



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.56
9 November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 5 November 1987, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

- 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 10.20 a.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)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to inform the Assembly that we still have a considerable number of representatives listed to speak in the debate on the item under consideration. The co-operation of all members in keeping their statements short is essential, bearing in mind that it will be necessary to hold an extended afternoon meeting today in order to hear all the speakers.

Further, I should like to urge representatives to be ready to speak in the order in which they are listed, so that we may proceed in an orderly manner and conclude the debate on Friday.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): The question of South Africa's racist, colonialist and oppressive rule has been on the agenda of the General Assembly, in one form or another, over the life of the United Nations. This is not a record of which the world Organization can be proud. The continued failure of the United Nations to carry out its responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia is disquieting on several counts. It means that the hopes of the Namibian people for self-determination and statehood have been repeatedly obstructed and that their

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

trust in the United Nations has been betrayed. Instead of achieving the same independence now enjoyed by formerly colonized peoples of Africa, they continue to endure the humiliation and injustice of apartheid and to suffer the long agony of their courageous armed struggle against a powerful and brutal oppressor.

Today the United Nations is once again at a critical juncture in the history of its involvement with the question of Namibia, as a result of the adoption last Friday of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which calls for a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

The constructive position of SWAPO and of Angola and other front-line States, which are prepared to co-operate fully with the terms of the resolution, puts the ball squarely in South Africa's court. If a cease-fire is achieved, nothing should stand in the way of the Secretary-General's task of establishing the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, as a first step in the independence process.

Somalia hopes that Namibia can at last enjoy a peaceful transition from colonial status to true independence and national sovereignty. However, in view of South Africa's past record, the Security Council may well continue to face the challenge of South Africa's intransigence. In that case, the issues involved will continue to be clear-cut.

No one disputes that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia in defiance of the International Court of Justice and of the United Nations is illegal. It is also not disputed that the plan for Namibia contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally acceptable basis for Namibia's independence. South Africa's arrangements for puppet régimes have been declared null and void by the Security Council. Since 1985 it has been established that all the conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan have been

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

met, following agreement on a system of proportional representation for the elections called for in resolution 435 (1978). A further obstacle should also have been removed by the Security Council's declaration that Namibia's independence could not be held hostage to the resolution of issues extraneous to resolution 435 (1978). Furthermore, the Council itself has warned that it would take appropriate measures under the Charter if South Africa continued to defy the United Nations and obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

In spite of the clearest international consensus on the principles and practical steps which should govern Namibia's independence - principles and steps which South Africa claims to have accepted - the Pretoria régime has continued with its evasive manoeuvres and its show of bad faith with regard to implementing resolution 435 (1978). If it now persists in obstructing the United Nations plan, those who have called for patience in dealing with South Africa will have no ground whatsoever to stand on.

Next year will mark the tenth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978). Ten years is more than enough time for patience from the world community while the people of Namibia endure the yoke of South Africa's racist and oppressive rule.

Unfortunately, the Security Council has failed time after time to take appropriate measures against South Africa and has given the Pretoria régime every reason to believe that Security Council ultimatums are empty threats.

That is why South Africa has felt secure in intensifying its policies of "divide and rule", of repression and terror in Namibia. That is why it has felt free to plunder the resources of the Territory in collusion with multinational corporations. That is why it persists in its illegal annexation of Walvis Bay and other integral parts of Namibia's territorial heritage. Undoubtedly that is why

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

it has been able to militarize Namibia and mount a full-scale war against SWAPO - the sole representative of the Namibian people and the leader of their just and legitimate armed struggle. We are all aware that in pursuing this war, South Africa has continued, with shocking impunity, to carry out acts of destabilization, occupation and aggression against Angola and other front-line States.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

All these policies have brought untold suffering, instability and violent conflict to the southern African region and have endangered not only regional, but also international peace and security. It would be unconscionable if those policies were to be continued and no effective international action taken to bring them to an end.

