awakening people of South Africa are determined to topple it.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

However, it could not have remained so intransigent if it had not been backed by certain Western countries. It is those countries which protect the apartheid régime from sanctions. It is also those countries which co-operate with Pretoria and supply it with military technology. Again, it is those countries which offer the racist régime the pretext of linkage as a pre-condition. That pretext has been condemned and rejected many times by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Nevertheless, linkage is still used by Pretoria and those who sponsor it to repudiate the nobility of the Cubans' coming to help their African brothers and sisters. It should be pointed out here that the Cuban internationalists came to Angola at the invitation of that sovereign State and were welcomed by all the front-line countries. Likewise, attention should be drawn to the fact that the so-called linkage came much later than many other pretexts used before it since 1966 to justify the illegal delay of independence to Namibia. Therefore, linkage, the by-product of the "constructive engagement" policy, is only another attempt by those who gave birth to it to excuse what they wanted to do. And what they want in that part of the world is obvious - they want to prop up apartheid and the bandits to maintain instability; they want to fish in troubled waters.

If there is any linkage to the independence of Namibia, it is the support given to Pretoria by certain Western countries and aid worth millions of dollars channelled to the reactionary forces in Angola and Mozambique. For those Western countries to join South Africa in support of the "contras in Africa" is a sure prescription for continuing the turmoil in southern Africa, not for ending it. So long as they can keep these bandits attacking the legitimate Governments of front-line countries, South Africa knows it can hang on to Namibia.

In the final analysis, South Africa and its Western allies lean on each other to stay on in that resource-rich Territory. They hope, on the one hand, to plunder

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

the precious strategic resources there and, on the other hand, to establish and consolidate their influence in that part of the world. From there they attempt to stop and then crush national liberation movements and threaten young independent African States. Their policies have been condemned by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries as obstructionist tactics aimed at prolonging South Africa's illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia.

Against that background, support for the struggle for the independence of Namibia is an imperative issue of the day - imperative because the Namibian people have suffered long enough. They should not be left to suffer any longer. The United Nations has proclaimed its responsibility for the Territory and worked out its plan for independence, as contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). During the past 20 years of discharging its duty towards the Territory, the General Assembly has adopted many important resolutions; and so has the Security Council. But, owing to South Africa's intransigence and certain Western Powers' abuse of the veto, those resolutions have remained unimplemented. Consequently, today the General Assembly is involved with the "question of Namibia", which means not only independence for Namibia but also the credibility of this august body.

The Namibians have waited long enough. Their patience is limited. Their disappointment and impatience are shared. Conscience dictates that the United Nations, above all the Security Council, take all effective measures possible to exercise its mandate provided for in the Charter, including Chapter VII, to force South Africa to implement fully resolution 435 (1978). Any further delay in its implementation can only prolong the sufferings of the Namibian people. The challenge now is to find the means to achieve the goal. It has been agreed that

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

comprehensive mandatory sanctions are the only peaceful means left to bring about Namibia's independence and at the same time to help restore this Organization's tarnished image. All the allegations that sanctions will endanger the African community have been proved hypocritical in light of the fact that the front-line countries have expressed their willingness to accept the sacrifices so that their brothers and sisters in Namibia can obtain independence. How can one call for sanctions against one State or another while considering sanctions against the apartheid régime unacceptable?

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

Confident that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the basis for implementation of independence for Namibia, the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam pledges its support for the Final Communiqué adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its ministerial meeting held in New York on 2 October 1987, which says:

"The Ministers urgently requested the Security Council to set an early date for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), no later than 31 December 1987 ...".

The communiqué adds:

"In the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by 29 September 1988, the Ministers called upon the General Assembly to consider, at its forty-third session, necessary action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations ...".

(A/42/631, paras. 16 and 20)

Believing that all possible ways should be explored and all efforts encouraged, my delegation welcomes and supports resolution 601 (1987), adopted last week by the Security Council authorizing

"the United Nations Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG)".

(Security Council resolution 601 (1987), para. 5)

We highly commend SWAPO for its seriousness and good will. On the other hand we strongly urge that the resolution be fully implemented.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, while supporting every effort taken by the United Nations to start implementation of resolution 435 (1978), wishes to reaffirm

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

its strong support to the Namibian people, under the enlightened leadership of SWAPO, which is demonstrating its determination to fight even an armed struggle for national independence. Our unqualified support extends also to the peoples in Angola, Mozambique and the other front-line countries that are fighting against acts of aggression and destabilization conducted by the racist Pretoria régime. That position of ours was clearly stated by the Chairman of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam before the forty-second session of the General Assembly, as follows:

"Now more than ever before the world community needs to extend to the just struggle of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and the front-line States the most resolute and powerful support in order to bring about the prompt eradication of apartheid, that stain on human civilization."

(A/42/PV.17, p. 52)

As long as South Africa and its allies block the road to independence for Namibia, the Namibian people can always be sure of the solidarity of all nations, including the people of Viet Nam.

Miss MILLAN (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): "Namibia is not yet free". That is the sentence most often heard in this body and the sentence that has the most painful and striking significance for the international community. More than 100 years of heroic struggle have brought to the Namibian people little more than universal recognition that the independence of their country is a categorical imperative. The responsibility the world bears for Namibia is nothing new, dating back a long time. Ever since the first decades of the twentieth century successive decisions have placed Namibia under the Mandate of foreign Powers, and finally under the trusteeship of the United Nations. Those documents clearly stated that its administration was temporary and that it should lead to swift and authentic independence for the Territory.

(Miss Millan, Colombia)

It was the League of Nations that granted the Union of South Africa the Mandate to administer the Territory then called South West Africa. The United Nations decided in 1966 to terminate that Mandate, placing the Territory under its own direct responsibility and later establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority until independence. The International Court of Justice in 1971 declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal and South Africa's acts on behalf of or with respect to Namibia invalid. In resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) the Security Council laid down the only universally accepted bases for reaching a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. All those bodies represent the international community, and it is therefore the international community that bears the direct responsibility and the moral obligation to enforce its own decisions, to put an end once and for all to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and speedily to bring about genuine independence for the Territory.

With a rarely seen unanimity, all countries agree that Namibia should be free and independent, that its people should, as soon as possible, exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and that the United Nations plan is the best solution and should be immediately implemented since there are no pending questions standing in its way. But none of that has been done, and everyone is wondering why. The answer is clear: an exhaustive analysis points to one reason, namely, South Africa's continued refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions and decisions whose binding nature it accepted when it signed the Charter of the Organization. This is a case of incredible defiance of the world by one country. But while it is unprecedented that out of an Organization made up of 159 Members one of them, in arrogant defiance of the rest, should decide not to abide by the provisions of the Charter they have all pledged to accept, is it not all the more unthinkable that the other Members should tolerate this? Certainly this is a

(Miss Millan, Colombia)

situation that not only undermines the credibility of the United Nations but also goes beyond and seriously jeopardizes international peace and security. There is a clear solution to all this: determined and joint action expressing the political will of the international community to end once and for all South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and immediately to effect implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

In this connection we find it encouraging that the Security Council, which a few days ago adopted resolution 601 (1987), clearly showed its determination to act with regard to Namibia. Now is the time to undertake the concerted effort referred to by the Secretary-General and obtain South Africa's co-operation in the immediate implementation of the Organization's plan.

SWAPO, because of its efforts in the struggle for the liberation and independence of its country, its acceptance of the United Nations plan and its repeated offer of co-operation in implementing the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, deserves our general support.

The courageous stand of the front-line States, which despite their vulnerability attach the highest importance to the cause of the Namibian people, makes it imperative that the international community lend them the co-operation and assistance they need to overcome their own problems.

(Miss Millan, Colombia)

The intense personal commitment and dedication of the Secretary-General to the cause of Namibia are crucial to success, as are the efforts of the Organization as a whole. Only thus can it reach its stated goal.

The United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Colombia has been a member since its foundation, is working indefatigably to help the Namibian people prepare for independence and to defend its interests, as well as to keep the Namibian cause alive and active throughout the world, bringing strong pressure to bear on international public opinion concerning South Africa. That is a part of its continued effort to carry out the functions and reach the objectives for which it was established. In that context, we would emphasize its defence of all the natural resources of the Territory, especially its marine resources, which must be preserved at any price, since they constitute an inestimable source of wealth for the harmonious development of a free and independent Namibia.

The case of Namibia is a case of decolonization, and should be dealt with as such. There is no valid excuse for attempts to place it in the context of the East-West conflict. It is in the framework of the United Nations that it can be resolved.

Colombia renews its pledge to co-operate fully in helping Namibia attain early independence with its national unity and territorial integrity unchanged, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands, which are a part of its territory.

South Africa's occupation of Namibia must stop immediately, and Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be implemented in its entirety, without any delay or preconditions.

(Miss Millan, Colombia)

It is time for the international community to shoulder its historical responsibility for the independence of Namibia. The future of the Namibian people must hold no further suffering or humiliation; it must hold only freedom and the means necessary to preserve it. Only when Namibia is free and truly independent will the United Nations and the international community at large be able to say, "Mission accomplished".

Mr. ROY (Nepal): Less than a week ago, the Security Council, after extensive debate, adopted an important resolution on Namibia, with 14 affirmative votes. While we welcome the recent decision of the Security Council, the international community cannot afford to be complacent in the light of South Africa's past policy of delay and deception.

It has been more than two decades since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and more than nine years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), thus providing a broad framework for a peaceful settlement. Yet the South African régime still continues to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia today. Even the verdict of the International Court of Justice has gone unheeded by the racist régime of South Africa.

Instead, the Pretoria régime has embarked upon a course of oppressing and exploiting the Namibian people and the natural resources of the country in defiance of United Nations decisions and Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Thousands of Namibian freedom fighters are still languishing in apartheid gaols, and thousands of others have been killed or maimed. Namibians are arbitrarily denied not only their legitimate right to freedom and self-determination, but also dignity worthy of the human person. It is unfortunate that in a country which is rated the fourth largest mineral producer of the world

(Mr. Roy, Nepal)

the Namibian people is among the poorest in the world. My delegation strongly condemns the continued illegal occupation and the plundering of Namibian resources by the racist régime under one pretext or another.

As if that were not enough, Pretoria has made Namibia a launching-ground for unprovoked aggression against neighbouring countries such as Angola, Mozambique and Botswana. Such naked, provocative acts of aggression have had a destabilizing effect and endanger peace and security not only in Namibia and neighbouring countries, but also in the whole of southern Africa and beyond. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its strong condemnation of those aggressive acts and to express its support for the front-line States in their legitimate efforts to safeguard their national independence and territorial integrity.

At this juncture, I should like also to record my delegation's support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in its struggle to attain the independence of Namibia. We believe that SWAPO is the sole representative of the Namibian people, and on this occasion we salute its leadership for their heroic efforts to gain independence for their people in the face of such terrible odds.

My delegation highly appreciates the Secretary-General's initiatives and those of his Special Representatives for Namibia aimed at finding ways to expedite the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We strongly condemn the apartheid régime's insistence on linking Namibia's independence with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, an issue which is irrelevant and extraneous to the independence plan. It remains imperative for the international community to remove this impediment to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Roy, Nepal)

By any standard, 20 years is too long a period. Such an unacceptable state of affairs cannot continue any longer without seriously undermining the principles and credibility of the United Nations.

My delegation strongly emphasizes the urgent need for concerted efforts to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia without further delay. Failing that, the world body should not hesitate to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter against such a delinquent régime. That remains the only option, the last peaceful option open to compel the racist régime to honour its international obligations and to ensure full and early independence for Namibia.

Mr. TEP (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): The question of Namibia is a subject to which the people of Kampuchea attaches great importance. It has been on the agenda of our General Assembly for more than 40 years. Today, 21 years after having put an end to the Mandate of South Africa and having placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, the General Assembly must once again debate this question.

Despite the numerous resolutions of the United Nations and the clearly expressed demands of the world community for Namibian independence, the Pretoria régime refuses to withdraw from that Territory and continues to sow death, grief and suffering among the Namibian people. The General Assembly has adopted numerous resolutions and decisions in this regard; in 1971 the International Court of Justice gave its advisory opinion; and the Security Council has adopted successive resolutions, including resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), containing a plan acceptable to all to ensure Namibia's accession to independence. But none of those resolutions has been applied because of South Africa's intransigent and obstinate refusal.

All those who have experienced the yoke of colonial domination know how intransigent and obstinate the occupiers and colonialists are; to get rid of them, they had to pay the price of freedom.

In speaking today, my delegation would like to stress that the development of the situation in Namibia clearly reveals that South Africa's intransigence springs from weakness, not strength. Its intransigence is by no means insurmountable. The Pretoria régime cannot indefinitely continue to defy the will of the Namibian people, the United Nations and the international community that Namibia accede to independence.

Arrogance, treachery and intransigence characterize all occupiers and expansionists - be it in Namibia, in Kampuchea or elsewhere. They are a challenge

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

to peace, security and stability throughout the world. Having itself been the victim of aggression and occupation by its large neighbour to the East, the people of Kampuchea shares the struggle of the Namibian people and the efforts of all countries of Africa to shatter Pretoria's intransigence.

Namibia has been under foreign occupation for more than a century. Nearly 10 years ago, the Security Council adopted the plan for the independence of Namibia. All outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of that plan have already been resolved, but Namibia is still illegally occupied by the racist Pretoria régime. Furthermore, South Africa has used all possible means - repression, massacre, life imprisonment, torture, martial law - to force the Namibian people to submit to its domination. None of these terrifying means, however, has been able to dissuade the Namibian people from successfully pursuing its courageous, just and legitimate struggle under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole legitimate representative. That suffices to testify to the great difficulties South Africa must face in its colonial enterprise.

Despite the mass acts of repression carried out by the occupier, the Namibian people, drawing on the bitter lessons it has learned in its struggle against racist conditions and exploitation of the most brutal kind, has strengthened its unity, and its present multiform struggle has shown its firm determination to thwart Pretoria's colonialist ambitions. Launched almost 20 years ago, following South Africa's refusal to resolve the problem through diplomatic and legal means, the armed struggle has intensified and destroyed the myth of the colonial régime's invincible power. Namibia's popular army of liberation has stepped up its attacks throughout the Territory, shot down aircraft and enemy helicopters, destroyed

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

military installations and cut the enemy's supply lines and inflicted on it heavy losses in men and material. The success won by our courageous brothers and sisters in Namibia commands our admiration. The people of Kampuchea, which is today the victim of colonialist forces similar to those of South Africa, considers those victories their own. My delegation would like to express its sincere and fraternal congratulations to the valiant Namibian people and its forces of national resistance.

It is to face this irresistible tide of the struggle of the Namibian people that the racist Pretoria régime has had to send in an army of more than 100,000 men. At present in Namibia, to ensure its domination, there is one South African soldier for every 12 Namibians. The price Pretoria must pay to maintain the colonization of Namibia is becoming ever higher, both in men and in financial means. It is indisputable that the colonialist forces in Namibia will become even further mired.

The just struggle of the Namibian people has drawn sympathy, support and assistance from the world community. The countries of Africa, and in particular the front-line States, have strengthened their unity and determination in supporting and assisting this struggle, despite the increased armed attacks and acts of sabotage launched by the South African colonialists. Moreover, an ever-growing number of countries, including those of Western Europe, have accepted the application of sanctions and even of the breaking off of their diplomatic, military and economic relations with Pretoria. This year, the Francophone Summit and the Commonwealth Summit condemned the South African régime for its obstinate rejection of the Namibian people's right to self-determination. The Heads of State of the Five, in their Declaration published at the end of the Seventh Summit Conference, held in May in Maputo, Mozambique, launched an appeal for unconditional

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

support for the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Last year, the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, the fourteenth special session and the forty-first regular session of the General Assembly, and the Summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) held last July, adopted resolutions demanding that global and binding sanctions, provided for in the Charter, be imposed on South Africa. The Security Council has met twice this year to consider the situation in Namibia and has heard many delegations from countries of five continents forcefully condemning the tactics of South Africa aimed at extending its colonial and illegal occupation of Namibia, and demanding immediate and unconditional application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The condemnation of the illegal presence of the racist Pretoria régime is unanimous.

Despite its failures and difficulties in Namibia, and despite its global isolation, the Pretoria régime is pursuing its activities to deceive world public opinion and make it believe it is ready to apply the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. At the same time it is resorting to all possible means to exert pressure on the front-line States to make them cease their support for the struggle of the Namibian people. The increasing number of acts of aggression and destabilization against all those States attests to that. Last May, squads of murderers infiltrated into Zambia, killed several inhabitants and destroyed a considerable quantity of material goods. My country would like to renew here its fraternal solidarity with the valiant struggle of the brotherly Government and people of Zambia and all the brotherly African Governments and peoples of the region defending their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

Moreover, the Pretoria régime has for several years now been manoeuvring for a so-called resolution of the problem of Namibia outside the United Nations, by imposing an internal settlement which would exclude the Namibian patriots and preserve its own colonialist interests. It has made proposals which have the appearance of democracy but which are in fact creations of the policies of apartheid and racial segregation. In arrogant defiance of the United Nations it installed in June 1985 a so-called interim government at Windhoek and since then has done all in its power to consolidate what it created, despite universal condemnation. Plans have been drawn up for a so-called declaration of independence of Namibia.

The racist régime of South Africa is therefore pursuing a two-pronged policy: at the same time as it is trying to make the international community believe that it is ready to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it is strengthening its occupying forces in Namibia and the various groups making up the so-called interim government.

All these actions clearly demonstrate that South Africa has no intention of co-operating with the United Nations in implementing the plan for the independence of Namibia and that it in no way intends to withdraw from the Territory or dismantle the odious system of apartheid, which is the fundamental cause of the continued deterioration of the situation in southern Africa.

My delegation nevertheless shares the opinion of Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia and Acting Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), who in his statement to the General Assembly last month declared that "as surely as night follows day, apartheid will be destroyed. It is not a question of if but of when and how apartheid will be ended." (A/42/PV.26, pp. 22, 23-25)

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

regardless of its intransigence, Pretoria will be forced to dismantle apartheid and end its illegal occupation of Namibia. The era of colonialism has ended in Africa. The anachronism of the colonialism and racism of South Africa cannot escape their fate. The Pretoria régime cannot indefinitely continue to oppose itself to the will of the Namibian people to win independence and freedom.

We are convinced that, thanks to the continued strengthening of its unity in its multifaceted struggle, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Namibian people will at last win independence, regardless of the obstacles and the sufferings it will have to overcome. The support of the international community will hasten the fulfilment of its aspirations to freedom and justice.

It is in that spirit that we support the decision in Security Council resolution 601 (1987) to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization so that measures can be taken for the implementation of the objectives laid down in paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) -

"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 ... ". (Security Council resolution 435 (1978), para. 2)

We greatly appreciate the co-operative spirit of SWAPO, which has always been committed to the application of the plan for Namibia and to that end has stated on numerous occasions its full readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with the Pretoria régime at any time and in any place except in the South Africa of the apartheid régime or in occupied Namibia. We sincerely hope that resolution 601 (1987) will be speedily and successfully implemented. Independence for Namibia has been delayed for too long. The freedom of the Namibian people, which has been

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

trampled underfoot for so long, must not depend on the solution of problems which have nothing to do with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). If the Secretary-General is not able to carry out the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council, my delegation will support all necessary measures provided for in paragraph 20 of the Final Communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia of 2 October 1987.

Throughout history the people of Kampuchea and the peoples of Africa have always assisted and supported each other in their unrelenting struggles for independence and against colonialism, aggression and foreign domination. They have forged together close links of friendship and fraternal solidarity, based on the community of ideals enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the Non-Aligned Movement. Today, although they have to face a difficult struggle, and one demanding many sacrifices, against foreign aggression and occupation, of which the whole world is aware, the people of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, led by His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, President of Democratic Kampuchea, will always continue resolutely to support the determined struggle of the Namibian people under the tried and tested leadership of SWAPO and the efforts of the African peoples for the independence of Namibia and through that for the full independence of Africa. Moreover, that struggle and those outstanding efforts are an undeniable contribution to the cause of peace, liberty and justice championed by all the peoples of the world, against colonialism, expansionism, foreign domination and racism.

I should be remiss if I did not express our warmest congratulations to the Council for Namibia on its excellent work. Since it was formed 20 years ago the Council has worked tirelessly as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory and in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. We extend our most sincere compliments to Ambassador Peter Zuze and to his outstanding

(Mr. Tep, Democratic Kampuchea)

predecessor, Ambassador Paul Lusaka, both of Zambia, for their important contribution to the success of the Council's work.

Finally, I should like to reaffirm my delegation's great appreciation of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his firm dedication to the cause of Namibia and his tireless efforts devoted to the application of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

Mr. JAYA (Brunei Darussalam): The Assembly has met today to deliberate on the question of Namibia against the background of a worsening situation in that country. Only last week the Security Council met as indeed it did on 21 August of this year, when members expressed their grave concern over

"the continuing deterioration of the situation in Namibia resulting from the increasing repression of the Namibian people by South African occupation forces throughout the Territory, including the so-called operational zone in northern Namibia, which has led to the loss of innocent lives, particularly in the last few weeks". (S/19068)

The question of Namibia represents a blot on the history of the United Nations. Twenty-one years after the United Nations assumed direct responsibility over the Territory, Namibia is still under the illegal occupation of South Africa. In violation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, South Africa stubbornly continues its occupation of Namibia and persists in its plunder of the natural resources of the Territory. South Africa also continues its acts of repression in Namibia, as a result of which in the last six months alone, as has been reported, 33 Namibians have been killed, 42 have been imprisoned and tortured - including the Reverend Hendrick Witbooi, Vice-President of the South West Africa People's Organization - 10 women have been raped and 42 buildings, particularly schools, have been attacked and set on fire by the South African army and police.

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei
Darussalam)

Such acts of brutality continue to be carried out by South Africa to suppress the popular movement towards freedom and independence in Namibia. Despite the decision of the international community and the wishes of the Namibian people, South Africa has done everything in its power to prevaricate on Namibia's independence. All appeals to South Africa to respect the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence have been scornfully rejected. Instead, in order to maintain its control over Namibia, South Africa maintains a military presence of over 100,000 troops in that Territory.

These troops have been responsible for the repressive acts carried out against the Namibian people over the years, causing extreme suffering and untold misery. We have learned that in raids conducted throughout Namibia by South African security police in August of this year, key leaders of SWAPO, as well as prominent trade union and church officials, were arrested.

The continuing resistance of the Namibian people is a strong and clear message to the South African régime that theirs is a lost cause. Despite the presence of well-armed South African troops in the Territory, the oppressed people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, will continue to oppose them as long as they remain there. The road to independence may be long and arduous, but the desire to live free from the yoke of colonialism and oppression will undoubtedly inspire the gallant people of Namibia to continue their struggle with determination.

No amount of diversionary tactics, such as the formation of the so-called interim government or the plan to adopt a so-called national anthem and a national flag to give the puppet entity in Namibia a semblance of independence from South Africa, can sway the Namibian people in their pursuit of independence. The South

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei
Darussalam)

African régime underestimates the intelligence of the international community if it believes that this Assembly will give credibility to the interim government that was established in Namibia.

Brunei Darussalam remains convinced that a peaceful settlement can still be achieved within the United Nations plan for Namibia as embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and calls upon the Pretoria régime to co-operate with the United Nations in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination. There is no justification for South Africa to prolong its illegal occupation of Namibia against the expressed wishes of the Namibian people. We urge South Africa to look around and take note of the voices of dissent and abhorrence concerning its policies of apartheid and illegal occupation of Namibia.

How much bloodletting must there be before the racist régime in South Africa succumbs to international pressure and before the people of Namibia can enjoy their basic right to freedom and independence? What we have witnessed recently have been more Draconian measures by the racist Pretoria régime to consolidate its stranglehold on the Territory of Namibia.

The international community, and this body in particular, should continue to bear the moral responsibility of ending the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime. The Namibian people look to the members of this body for more moral and practical support so that they too can enjoy the freedom and independence that many of us here now enjoy and cherish.

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) and 435 (1978).

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei
Darussalam)

We urge the United Nations Council for Namibia, in particular, to continue its work until Namibia, in accordance with the wishes of the Namibian people, joins the list of independent nations.

We welcome the Secretary-General's efforts in sending his Special Representative for Namibia to the region with a view to exploring ways of ending the impasse regarding implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We also welcome the recent adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which authorizes the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO, and we hope this will meet with success.

Even as we deliberate on this item today, the Namibian people continue to suffer. We hope that we will succeed in our unified goal to alleviate the suffering of the Namibian people so that we can once again contribute to regional peace and security and end the injustices that the Namibian people have long endured.

Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): Before I address the question of Namibia, I should like to congratulate warmly Ambassador Reed on his assumption of the post of Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs. His vast experience with peoples of various cultures places him in a position to serve the United Nations well.

Among the colonial problems of Africa, the one which is of the greatest concern to the international community is the question of Namibia. The Namibian situation very clearly illustrates racist South Africa's violation of the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law.

The annexionist tendencies of the Pretoria régime date back some decades ago. The international community - the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

and the Non-Aligned Movement - has long since taken various measures to end this sad situation, but without very positive results.

In 1946 the General Assembly rejected the racist South African proposal to incorporate the then South West Africa, now Namibia, into racist South Africa, and recommended that the Territory be placed under the international trusteeship system.

That historic position of the General Assembly was successively reiterated in the years that followed. On more than occasion, and upon the request of the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice rendered the opinion that Namibia was a Territory under international mandate.

Namibia was to become an independent Territory in the 1960s, when racist South Africa's Mandate was terminated and the United Nations assumed direct responsibility over the Territory.

The General Assembly's decision to create the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1967 was of great importance owing to its goal of administering Namibia until it achieved independence.

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), among all the relevant United Nations resolutions related to Namibia, is the keystone to the solution of the Namibian issue. With the adoption of that resolution, Namibia was supposed definitely to become independent in 1978, because we, the Member States of the United Nations, including racist South Africa, agreed to resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted by consensus for the settlement of this problem. Resolution 435 (1978) therefore became the open door leading to peace, self-determination and independence for the Namibian people. However, through its dilatory manoeuvres, the Pretoria régime closed the door to peace and liberty, challenging the will of the international community. Racist South Africa has come up with the unacceptable argument of linkage, insisting that the internationalist Cuban forces withdraw from Angola. But the point is that when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted in 1978, the internationalist Cuban forces were already in Angola.

The apartheid régime, which is rightly considered by the General Assembly to be a "crime against humanity", is the cancer of the southern Africa region. In fact, the apartheid régime not only violates the most elementary rights of the South African and Namibian peoples, but also attacks the neighbouring sovereign States, namely, the front-line States.

In my country, there is no need for anyone to read documents of the United Nations or the Organization of African Unity (OAU) or of the Non-Aligned Movement, to know about the brutality and the crimes of the heinous apartheid régime. Every day, terrorists, an extension of the South African army, massacre defenseless members of the population of all races and ages and of both sexes. They burn schools, hospitals, buses and trains, and kidnap and kill teachers, students, doctors, nurses and priests.

Namibia is being used as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring countries, especially Angola. At this moment a large South African contingent of

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

Invading troops is engaged in a vicious military campaign against the People's Republic of Angola. We strongly condemn this invasion and demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of those aggressive troops.

Until when will the apartheid régime of Pretoria continue the anguish, humiliation, suffering and death in southern Africa? Until when will racist South Africa continue to challenge the entire international community? Until when will the Namibian people continue to suffer under the racist South African colonial oppression?

In essence and practice, the apartheid régime has the same philosophy as nazi fascism. Therefore, the behaviour and policy of apartheid is violence, expansionism, aggression and terrorism. The whole world must do what it did in the Second World War: it must redouble its efforts to fight and eradicate apartheid. We must say: enough is enough.

The People's Republic of Mozambique is deeply concerned with the day-to-day sufferings of the Namibian people caused by the racist South African régime.

The most basic rights of the Namibian people are denied by the Pretoria régime. To the intensification of the national resistance of the Namibian people against the illegal occupation of their territory, the Pretoria régime responds with more violent and repressive measures against nationalists and freedom fighters.

The police brutally attack the civilian population in numerous public rallies and mass demonstrations against the colonial régime. There are frequent incidents involving riot police descending on crowds with sticks, tear gas and bullets. Many people are injured and even killed. Thousands of patriots are still held in prison without trial, suffering inhuman conditions, brutality and torture. Many patriots have been sentenced to death for the crime of fighting for the freedom and

(Mr. Dos Santos, Mozambique)

independence of their motherland. Namibians are given the worst conditions in health, education and labour based on apartheid laws.*

The growing militarization of Namibian territory is a matter of deep concern for the People's Republic of Mozambique. Racist South Africa has continued to strengthen its illegal military presence in Namibia by increasing its occupation forces inside the Territory through the recruitment of mercenaries and the forcible conscription of Namibians into its ranks. Moreover, Pretoria has fortified and expanded its military bases in the Territory. The number of troops in Namibia has increased from 17,000 in 1971 to more than 100,000 in 1985.

Despite the adoption of many resolutions by the United Nations and the enactment of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, racist South Africa and other foreign economic interests continue to plunder its natural resources, which is absolutely contrary and detrimental to the interests of the Namibian people. The economic activities of transnational corporations coupled with activities of the South African colonial régime contribute to the perpetuation of the apartheid system and the illegal occupation of Namibia.

In conclusion, the People's Republic of Mozambique would like to reaffirm once again its solidarity with and support for the Namibian people and their legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We welcome and fully support the recently adopted Security Council resolution 601 (1987). We reaffirm our full support for resolution 435 (1978), and reiterate our rejection of "linkage". Let us not delay Namibia's independence any longer.

* Mr. Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Vice-President, took the Chair

Ms. BROŠNAKOVA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Yet another year has elapsed since the day when the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South Africa's Mandate regarding the administration of Namibia and simultaneously proclaimed the further presence of South Africa in that Territory illegal. Even so, more than 21 years after adoption of that resolution, the Namibian people has still not attained its freedom. The South Africa racists are continuing the illegal occupation of Namibia, which is accompanied by cruel oppression and acts of repression against the indigenous population and the plundering of the natural resources of the country. More than 270,000 Namibians have been forced - in effect without any kind of legal protection - to work in the South African mines.

(Ms. Brosnakova, Czechoslovakia)

Such a fate is also shared by more than 56,000 black workers on farms belonging to the white population and other groups of the Namibian indigenous population. Inhuman conditions, the system of reservations and limitations on movement and residence are indeed a faithful copy of the South African Bantustans and the apartheid policy of the South African Government. Thus, the people of Namibia is simultaneously suffering from two of the greatest evils of our time: colonialism and the most acute form of racism, apartheid.

For South Africa to continue its colonial rule in Namibia it must rely to an ever greater extent on its machinery of State power. Indeed, for approximately every 10 inhabitants in Namibia there is one soldier from the South African Army. Maintenance of the South African Army of occupation in Namibia and expenditures for the struggle against the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) reach the sum of R2 billion annually.

Czechoslovakia firmly condemns South Africa's stubbornness with regard to the settlement of the situation in Namibia and unequivocally favours immediate and full implementation of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence and free development. We fully agree with the results and decisions of the recent extraordinary meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in Luanda. That representative forum adopted a Declaration once again reaffirming that the only means to force South Africa to comply with the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations is by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on South Africa.

Despite our Organization's untiring efforts to achieve a just settlement of the question of Namibia, the major goal set by the General Assembly many years ago - to secure the exercise by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination - has not yet been achieved.

(Ms. Brosnakova, Czechoslovakia)

It is known, moreover, that the Pretoria régime's colonial and apartheid policies would be impossible to maintain without the multilateral and regular assistance rendered it by certain Western countries. For South Africa and a great number of Western countries Namibia continues to be an important supplier of minerals and raw materials, including uranium and rare strategic metals. A considerable part of this is represented also by the importation of raw agricultural materials. Every day more than 300 transnational corporations mercilessly exploit the people of Namibia and its natural resources.

South Africa and its Western allies are interested in keeping Namibia within their sphere of influence from a military-political point of view as well. The South African racists are making use of the Territory as an enormous military base and a testing ground for new weapons. In addition, Namibian territory is being used as a springboard for carrying out acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other neighbouring African States. The major part of the material support provided to the counter-revolutionary organization in Angola, UNITA, is transported through the Territory of Namibia.

To ensure its economic and political interests South Africa, supported by certain Western countries, is doing everything possible to delay the end of its colonial domination of Namibia. It consistently rejects the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and refuses to begin implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Pretoria régime is stubbornly trying to link the question of the granting of independence to Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. The policy of linkage to irrelevant issues is nothing but an expression of South Africa's colonial administration and inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, the People's Republic of Angola, which has rightfully been

(Ms. Brosnakova, Czechoslovakia)

condemned by practically all States Members of the United Nations as a clear manoeuvre of the Pretoria régime. Czechoslovakia firmly rejects the continuing attempts of the South African régime and its closest allies to make the question of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) dependent on other irrelevant issues and, in particular, on the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

We also reject any attempts at distorting the question of decolonization of Namibia, and in particular those of certain States to represent it in the context of a global East-West confrontation. We should like to emphasize that the question of Namibia is quite clearly one of decolonization and of great significance for international peace and security. In this connection we approve the constructive decisions adopted by SWAPO and Angola and the other front-line States as an expression of their desire for peace, stability, freedom and independence; they deserve full support from the entire international community.

Although the South African régime's most loyal protectors verbally condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia and the policy of apartheid in South Africa, they do not undertake any practical measures that might lead to a settlement of both problems. They try to mask their genuine positions on these acute questions through a policy of "constructive engagement". Instead of taking a clear position of principle on resolving the problem, they support the so-called cosmetic corrections of apartheid. But such a policy cannot lead to the solution of a single one of the urgent problems of the international community in the region.

Today, there no longer remains any doubt that the only language understood by the South African racist régime is the imposition of and strict compliance with comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Only by fully isolating the Pretoria régime can we force it to abandon the policy of apartheid and oppression of the people of Namibia.

(Ms. Brosnakova, Czechoslovakia)

Czechoslovakia welcomes the results of the latest meetings of the Security Council and the adoption of resolution 601 (1987). It is now incumbent on all States Members of the United Nations to create the conditions and to render all possible support to the Secretary-General so as to make it possible for him to carry out his mandate in keeping with that resolution.

(Ms. Brosnakova, Czechoslovakia)

We are convinced that consistent implementation of the resolution would promote a lowering of tension in the region, and that it could become an important step towards implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Weakening international pressure on the South African régime at this stage would be a serious and dangerous mistake. Indeed, stepping up such efforts and adopting new and effective measures is necessary for the United Nations honourably to carry out its commitments. In that connection, we continue to consider it necessary to strengthen the United Nations role, including the role of the Security Council, in resolving this extremely important question.

In our view, the present situation in Namibia requires the immediate and unconditional implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions on Namibia - primarily Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Those two resolutions should be considered the minimum realistic point of departure to achieve progress in resolving the question of Namibia.

We once again pay tribute to the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and express our full support for any further steps it may take which could promote the achievement of the ultimate achievement - the realization by the people of Namibia of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. In turn, we reaffirm that we shall continue to give comprehensive support to the selfless struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole genuine and legitimate representative.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I normally participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly to go into the item under discussion in a constructive spirit and to take an active part in the debate. In the case of

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

Namibia, my frame of mind is quite different. I would prefer not to have to speak on this matter; I wish the question of Namibia were not under discussion because, obviously, the people of Namibia should today be enjoying full independence and should be a sovereign people.

We are left with a deep feeling of frustration when we realize that after more than 40 years we are here endeavouring to ensure that the Namibian people will be permitted to exercise its right to self-determination.

The Government of Chile has consistently given its full support to the plan for Namibia's independence in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which we believe contains all the elements needed to make progress towards Namibia's speedy independence.

The decolonization process is one of the major achievements of the United Nations. With the passage of the years, when we have the perspective needed to analyse this period, which only time can give, that process may be regarded as the great accomplishment of our Organization, the one which perhaps has contributed most to strengthening world peace. However, that task will remain unfinished, and our work will appear historically and morally flawed, if it is not completed with the independence of Namibia.

Namibia possesses all the attributes to become an independent State with the right to join the community of free and sovereign States. It has a territory, a population and a culture, and its people have the desire and the resolve freely to decide its future. In addition, the international community unanimously supports Namibia's attainment of independence.

Our Organization has a direct legal responsibility for Namibia, and beyond that legal obligation it has a moral imperative to secure Namibia's independence.

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

In his two most recent reports to the Security Council on the matter, the Secretary-General states that all the outstanding issues relating to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved. Therefore, what is needed now is the final political decision necessary for South Africa to comply with all the elements of that resolution.

There is no justification whatsoever for the persistence of a colonial régime in Namibia. The illegality of the occupation of Namibia has been recognized in the most diverse bodies of our Organization and at all levels.

My delegation wishes to reiterate Chile's unswerving position, which may be summarized as follows. The Government of Chile recognizes the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Chile condemns the occupation of Namibia by the Government of South Africa. Chile strongly condemns the application in the Territory of Namibia of the policy of apartheid. Chile fully supports the plan put forward by the Security Council and urges South Africa to negotiate with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as the only viable way to bring about a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia.

Chile therefore fully agrees with the organization of a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO and the adoption of all the measures necessary for the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to start playing its role. The Secretary-General has undertaken those tasks, under Security Council resolution 601 (1987), of 30 October.

Finally, the Government of Chile fully supports the various General Assembly resolutions on the question of Namibia.

As I have said, the Security Council recently adopted a resolution, resolution 601 (1987), which strengthens the Secretary-General's hand. The political support

(Mr. Daza, Chile)

that all States can give him will be a valuable and positive factor in making progress towards settling the problem of Namibia, a cause which has enjoyed, and will continue to enjoy, the unconditional support and co-operation of Chile.

Mr. ZUZE (Zambia): It is a great honour and privilege for me to participate in this debate on behalf of the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). For us in the OAU, the issue at hand, namely, the question of Namibia, is one that is very close to our hearts and definitely one that invokes strong emotions. From the early days of the founding of the Organization of African Unity, as the winds of change began to sweep through the African continent in the early 1960s, statesmen and women of Africa have been seized of this matter. They have discussed it and agonized over what type of measures would be effective to end South Africa's stranglehold over Namibia. Indeed, this is a matter that has exercised the minds of African leaders and ordinary people alike for a very long time.

Since our last consideration of this item during the forty-first session of the Assembly, there has been no progress towards ending the impasse on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). South Africa, with the help of the United States, has deliberately thwarted all efforts of the international community to put in place the internationally accepted plan for the independence of Namibia. There has been no progress because, as the Assembly is aware, South Africa and the United States have insisted on the resolution of issues outside the agreed plan for Namibia. Despite the United Nations categorical rejection of linkage, those two allies have arrogantly insisted on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola before resolution 435 (1978) can be implemented.

The Organization of African Unity has condemned and rejected linkage because it is irrelevant to the plan for Namibia. It is a policy designed to divert the attention of the international community from the real issue of the decolonization of Namibia to the issue of super-Power rivalry. We see in this bankrupt policy a deliberate intent of the United States and racist South Africa to safeguard their so-called international interests at the expense of the cardinal objective of the

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

United Nations to end the colonial situation in Namibia. It is a pretext for inaction and inertia on resolution 435 (1978). Encouraged by that support, South Africa has continued to entrench itself inside the Territory. It has continued to grow roots that will take the force of dynamite to eradicate.

In recent months racist South Africa has increased its acts of atrocity in Namibia. Fleeing Namibians have given first-hand reports of the régime's brutalization of the Namibian people, particularly in the so-called operational zone in northern Namibia, where South Africa continues to maintain many forward bases. Many Namibians have been killed in cold blood by racist troops for allegedly breaking curfew regulations. Many have been arrested, tortured and maimed on the mere suspicion that they belong to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Small children and their mothers have perished in their homes, which have been deliberately overrun or set on fire by the racist troops. In a desperate attempt to intimidate SWAPO supporters, the racist troops have from time to time displayed dead bodies of Namibians in villages as a warning to others not to continue supporting SWAPO.

Church leaders and church-goers have been persecuted on behalf of and in the name of Western democracy. Schools have been destroyed. There has been no limit to what these cut-throat criminals can do in order to maintain a status quo. All these crimes are being committed in defence of an evil system of apartheid and in the name of Western values. The West has generally lacked the courage of its convictions to stand up for positive change in Namibia.

Let me ask the question: Has the conscience of the world suddenly become numb, so that the plight of millions of oppressed Namibians has become a matter of little consequence? Is the world now so punch-drunk with tragedy that we only respond to the immediate tragedy - the drought, the famine, the floods - while a nation under military and social tyranny and injustice is allowed to suffer, decade

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

after decade. There must be a reason for this - and there is. If we look at the stark fact of Governments which apparently subscribe to the United Nations resolutions, but allow their investments in South Africa and Namibian businesses to continue and flourish, we see more of the answer. If we realize the success of South African propaganda that exploitation of the mineral wealth of Namibia is vital to the West, then the picture becomes clear.

The question of South Africa's destabilization has been a subject of detailed study by the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC). SADCC sought to quantify the costs borne by its members. They include not only the cost, but also reduced revenue from exports and tourism, reduced production, the cost of refugee facilities and the cost of boycotts and embargoes applied by South Africa against its neighbours. For example, South Africa has consistently boycotted the Port of Maputo in order to deny revenue to Mozambique.

South Africa pursues a number of related objectives through its policy of aggression and destabilization. They include undermining the work of SADC, which seeks to reduce the dependence of its member States on South Africa. They include efforts to reverse the gains of African freedom secured over recent decades and to reimpose South Africa's economic and political domination over the region. They include preventing the development of democratic non-racial States, which would serve as an example to the people of South Africa and Namibia. They involve stopping neighbouring States from providing refuge to those fleeing from South Africa and Namibia. And finally - and this is important - they involve perpetuating the myth that resistance to apartheid and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is an external phenomenon.