The world community has long called for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, including an oil embargo, as the only peaceful and sufficiently forceful measure available to the United Nations in its efforts to establish Namibia's independence and bring an end to the crime of apartheid. The failure of limited sanctions to effect significant change underlines the validity of the call for the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions to the situation in southern Africa.

Somalia strongly hopes that the Security Council will not hesitate to take effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter if South Africa continues to resort to obstructive tactics. In this event, the use of the veto by a permanent member of the Security Council would be a disturbing rejection of the legal and moral stand taken by the world community on the issues of Namibian independence and the continued existence of apartheid.

Somalia believes that, at the present time, Member States must continue to refrain from all political, diplomatic, economic, social and cultural relations with South Africa and withhold all support in the military and nuclear fields. Any collaboration with South Africa undeniably strengthens the Pretoria régime in its intransigence and in its ability to maintain its policies of repression and terror.

In this same context, we hope that States will make every effort to ensure national compliance with Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia for the Protection

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

of the Natural Resources of Namibia. We hope also that generous support will be extended to the United Nations Fund for Namibia to enable it to carry out effectively the task of providing Namibians with the skills they will need when independence has been achieved.

Along with the vast majority of Member States of this Organization, Somalia will await the outcome of developments on the Namibian question with renewed optimism and also with the conviction that, if necessary, there must be redoubled efforts to end the agony of the Namibian people.

Whatever transpires in the months ahead, we hope that the Security Council will be able to discharge its responsibility for Namibia's independence, for ending the serious breaches of peace and security in southern Africa, and for maintaining the credibility and authority of this world Organization, whose declared purposes and principles we are committed firmly to support in the interests of international peace and co-operation.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): Over 20 years have passed since the United Nations terminated the Mandate of South Africa in Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the country, establishing the United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole legal authority over the Territory until independence. Yet today this nation still remains subject to the political, moral and social anachronism of occupation by the racist régime, which from the beginning has succeeded in preventing the United Nations Council for Namibia from assuming its role inside Namibia. In spite of many years of hard work and great efforts, the Council has not been able to achieve its main goal - the liberation of Namibia - although its contribution cannot be overestimated, especially in arousing social awareness of the necessity of a quick and definitive solution to the problem, as well as in obtaining the firm support of the international community.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Against the background of great historical achievements in the decolonization process, which has led to the creation of new independent States, many of which contribute much today to the improvement of human well-being, we feel ashamed of the continuing illegal colonial bondage of Namibia, which is totally inconsistent with the general trend of the liberation of man which characterizes our times.

Poland has always actively supported the Namibian cause, because of our respect for every nation's right to freedom, independence and self-determination, which long ago became the principle of our foreign policy. The latest confirmation of Poland's position was the participation of the Foreign Minister of my country, Mr. Marian Orzechowski, in the ministerial meeting of the Council for Namibia, held on 2 October 1987, and his personal endorsement of the final communiqué.

We truly believe that the heroic struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence, waged by the people of illegally occupied Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), is fully justified. We are also convinced that the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations constitute the only realistic and peaceful basis for the solution of this problem. Therefore we welcome the adoption of resolution 601 (1987) by the Security Council on 30 October 1987.

After a period of inaction, the Council has broken its silence and shown its willingness to revive the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and to send a clear signal to Pretoria that it intends to compel the racist régime to withdraw from Namibia. At the same time, we consider that it strengthens the role of the United Nations and especially of the Security Council as the body having special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We fully agree with the strong condemnation of the racist régime for its acts of violence and terrorism inside and outside South Africa and for its refusal to end

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

its illegal occupation of Namibia and parts of southern Angola, in contravention of United Nations resolutions and decisions.

We categorically reject all attempts to take away from the United Nations the right to solve the question of Namibia and to undermine the process of liberation and decolonization of the Territory.