The people of South Africa will settle for nothing less than the abolition of apartheid, and they regard constructive engagement as a protective collaboration for commercial gain. The political-cultural homogeneity among black South African

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

is precisely the reason Pretoria legislates to divide them into false ethnic and political compartments.

And must we wait? Should we wait? The answer is obviously a firm "no." But the world must be alerted to what is going on within and outside our borders. It is in the power of the West to bring the shame to an end.

Let it be known that our resolve to survive and succeed has been strengthened by South Africa's efforts at destabilization. We will not succumb to bullies. We will not bow the knee to a massive military machine. If our economies are threatened, we will tighten our belts and diversify. We are determined that no Power, let alone a racist Power, will divert us from achieving for all our people the full life, which is their birthright. The future is one of struggle, but of eventual victory.

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

I wish to reiterate that apartheid is the source of tension and instability in southern Africa. This obnoxious system, which has also been extended to Namibia, relegates the black people in Namibia and South Africa to the status of second-class citizens. It is an unjust system by which the black people have been denied all human rights. They work in filthy conditions to enrich the white. As far as the racist régime is concerned, black workers are there only to provide cheap labour. They are not to be accorded any political and economic rights. They live like slaves in a land of their birth. They are designated by law to settle on unproductive barren land while the white settlers have taken the fertile land. Not only have the people of Namibia suffered personal economic and political deprivation; their natural resources have been and continue to be plundered at an alarming rate without regard to the development needs of the Territory.

The situation in Namibia is critical. The United Nations cannot just sit back and wait hopelessly for a change of heart on the part of South Africa. The Pretoria régime is a barbaric régime which thrives on the exploitation of the black majority and state terrorism. African countries have, in the past, tried to make South Africa heed the voice of reason, but to no avail. So, when we urge the international community to take punitive measures against South Africa as a way of ending apartheid and its illegal occupation of Namibia, it is not because we have not considered other options, but because we know that the alternative to actions at this stage may be too ghastly to contemplate.

It is not too late for the United Nations to act resolutely. As far as the question of Namibia is concerned, there exists a blueprint for ending the suffering of the people of Namibia. We feel that the Security Council must assert its central role to ensure the speedy accession of Namibia to genuine national independence. To this end, all Member States should lend their unqualified support and

(Mr. Zuze, Zambia)

co-operation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his efforts to obtain a cease-fire between SWAPO and South Africa and in particular the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. Let us act together, in order that the inhabitants of Namibia too can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. This is our solemn responsibility. We in the Organization of African Unity are ready to contribute whatever will be necessary to fulfil this noble goal. Africa is ready.

Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan): As we gather in this General Assembly Hall to consider once again the long-standing and tragic question of Namibia, the temptation to succumb to feelings of frustration and despair is, indeed, great. Twenty-one years after the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, the people of Namibia are still being denied their right to self-determination. South Africa continues to maintain its stranglehold on the land and its people, turning a deaf ear to the voice of world public opinion.

One of our primary purposes in gathering here today is, I believe, to impress upon South Africa that the international community, far from becoming resigned to its illegal occupation of the Territory, is united and undeterred in its fight for Namibia's independence.

The international community has, over the years, worked unceasingly for the settlement of this question. In the United Nations, the Security Council and the General Assembly have adopted a number of resolutions. The Secretary-General has made serious efforts to resolve the issue. The front-line States and the Contact Group have expended much time, patience and energy in an effort to establish conditions that will urge South Africa to withdraw from the Territory. In addition, many countries, including my own, have been pressuring South Africa in a variety of ways.

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

Although these efforts have not yet achieved their ultimate objective of Namibian independence, it would be wrong to conclude that they have been of no avail. Among the most valuable fruits of those efforts is Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence.

It is recalled that both the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have indicated their acceptance of the settlement plan endorsed by this resolution. But South Africa, while professing its willingness to co-operate with the international community, has in fact been working to prevent the implementation of the resolution. In June 1985, for example, South Africa set up what it calls an interim government in Namibia, in violation of the explicit provisions of the resolution. This so-called interim government is nothing but a ploy to circumvent the United Nations plan and further delay a peaceful settlement. Japan regards it as null and void.

South Africa's obstinate insistence on the linkage issue is another case in point. As the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, pointed out in his recent report, dated 27 October 1987, by insisting on this pre-condition South Africa has blocked

"successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan".

(S/19234, para. 25)

Moreover, South Africa continues to mount armed attacks against neighbouring countries, destabilizing the situation throughout the region and making the possibility of settling the Namibian question more remote.

Japan is gravely concerned over the continuing deterioration of the situation

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

in Namibia and condemns in particular the arrest of five SWAPO leaders and the repressive measures South Africa has been taking against students and labour organizations since last August.

Japan's position on this issue is firm: Namibia's independence must be achieved in accordance with the wishes of its inhabitants, as expressed through free elections, to be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It firmly supports Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and will spare no effort to achieve its implementation.

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

Accordingly, Japan has taken vigorous measures to urge South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and abandon its racist policy of apartheid. In demonstrating its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, Japan refrains from any action that would in effect acknowledge the present status of Namibia, such as extending grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind to South Africans in Namibia. It prohibits direct investment in South Africa and Namibia by Japanese nationals or corporations under its jurisdiction.

On the other hand, Japan has long been extending assistance to the Namibian people through its contributions to the humanitarian and educational funds and programmes administered by the United Nations, including the United Nations Institute for Namibia. It will provide such assistance as long as it is needed.

When the United Nations Transition Assistance Group comes into being, Japan will provide assistance in the form of financial contributions and personnel. And once the independence of Namibia is achieved, Japan looks forward to extending bilateral economic and technical co-operation for Namibia's nation-building efforts.

It was for those reasons and as an expression of its unqualified support for the cause of Namibian independence that Japan voted in favour of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which was adopted on 30 October this year. The main thrust of the resolution is to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in preparation for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

Japan pays a high tribute to the Secretary-General for his past efforts and extends to him its full support as he undertakes his important new mission.

As I said at the outset of my statement, the people of the world are united in calling for Namibian independence; their voice is growing louder with each passing day. It should be clear to South Africa that the international community will not

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

be put off by Pretoria's prevarications and empty excuses and that it will be unflagging in the pursuit of its goal. Japan therefore demands once again that South Africa co-operate with international efforts to settle the question without further delay, so that Namibia can assume its rightful place as a sovereign State in the world community.

Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly is once again considering the question of Namibia - and at a moment when particular attention is being focused on the international community's efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Indeed, this discussion is taking place at a time when a glimmer of hope has appeared on the horizon, with the adoption by the Security Council on 30 October last of resolution 601 (1987), which authorizes the Secretary-General

"to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group". (Security Council resolution 601 (1987), para. 5)

In our view, that resolution was not adopted by chance. It was the result of pressure exerted by the international community on the Security Council to face up finally to South Africa's arrogant challenge to the Council's authority and our Organization's credibility. How many resolutions have been adopted, how many declarations have been made by various international bodies on this question of Namibia since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978)! I shall refer to only the most recent ones: resolution S-14/1, adopted on 20 September 1986 by the special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia; the Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted during the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in Luanda from 19 to

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

22 May 1987; the Declaration of the Ministerial Meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in New York on 2 October 1987; and, of course, the resolutions and declarations adopted by the Organization of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the States members of the Commonwealth.

That concerted pressure by those international, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the tireless efforts by the Secretary-General to ensure a final and lasting solution to the question have now borne fruit, clearing the way, on the one hand, to the possibility of reaching a cease-fire agreement, as a first stage in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and, on the other hand, to the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

The adoption by the Security Council of resolution 601 (1987) has given new impetus to the efforts to restore the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, through fair and free elections under the supervision of the United Nations. Indeed, as the Secretary-General has stressed in his two most recent reports on the question to the Security Council, all the necessary conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan were met when all the parties concerned accepted a system of proportional representation for the elections envisaged in resolution 435 (1978).

Our satisfaction would be complete if we could be assured that South Africa would co-operate voluntarily with our Organization for the swift implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Unfortunately, that is not the case. The racist régime has accustomed us to constant political subterfuge and delaying tactics aimed at maintaining its hold over Namibia. The bitter experience of recent years has amply demonstrated that we must not be lulled into optimism or hope when we are dealing with the supporters of apartheid. South Africa has for a long time now been seeking every possible means to avoid the application of the United Nations plan.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

In fact, all of South Africa's fraudulent manoeuvres designed to delay the
ing of independence to Namibia are simply elements of its global strategy in
ern Africa, aimed at perpetuating white supremacy in South Africa. To achieve
objective and to guarantee the continued shameless exploitation of Namibia's
human and natural resources, the racist régime wants to create a security belt
d its borders.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

In clothing this policy with the banner of the defence of civilization against the threat of communism, alleged communist obscurantism, and the defence of foreign interests - whose activities in Namibia are illegal - the South Africa régime is benefiting from the complicity of some countries and the encouragement of some circles. Otherwise, how indeed could we explain South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola? How could we understand the Pretoria régime's insistence on imposing so-called internal settlements on Namibia? Finally, how also could we justify its aggressive policy against the front-line States?

To claim that the presence of military forces in a country with which South Africa has no common frontier constitutes a threat to its security is pure fantasy. To put forward such a view is tantamount to accepting the illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia by South Africa, and to believe such a thesis is tantamount to accepting its illegal occupation. The international community has not been fooled by this strategy, the only aim of which is to divert attention from the real issues. The Security Council rejected this theory of linkage in its resolution 539 (1983):

"as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)".

Finally, we must stress in this context that indeed there are only three parties to the conflict in Namibia, namely, the Namibian people represented by their sole authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Pretoria occupying régime and the United Nations, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only legal Administering Authority of the Territory pending its independence.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

It is regrettable none the less that despite the unanimous condemnation by Member States of the Organization on this issue some should insist on giving priority to their own strategic and ideological concerns or allow them to interfere with an issue of decolonization. For us the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is the result of a sovereign agreement between two independent States and the interference of a third State in this matter constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles and norms of international law.

All the attempts by the racist régime to consolidate the results of its policy of fait accompli go hand in hand with its efforts to establish phantom puppet institutions in Namibia for the purpose of ensuring docile service of its interests. In 1978 we witnessed the holding of so-called elections, which were declared null and void by Security Council resolution 439 (1978); on 17 June 1985 a so-called provisional government was put in place in Windhoek - this action was also condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 566 (1985); and at present the Pretoria régime is devoting enormous financial resources to the maintenance of so-called information offices on Namibia in various Western countries, the sole purpose of which is to carry out campaigns of disinformation against SWAPO aimed at public opinion in these countries.

My delegation fully supports the viewpoint expressed by Mr. Theo-Ben Gurirab, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO, in the Security Council on 6 April 1987, when he said:

"What gives cause for indignation is not Pretoria's intentions and its political chicanery, but, rather, the fact that certain Western countries and their mass media, instead of dismissing such fraudulent schemes, are treating them as viable political options, the result being that those nonsensical antics, treated as significant developments, help contribute towards the further undue delay of our independence." (S/PV.2740, p. 42)

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The third element of South Africa's delaying tactics is its policy of destabilizing the front-line States so that they will bend to its diktat and cease their support for the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC). South Africa is committing ever more acts of aggression and State terrorism, political subversion and economic blackmail against these States and for this purpose is using the international Territory of Namibia. The racist régime is recruiting, training and financing bandits and mercenaries to carry out its military raids into these countries.

No later than last Saturday, 31 October, the day after the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987), the racist armed forces attacked a village in southern Angola killing about 150 SWAPO militants. This latest attack is the very prototype of a calculated act of aggression by the Pretoria régime to divert the attention of the international community. Despite these arbitrary arrests, torture and intimidation and the terrorism and efforts to discredit and destroy SWAPO, that organization will continue to survive.

The Namibian people are the victims of one of the most brutal and cruel forms of colonial exploitation but even so they claim their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The determination and courage of this martyred people should be supported by additional international action. The so-called regional question in this context should not be considered outside the framework of the independence of Namibia, the cessation of the acts of destabilization perpetrated by South Africa and the abolition of the odious system of apartheid, because the threat thus posed by the racist régime to regional and international peace and security is without doubt a daily reality.

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

The adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) comes at a time when the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory pending its independence, is celebrating the twentieth anniversary of its establishment. We hope that the Security Council will be in a position to force South Africa to withdraw from Namibia in order to make it possible for the United Nations Council for Namibia to carry out its mandate.

However, following the latest raid by South Africa against Angola and the SWAPO militants our scepticism has not been removed. In this regard the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Madagascar, Mr. Jean Bemananjara, addressed a message to the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which he reaffirmed:

(Mr. Rabetafika, Madagascar)

"Only the respect of the right of peoples to independence, self-determination and sovereignty, which are the legitimate rights of the peoples, may lead to peace and justice. Madagascar continues to feel that the serious implementation in good faith of resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council is the best way to ensure that the people of Namibia will see their basic rights restored. The Democratic Republic of Madagascar will always stand at the side of people struggling for their liberation. It is with particular emotion that we offer our brother people of Namibia and SWAPO the assurance of our full support and militant solidarity."

In conclusion, my delegation would like to pay tribute to the President and members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for their efforts to ensure the swift, full and unconditional application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the effective mobilization of international public opinion, a logical objective thereof.

Mr. MUTHANA ALI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The question of Namibia represents one of the most prominent concerns of the international community. It is a special responsibility of the United Nations because, despite the overwhelming progress that has been achieved so far in the process of decolonization, this question remains the principal obstacle to the completion of that process in those territories still under the yoke of colonial rule. The people of Namibia still suffer because of the continued occupation of its Territory by South Africa. They have been unable to exercise their right to independence and to the creation and shaping of their own life.

We have once more listened in the Fourth Committee to statements presented after requests for hearings by organizations and individuals. All the reports that we have received from Namibia reflect the serious deterioration of the situation

(Mr. Muthana Ali, Democratic Yemen)

here and this, in turn, reflects the suffering of the people of Namibia, because of the continued repression exercised against it by the occupation authorities of the South African régime.

Unfortunately, and despite all that we sense, despite all of the repeated resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, and despite other efforts deployed by the Secretary-General, all indicators show us that the question of Namibia, which is mainly related to the right of peoples to self-determination, remains unresolved. The racists still continue their illegitimate and illegal occupation of Namibia, continuing thereby in their intransigence, their challenge to the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council, especially resolution 435 (1978).

The international community is following with great concern the situation in Namibia. It still perceives the possibility of a change over there in the course of time. Nevertheless, yet at the same time the international community, through the numerous resolutions that have been adopted by the General Assembly and the statements that have been issued by other forums, still expresses the opinion that there should be no further delay in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), since that resolution was adopted 10 years ago by the Security Council. It clearly outlines the necessary elements for the independence of Namibia and there is no alternative now to the immediate implementation of that resolution, as has been indicated by the Secretary-General in his report dated 27 October 1987.

It is very clear that the only obstacle to the independence of Namibia now is the obstinate position of the racist régime in Pretoria, which is preventing the people of Namibia from exercising its right to freedom and independence. In this, that régime relies on the support and protection it receives from the United States of America and it also relies on the co-operation of other Western States and

(Mr. Muthana Ali, Democratic Yemen)

Israel to continue the occupation of the Territory of Namibia, since they participate with the racist régime in the exploitation of the resources of that Territory.

The international community calls upon those States to stop supporting the racist colonial régime. It emphasizes the need to ostracize that régime and apply to it mandatory comprehensive sanctions according to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. At the same time, the international community requests that all forms of assistance and support be given to the heroic people of Namibia in their struggle to achieve independence and self-determination.

The aggressive practices of the Government of Pretoria have not been restricted to Namibia. They have also reached other neighbouring States, where state terrorism is being practised, especially against the People's Republic of Angola. All this is considered a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and a flagrant defiance of the will of the international community.

We in Democratic Yemen pay tribute to the steadfastness of the peoples of southern Africa. In particular, we hail the struggle of the people of Namibia and we affirm our full solidarity with that people and with its sole legitimate leadership, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). My country firmly supports the exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination as soon as possible, according to the stipulations of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We call for the full and immediate withdrawal of South Africa's forces and its administration from Namibia and for the transfer of authority to SWAPO. SWAPO is recognized by the United Nations and by the Organization of African Unity as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Muthana Ali, Democratic Yemen)

My country rejects any linkage between the independence of Namibia and other issues of concern to other independent and sovereign States. All these attempts are mere pretexts that aim at prevarication and impeding and hampering the independence of Namibia. All this jeopardizes the responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia and also puts in question the authority and the prestige of the Security Council. My country also rejects the policy of constructive engagement because that policy encourages the régime of South Africa to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia.

All attempts to permit the Security Council to shoulder its historic responsibility towards the people of Namibia have been in vain. The attempts to compel the Pretoria régime to comply with the wishes of the international community have been unsuccessful. All this is because of the stance of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom, which have so far prevented the Security Council from working effectively and have prevented the achievement of any tangible progress towards a just settlement of the question of Namibia. Those two States, by their assistance to South Africa, are helping to perpetuate the occupation and apartheid, and thus they have become a party to the challenge to the resolutions of the United Nations and the peaceful efforts of the international community.

We express our appreciation of the peaceful spirit and the brave step that has been taken by SWAPO. We also commend that Organization for its wisdom in declaring its readiness to negotiate, to embark on a dialogue and to respect a cease-fire with South Africa in order to facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In this respect we cannot but express our welcome of resolution 601 (1987) recently adopted by the Security Council and which represents an effective step in this direction. We are confident that the national will and the solidarity among the peoples of southern Africa, spearheaded by the people of

(Mr. Muthana Ali, Democratic Yemen)

Namibia, cannot be vanquished by the racist military machine. This is demonstrated by the history of peoples struggling to achieve their rights in freedom and in progress, and victory will eventually be theirs.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania) (interpretation from French): The problem of Namibia is one of the oldest items on the agenda of the United Nations. It has been discussed on an ongoing basis at each session of the General Assembly. The Security Council, in turn, has considered it virtually every year. Three special sessions of the General Assembly have been devoted to studying this question. However, despite numerous resolutions and repeated demands by the General Assembly and the Security Council and despite efforts to find a political solution, South Africa, in defiance of the United Nations and the world community and in flagrant violation of international law, has obstinately continued its illegal occupation of Namibia.

Colonial, illegal and continuous occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the militarization of the Territory and the crushing of the liberation struggle, as defined by the General Assembly, are an open challenge to the United Nations, which, over 20 years ago, terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for Namibia until its independence.

After great effort, the Organization adopted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia calling for free and equitable elections under international supervision and control.

This consensus, which deals with all the basic aspects relating to Namibia's independence, was clearly reaffirmed at the recent series of Security Council meetings on Namibia, with due consideration of all questions relating to the United Nations plan for Namibia. But, despite every effort to surmount the obstacles impeding implementation of the United Nations plan, the realization of independence by Namibia is still not possible because of South Africa's intransigence.

Pretoria's persistent refusal to respect United Nations resolutions, in particular its machinations designed to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia, has given rise to a feeling of deep concern and disturbance throughout the international

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

community. The South African régime's delaying tactics, postponements and impossible demands with regard to a so-called linkage, and other extrinsic factors incompatible with the clear terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), have all been rejected and condemned by the international community.

The reinforcement of the régime's illegal occupation of Namibia, attempts to impose on Namibia so-called internal solutions and an interim government, and the ongoing use of Namibian Territory as a base for launching acts of aggression and destabilization against independent neighbouring African States - all of which acts are also a threat to international peace and security - show once again that the racist Pretoria régime is not ready to allow the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination in keeping with the demands of the international community.

We are obliged to take note of the international community's reaction and even more urgent measures taken to promote the independence of Namibia and end South Africa's acts of aggression and other activities. At the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held on 2 October 1987, the ministers asked, as a matter of urgency, that the Security Council set a deadline for the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) and decide to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, if South Africa continued to oppose that clear demand. That clear determination was also reaffirmed at a meeting last week of the Security Council.

We fully support Security Council resolution 601 (1987) and are convinced that the task conferred upon the Secretary-General is part of the necessary steps that must be taken to implement rapidly the United Nations plan for Namibia.

Indeed, it is high time that the international community, the United Nations, take this course. The deliberations of the Security Council showed a growing concern among States at the lag in achieving independence for Namibia, which has

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

been undermining the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations. More than ever before, it is necessary to enhance the authority of the United Nations and its capacity to ensure peace, stability, security and international co-operation.

It is necessary immediately to take decisive and radical measures to end South Africa's illegal, colonial domination of Namibia, as has been emphasized many times by the Romanian delegation speaking before this Assembly.

As in the past, the Socialist Republic of Romania expresses once again its unreserved solidarity with the struggle of the African peoples completely to eliminate colonialism, defend and strengthen their national independence, and ensure the achievement in complete freedom of their economic and social development. In this context, Romania is firmly against all South Africa's activities to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and stifle the Namibian people's just struggle, which is under the direction of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its legitimate representative. That struggle is to achieve the exercise of its right to self-determination and independence and to decide freely its own future, so that the Namibian problem can be settled in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Socialist Republic of Romania and the Romanian people demand that South Africa end immediately its illegal occupation of Namibia and all its manoeuvres in the Territory to allow the Namibian people freely and completely to exercise its legitimate right to live in a free and united Namibia, safe from all foreign interference.

Romania's position - which is to support and show solidarity for the just cause of the Namibian people in its heroic struggle to exercise its right to self-determination and independence and live free in its own territory - is one of calling for political, diplomatic, moral and material support for the Namibian people, and this has been reaffirmed in the clearest possible way by President Nicolae Ceausescu, who recently said:

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

"We are actively in favour of the independence of Namibia and hence fully support SWAPO's struggle. We are in favour of an end to the racist policy of apartheid in South Africa. We feel that an end should be put to all interference by South Africa in the internal affairs of the countries of southern Africa and, in a general way, we fully support the African peoples in the struggle they are waging to enhance their independence and ensure their economic and social development."

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania energetically condemns the acts of aggression committed by the racist régime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and other independent African States. Such acts show the aggressive nature of the apartheid régime which, by its repeated attacks and constant provocations against independent neighbouring States, has caused a notable deterioration of the situation in southern Africa, increased tension and exacerbated conflicts in the region - all matters which have seriously threatened the peace and security of the region and the world as a whole.

The Romanian Government demands that an end be put to South Africa's violation of the sovereignty and independence of those countries and all irresponsible acts of aggression and provocation to which the African States are subjected.

It is in this spirit that the Romanian delegation - following the example of the African countries, other non-aligned countries, socialist countries and all to States devoted to the noble principles of the Charter, and convinced of the responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia - voices its determination to step up the process of accession to independence by the Namibian people in a free, united and sovereign country, to enable Namibia to take its rightful place among free nations, to contribute to the international community's efforts for peace, understanding and co-operation so as to achieve a better and more just world.

(Mr. Tanasie, Romania)

We note with satisfaction the declaration by the South West Africa People's Organization that it is ready to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa and to co-operate to this end with the Secretary-General. What is necessary is for decisive action to be taken by the United Nations and the international community to require that South Africa immediately conform to the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitute the sole internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

In conclusion I would add that the Romanian delegation fully supports the draft resolution proposed by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Mr. TANTEM SAPYA (Thailand): At the outset I should like to express my delegation's strong support for Security Council resolution 601 (1987), adopted last week. My delegation welcomes in particular the Council's decision

"to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization, in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group".

The recent meeting of the Security Council to consider the fate of Namibia testifies to the international community's continued concern about Namibia, which is still under illegal and colonial occupation by the racist régime in South Africa. The international community has been trying, since the termination of the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and the placing of the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations in 1966, to seek peaceful ways and means to grant independence to the Namibian people, but to no avail, owing to the intransigence of the Pretoria régime.

We have to come to grips with this problem of Namibia again and again, not only because fundamental rights and principles are at stake, but also because of the danger of violent escalation inherent thereto, since South Africa's continued

(Mr. Tantemsapya, Thailand)

illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a breach of international peace and security in violation of the United Nations Charter.

The Secretary-General himself, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, to whom I wish to pay a tribute, has continued his efforts to assist the Namibian cause by offering his good offices to the South African Government to institute at an early date a cease fire and the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Thailand's policy with regard to one country's armed aggression and occupation of another, as well as the strict observance of another country's sovereign independence, territorial integrity and its people's right to self-determination, is well known. The position of Thailand with regard to the question of Namibia is clear and consistent. Thailand attaches great importance to the question of Namibia and supports fully the Namibian people in their just struggle against the apartheid régime in Pretoria to gain their freedom and independence. We have joined the international community in condemning the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime in the strongest possible terms and have unreservedly supported the efforts of the United Nations to bring about the complete withdrawal of the illegal presence of Pretoria and the genuine self-determination of the Namibian people in freedom and independence in a united Namibia with fully sovereign rights over their national resources, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Opening the meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia in May 1984 in Bangkok, General Prem Tinsulanonda, Prime Minister of Thailand, said in his inaugural statement that the major obstacle to the realization of Namibia's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity had

(Mr. Tantemsapya, Thailand)

been the continued illegal occupation of that country by South Africa. His Excellency went on to reiterate Thailand's full support for the legitimate cause and struggle of the Namibian people, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Again, in a message addressed to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the solemn meeting in commemoration of Namibia Day on 26 August 1987, His Excellency stated, inter alia:

"Today Thailand joins the international community in commemorating Namibia Day and solemnly reaffirms her steadfast solidarity with the people of Namibia in their just struggle for freedom and independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people."

My delegation wishes to state once again that apartheid is the scourge of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and the front-line and other States in the region. The policies of apartheid of the racist régime in South Africa are the major cause of the three main problems confronting the peoples of southern Africa.

First, the indigenous African people in South Africa are still under the oppression of the apartheid system imposed through the most brutal means by the racist régime in Pretoria in defiance of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Secondly, the racist régime of South Africa continues to utilize the territory of Namibia as a springboard for sustaining its armed attacks against the neighbouring countries in order to weaken the unrelenting support of those countries for the Namibian people in their quest for self-determination, which should be linked only to the highest moral dictates and legitimate aspirations of people everywhere.

(Mr. Tantemsapya, Thailand)

Thirdly, an escalation of hostile, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression is being perpetrated or threatened against the front-line and other States by the Pretoria régime in violation of those States' sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The only way to end these problems is to dismantle the apartheid system in the southern part of Africa, the root cause of the festering problems in that important part of the world. In this connection the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), of which my country, Thailand, is a member, also issued a joint statement at the end of the annual meetings of its foreign ministers in Singapore on 16 June 1987.

(Mr. Tantemsapya, Thailand)

The ASEAN Foreign Ministers

"reiterated their condemnation of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the imposition of the apartheid system there by the racist Pretoria régime. In this regard, they welcomed the important decisions of the Vienna International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, the fourteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, on the question of Namibia, and the extraordinary plenary meetings of the Council for Namibia held last May in Luanda, as these reflected the total and unequivocal commitment of the international community to bring about, as early as possible, genuine independence to the Namibian people in a united Namibia".

(A/42/477, annex III, para. 5)

It is therefore regrettable to note that, despite unrelenting efforts by the United Nations and the Secretary-General as well as by the vast majority of the international community to bring about a free and independent Namibia, the fact is that the suffering of the Namibian people remains unremitting. The racist South African régime continues to occupy Namibia illegally and persists in arrogantly disregarding the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

The blatant attempts to confuse the issue or distort the root cause of the problem are also unacceptable to my delegation. My delegation therefore denounces the Pretoria régime's insistence on so-called linkage of the Namibian question to the extraneous issue of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

For the foregoing reasons, therefore, my delegation, as I stated at the outset, unreservedly welcomes Security Council resolution 601 (1987), in particular the decision to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire. My delegation hopes that that decision will eventually lead to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia so that justice and the rule of law may prevail in that part of southern Africa.

(Mr. Tantemsapya, Thailand)

I should like to conclude by reiterating once again my delegation's full support for the efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about freedom and independence for Namibia. I should like also to record my delegation's sincere appreciation of the efforts of His Excellency Ambassador Peter Zuze, Permanent Representative of Zambia and President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as those of the other members of the Council, on behalf of the Namibian people.

Mr. VASILIEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The world-wide historical process of national liberation was begun by the great October socialist revolution, whose seventieth anniversary is now being commemorated by all progressive mankind. After the rout of German fascism and German militarism, that process was marked by the collapse of the colonial system, from whose ruins arose dozens of sovereign States.

Speaking in the Kremlin on the occasion of that important anniversary, on 2 November this year, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeiyevich Gorbachev stressed that

"The October revolution - in all its contradictions and in spite of all the various ways civilization presses onwards - was the natural result of the evolution of the ideas and practices of many centuries of struggle by workers for freedom, peace and social justice and against class, national and spiritual oppression".

A major role in the struggle to eliminate colonialism has been played by the United Nations and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted in 1960 on the initiative of the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Vasiliev, Byelorussian SSR)

But colonialism is far from ended. That is clear from the present consideration of the question of Namibia. The people of Namibia are still being subjected to one of the cruelest forms of colonial exploitation.

Over two decades ago the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and decreed that the administration of the Territory would thenceforth be the responsibility of the United Nations. Thus, the United Nations is directly responsible for the political fate of Namibia, for its decolonization and for its achievement of genuine independence.

However, the racist régime in Pretoria, shored up by the policy of so-called constructive engagement and by support from its Western patrons, persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia. It is attempting to perpetuate its colonial racist domination of the Territory and to impose a neo-colonial future on the Namibian people, using Namibia as a springboard for aggression against neighbouring independent African countries, notably Angola.

Despite numerous United Nations decisions and despite universal condemnation of apartheid as a crime against humanity and a grave threat to international peace and security, the racist régime of South Africa has extended its repugnant system of apartheid to Namibia. The South African policy of fragmenting Namibia according to social and racial criteria is largely based on the racist system of bantustans in South Africa.

The 100,000-strong South African army and police force are trying to crush the Namibians' aspirations to independence and freedom for their homeland. The Pretoria racists are stepping up the militarization of the Territory. They have established over 40 military bases and instituted forced conscription into the army.

(Mr. Vasiliev, Byelorussian SSR)

The human and natural resources of Namibia along with its incalculable wealth are monopolized by the illegal South African régime and other foreign economic, financial and other interests, which mercilessly exploit and plunder them. The impact of the activities of foreign economic interests is to be seen not only in the foreign exploitation of Namibia's wealth, to the detriment of the Namibian people, but also in the strengthening of South Africa's colonial domination of the Territory. In corporate profits alone, these interests pocket over 60 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product.

Among the transnational corporations plundering Namibia's natural resources are well known South African, Western European, North American and other companies such as Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, the Tsumeb Corporation, and Rössing Uranium. That triumverate accounts for about 95 per cent of mineral production and exports, and holds approximately 80 per cent of the Territory's mineral. Those and other facts may be found in part I of the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/42/24).

Western transnational corporations are the main bulwark of the South African military. South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia costs the Pretoria régime over 4 million rand a day, but loans from Western sponsors and credits from, for example, the International Monetary Fund enable South Africa to bear that expense and to increase its military potential.

The documents before the General Assembly at its current session, statements made during the recent debate in the Security Council, the present debate in the General Assembly and testimony by petitioners show that the situation in and around Namibia is steadily deteriorating. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia states that South Africa

(Mr. Vasiliev, Byelorussian SSR)

increased its militarization of the Namibian territory and its acts of brutality and oppression with a view to intimidating the Namibian people. Disappearances and detention of members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and of its supporters and sympathizers were stepped up and cold-blooded murders became widespread". (A/42/24, part I, para. 3)

*Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Vasiliev, Byelorussian SSR)

In this connection, I should like to quote from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) when he addressed the Security Council on 28 October this year:

"In Europe, the whole world rose up to oppose Hitler's genocide and tyranny. Why is genocide and tyranny tolerated and actually encouraged and sustained in Namibia today? How can you give guns, matches and gasoline to the outlawed murderers and arsonists in Pretoria and claim that you are saving the lives of the African masses? This is how we see Western involvement and hypocrisy in Namibia." (S/PV.2755, p. 22)

The economic, political and strategic interests of Western circles and the racist régime of Pretoria are as a result of their collaboration responsible for the continuing tragedy of the Namibian people. Despite the numerous appeals of the United Nations to all Governments to help end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and to adopt the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to isolate effectively the apartheid régime, certain well-known countries are continuing a policy of de facto support for the racist Pretoria régime. It is they who are preventing the Security Council from adopting effective international sanctions against South Africa.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR fully supports the appeals of African countries, the non-aligned and others, as well as international forums, to the Security Council to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime in order to compel it to implement United Nations and Security Council resolutions on the immediate granting of genuine independence to Namibia.

We are convinced that granting independence to Namibia would improve and stabilize the situation in South Africa and beyond its borders. This would facilitate a universal system of international peace and security. We are also convinced that the problem of Namibia can and should be settled by political means

(Mr. Vasiliev, Byelorussian SSR)

It is of the utmost importance now to step up the role of the United Nations, the Security Council and the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to solve the Namibian problem. The internationally recognized basis for the independence of Namibia is to be found in the relevant United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The full implementation of these decisions cannot and should not be made conditional on any other unrelated questions.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR welcomes Security Council resolution 601 (1987), adopted a few days ago, authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia.

We call for the Namibian people's speedy enjoyment of its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, the immediate and full withdrawal of the South African army and administration from Namibia, and the transfer of all authority to the people of Namibia through SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, and the Non-Aligned Movement as the sole, genuine representative of the Namibian people.

We declare here our unswerving solidarity with the Namibian people in their struggle against the racist Pretoria régime and for genuine independence and freedom.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is convinced that the heroic Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, will, despite all the machinations of imperialist forces, soon achieve genuine independence because the countries of the socialist community, the non-aligned States, and all democratic and progressive forces of the world are on the side of its just cause.

Mr. DEEN (Malaysia): There are certain items on our agenda - in fact they have been on our agenda for more years than some care to remember - deserving not merely our highest attention but our total commitment in their solution. To be sure, there has been no lack of effort as, over the years, many debates and many resolutions have been devoted to these subjects. To the disappointment of many if not all, we are no nearer solving them now than we were many years ago when they first appeared in our agenda. While these issues remain unresolved, they are a reminder that this Organization has much to achieve.

The question of Namibia belongs in this category. A quick trip through the developments on this subject will establish the following:

First, the question of Namibia is an issue of decolonization - a subject so basic and fundamental to the United Nations.

Secondly, Namibia is not merely a colony; it is in the grip of a régime which takes pride in its system of institutionalized racism.

Thirdly, the Mandate of South Africa to administer Namibia ended in 1966 with the adoption of resolution 2145 (XXI).

Fourthly, a year later, by resolution 2248 (S-V), Namibia was placed under the care of the Council for Namibia until the Territory achieved its independence. This decision makes States Members of the United Nations individually and collectively responsible for the well-being of the people of Namibia until independence.

Fifthly, after years of often acrimonious debate and several resolutions, resolution 435 (1978) was adopted by the Security Council setting out a blueprint for the independence of Namibia.

Finally, the reality that South Africa is still in illegal occupation of Namibia, while resolution 435 (1978), in spite of the hopes it inspires, remains yet another unfulfilled promise.

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

One of the issues which surfaced in our ongoing efforts to improve the efficacy of the United Nations is the concern that so many resolutions have to be voted upon at the expense of consensus. We are ourselves concerned because Malaysia believes that a consensus is always preferable to a vote. A consensus resolution implies consent by all on a common course. So the theory goes, at least; but we all know that this is not necessarily what happens in practice.

For example, in our many years of deliberations with regard to this question of Namibia, there is a definite consensus that the continued colonization by the apartheid régime of South Africa is not merely illegal but immoral. We are all resolved that it should end. Why then does it continue? Particularly, in view of resolution 435 (1978), which we have all pledged to support because it represents a just, reasonable and feasible plan for the restoration of sovereignty to Namibia, putting it in the hands of the people of Namibia? Why should Namibia's freedom be linked to the presence of foreign forces in a neighbouring country? Is it simplistic or naive to expect that given this "welling" of interest and consensus this issue should transcend ideological and narrow strategic interests? It is unthinkable that an independent Namibia can be a threat to Pretoria's security. The threat to South Africa clearly lies in its apartheid policy.

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

What has given South Africa sustenance in pursuing its policy of undisguised racism, at home as well as in Namibia, and its campaign of subversion against its neighbours is the attitude of the few countries that could make a difference. Why is it that for these countries appeasement is preferred when dealing with South Africa? We are told that comprehensive mandatory sanctions would not work against South Africa, yet, when it suits those countries, unilateral sanctions are resorted to. The provisions of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII are designed for situations such as that created by the Pretoria régime. The moral consensus is that the book should be thrown at them.

If the fear is that the fall-out from comprehensive sanctions could have worse repercussions for the blacks of South Africa and the front-line States, then it is incumbent upon the international community to take collective action to cushion and minimize those effects. Such a step was taken by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries when in Harare it established the Solidarity Fund for Southern Africa. More needs to be done and more can be achieved if the nations which participate in the plunder of Namibia's rich fishing grounds, its uranium and other mineral resources while at the same time espousing abhorrence for South Africa's wanton racism and violations of basic human rights to millions will only agree to "belling the cat".

The Commonwealth Heads of Government, at their meeting recently in Vancouver, reaffirmed as a matter of the utmost priority their resolve to bring to an end the apartheid policies of South Africa. On Namibia, the Heads of Government reiterated their conviction that resolution 435 (1978) must provide the only basis for an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibian question. In their Vancouver communiqué they state:

"The challenge, therefore, is to develop an effective process of negotiation leading to the resolution's implementation."

(Mr. Deen, Malaysia)

It is a source of some encouragement that the Security Council only a few days ago adopted resolution 601 (1987). It is at the same time regretted that that resolution could not be adopted by consensus because a permanent member continues to feel constrained on the issue of linkage.

My delegation would like to reaffirm Malaysia's support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We note with great satisfaction that, as with resolution 435 (1978), SWAPO has once again expressed its readiness to sign and observe the cease-fire provisions and accept the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We applaud the decision of SWAPO, which illustrates the flexibility, reasonableness and pragmatism which it has always shown. We stand firmly behind SWAPO in its struggle for national liberation. There can be only one end to that struggle: the full independence of Namibia.

Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): I am speaking in order to join the other representatives of countries and reputable organizations who have voiced our common concern and support for the people of Namibia in their struggle for self-determination and independence.

The world must not be dissuaded by the fact that the question of Namibia has been debated over and over here in this Assembly but without a change of attitude on the part of the authorities in South Africa. This Assembly, the Secretary-General, the Security Council and the Council for Namibia must continue to put extra pressure on South Africa and its friends.

Papua New Guinea will continue to maintain that we must all make a concerted effort, in keeping with the spirit of the statements we make here in the Assembly, to bring about an early and immediate implementation of Security Council

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

resolution 435 (1978) and all related resolutions or efforts of the United Nations and the Council for Namibia.

Papua New Guinea is hopeful that all the peoples of the world and the different interest groups in Namibia will stay united, because if we do not the racist régime will continue to utilize the opportunity to gain more ground and cause further instability amongst the good people of Namibia and southern Africa.

Papua New Guinea looks forward to the implementation of the recent Security Council resolution 601 (1987) adopted on 30 October 1987 which, inter alia, authorizes the Secretary-General to mediate a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We are pleased to note that SWAPO is ready to sign a cease-fire agreement and we call on South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the United Nations

Papua New Guinea appeals to all Member States to be realistic and to give full support to the draft resolution now before the Assembly. Let us for one moment forget our differences and come out and sing in tune and in harmony, and show South Africa that independence for Namibia must come. In so doing, we will have at least two more countries added to the membership of the United Nations, in keeping with the objective of achieving universality of membership of this Organization, the world family of nations.

We, the Members of this Organization, regard ourselves as the champions of liberation struggles. Many more have likewise fought hard to set themselves free from colonial bondage and are thus totally committed, both in word and in deed, to the principles of decolonization. Though colonialism as a system in human history has been done away with, its remnants, to our great indignation, have not disappeared completely. Indeed, Namibia is an unfortunate remnant of a colonial era of the past in the great African continent, just as New Caledonia is another

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

is the aquatic continent of the Pacific. Certainly decolonization is one issue on which unanimity must prevail. How can we, who fought vigorously to free ourselves from colonialism, ignore those who are fighting against the same common enemy of mankind today?

The persistent defiance by racist South Africa of the universal calls for an end to apartheid and the withdrawal of its bandit troops from Namibia can be countered only by a strong demonstration of a firm political will and moral responsibility on the part of those who are well placed to bring about effective pressure on the racist South African régime.

Papua New Guinea reaffirms its solidarity with the people of Namibia and the African people in their just struggle on the rough and bitter road to freedom and independence, for there is no power that can for ever resist a people determined to free themselves from colonialism, racism and apartheid.

Mrs. MUKUMBA (Zimbabwe): I observe with deep sorrow that the question of Namibia's independence has become a chronique scandaleuse to all peace-loving mankind within and outside this body. The solution to the question of Namibia has remained elusive for the past two decades.

Yet the solution to the problem, recently reaffirmed by the Security Council, has long been in our hands. Despite past efforts to supplant it, resolution 435 (1978) remains the only compelling and realistic basis for the realization of Namibia's independence. We need not engage our minds in a further search, for another formula to prescribe for this problem.

In welcoming the position adopted by the Security Council, the realities of Namibia should be borne in mind. The epoch we are entering will be full of land-mines potent enough to render the efforts of the Secretary-General ineffective.

It is important to take cognizance of the reasons why Namibia is still shackled and condemned in the dungeon of colonialism. It is important to understand why the architect of the heinous system of apartheid, South Africa, has with such impunity defied the will of the international community in order to block the aspirations of the people of Namibia. The people of Namibia, like other inhabitants of Planet Earth, wish to exercise their inalienable right to genuine freedom, their right to independence from colonial rule, their right to choose their own representatives and to map out their own socio-economic and political paths to development.

The news and information black-out imposed by the occupation régime in Namibia has not stemmed the flow of information to the ears of the international community on the odious happenings in Namibia. The people of Namibia are daily subjected to torture, murder, harassment, arrest and detention in the racist gaols. Martial law has been imposed to facilitate the virtual incarceration of one million inhabitants of Namibia at the hands of 100,000 armed occupation forces.

(Mrs. Mukumba, Zimbabwe)

The racist régime, not content with the blood on its hands, has embarked on a divide-and-rule policy in an attempt to suppress the national liberation struggle in Namibia. Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55, the unwilling accomplices to this bloody ritual, are now conscripted into the occupying colonial army. Brother is now forced to fight sister, brother, mother and father, to perpetuate the stronghold of colonialism.

Military conscription is the new racist tool to buttress its military build-up and the imposition of the so-called interim government. These indeed are the machinations of a colonial Power determined to consolidate its neo-colonial status in Namibia. The objective is clear: it is the continued denial of genuine freedom and independence to the Namibian people.

One is forced to wonder from what sources the racist régime draws its strength, both material and spiritual, to perpetuate this genocidal war against the will of the majority of the international community.

It is an open secret that the régime is not a lone crusader in this genocidal act. The culprits that sponsor and give succour to the racist régime are counted among the great Powers of today. They are with us in this Assembly. They have tainted their hands with the blood of innocent Namibians by giving support to the racists in their unquenchable thirst to milk Namibia dry of her irreplaceable wealth.

The veto power has been abused and exercised to nurture and give succour to apartheid by the very same prophets who are at the forefront of the gospel of democracy. One is forced to inquire whether democracy for the colonized Namibians is inadmissible in the quest to protect Western economic interests anywhere in the world.

(Mrs. Mukumba, Zimbabwe)

The act of exercising the veto power on the question of Namibia was an act of defiance against the principles of the Charter, but we hasten to advise that a people's will and determination to gain freedom and independence cannot be vetoed forever.

For us, democracy entails recognition of and compliance with its very corner-stones - those principles embodied in the Charter. Are we to allow further erosion of those principles by sustained procrastination in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? The Security Council has demonstrated that now is the time to act in concert, with a clear commitment - commitment to resolution 435 (1978).

We challenge the accomplices of the Pretoria régime to practise what they preach. Let them demonstrate their abhorrence of the régime's policies by joining hands with all the international community in implementing resolution 435 (1978).

The act of collaboration with the Pretoria régime has many facets. We witnessed with anguish the birth of the so-called linkage pre-condition. Linkage, the brain-child of the United States Administration, did not exist before 1978. Linkage is not mentioned in any of the paragraphs of resolution 435 (1978), nor in the recently adopted Security Council resolution 601 (1987). We are therefore baffled and perplexed when the issue of Namibia's independence is linked with this extraneous and irrelevant element.

Linkage to us epitomizes the policy of denying the Namibian people their rights. Linkage legitimizes the continued use of mercenary forces to overthrow the sovereign and legitimate Government of Angola. Linkage guarantees the Pretoria régime unhindered and unfettered use of Namibia as a launching pad for attacks by its mercenary forces on the front-line States in pursuit of its policies of aggression, destabilization and subversion.

(Mrs. Mukumba, Zimbabwe)

There is yet another facet to the collaboration between some countries and the Pretoria régime. Resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as well as the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, are consistently defied with impunity.

What could be more criminal than the act of stealing the wealth of a dispossessed people? We note with horror and abhorrence the continued plundering of Namibia's wealth by foreign economic interests. We urge the United Nations Council for Namibia to proceed with speed to bring these criminal elements before the law. To them we say it is immoral to fill their coffers at the expense of Namibian independence. Do they not in their race of theft and plunder against time, hear the cries of the Namibian people, who, though their country possesses such immense wealth, are ranked among the poorest of this planet?

We urge them to desist from these activities and call on the rest of the international community to apply and take measures in fulfilment of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

The exposé I have just given takes full cognizance of the recently adopted Security Council resolution 601 (1987). We applaud the Security Council for the positive step it has taken. We pledge our support to the Secretary-General in his endeavours to implement the resolution and the principles embodied therein.

The people of southern Africa are united by the realities of their region. Geographical propinquity, a common history of being colonized, a spirit of brotherhood, adherence to the principles of international law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, as well as a common abhorrence of the evil system of apartheid are factors that have united us in our crusade for the establishment of free and just societies.

(Mrs. Mukumba, Zimbabwe)

The scenario given by Hobbes aptly presents the current realities for the majority of people in southern Africa. To them life "has become nasty, short and brutish". South Africa's acts against front-line States have been well chronicled and are known by all assembled here. We have suffered from apartheid. Destabilization, aggression, threats and loss of innocent lives have become our daily experience. We are therefore committed to standing together or perishing together in our struggle for survival. We draw strength and inspiration, however, from the realization that our cause is just and noble. We look forward to the day when "the state of nature" our region is in will be history.

Yet as rays of hope begin to penetrate our overcast and dark skies, we are rudely awakened by the latest murderous acts of the Pretoria régime. True to form, the régime has embarked on yet another unprovoked rampage into Angola. Is this act of aggression a harbinger of worse things to follow? The régime could not even exercise self-restraint. It had to demonstrate its disregard for international norms and human values by attacking Angola just as the Security Council was adopting resolution 601 (1987).

Yes, these are the realities in southern Africa. The United Nations is the last resort of hope and sanctuary to those in need.

We salute the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for its vanguard role in the struggle for Namibia. It has remained principled in its objective of fighting for genuine freedom and independence for its people and motherland. We salute the gallant sons of Namibia, the Namibians inside the occupied Territory, for fighting the racist army with whatever means they have at their disposal. We say to them, "Well done".

We urge all members of the international community to render all needed assistance to the struggling people of Namibia.

(Mrs. Mukumba, Zimbabwe)

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation of the work being done by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Council has endeavoured to fulfil its immense task in the face of innumerable obstacles. We wish the Council well, for the task ahead of them is extremely difficult. Zimbabwe stands fully behind the Council and is committed to assisting it in any way it can.

Mr. JARRETT (Liberia): It is indeed with some frustration that my delegation is speaking in this debate on the question of Namibia, a Territory for which the United Nations bears full responsibility but which the racist Pretoria régime continues to occupy illegally, in arrogant defiance of resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and in defiance of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

Twenty-one years ago, on 27 October 1966 to be precise, the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), assumed formal responsibility for, and authority over, Namibia. Part of the resolution states that the General Assembly:

"Declares that South Africa has failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory and to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants of South West Africa and has, in fact, disavowed the Mandate;

"Decides that the Mandate conferred upon His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa is therefore terminated, that South Africa has no other right to administer the Territory and that henceforth South West Africa comes under the direct responsibility of the United Nations." (resolution 2145 (XXI), paras. 3 and 4)

Following that decision the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole Administering Authority until independence.

Almost 10 years ago the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

embodies the plan for Namibia's independence. That plan sets out the modalities by which the people of Namibia would be able to determine their future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

What has happened since then, 21 years after the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and 10 years after the adoption of a proposal for settlement of the Namibian question, is a lamentable saga of disappointment and frustration for the Namibian people, as the racist clique in Pretoria vacillates over Namibia's freedom from colonial bondage and independence.

While this vacillation goes on, South Africa is engaged in reinforcing its occupation forces in Namibia with a view to strengthening its illegal interim Government in the Territory. Its occupation army, police and murder squads perpetrate the most heinous crimes against the people of Namibia, killing women, children and old people indiscriminately, and destroying homes, schools and medical clinics. The leaders, supporters and sympathizers of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) are constantly harassed, arrested, detained and tortured. The racist Pretoria régime also engages in diplomatic manoeuvres, and insists on linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

The presence of Cuban forces in Angola is a matter that falls exclusively within the sovereign jurisdiction of Angola and is therefore extraneous and irrelevant to the question of Namibia's independence. The international community, and indeed Angola, the front-line States and SWAPO have consistently rejected the issue of "linkage". Moreover, the Security Council has stated very clearly that its resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally accepted basis for settlement of the Namibian question, as it provides for the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

The settlement plan embodied in resolution 435 (1978) was formulated to facilitate racist South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia, and a peaceful transition to the independence of the Territory. The plan had been carefully negotiated with the parties, and all outstanding issues pertaining to its implementation had been resolved in November 1985. Agreement was reached on a system of provisional representation, thus making it possible for the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

Having reached that far on the road to a settlement of Namibia's independence, the racist Pretoria régime, in spite of the warning contained in Security Council resolution 566 (1985), has shown no willingness to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), nor indeed any of the other resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Such arrogant defiance of the authority of the United Nations should not be tolerated, and the fact that it has been permitted to go on for so long erodes the credibility of this Organization.

The Declaration of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July 1986, pointed out, inter alia, that the people of Namibia were waging a heroic struggle against foreign domination and exploitation, that the achievement of that Territory's independence had been frustrated by the intransigence of the apartheid régime and the duplicity of certain members of the international community and that selfish interests had come to the fore, pushing to the background the real issues of decolonization and the Namibian people's right to freedom, self-determination and independence.

That is the cause of the impasse which we face over the question of Namibia's independence. The national and commercial interests of certain States, and their collaboration with the Pretoria régime in the plunder and exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, in gross violation of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia and the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, have superseded any interest they may have had in the self-determination and inalienable rights of the Namibians. As long as that exploitation continues, it matters not to them if the Namibian people suffer and die under the bondage of brutal and cruel colonial oppression.

What, then, should be our course of action? The answer is clear. About a year and a half ago the Security Council, by the adoption of its resolution

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

566 (1985), gave a clear warning to South Africa that failure on its part to co-operate fully with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of that resolution would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter, including Chapter VII, as additional pressure to ensure South Africa's compliance with resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia. It seems to my delegation that the Council's inaction, in spite of the urgency expressed in resolution 566 (1985), may have emboldened South Africa in its defiance of the international community.

It is in this context that the Government of Liberia was heartened by the very recent debate of the Security Council on the situation in Namibia, which was held at the request of the African Group and the Non-Aligned Movement, and welcomes the adoption by the Council of resolution 601 (1987).

My delegation commends the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and bring independence to Namibia. However, those efforts continue to be thwarted by the intransigence and arrogance of the racist régime. Last Friday, 30 October 1987, the Security Council entrusted the Secretary-General with a new mandate to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). Liberia wishes to reassure the Secretary-General of its support, and calls upon South Africa to render him every assistance in the successful execution of this important mandate.

Independence for Namibia has been delayed for far too long. That delay is causing untold hardship, not only in that Territory, but throughout the region.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

Our responsibility as members of the United Nations is to act decisively for the achievement of that goal, thereby bringing to an end the bloodshed and sufferings in Namibia and the region of southern Africa.

Mr. SIDDIKY (Bangladesh): While the list of resolutions on Namibia grows long, the litany of Pretoria's misdeeds grows longer. How long must the global community tolerate the intransigence of that odious régime? Namibia remains a thorn in the side of this house, and it must now be removed once and for all.

To determine the status of a man based on the colour of skin is wrong. To erect that concept into a theory is vile. That is what Pretoria has done domestically in South Africa. That is what Pretoria has perpetrated in a Territory over which it has no legal or ethical right - Namibia.

Apartheid deserves to be demolished. Fourteen hundred years ago the Prophet of Islam registered his protest against racial discrimination when he entrusted to the Abyssinian slave, Belal, the task of summoning the faithful to prayers. To see discrimination persist, even when one and a half millenniums have elapsed since then, is shocking. To impose this discrimination on other peoples, having stolen their lands and limbs and suppressed their freedom, is criminal. That is what the South African Government has done, and continues to do, despite the protests of the world.

Mere protests obviously will not suffice. The situation calls for firm action. The Security Council has just adopted resolution 601 (1987), which had very broad support not only there, but also in this forum, as also in the world. I made a statement in the Council in its support. I reiterate that support now. The Secretary-General must proceed to discharge the responsibilities given him, such as arranging for the cease-fire and for the emplacement of the United Nations

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). In this context we warmly welcome the offer of a cease-fire by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

Namibia has been a United Nations responsibility for over two decades. The Charter was meant for the benefit of the peoples of the world. Why should an entire nation continue to be denied its benefits? If we cannot act to reverse that, we must all hang our heads in shame.

My country, Bangladesh, as a member of the Council for Namibia, has done its best, despite many and varied constraints, to contribute to the noble cause of Namibian independence. We firmly believe that the only way to cut this Gordian knot is to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia, elements of which are contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Siddiky, Bangladesh)

We condemn in the strongest language the schemes of the South African régime to hoodwink the global community by fraudulent political arrangements in Namibia, one of which is the creation of a puppet régime in Windhoek. These are nothing but unholy designs to perpetuate Pretoria's illegal domination over the people of Namibia and its resources. We must also thwart the attempt to link the independence of Namibia to extraneous and irrelevant issues.

Not content with the relentless pursuit of racism at home and colonialism in Namibia, Pretoria has unleashed a series of acts of aggression against the neighbouring States of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe. We denounced those actions unequivocally.

My delegation would therefore commend to the Assembly the resolutions submitted by the Council for Namibia. We urge that they be given the broadest possible support to signal once again to Pretoria that the world does not condone its machinations, but condemns them.

It is our fond and cherished hope that Namibia will one day soon achieve its freedom under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). To my mind this Assembly is incomplete without the membership of a free and sovereign Namibia, a Namibia that has taken its rightful place amongst us.

Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): Four decades after the beginning of the plight of the Namibian people, we are still debating the question in this forum. Twenty-five years after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization, we are still debating this question. Two decades ago, the General Assembly adopted its resolution which ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Since then the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted scores of additional resolutions all of which have been unanimous on the need to enable the Namibian people to exercise their right t

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

self-determination and the urgent need for Namibia to achieve early independence. Indeed, the international unanimity reflected in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) has put an end to any ambiguity in regard to this important question. When we add to this Security Council resolution 601 (1987), it becomes evident that the international community is intent on putting a prompt end to the racist-colonialist injustice inflicted on the people of Namibia.

It is racist injustice to illegally occupy Namibia and practice every form of hegemony, terrorism, mass arrest, assassination, expulsion, exile, harrassment, persecution, plundering of natural resources and the deprivation of the most basic human rights of the indigenous population. In addition, Namibia is being used as a launching pad for attacks on such independent neighbouring States as Angola. South Africa also continues its acts of aggression against other front-line States such as Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe and others, with the evident aim of destabilizing those States and undermining their legitimate national Governments.

The practices of the racist terrorist régime of Pretoria, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its unending acts of aggression against its neighbours go unpunished. It is treated as the spoilt child of imperialism, and its criminal behaviour is parallel only to that of the other spoilt child of imperialism, the usurper of Palestine, which commits with impunity every crime and act of aggression against that territory's original inhabitants and the neighbouring Arab States, whose territories it continues to occupy illegally, just like its racist counterpart in Pretoria. The perfect harmony and accord between those two régimes which are now clear to all, are, in fact, due to the umbrella of economic, military and political support they both enjoy. This support is provided by certain imperialist Powers which defy the will of the international community

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

with unprecedented arrogance, thanks to the privileges they enjoy in the Organization, such as the right of the veto in the Security Council. In this way, those Powers prolong the plight of the people of Namibia and the Arab Palestinian people alike.

There is now only one peaceful option open to the international community. It is the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter, so that the régime may acquiesce at long last to the will of the international community and put an end to the suffering of the Namibian people. In this context, we call upon the protectors of the racist entity to take heed of the will of the vast majority of the nations of the international community and renounce their failed policies of constructive engagement and deceitful linkage, both of which have been rejected and declared void by the international community.

Lastly and despite the attacks and siege against my country which at times has taken the form of direct military action by imperialist Powers with the aim of subjugating my country and hindering its supporting role in struggles for national liberation, my delegation wishes to reaffirm anew its support for and solidarity with the struggle of the heroic Namibian people, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We will continue to support them until their independence and self-determination have been achieved. My delegation strongly condemns the collaborators of the Pretoria régime, especially the multinational corporations which have been actively plundering the wealth of Namibia. My delegation wishes to express our full solidarity with our brethren in the front-line States in their heroic and historic struggle against the aggression of the racist Pretoria régime.

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

My delegation also wishes to declare its full solidarity with the political prisoners in Namibia and South Africa, especially the recently arrested leaders of SWAPO. We call upon the international community to bring pressure to bear on the racist entity to release all those prisoners unconditionally.

Mr. DELPECH (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of Namibia continues to be a matter of great concern to the United Nations, which, through the General Assembly and the Security Council, has adopted clear and precise decisions with a view to solving that question.

The vast majority of the international community recognizes Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only acceptable basis for the peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. Its immediate and full implementation would enable the Namibian people freely to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, which cannot be postponed.

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

The General Assembly has also constantly supported the heroic struggle for independence of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), recognized by this Organization as its sole, authentic representative.

Despite all these pronouncements and despite international consensus on the subject, the Pretoria Government continues to occupy Namibia illegally and to impede the process of decolonization and independence of the Territory, thus endangering peace and security in southern Africa.

The illegal occupation of Namibia and apartheid not only constitute a specific defiance of the credibility and effectiveness of our Organization; they also constitute a mockery of international order, which is based on the maintenance of international peace and security, respect for the rule of law and the promotion of human dignity.

The South African régime's negative response to the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and to the specific proposal of the Secretary-General for the establishment of a cease-fire and the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is well known. Pretoria insists on demanding the fulfilment of preconditions which are extraneous to the Plan. South Africa's intransigence is prolonging the illegal colonialist occupation of the Territory of Namibia. Furthermore, that Territory is still being used as a base for launching armed attacks against Angola and other neighbouring States, which the Pretoria Government is trying to destabilize.

This rigid negative position clearly suggests that the chances of a voluntary change of behaviour on the part of Pretoria are slight. In this context, Argentina, as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, co-sponsored in April this year a draft resolution to promote the application of comprehensive mandatory

(Mr. Delpech, Argentina)

sanctions against South Africa. It is regrettable that the Council was not able to adopt that decision.

Argentina fully supports the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. In full agreement with the overwhelming majority of the international community, my Government believes that the achievement of independence for Namibia will be possible only if Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is fully implemented. In this context, we view with satisfaction the recent approval by the Security Council of resolution 601 (1987), of which my country was a sponsor, together with the group of non-aligned countries in that body. By that resolution the Council authorizes the Secretary-General to make arrangements for a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO and to carry out the other practical and administrative steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

If Pretoria persists in its intransigence and its continued refusal to comply with resolution 435 (1978), the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions would be fully justified, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation would like to express its gratitude for the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the distinguished and efficient leadership of Ambassador Zuze of Zambia, and we should like to reiterate our support for the actions being carried out in favour of the just cause of the independence of Namibia. We shall support the draft resolutions contained in the Council's report and placed before this Assembly for consideration.

Lastly, I should like to reaffirm, once again, the firm solidarity of the people and Government of Argentina with the peoples struggling in Namibia and South Africa for self-determination, dignity and national independence and the establishment of just, egalitarian and democratic societies on their territories.

Mr. AGATHOCLEOUS (Cyprus): The question of Namibia has been before the United Nations for decades now and has been debated at length both at regular sessions and at special sessions of the General Assembly. In that time numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions have been adopted, and there has been an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, stressing that the continued presence of South Africa is illegal and that its administration should be withdrawn from Namibia immediately, thus putting an end to its occupation of the Territory.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has consistently condemned South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and for its disregard of all relevant United Nations resolutions. We consider the question of Namibia a clear case of colonialism, racism, foreign occupation and oppression, which are allowed to persist in flagrant violation of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people and in defiance of the very authority of the United Nations. We have also consistently expressed our solidarity with the people of Namibia in their legitimate struggle for freedom and national independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic representative.

Cyprus has repeatedly maintained that the independence of Namibia can justly be achieved on the basis of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which constitute the only acceptable basis for a lasting settlement of the question of Namibia. The international community has repeatedly demanded the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, without any preconditions, qualification or modification. That is why it unanimously rejected the linkage of the independence of Namibia with extraneous and irrelevant issues. Cyprus has firmly rejected such attempts. We have likewise condemned and

(Mr. Agathocleous, Cyprus)

rejected South Africa's continued attempts to circumvent the United Nations plan for Namibia through the imposition of puppet institutions, including in particular Pretoria's installation on 17 June 1985 of a so-called interim administration in Namibia, which was declared by the Security Council illegal, null and void.

In view of South Africa's persistent intransigence and procrastination and its refusal to adhere to the mandatory resolutions of the Security Council, as well as to those of the General Assembly, under various excuses, we firmly believe that the existing measures applied to South Africa should be supplemented by the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The failure so far of the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions has created considerable frustration and disappointment in the international community at large. Apart from dealing a heavy blow to the aspirations, not only of the Namibian people but of humanity as a whole, for a world of freedom and justice, the inability of the Security Council to act posed, once again, the question of the very credibility of the United Nations. The forces of aggression and injustice are allowed to prevail over the principles of freedom, peace and justice, because of the inability of the United Nations to pursue the implementation of its resolutions, a fact which hinders its effective functioning and erodes the very concept and even the raison d'être of this Organization.

(Mr. Agathocleous, Cyprus)

In Namibia, South Africa continues to organize and make additions to its machinery of repression against the Namibian people, utilizing methods of execution, torture, detention and forced labour and denying the people their most fundamental rights and freedoms. Furthermore, South Africa continuously increases its massive military presence in Namibia and its uninterrupted exploitation of the rich mineral resources of Namibia.

In order to consolidate its illegal occupation of Namibia, South Africa has been constantly trying to expand its aggressive policies throughout the southern African region. Once again Cyprus expresses its unequivocal condemnation of these incursions of South Africa into neighbouring front-line States, which constitute acts of aggression and are contrary to all norms and principles of international law. The Government and people of Cyprus stand solidly by the Government and people of the front-line States.

As a Member of the United Nations and a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations Council for Namibia, we shall continue to exert every effort to promote the just cause of the people of Namibia for self-determination and independence in a united Namibia.

We wish to emphasize that resolutions alone cannot lead to the desired goals. It is their effective implementation that is of paramount importance. We maintain that the implementation of the United Nations plan is long overdue. It is the duty of the United Nations, and especially of the Security Council, to take the necessary steps and measures to compel South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. It is perhaps necessary to remind ourselves that, in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter, all Members of the United Nations have an obligation to ensure the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council on Namibia, as indeed of its decisions on any other problem of

(Mr. Agathocleous, Cyprus)

which it is seized. The United Nations has the duty and obligation to discharge its responsibility with regard to the people of Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia has been entrusted with the sacred task of leading the Namibians to their independence, and we should intensify our efforts to bring about the realization of the legitimate aspirations of a people that has suffered so much for decades under colonialism, racism, foreign domination and oppression.

We are now perhaps at the most critical juncture in the history of the United Nations involvement with the question of Namibia, as a result of the adoption last Friday, 30 October 1987, of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which calls for a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

We have all noted with satisfaction the constructive position of SWAPO, through its legal representatives, as well as of Angola and the other front-line States, which have expressed their willingness to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General within the terms of that resolution. The responsibility now is thus squarely in the court of the South African régime.

We firmly believe that the achievement of a cease-fire can enable the Secretary-General to go ahead with his task of taking the necessary practical steps for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia, as a first step in the Territory's independence process. We look forward to the day - which we hope will come soon - when this process is completed and we at long last greet Namibia as a free and independent State and a full Member of our Organization.

Once again we express our solidarity with and full support for the noble cause of the Namibian people and SWAPO, their sole and legitimate representative, in their struggle for the self-determination and independence of their country.

Mr. SALLAH (Gambia): I wish first of all to place on record my delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts to bring about the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). I should also like to thank the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the entire Council for the way it has been discharging its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. The manner in which the Council has been mobilizing international public opinion has been truly impressive.

Only last week the United Nations family, joined by the rest of the international community in an unprecedented show of unity, celebrated the Week of Solidarity with the people of Namibia and their sole and legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The commemoration of that important event came only a few months after the special session of the United Nations Council for Namibia in Luanda and the ministerial-level meeting in New York a few weeks ago. Only last week the Security Council concluded its consideration of the question of Namibian independence by adopting resolution 601 (1987). Yet again we are meeting here at the level of the General Assembly to grapple with an issue that should have been solved well over a decade or two ago.

It is indeed sad to note that despite the momentum generated in regard to the quest for Namibian independence when resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and the universally accepted plan was adopted by the Security Council, Namibia is still not independent. None the less, I am heartened by the renewed commitment of the Security Council, to be reaffirmed shortly by the General Assembly, to the just cause and legitimate aspiration of the Namibian peoples.

Almost 10 years have now elapsed since the international community endorsed the United Nations plan for Namibian independence as embodied in Security Council

Mr. Sallin, Gambia

resolution 435 (1978), but to everyone's dismay the Pretoria régime, supported by a tiny number of countries, is still inventing all sorts of excuses in order to circumvent the implementation of the United Nations plan. Of all the extraneous and irrelevant elements now being brought into play by Pretoria, none is more atrocious and absurd than the linkage of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. This unreasonable position held by Pretoria is the main obstacle to a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and the restoration of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. The pre-condition of linkage has been totally rejected by both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

As far as my delegation is concerned, the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is not only legitimate but an important element in the defence of the territorial integrity of Angola. The Angolan people have been subjected for far too long to incalculable suffering and the loss of life and property caused by South African aggression, and they therefore have the right to defend themselves by all available means. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola will be necessary so long as South Africa persists in maintaining its presence in Namibia by force and, in the process, threatens peace and security in the region by carrying out military activities and acts of aggression in Angola and the territories of the neighbouring independent States, especially Mozambique.

It is indeed unbelievable that despite the fact that all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations independence plan for Namibia have been resolved, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented because of the continued insistence by South Africa on the linkage of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

(Mr. Sallah, Gambia)

It is regrettable that ever since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) we have been faced with an impasse on the issue of Namibian independence, because of the misplaced and misguided policy of apartheid. This situation is indeed unfortunate, and it is for that reason that my delegation is of the view that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter should be imposed by the entire international community without further delay. We ask those who are still unwilling to embrace this important and effective measure to reconsider their unreserved opposition to comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against a racist régime which violates daily all norms of civilized behaviour and also takes pride in defying the international community and thrives on racial segregation, injustice, violence and total disregard of the principles of democracy and human rights.

(Mr. Sallah, Gambia)

It should therefore be our resolve to expedite implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by bringing greater pressure to bear on the Pretoria régime. Namibian independence is long overdue and the continued postponement of the full implementation of the United Nations plan in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), will only encourage increased violence and incalculable loss of life. Failure so far to implement resolution 435 (1978), has resulted in widespread frustration for all peace-loving nations. But despite these frustrations the United Nations plan will never be abandoned. To do so would amount to undermining the authority of the Security Council and, by extension, the very foundation of the United Nations itself.

While the international community is held hostage by Pretoria's intransigence, it is equally disheartening to note that the human and mineral resources of Namibia continue to be plundered, despite Decree No. 1 adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. If this shameful act is not stopped the future legitimate Government of Namibia will be left with an empty land.

My delegation is of the opinion that humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Namibia owing to the apartneid policies of South Africa, is part of the important measures the members of the international community must take in order to prepare the Namibian people for the future. It is for this reason that in the field of education, the Gambia Government has, since 1977, hosted a good number of young South African and Namibian refugees under a programme whereby they are provided with secondary, technical and vocational training. I should like to take this opportunity to assure our Namibian brothers and sisters that the Gambia Government, despite its limited resources, will continue to provide assistance to Namibian refugees for as long as it is needed.

My delegation would like to place on record its gratitude to the Australian Government for offering earlier this year \$5 million of assistance to Namibians and

(Mr. Sallah, Gambia)

South Africans. The part of this money to be spent on education and training of Namibians and South Africans is an important part of the process of preparing these valiant people to assume full responsibility for running their own countries.

Against the gloomy political climate that prevails in Namibia, we are consoled by the major successes we have had in southern Africa and other parts of Africa due to the indomitable character of the peoples of Africa. My delegation is confident that the victories scored by the people of Africa against the forces of colonialism and racism in the recent past will be repeated in Namibia, an objective that is entrenched in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). With our continued support, Namibia's legitimate struggle for independence, justice and human dignity will be reached sooner than the South African racist régime could ever imagine possible.

Our steadfast aim must be the attainment of independence for Namibia. To this end, we continue to urge the Security Council to take effective action to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia so that our brothers and sisters there, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their true and authentic representative, can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. So far as my delegation is concerned, so long as any African territory, even a square metre, remains under illegal occupation and domination, the independence of Africa will be incomplete and insecure.

Finally, the Secretary-General in his statement at the meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held on 9 January said it all:

"South Africa must be made to realize that the just and legitimate aspirations of the people of the Territory cannot continue to be thwarted without serious detriment to South Africa's peace and the stability of the region as a whole.

Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): It is now 21 years since South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia was revoked and terminated by the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of October 1966, by which the Territory was placed under United Nations direct responsibility; and yet the General Assembly is once again preoccupied with the question, and problems, of Namibia whose plight has defied all possible solutions. That is because the South African régime refuses to terminate its illegal and brutal occupation of Namibia and continues to deny the Namibian people their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, in total defiance and disregard of United Nations resolutions and decisions.

Determined to perpetrate its colonial occupation and domination despite international outrage and condemnation, the racist régime intensified its apartheid practices by increasing military and police repression to subjugate the Namibian people and reduce them to a state where the apartheid régime will meet less opposition when robbing and squandering the vast natural and mineral resources of the Territory.

The South African régime, in an effort to secure its colonial domination over Namibia, has endeavoured to achieve success in the establishment of the so-called internal settlement policy in the Namibian Territory to circumvent the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, and to isolate the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and install a puppet government that will pose no threat or opposition to the apartheid system practised in the Territory. We were gratified, however, to witness that the international community did not hesitate to reject the so-called internal settlement policy and to declare it null and void.

The encroachment of South Africa's armed forces has not been limited to the Namibian and South African territories, but has gone beyond these borders. The South African régime, using Namibian Territory as a base for acts of aggression

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

aimed at political and economic destabilization and State terrorism against the southern African region, waged war against the neighbouring sovereign and independent front-line States so as to disrupt their political and socio-economic fabric and prevent them from extending support to the courageous people of Namibia.

It is high time that the international community denounced these acts of aggression by South Africa and expressed its strong solidarity by extending adequate moral and material support to the front-line States to enable them to strengthen their defence capabilities against the repeated attacks by armed South African forces.

The Namibian people have always fought colonization and foreign domination and made great sacrifices and they will continue to resist with resolve the exploitation of their land and the rapid depletion of their natural and mineral resources by South Africa and other foreign economic interests.

We reaffirm our support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people against such exploitation of their land by the racist régime, which, in collaboration with foreign economic interests, is endangering the political, economic and social welfare of the Namibian population. We are very confident that the Namibian people, guided by the wise leadership of SWAPO - their sole and authentic representative - will continue to step up their heroic resistance in their rightful struggle for self-determination and the achievement of full independence.

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

SWAPO, in its quest for freedom and national independence, has always tried and reverted to peaceful means for transition to majority rule and national independence. Intensified international pressure must be exerted to compel South Africa to come to the negotiating table with SWAPO and accede to speedy independence of Namibia.

We commend SWAPO's patience and readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa within the context of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without precondition or further delay.

We are happy to commend the Security Council's recent decision, contained in its resolution 601 (1987), authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

We call upon the entire international community to give this decision a fair chance to succeed and to extend full support to the Secretary-General in his endeavour to accomplish fruitful results in the important assignment entrusted to him by the Security Council.

We reiterate our full support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978), for we believe that it is the only one internationally accepted as a genuine basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. Any plan or strategy that deviates from that of the United Nations Security Council will be incompatible with the spirit of the plan and will only increase the intransigence of South Africa and encourage it to persist further in denying to the Namibian people their right to freedom and independence.

We believe that all efforts exerted in search of a political solution of the Namibian question should strive for a complete cease-fire followed by the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's occupying forces so as to enable the

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of December 1960 and the United Nations plan for Namibia as expressed in resolution 435 (1978).

It is really tragic to see the apartheid régime of South Africa defiantly insisting on denying the Namibian people their right to self-determination and independence, in spite of the countless resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations in that regard. In these circumstances the only option open to the international community in this body is to recommend to the Security Council the adoption of the strongest actions as an effective means of persuading the apartheid régime to conform to General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and decisions related to Namibia.

It is high time that the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security in southern Africa, shouldered that responsibility by applying effective peaceful measures to ensure South Africa's compliance with the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. The international community is convinced that at this stage in the Namibian plight the most effective and peaceful measure would be to adopt a decision imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

In the meantime the Namibian people, in their heroic resistance against the apartheid system and foreign domination, should be given the assistance they need and deserve to counter South Africa's aggression and to enable them to carry on their struggle, under the wise leadership of SWAPO, their sole, authentic representative, to gain genuine freedom and independence.

In conclusion I should like to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Ambassador Peter Zuze of Zambia, on the presentation of the comprehensive annual report on the assessment of the Namibian situation. I am pleased to commend their tireless efforts in effectively carrying out the Mandate

(Mr. Farah Dirir, Djibouti)

entrusted to them and in particular in mobilizing concerted international action for the promotion of the Namibian cause and to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

Mr. AMARI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Whereas from the eighteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century the great colonial adventure led to the subjugation of a large part of the peoples of the world, the year 1960 can be considered as that of the liberation of the peoples.

On 14 December 1960 the General Assembly, by its resolution 1514 (XV), adopted without dissent the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Declaration was historic because it proposed to abolish colonialism once and for all and to liberate humanity from the scourges that it had engendered. That instrument proclaims that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that by virtue of this right they are free to choose their political status and path of economic, social and cultural development.

No one doubts that the United Nations has played a role of catalyst in this struggle for decolonization and this is precisely what evokes in us today a feeling of profound frustration in the case of Namibia, the case of a people who have for more than a century been struggling against foreign occupation and have long anticipated becoming a free and independent country.*

If today we are to see triumph and apply internationally recognized principles it is up to us also to take up the constant arrogant challenges launched against our Organization by the South African régime. It is high time we did so. These challenges, alas, do not date from today. In 1946, one year after the founding of the Organization of the United Nations, South Africa launched its first

*Mr Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

challenge in refusing to place Namibian territory, which in those days was called South West Africa, under a trusteeship régime as the General Assembly at its first session advocated. In 1949 South Africa unilaterally declared null and void the international Mandate and refused, despite the opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1950 confirming the validity of the Mandate, to give an account of its administration to our General Assembly, which had expressly demanded it. Since that date Pretoria's challenges have become constant.

Exasperated by this policy of fait accompli practised by the South African régime, the United Nations decided in 1966 officially to end the international Mandate and deprived South Africa of all right to administer this Territory. Shouldering its full responsibilities, it decided through the intermediary of the United Nations Council for Namibia, created subsequently, to undertake, itself, to lead this Territory to independence.

South Africa replied to this decision by another refusal, a new challenge, and the continuation of its presence, which had now become illegal, in Namibia.

To the decision of the Security Council, which through its resolution 276 (1970) confirmed the illegal character of the South African presence in Namibia, and to the opinion of the International Court of Justice, which declared in 1971

that South Africa

"is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory",

Pretoria offered the same attitude of rejection and defiance.

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

That advisory opinion by the highest legal authority on questions of relations among States not only confirmed the decision of the General Assembly but also declared that States had the obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in the Territory and the invalidity of any actions it might take in the name of, or on behalf of, Namibia.

Five years later, in 1976, the Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution 385 (1976), in which it reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to determine their own future and declared that it was

"imperative that free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations be held for the whole of Namibia as one political entity".

(Security Council resolution 385 (1976), para. 7)

The elections decided upon by the Security Council in 1976 have not yet taken place. Pretoria's unanswered challenge gave way to doubts about the will and determination of the United Nations. The people of Namibia and all Africa were puzzled. There was a reply in 1978, in the form of a plan to settle the question of Namibia through negotiations, a plan set out in detail in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Namibian people had proved its determination and courage, and, through its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, accepted the path offered to it to exercise its right of self-determination and to achieve independence through dialogue and negotiation.

The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the result of great effort, has not yet begun, nine years after its adoption. It had given rise to hope for a peaceful negotiated settlement, yet that hope - difficult enough to maintain - has gradually dissipated in the face of Pretoria's blatant arrogance and renewed defiance.

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

In spite of the Secretary-General's efforts to find ways to hasten implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the Members of the United Nations and the United Nations bodies directly involved - specifically the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on decolonization - the Namibian people, for which we reaffirm our admiration, has been unable thus far to realize its legitimate aspirations to freedom, dignity and independence.

I take this opportunity to reaffirm Tunisia's solidarity with the heroic struggle waged by the Namibian people led by its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, and to assure that people that we shall support it unswervingly and firmly until there is a free and united Namibia.

We wish also to salute the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Ambassador Peter Zuze of Zambia. The Council and its President deserve all our esteem, gratitude and support for the able and effective way in which they have formulated and implemented their decisions and programmes in fulfilling their mandate.

Since its creation in 1967 the United Nations Council for Namibia has played a major role in making public opinion aware of this problem and has helped increase international support for the Namibian cause. That is why we should support it and its activities; it is not only the legal Administering Authority of the Territory, but is also an effective body for ending South Africa's illegal presence in Namibia.

This Organization, to whose principles we are firmly devoted, must change its approach, and make South Africa respect its resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, in our view, remains the sole valid basis for a just negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

(Mr. Amari, Tunisia)

In that connection, we welcome the Security Council's adoption on 30 October last of its resolution 601 (1987), authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO, in order to undertake the practical steps necessary for emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

That same resolution strongly condemns racist South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its stubborn refusal to comply with the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, in particular its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We think that should South Africa again refuse to co-operate with the Secretary-General, effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to preserve the territorial integrity of Namibia and the inalienable right of its people to self-determination and independence should be taken. By resorting to Chapter VII of the Charter, it may yet be possible to spare the peoples of southern Africa the threat of a grave confrontation with unforeseeable consequences.

We are convinced that efforts taken by all with sincerity and conviction, backed by law and by the obligations of our Organization, can ensure that Namibia emerges from the long night of colonialism to become a full-fledged Member of the United Nations, fully assuming its international responsibilities as a free, sovereign and independent State. In that way we should fulfil our commitment to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MAITHA (Kenya): I am grateful for this opportunity to address the Assembly on the question of Namibia. The details of the question of the independence of Namibia are all well known, and my delegation expects everyone in this Hall to be fully familiar with them, particularly the undue delay in granting independence to Namibia and the reasons why effective decisions on the right

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

course of action to be taken in the light of that delay have not been fruitful. I need not, therefore, recount here the details of the whole history of the struggle for Namibian independence.

Let me briefly state, however, that ever since South Africa obtained the Mandate to administer Namibia the racist régime has been flouting the terms of the Mandate in an attempt to annex the Territory of Namibia. By its Mandate, South Africa was first and foremost required to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Territory, to promote their progressive development towards self-government or independence, to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, and to ensure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters.

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

A look at the situation that followed in that Territory over the years leading to the abrogation of the Mandate in 1986 shows clearly a negation and a breach of the terms of the Mandate, with which, in the first place, South Africa had had no intention of complying.

Consequently, upon the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the protracted proceedings, the decision of the International Court of Justice and the confirmation by the Security Council of the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia, the racist régime defiantly refused to evacuate the Territory and thereby prevented the United Nations from exercising its direct administration of Namibia - an act which constitutes aggression against the people of Namibia and a flagrant defiance of the United Nations.

Here it should be recalled that the United Nations, after assuming direct responsibility over Namibia, established the Council for Namibia with a mandate to carry out the administration of Namibia on its behalf until the Territory had achieved its independence. To date, the Council has been prevented by the racist régime of South Africa from directly exercising its responsibility in Namibia and for the affairs of the Namibian people.

Further, the efforts of the United Nations to persuade South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations and the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), to which South Africa had originally agreed, have been met with procrastination and prevarication at the implementation stage. That has led to the present situation, whereby South Africa, in total defiance and disregard of resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly calling for the immediate independence of Namibia, on the one hand still illegally occupies the Territory of Namibia, under its colonial domination, while, on the other hand, it commits acts of aggression and

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

destabilization against the neighbouring independent States, while the racist régime, with brutal force, still prevents the people of Namibia from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination.

In my delegation's view that is the picture and the posture that the racist régime has taken all along, and it is alarming, disturbing, threatening and violent. The situation could explode at any time in a manner that would dangerously escalate tensions, violence and instability throughout the whole African region.

The neighbouring States, particularly Angola and other front-line States, have become constant victims of South Africa's unprovoked attacks and wanton aggression. Kenya condemns the aggression and attacks against South Africa's neighbouring States, as well as the utilization of Namibia as a springboard for military attacks and destabilization in the region. We see such attacks and destabilization carried out by South Africa as attempts by that régime to create the pretext under which it argues internationally the cause of the delay in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We declare that reasoning irrelevant and extraneous.

On 30 October 1987, the Security Council boldly adopted resolution 601 (1987). Kenya supports the adoption of that resolution, for we have been calling for the adoption of such a resolution by the Council. We have supported such a course of action, because we totally agree with the reports of the Secretary-General, particularly when he reported to the Security Council (S/18767 of 31 March and S/19234 of 27 October), that all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had now been resolved. A new Security Council resolution was therefore required to initiate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

In our view, no one should now attempt to introduce irrelevant and extraneous issues on this question, since the Council has authorized the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

At this stage, let me express Kenya's appreciation for the stand all along taken by SWAPO with regard to the cease-fire, and express the hope that the racist régime will agree to sign, comply with and observe a cease-fire arrangement to enable the United Nations Transition Assistance Group to carry out its duties and fulfil its responsibilities.

In conclusion, let me take this opportunity to express Kenya's unwaivering, committed support with regard to the struggle for Namibian independence. Pending an acceptable response by South Africa to Security Council resolution 601 (1987) and the actual cease-fire and emplacement of UNTAG, the position of Kenya with regard to the question of Namibia remains unchanged. Kenya will continue to support SWAPO, both bilaterally and within the regional arrangements already established, and, similarly, in the international efforts to free the people of Namibia from the illegal racist occupation. We remain anxious to receive the report of the Secretary-General requested by the Security Council in resolution 601 (1987) on progress in the implementation of that resolution.

Last, but not least, I take this opportunity to thank the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the

(Mr. Maitha, Kenya)

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for their illuminating reports submitted to the General Assembly.

Mr. ADOUKI (Congo) (interpretation from French): On 27 October 1966, as is known, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The Assembly then placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The establishment the following year of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the Administering Authority for the Territory on behalf of the Assembly, confirmed the will of the international community to guarantee the immediate independence of the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) its only representative. That vital decision, which was particular to Namibia, also strengthened an important spectrum of measures and instruments created, one after another, by the international organization with a view to ensuring the freedom of the non-self-governing Territories.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

In connection with the international Territory of Namibia, consideration of the blocked implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) or, in particular, of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 435 (1978), and even of the decisions taken by the United Nations Council for Namibia, leaves one perplexed.

Namibia remains the last genuinely colonial territory left on the African continent. This situation of rare political and diplomatic ineptitude results from the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African apartheid régime even though the Territory is under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The Secretary-General, in his report S/19234 dated 27 October 1987 concerning the question of Namibia, stressed that in connection with the United Nations plan contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) pending questions had been settled in November 1985 when an agreement was reached on the choice of an electoral system.

The developments concerning the situation in the Territory are primarily the result of blind violence and oppression, in addition to the illegal occupation that is turning the international Territory of Namibia into an immense barracks, militarizing the entire Namibian society and justifying martial law, strict censorship of the press and invasion by South African troops.

My purpose is not to dwell on this situation which has been fully analysed in the reports which are now available and which deal also with the terrifying acquiescence that supports the fierce exploitation of Namibia by foreign economic interests. It would in fact be beneficial to consult the excellent reports of the Special Committee, of September 1987, and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as well as the equally excellent and complete report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

Hence, South Africa has unleashed apartheid and racist imperialism dedicated not only to oppressing the majority of its people but also to colonizing the international Territory of Namibia and destabilizing the States of the southern sub-region of Africa.

Taking duly into account all past forums, and following the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia on 2 October, the recent celebration of the Week of International Solidarity with the People of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), it is extremely urgent to define a concerted strategy to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and to enable the historically sovereign Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence. When apartheid is brought down, Namibia will rise up as a united, free and independent State.

My country's position on the question of immediate independence for Namibia was elaborated here by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Congo scarcely a month ago, on behalf of President Denis Sassou-Nguesso. My country supports the struggle for liberation of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, and also supports the United Nations peace plan for the immediate independence of Namibia. In this context we greatly appreciate the renewed efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in his initiatives to implement the peace plan set out in resolution 435 (1978). In the same spirit, the Congo supported in the Security Council the measures laid down in resolution 601 (1987). No doubt the cease-fire and the deployment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) depend on South Africa and SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

My delegation and many others have noted with satisfaction that SWAPO has made known its readiness to fulfil its obligations and to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolution 601 (1987) and the United Nations peace plan. The other side, through its arrogant policies and practices, continues to invoke groundless arguments and to defend, inter alia, the policy of linkage of the immediate independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. As the international community knows, the Security Council stated that the question of Cuban troops in Angola is completely extraneous to implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Therefore this question must not in any way be used as a pre-condition in the process leading to immediate independence for Namibia. The Congo condemns any delaying tactic with regard to independence for Namibia and rejects the policy of linkage and any other policy of so-called constructive engagement.

The international community must stand in opposition to South Africa and vigorously condemn its policy of apartheid and illegal occupation of Namibia.

(Mr. Adouki, Congo)

The international community must, lastly, demand that any political solution in Namibia be based on the cessation of the colonial, illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, the withdrawal of South African armed forces and, of course, the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the remarkable work it does despite the obvious obstacles.

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): On Friday of last week the Security Council ended a debate on Namibia whose sole purpose was the adoption of a simple and straightforward resolution setting in motion the process of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The resolution was adopted by 14 votes, with one unfortunate abstention. The implementation of the United Nations plan enshrined in that resolution has thus been triggered.

So this debate, taking place as it does so soon after that historic decision by the Security Council, may turn out to be redundant. My delegation has no reason to imagine that the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987) with the intention of letting it rot in the files, either as a victim of cynicism or as a hostage to impertinence. We believe, as we said in our statement in the Council last week, that the Council can carry out its decisions because it has the capacity, enshrined in the Charter, to do so. We therefore have to assume in good faith that Security Council resolution 601 (1987) was adopted with serious, action-oriented intent on the part of the Council.

Indeed, we expect nothing less from the Council. It has always been understood that, once everything, every issue, relevant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has been successfully negotiated and agreement on it reached between the parties concerned, implementation of the United Nations plan should become a mere formality. An agreement was reached in November 1985 with the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

long-awaited acceptance by South Africa of the electoral system to be used in the conduct of the elections in Namibia. The adoption by the Security Council of an enabling resolution was thus almost two years overdue when the Council finally met last week to give the Secretary-General the authority to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

But are we justified in our expectation that the Security Council will insist on the implementation of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) to trigger the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)? Have we not seen the Council adopt momentous decisions in the past only to watch them defied to death with impunity by the culprits? Is the fact that there was an abstention in the voting not sufficient evidence of the inevitable doom the fledgling resolution 601 (1987) is likely to face? These are pertinent questions, but, not having the gift of insight, I suggest we leave them for future historians to answer.

Meantime, this debate must proceed as if nothing had happened last week. We have been hoodwinked before. The people of Namibia's hopes have been raised to lofty heights many times before only to be dashed. Opinions of the International Court of Justice, numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and several decisions of the Security Council are lying comatose in the bulging archives of this wonderful Organization.

Therefore, we cannot afford to relent in our determination to put an end to the needless carnage in Namibia, and we are duty-bound to keep the world mindful of the fact that a mechanism for ending that carnage in Namibia has been in place over the past nine years. The world has the right to know why this mechanism, carrying as it does the stamp of international acceptability and authority, has virtually become a dead letter.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia means a great deal to us and to the people of Namibia. It means a great deal to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the front-line States and the continent of Africa. Nine years ago we welcomed the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as a historic breakthrough in the search for peace in our region, not only in Namibia. We proceeded in good faith to nurture the resolution and the peace plan it enshrined to maturity. We did so with tender loving care. We bent over backwards to accommodate all manner of manoeuvres and machinations employed by South Africa to twist and deform the United Nations plan to suit its vile purposes. We sincerely and faithfully participated in a charade called the Pre-Implementation Meeting in Geneva in 1981, because we genuinely believed that the other side was sincere in its intentions and was finally ready to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan. In July and August 1982 we gathered at the Canadian mission to go through yet another negotiating process, which turned out to be nothing more than a barely audible shuffling of feet masquerading as progress.

There cannot, therefore, be any doubt as to our commitment to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, if we can go through all these futile processes in order to promote its implementation. To us, the plan represents the difference between peace and war, between life and death and between freedom and tyranny in Namibia. That is why we want those that are placing impediments in the way of its implementation seriously to consider the import of their action. We want them to know that we hold them squarely responsible for the continued bloodshed in Namibia and the general absence of peace in southern Africa. History will remember them as having taken an active and conscious part in the destabilization of our sub-continent, while claiming piously to harbour good intentions towards the people of the region.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

Last week we challenged the Security Council to awaken to its responsibilities and face its moment of truth, to avoid ridicule. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is its resolution and it is the Council's responsibility to implement it - or demand its implementation by all the parties concerned. SWAPO is ready to participate in its implementation, it is ready to agree to a cease-fire. And here and now we issue the same challenge with the same sense of urgency to the Assembly. We challenge the Assembly to face its own moment of truth, because we believe that too much is at stake in southern Africa. At least with regard to Namibia there is a blueprint for peaceful change in place. It is not as if we were still groping in the dark for a mechanism by dint of which we could respond to the cries of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence. The mechanism is in place.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

What is the Assembly going to do about the Security Council's seemingly permanent state of paralysis? Or are we also suffering from a paralysis of our own? The Security Council is paralysed by the intransigence of a tiny minority of its members which have taken upon themselves the invidious responsibility of acting as Pretoria's apologists. But what about the General Assembly? Are the painful facts pertaining to the situation in southern Africa not clear enough? Is there any confusion as to the real import of the linking of Namibia's independence to the presence of Cuban troops in the People's Republic of Angola? Have we not been told on several occasions, and in no uncertain terms, that the linking of Namibia's independence to the irrelevant issue of Cuban troops in Angola is designed to address South Africa's security concerns?

The fact is that the linkage can in no way be said to contain benefits for the rest of us in southern Africa. On the contrary, it has caused us a lot of pain. It has cost thousands of lives in Namibia and Angola by delaying the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Cuban troops in Angola pose no security threat to the front-line States, let alone to South Africa, and even less to Namibia. Those Cubans are in Angola to help defend that front-line State against South African aggression, which dates back to 1975. They have never set foot on Namibian or South African soil, or anywhere else near there, and it is not their ambition to do so, to provoke a conflagration in our region. So what security concerns does South Africa have that are so important, so vital, that they are worth the sacrifice of the innocent lives of many Namibians and Angolans?

The reality is different. In reality, it is the majority-ruled States of southern Africa, the front-line States and others, whose security concerns ought to be addressed very seriously. And the whole world knows the genesis of these

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

concerns. We are the ones that are being destabilized by South Africa, thereby rendering us perpetually insecure. In contradistinction to our insecurity, therefore, South Africa, which prides itself on being the invincible regional Power in southern Africa, is much more secure by far. And its security cannot, geopolitically speaking, in any case, be threatened by the presence of Cubans in Angola; nor can that of Namibia.

So the question we must ask is what South African security concerns the linkage is supposed to address. Are we not talking here about the security concerns of a white minority in South Africa, whose colour and longevity in power are perceived to be of such vital interest to the West that its safeguarding is considered important enough to call for human sacrifice, the sacrifice of the lives of Angolans, Zambians, Zimbabweans, Batswana and Namibians? Is the linkage a not-so-subtle way of preferring the continuation of the status quo, of apartheid in South Africa and illegality in Namibia to allowing the communist phantom to run riot in southern Africa?

Why is there the stubborn determination by the linkers to persist on a course which is bound to plunge our region into a bloody conflict? Why? Why is there the stubborn determination by the proponents of the linkage to continue to team up with the bandits of UNITA and South Africa to destabilize the front-line State of Angola to death, in addition to denying the people of Namibia their right to self-determination?

We are not accusing anybody of anything. We recognize the blinding power of ideological prejudices and man's capacity for evil deeds. Indeed, there is an awful lot that is evil in apartheid, in the continued denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Namibia through the stubborn insistence on the incomprehensible linking of their exercise of that right to irrelevant issues.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The Assembly must insist on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without delay now that the enabling resolution, Security Council resolution 601 (1987), has been adopted. If the Security Council fails to enforce its will, owing to the paralysis I referred to earlier, the General Assembly should find ways of putting pressure on the Council to live up to its responsibilities under the Charter. The Assembly should also consider taking the law into its own hands, so to speak, if nothing else helps. It is high time we considered uniting for peace and sanity in southern Africa, if the Security Council is unwilling or unable to do so.

Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (interpretation from French): It is now 21 years since the General Assembly took its historic decision to deprive South Africa of its Mandate over South West Africa. The adoption on 27 October 1966 of resolution 2145 (XXI) meant the end of a conflict between the League of Nations and the South African régime over South West Africa, a Territory that Pretoria wanted to annex, pure and simple. In other words, the stubbornness of the South African authorities is not new, but today that stubbornness has been transformed into open contempt for, even provocation of, the United Nations. I dare to think that the Organization still has the necessary political and moral power to put an end to that attitude.

Twenty-one years after the withdrawal of the Mandate over South West Africa entrusted to South Africa, we should individually and collectively examine our consciences in depth and learn the necessary lessons.

It has been said here - and I do not dispute it - that the parties to the conflict are the Government of South Africa and the people of Namibia. Yes, one party is the Government of South Africa, which persists in its illegal occupation, and another is the Namibian people, which is defending its legitimate rights. But

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

the conflict is also between the South African régime and the United Nations, for our Organization has the legal and moral duty to lead the Namibian people to its destiny. Are we, the Members of the United Nations, doing everything possible, individually and collectively, to restore the honour of our Organization, which is in fact our own honour?

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

What will the outcome of this conflict be? What future are we reserving to the people of Namibia now suffering under an unjust rule? What about the future relations between the Namibian people aspiring to their liberation and their current oppressors? How long will the acts of terrorism and destabilization being carried out by the Pretoria régime against its neighbours last? For how long must we still tolerate a régime that deliberately acts outside the law? Such are the questions the Organization and each of its Members must answer.

In my delegation's opinion the problem of Namibia has four closely interrelated aspects. First, both in its essence and in its external manifestations it is a colonial problem, with all that implies in exploitation and humiliation. Namibia is being overexploited and pillaged for the benefit of a usurping régime. Its people are victimized and bent beneath the yoke of a rule in which they have had no choice.

The second aspect of this painful reality - and I need not dwell upon it since we all know it only too well - is that the colonialist imposes his own law upon the people he colonizes. The law that prevails in South Africa and the law in effect in Namibia is apartheid. The apartheid régime, which lies at the root of the ills afflicting the blacks of South Africa, has been called many things: the negation of all values, absolute evil and so on. The apartheid régime is also in effect in Namibia. As a simple illustration, I need only quote at random a passage from the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia:

"The black majority, which comprises approximately 95 per cent of the population of the Territory, has been herded, on a tribal basis, into 10 non-contiguous 'homelands' spread over the most barren regions of Namibia. Secondly, mining concessions have been granted to numerous South African and other foreign economic interests, enabling them to exploit the Territory's extensive mineral resources." (A/42/24 (Part I), para. 384)

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

The third aspect of the problem of Namibia is the geopolitical aspect. Certain countries are making heroic efforts to turn the problem into a conflict of interests between East and West; such efforts are in fact attempts to justify the inadmissible acts being carried out against the people of Namibia and against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of southern Africa. The use of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression and destabilization is to be condemned, and we condemn it here today, as we have done in the past. It is as worthy of condemnation as are the acts of aggression themselves. We have condemned so-called linkage as a diversionary tactic to focus attention away from the machinations against peace and justice in the southern part of the African continent. I wonder on what legal, political or moral basis a State can allow itself to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another state; on what logical principle can a State impose its own law and view of the world on another State?

The fourth aspect of the Namibian problem consists in the outside influences that are also obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In 1981, as members of the Bureau of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Rwanda was a member of a commission entrusted by the OAU with visiting the countries members of the contact group - which has had its day, let it now be said. In certain capitals we were told that the independence of Namibia could be facilitated if only measures were adopted to create or strengthen confidence - in other words, guarantees. We asked for clarifications with regard to such measures, but the replies we were given were, to say the least, vague. We did not insist, because we could see beyond the words to their true intent.

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

Today, it is our turn to ask questions. What could better inspire confidence than the acceptance by the people of Namibia, as expressed through the voice of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), of the United Nations settlement plan under Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978)? What could better inspire confidence than SWAPO's constantly reaffirmed readiness to lay down its arms in a cease-fire operation and to participate with the South African Government - even though it is a Government of illegal occupation - in negotiations on ways of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978)? Finally, what could better inspire confidence than the assurances given by the United Nations and supported by the international community that an independent Namibia will be governed by a democratic constitution that ensures respect for the rights of all citizens and the legitimate interests of foreigners in the country? We believe that the guarantees so keenly sought by South Africa and those concerned about the future of their nationals in the Territory have already been given, unless words have really lost their meaning.

On the other hand, what could be more likely to undermine confidence than the actions of South Africa, such as the attempt to amputate such parts of Namibian territory as Walvis Bay and various islands? What could be more likely to undermine confidence than the continued systematic exploitation and pillaging of Namibia's natural resources, in contempt of Decree No.1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, a Decree designed to preserve the Territory's natural resources?

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

What could be more likely to undermine confidence than the forcible enrolment of Namibian citizens between the ages of 17 and 55 in the army of occupation, so that brothers are carrying out repression against brothers, or the attempt to organize elections in Namibia before a unilateral proclamation of independence which would be the prelude to a civil confrontation in Namibia? What is more likely to undermine confidence than the installation in Windhoek, on 17 June 1985, of an interim government composed entirely of hirelings in the pay of Pretoria, or the permanent state of emergency in that Territory? I have spoken earlier about the numerous acts of subversion and destabilization against the front-line States.

I have mentioned only some of the facts that amply demonstrate the bad faith of the Pretoria Government and that should provide food for thought for those who may be convinced to the contrary.

Earlier I mentioned Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and in this connection I should like to repeat my delegation's view as expressed here last year. Namibia's natural resources, mineral and other, cannot be the object of expropriation and thoughtless exploitation. Several delegations have said that, and it is the truth. In other words, those engaged in such operations on the spot should, at the risk of being subjected to prosecution, abide by the rules by seeking registration with the United Nations Council for Namibia, which could make operating licences available to them. I want to issue this warning to them; if they refuse to listen, history will deal with them.

Let me now urge the international community to do something for the refugees from Namibia - and also from South Africa, for they are all victims of the same policy. Certainly a great deal of generosity has been shown these refugees, particularly those who have been welcomed by the front-line countries, whose economies are at present suffering, for reasons with which we are all familiar. However, when speaking of refugees I am thinking also of the young people who have

(Mr. Kabanda, Rwanda)

to pursue their educations. I should like to associate my delegation with those who have expressed thanks on behalf of those refugees.

This is the time and place to pay a tribute to the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and, in particular, to those States which have contributed or will contribute in the future to the solidarity fund for southern Africa. Rwanda will not fail in its duty of solidarity, even though its own resources are extremely limited.

I reaffirm my Government's total support for SWAPO in its just struggle for the independence of Namibia. We should like also to offer words of encouragement to the United Nations Council for Namibia and express the hope that it will soon be able to meet inside the Territory itself.

In concluding, I feel that I have not said everything there is to say about Namibia, for no one could say everything about the Territory. The problem is still a difficult one, and the last word will and should be spoken by the people of Namibia itself.

Mr. NIYUNGEKO (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Addressing the question of Namibia in the general debate on 8 October the head of my delegation to the forty-second session of the General Assembly said the following:

"We regard the tragic and anachronistic situation of the Namibian people as a thorn in the flesh of the people of Africa, an insult to the United Nations Council for Namibia, a challenge to the Security Council and a cause of shame to the United Nations." (A/42/PV.31, p. 83)

That assessment is in no way exaggerated; quite the reverse. Indeed, when one hears or reads the statements of many of the delegations which have spoken on the question of Namibia, one feels that many are making an effort to control their anger and their emotions. Those delegations experience such anguish because they feel so deeply the effects of South African colonialism and apartheid installed in Namibia by the racist South African régime. My delegation is one such.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

The United Nations Council for Namibia is the only legal authority recognized by the international community as the Administering Authority of the Territory of Namibia. It was so appointed 20 years ago through General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), adopted on 12 May 1967. However, South Africa has refused to allow it any access to Namibian territory. On the contrary, it has substituted itself for the Council. It has installed its administration, and its army of more than 100,000 men. It has enacted its apartheid laws there and set about organizing the political life in the image of that practised within its own borders, that is, the heinous system of apartheid. It believes that what is good for Pretoria should be good for Windhoek, because it regards Namibia as one of its provinces. We, who have always unambiguously condemned the policy of apartheid in South Africa, cannot accept it in Namibia. We reject it totally.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

The services of the Security Council were drawn upon. On a number of occasions it adopted resolutions consistent with history. In resolution 264 (1969) it recognized that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal. In resolution 269 (1969) it called upon South Africa to withdraw its administration from the Territory. It approved the plan for the independence of Namibia, in resolution 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978. But nothing happened. It has just taken another step in the right direction by adopting, on 30 October last, resolution 601 (1987), in which it authorizes the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

We know that the highest official of our Organization - to whom we pay a tribute for his courage and dedication - will spare no effort in carrying out his mission. But we are already wondering what kind of linkage will be placed in his path.

We for our part urge all those who have the means and the possibility of helping the Secretary-General in carrying out his mission to give him their assistance. If South Africa refuses to co-operate with our emissary, we recommend that the Security Council meet and adopt comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against that country, in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The General Assembly - the most important body of our Organization - since it set the tone by terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, has adopted resolution after resolution demanding Namibia's independence. But today, 21 years later, we are still at an impasse.

The International Court of Justice, to which the question was submitted, rendered on advisory opinion unequivocally stating that South Africa should withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and put an end to its occupation.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

South Africa obstinately refuses to listen to anybody. That is why we have used the words "insult", "challenge" and "shame". How much longer must we wait before Namibia is free, independent and sovereign? No one can predict exactly how long it will take, but one thing is sure: that independence will come one day. It will come because SWAPO has decided to win it, weapons in hand. It will come because the blood of the martyrs has not been shed in vain. It will come because the present and future generations in South Africa and Namibia will not tolerate this injustice. It will come, finally, because it is consistent with history.

When that day does come, there will be many who will rush to embrace and congratulate the courageous SWAPO combatants. Both the true and the false friends - no one will miss the rendezvous. But, just as will happen on the Day of Judgement, everyone will get what he deserves. What we have said or refused to say, the votes we have cast or refused to cast, the assistance we have provided or refused to provide: all that will be placed on either the debit or the credit side of our States.

The Secretary-General of our Organization, in whom we have complete confidence, reported to us two years ago that the conditions had been met for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which established the plan for the independence of Namibia. Reference to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, known as "linkage", was not taken into consideration, because that element - which did exist when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted - had not been raised. Moreover, it was subsequently rejected by the Security Council in its resolution 539 (1983) of 28 August 1983. Those who put this argument forward know that it is fallacious; but they continue to cling to it because it serves as a pretext for them to interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign, independent States.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

The Pretoria leaders know that by themselves they are incapable of resisting the international community's pressure. They are aware that they cannot for long maintain the apartheid system and their occupation of Namibia without the support of their powerful protectors.

We should express our point of view clearly to them - and not only by voting in favour of resolutions submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia; we also have the duty to come to this rostrum - all of us, if possible - and tell them that we are frustrated and our self-respect is affected when we see our brothers and sisters in Namibia bowed under the yoke of apartheid.

Until the Namibian people regain their inalienable and inviolable rights, we call upon the international community to remain mobilized in order to provide all the necessary material, diplomatic and political assistance to SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. That is the only way to reduce the imbalance in the relationships of force - because that is really what is at stake.

Our most cherished wish is to see Namibia free, independent and sovereign.

Mr. KIBEDI (Uganda): When he addressed the General Assembly on 21 October 1987, my Head of State expressed my delegation's congratulations to the President of the Assembly on his election to that lofty office. As this is my first statement in the Assembly at this session, allow me the indulgence of expressing to him how happy I am to see him presiding over our deliberations. It is particularly opportune that this debate is taking place under his guidance, as his country has taken a principled and unequivocal stand on the decolonization issue.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Reed on his appointment as Under-Secretary-General in charge of General Assembly Affairs. He is very well suited to the heavy responsibilities of his new office, and he can count on our full support.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

My appreciation goes also to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, who has exerted a supreme effort to achieve the independence of Namibia. Despite the obstacles placed in his path, he has remained undaunted and has continued to press for ways and means of implementing resolution 435 (1978).

The unresolved problem of Namibia remains one of the gravest challenges - indeed to a large extent an embarrassing challenge - to the international community, and specifically the United Nations, which has a unique responsibility for Namibia. The United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) expressly provide that self-determination and independence are the inalienable right of all countries and all peoples.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the obstacles it has placed in the way of the Namibian people realizing their inalienable right to self-determination and independence is clearly a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as a breach of the principles of international law.

In line with the aspirations of the international community, the United Nations has passed several resolutions to accelerate the independence of Namibia. The General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia in 1966, a decision which was confirmed by the Security Council in 1969. In an advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice supported that position and spelt out the obligations of all Member States to put an end to this illegality. The unequivocal decisions of the three major organs of the United Nations have clearly invalidated each single pretext hatched and used by South Africa and its allies to perpetuate the illegal occupation.

The plight of the Namibian people is an affront to our sense of justice, and to the collective consciousness of the international community. We have continued to witness the suffering of millions who are fighting for human dignity and justice as the Pretoria régime ruthlessly pursues its twin policies of apartheid and colonial occupation of Namibia, in defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides a viable, realistic and just basis for solving the Namibian problem. It reflects the Namibian peoples' desire freely to exercise their right to self-determination. The plan entails a cease-fire, the withdrawal of colonial troops under the supervision of the United Nations and the achievement of independence through free and fair elections. It is the only viable way of reaching an internationally recognized peaceful solution in Namibia. Regrettably, the implementation of the plan continues to elude us.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

Resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia were adopted way back in 1978. They were accepted by all parties and those who were involved in the negotiations, that is, South Africa, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Western Contact Group and the front-line States on behalf of Africa. As we all know, resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan would have been implemented a long time ago had it not been for South Africa's obstructions. All outstanding issues regarding the implementation of the United Nations plan have been solved. The stalemate continues because of the insistence of South Africa on linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, a condition never contemplated in the United Nations plan.

Last year in his report the Secretary-General stated:

"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. 5)

The Secretary-General reiterated that view in his most recent report:

"... successive attempts in recent years to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, in order to commence the implementation of the United Nations plan, have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition". (S/19234, para. 25)

The stand of Uganda on this issue is clear and unequivocal. The presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a bilateral arrangement legitimately entered into in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. We reject linkage, and any attempt to view the liberation struggle in southern Africa in the context of

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

East and West rivalry is also rejected. We believe it is illegal and reprehensible to hold a people's freedom hostage to the selfish strategic interests of any outside Powers. It is to us a matter of deep regret that, rather than directing the pressures and sanctions on South Africa, inordinate efforts are made by a permanent member of the Security Council on Angola with regard to the withdrawal of Cuban troops. In our view, this is a transparent attempt to put the victim in the dock and have the aggressor masquerade as the one who is aggrieved. Those who are vociferous in supporting or prompting South Africa in that stance must be reminded that South African troops have maintained a permanent presence in southern Angola since 1982. As we deliberate in this forum, South African troops are in combat in Angola fighting alongside their renegade surrogates to destabilize the legitimate Government of Angola.

The Pretoria régime has seen linkage as a convenient cover to delay the independence of Namibia and to manipulate an internal settlement. Those who prompted South Africa to insist on linkage have a duty to prompt it to delink it.

South Africa will use every trick to retain Namibia by all available means. It is intent on having an internal settlement to forestall SWAPO's victory at the polls. In 1985, it set up an interim government of handpicked puppets - the so-called internal parties. In an attempt to consolidate the so-called interim government, the racist régime increased the suppression of SWAPO, increased arrests, the bombings of schools and the arrest of innocent people. Plans are in hand at the moment for these puppets to be given sham independence just like the Bantustans outside the United Nations plan. It is for this reason that efforts have been stepped up in drafting a so-called constitution and planning so-called local elections. Any such moves must be strongly rejected by the international community, as they would clearly be illegal. At the same time, armed invasion and acts of subversion against the front-line States have been stepped up.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

Using Namibia as a base, South Africa, in its quest to make the region safe for apartheid, has carried out constant acts of aggression and subversion against neighbouring African countries. Angola and Mozambique have been particularly targeted. According to the The Guardian, a paper published in London, of 5 October 1987, the racist Defence Minister, General Magnus Malan, confirmed that:

"South African security forces were fighting in Angola on the side of UNITA rebels battling to contain an offensive by Angolan Government forces.

"General Malan's acknowledgement came in the wake of reports that South African Mirage fighters had helped Dr. Jonas Savimbi's UNITA rebels repulse the first phase of an attempt by Angolan and Cuban forces to capture the strategic town of Mavinga in south-east Angola".

It is regrettable that, rather than assisting Angola to resist this act of blatant aggression, a super-Power has chosen to join South Africa in arming and sponsoring the forces of destabilization. In Mozambique, in spite of the Nkomati Accord, South Africa continues to sponsor, arm and direct the Renamo group to destabilize the country. The acts perpetrated by those on the payroll of apartheid are chilling. The 25 July Homoine mass murders perpetrated by Renamo bandits are vivid in our memories. Together with Kassinga, Sharpeville, Langa and Soweto, they are part of a long litany of Nazi-like atrocities committed against the opponents of apartheid. Botswana, Zimbabwe, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zambia have not been spared the brunt of those terrorist attacks.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

These acts of aggression have violated the sovereignty and integrity of African States, causing heavy loss of life and property. They clearly constitute a threat to international peace and security, which warrants the imposition of measures as envisaged in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

We believe that South Africa has been able to carry out these aggressive actions with impunity because of the support of some countries in the West. Not only have they continued to collaborate with South Africa economically and militarily, but they have offered South Africa a protective cover against the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. In spite of a near-universal call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions, the Security Council has been prevented, through the use of the veto by some members of the Contact-Group Five, from imposing the minimal economic sanctions, which many countries - including the United States Congress - have adopted. Rather than working rigorously to enforce the sanctions and finding ways and means of closing the loopholes, we are witnessing a campaign by a number of Western Governments to undermine and discredit the sanctions legislation passed in various countries.

The vetoes used this year to protect racist South Africa from the economic sanctions envisaged by the Charter - sanctions which are overdue - have certainly not furthered the cause of international peace and security. We call on those Powers which are giving succour and comfort to racist South Africa to rethink their policies.

As if it were not enough to frustrate Namibia's independence, the Pretoria régime, in collusion with many Western countries, is feverishly plundering the Territory's mineral and marine resources to the detriment of the interests of the people of Namibia and in clear contravention of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It is incumbent upon this Assembly to call for the enforcement of that Decree.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

The Secretary-General says in his most recent report on this subject that, if the Namibian issue is examined with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of that Territory, it should be possible to open the way for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

In response to that report, the Security Council adopted its resolution 601 (1987), which, inter alia, authorized the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in order to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

We have no illusions about the attitude of South Africa to that resolution, or about whether it will reciprocate SWAPO's willingness to have a cease-fire and proceed with the implementation of the resolution. It was clear from the racist representative's statement in the Security Council that their response would be negative, though ambivalent. Should South Africa continue to flout the Council's call, it will be incumbent upon the Council to apply enforcement measures under Chapter VII. In the meantime, armed struggle, spearheaded by SWAPO, must be enhanced and supported.

Addressing the General Assembly very recently, our President, Mr. Yoweri Museveni, said the following:

"Our people in South Africa are ... waging a valiant struggle and, the arrogance of the racists notwithstanding, our people will win in the not-too-distant future. Throughout history oppressors have always been overestimated until the hour of reckoning.... The South African régime is narrow-minded, aggressive, arrogant, disdainful of the African and of world opinion, and it thinks it can hold back the march of history by subversion against Africa, aggression against Angola and repression within South Africa

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

itself. Who has ever succeeded in this task of holding back the forward march of history? How many repressive régimes that had greater power has history witnessed collapsing?

"Therefore, neither the African people nor the whole world need be pessimistic or cowed. There is a lot of power in Africa that could be harnessed, to the great disadvantage of the handful of racists in the southern part of our continent. The sooner the racist recognize this, the better for them and for southern Africa as a whole." (A/42/PV.45, p. 19-20)

It is our hope that the imperatives of the situation in Namibia will make it possible to implement the United Nations plan. An agreed settlement exists, all outstanding problems have been settled and the Secretary-General and SWAPO have expressed their willingness to play their parts. An enabling resolution with regard to the cease-fire has been adopted by the Security Council, and the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, are ready to assume the responsibilities of statehood. We are all duty-bound to bring this about.

The delegation, Government and people of Uganda pledge their militant support to the people of Namibia and to SWAPO, their sole legitimate and authentic representative.

Mr. KARIM (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): One hundred and three years ago, the Territory of Namibia fell victim to colonialism and foreign rule. More than 26 years have now elapsed since the adoption by the General Assembly of the historic Declaration on decolonization, resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which recognized the right of all peoples to self-determination and to have power transferred to them unconditionally and in accordance with their freely-expressed will.

(Mr. Karim, Sudan)

The whole world has seen that Declaration's impact on the process of decolonization, especially in Asia and Africa. The beacon of freedom has cast its light nearly everywhere in Africa. With the independence of Namibia, that continent will see the end of all foreign rule.

More than 20 years have passed since this Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia and adopted a resolution providing for assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility over the Territory, and for the administration of the Territory by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Sixteen years have passed since the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which stated that the occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime was illegal. The Security Council took note of that opinion in its resolution 301 (1971).

It is nearly 10 years since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in which the Security Council outlined the United Nations plan for the immediate independence of Namibia.

Despite all these resolutions, the situation remains unchanged because of the policies of the racist régime which continues to ignore the will of the international community, and flout all the resolutions it has been adopting since 1960.

(Mr. Karim, Sudan)

The régime is bent on prevarication, procrastination, flouting the resolutions of the international community and persisting in its arrogance and its racist policies based on the lame excuses of untenable and anachronistic logic.

The situation now is as follows.

The racist régime of South Africa, in its illegal occupation of Namibia, is still controlling the Territory and the people of Namibia, which is struggling under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for self-determination and complete independence. The racist Pretoria régime is still oppressing the Namibian in all ways. It resorts to murder, detention and indiscriminate mass imprisonment of Namibian freedom fighters; even women, and children under the age of eight are affected. Retaliatory military acts of aggression continue to be committed by the South African régime against neighbouring States with the aim of destabilizing them and wreaking havoc in the area, as is reflected in the constant acts of aggression committed against Mozambique, one of which resulted in the death of its President, the late Samora Machel. Moreover, parts of Angolan territory are under occupation by the forces of racist Pretoria, which use Namibia as a springboard. As a result of these aggressive policies the area of southern Africa has become a hotbed of tension torn by conflict.

The practices of the heinous racist South African régime in Namibia are no different from those of Israel in the occupied Arab territories and Palestine. This similarity between the two racist régimes is reflected in non-recognition of the right to self-determination of the Namibian and the Palestinian peoples; non-recognition of the sole, legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people and of the Namibian people - the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO); their illegal occupation of

(Mr. Karim, Sudan)

Namibian and of Palestinian territories; and their total dependence on the external support of Western countries in the military and economic fields. They both pursue unabated aggression, in particular against neighbouring countries. They destabilize the neighbouring countries and create a state of disruption which jeopardizes peace in the Middle East and in South Africa.

In view of this similarity of aggressive tendencies it is not surprising that there is intensive co-operation between the two countries, which has been condemned by the Assembly for the last 10 years. That co-operation, which is seen especially in the military and security fields, has developed and intensified recently in the nuclear research field, in addition to the economic, training and commercial spheres.

Sudan, which since its independence has called for the freedom of peoples and the right to self-determination and which participated in the drafting in 1960 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), will continue to call for and support the process towards the immediate independence of the Namibian people, in accordance with the international will and with the United Nations plan as endorsed in resolution 435 (1978).

In keeping with this position, Sudan appreciates the co-ordinated and unstinted efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My delegation rejects all the groundless arguments that attempt to link the independence of Namibia with the presence of foreign troops in neighbouring countries. It is a policy devoid of logic and indeed is but another element in the vicious circle of procrastination and prevarication which has become a hallmark of the racist régime of Pretoria.

(Mr. Karim, Sudan)

I wish to confirm my country's support for Security Council resolution 601 (1987), adopted on 30 October this year. That resolution, which was supported unanimously by the members of the Council, calls for the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the immediate accession to independence of the Territory of Namibia. We hope that Namibia will soon occupy its seat among the liberated States in this Assembly.

Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria): As several speakers before me have correctly stated, our Organization has been seized of the item currently before this body since 1946, when it was first inscribed on the agenda. Indeed, the agenda item has now been considered by the United Nations for almost the entire 42 years of the Organization's existence.

The situation that gave rise to the Namibian question was, ironically, part of the *raison d'être* of the birth and continuous existence of the United Nations itself. The history and nature of the Namibian situation is sufficiently well known not to warrant unnecessary repetition by my delegation. It is indeed shameful that more than 20 years after this Assembly terminated apartheid South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility the racist régime is continuing blatantly to defy the authority of the United Nations and the will of the international community that it surrender its pernicious control over the Territory.

Although my delegation addresses this Assembly with a heavy heart and a sense of disappointment, we are indeed heartened by recent developments which portend hope and optimism over the Namibian situation.

Nearly 10 years ago the Security Council, which the founding fathers of our Organization, in their wisdom, vested with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, adopted the United Nations plan

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian crisis, through Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That action was hailed and endorsed by all the parties involved in the Namibian conflict, including the apartheid entity. The United Nations plan, however, remains unimplemented to this day because of the prevarications of racist South Africa, encouraged by certain friends and allies. Issues extraneous and irrelevant to the plan under Security Council resolution 435 (1975), issues which even pre-date the adoption of that resolution and which were not raised at the time of the negotiation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence, have been raised again and again as red herrings to block the implementation of the plan, thereby prolonging the legitimate quest of the people of Namibia for self-determination, freedom and independence.

It is the greatest irony of history, and perhaps a reflection of the contempt in which some Members hold our Organization, that countries which voluntarily and actively participated in fashioning the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence have been those guilty of subverting the implementing of that same plan. It beats the imagination of my delegation that the implementation of resolution 435 (1975), which was designed to assure the much-delayed settlement of the greatest travesty of justice of our time, has been postponed for so long because of the arrogant and selfish calculations of certain countries which pay only lip-service to freedom, justice and democracy.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

As Nigeria has stated repeatedly in other forums, the Governments which have so far allied themselves with the oppressor régime in South Africa and Namibia would be well advised to abandon their doomed policies before it is too late. They should live up to the true traditions and legacies of their own national historical experience and reflect the predominant feeling of sympathy and understanding for the Namibian cause expressed by their own citizens in their official policies. My delegation pays tribute to the ordinary people of those countries who, through mass action, have distanced themselves from the myopic policies that their Governments have so far pursued in Namibia and South Africa.

Only last week, on 30 October 1987, the Security Council, without any dissenting vote, adopted yet another historic decision. It is our hope that resolution 601 (1987), recently adopted by the Council and designed to enable the Secretary-General to proceed with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) by arranging a cease-fire between the warring parties and also emplacing the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), will attract the support and co-operation of us all. In this regard, my delegation notes with pleasure and satisfaction repeated public expression by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) of readiness to co-operate in the immediate negotiation of a cease-fire and commencement of the implementation process. We commend SWAPO, whose dedicated leadership has demonstrated tremendous foresight and imagination in the prosecution of the liberation struggle.

Nigeria would like to seize this opportunity to serve notice of its readiness to contribute meaningfully to the process of implementing resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful resolution of the Namibian conflict. We call on the international community, especially the five permanent members of the Security Council, to uphold the authority and integrity of the United Nations, especially of the Security Council, by lending their full

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

weight to resolutions 435 (1978) and 601 (1987). We appeal particularly to the Western permanent members of the Security Council to desist from any acts or policies that would frustrate the Secretary-General's efforts to carry out the mandate contained in resolution 601 (1987). The racist South African régime must now realize the futility of holding on to a people whose desire it is to achieve freedom and independence. Botha and other barons of racism must now see the handwriting on the wall and abandon ship before the swelling gale of violence consumes them in the cauldron which they have created in Namibia, and indeed in the entire southern African region.

The Government and people of Nigeria have no illusions whatsoever about time being on the side of the oppressed people of southern Africa. As we peer into the future, we see signs and signals which lead us to believe that victory is not only inevitable, but might indeed be near. The schemings and manoeuvres of the pariah South African régime, as evidenced in the establishment of a puppet régime in Windhoek, the imminent adoption of a bogus constitution designed to confer phoney independence on Namibia and the scheduling of so-called elections can only signify the last-minute struggles of a dying colonialist régime to stay alive and afloat. History tells us that such attempts are doomed to fail. Even as the Pretoria entity is embarking on these doomed schemes, Namibian workers and activists have become more militant in their demand for self-determination and independence. The recent clamp-down on SWAPO leaders, trade unionists and leaders of thought inside Namibia, along with the miners' strike there, which resulted in the summary dismissal of over 4,000 Namibian mineworkers, are all indicative of the increasing militancy and restiveness of the Namibian people in their quest to be free.

My delegation need not remind the racist régime that its attempts to prolong its occupation and bastardization of Namibia are doomed. The Botha régime is aware that when the now defunct Ian Smith régime embarked on a similar cause in

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

Zimbabwe in the 1960s, with the overt support of racist South Africa, it only facilitated the process that has since consigned it to Africa's historical dunghill. Botha and his proxies in Windhoek need not be reminded that no force on earth, no matter how powerful, can checkmate the unstoppable and determined march of a people to freedom, dignity and independence in their God-given land.

The people of Namibia have suffered enough. As one of Nigeria's illustrious sons once stated from this rostrum, an unfinished liberation struggle is certainly not one of the abandoned causes with which the world's historical landscape is strewn.

While the apostles of non-violence are busy preaching to Africa to be patient, to renounce violence and armed struggle, Africa's innocent sons and daughters are being muzzled, maimed and murdered daily by the agents of the self-appointed evangelists of peace, with the tacit support of the evangelists themselves. We appeal to the Governments of the Western Powers which have brazenly supported the perpetuation of the colonial situation in the southern part of the African continent to rethink their policies which vainly seek to frustrate Africa's inevitable march to complete decolonization and freedom. Without freedom from political enslavement, economic exploitation and social malaise the African continent cannot stand on its feet and contribute a commensurate quota to world civilization and culture.

Racist South Africa's colonialism in Namibia must be brought to an end. The Pretoria régime must be forced to discharge its responsibilities and obligations under international law in the context of resolution 435 (1978).

For our part, the Government and people of Nigeria will continue to extend maximum moral, diplomatic and material support to the oppressed people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, their liberation movement and sole, authentic representative.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

We call on all other countries to follow suit and bring the abnormal situation in southern Africa to an end before the simmering cauldron of violence becomes a boiling cauldron and consumes the perpetrators of this veritable act of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

The pertinent issue, as my delegation sees it, is that time seems to be running out in the ever lengthening calendar of violence in the subregion, which is fast sliding into a bitter racial war of unspeakable magnitude and ferocity. Can the Assembly afford to wait? That is a question which I beg representatives to ponder seriously.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.