The resolution empowers the Secretary-General to undertake, without delay, the implementation process of resolution 435 (1978) by making arrangements for a cease-fire and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. In this connection, I should like to express my Government's appreciation of the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General to set in motion the United Nations plan for Namibia, and to wish him success in the new mission entrusted to him.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

In spite of the fact that there are no encouraging signs of fundamental changes in South Africa's policies in the foreseeable future, we hope that Security Council resolution 601 (1987) will be a turning-point in the long fight for Namibia's independence. However, should the Pretoria régime continue to place obstacles in the way of implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia and ignore all calls to desist from its obstructive attitude, the international community should leave no doubt that it would have no choice but to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

In conclusion, let me once again reaffirm Poland's unqualified support for SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and for their just struggle for the attainment of their right to freedom and independence.

It would be intolerable to let the question of Namibia remain unresolved, causing further deterioration of the situation in the entire region. The whole world is aware of the dangers of the apartheid policies carried out by the Government of South Africa which, relying on its powerful allies, shows as little respect for world opinion as it does for the Namibian people.

We simply cannot afford any more to ignore the hopes and wishes of that heroic nation, sick and tired of waiting for old promises to be fulfilled. We are convinced that failure to solve peacefully the question of Namibia in a short period of time might result in dangerous consequences for international peace and security. There is no justification or excuse for any further delay.

Mr. FERM (Sweden): I am honoured to speak on the important question of Namibia.

I believe we all agree that the mere fact that this item is on our agenda today should itself be a matter of great concern to us all as Members of the United Nations - and for the following several reasons: it is now more than four decades

(Mr. Ferm, Sweden)

since the Assembly, at its very first session, rejected South Africa's claim to incorporate within its territory what was then called South West Africa; it is now more than two decades since the Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia; and next year will mark the first decade of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), by which the Council decided to establish under its authority the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to ensure the early independence of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Ten years later that resolution still remains unimplemented.

The fact that the Namibian issue remains unresolved is, indeed, a human tragedy and an international disgrace. The credibility of the United Nations is at stake. As has been stated before on so many occasions, the United Nations bears special responsibility for Namibia. It is certainly the most urgent problem of decolonization outstanding. What is more, the people of Namibia are subject to the unique and abhorrent system of apartheid through South Africa's illegal occupation. South Africa is also using the Territory as a base for its terrorism and frequent military actions against its neighbours, in particular against Angola and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The South African policy relating to Namibia thus constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

South Africa's persistent refusal to co-operate in implementing the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is a matter of great concern to my Government. That resolution constitutes the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful, just and lasting solution through democratic means to the question of Namibia. My Government rejects the attempts to introduce into the Namibia plan any extraneous

(Mr. Fern, Sweden)

issues, such as the condition that the Cuban forces should be withdrawn from Angola before the implementation of the plan can start. It is, indeed, unacceptable that the implementation of the Namibian plan should be made dependent on an issue that is irrelevant to the independence of Namibia and the legitimate aspirations of its people. The United Nations plan for Namibia must be implemented without pre-conditions and without further delay. Even the South African Government itself must be made to realize that further protraction of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can no longer be tolerated.

In this connection, my Government wishes to express its great appreciation for the untiring efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to have the resolution implemented and for their active dedication in trying to find ways and means to achieve this goal through negotiations. Their commitment to Namibia's independence is of great value in promoting the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter.

Last week the Security Council adopted yet another resolution on the question of Namibia; it was, I believe, the twentieth resolution adopted by the Council on this matter. By that resolution, the Secretary-General is authorized to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO, in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. My Government welcomes that resolution as a positive step - not least the fact that it was adopted by such a large majority; but we regret that it was not adopted unanimously. Full and unambiguous support for the Secretary-General by the international community is of vital importance in the difficult and delicate task now before him.

The question of Namibia, as pointed out by the Secretary-General in his report (S/19234) to the Security Council, is a matter that, if re-examined with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of Namibia, could be

(Mr. Fern, Sweden)

resolved through the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan. The Namibian people must be permitted to enjoy the freedom and independence that is their right. Concerted action by the international community is necessary to achieve this objective. It is my Government's strong belief that the international community must increase its pressure on South Africa. No pause or weakening should be allowed in that pressure. Effective measures, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions decided upon by the Security Council, are, as we see it, imperative if South Africa is ultimately to be made to co-operate and accept the United Nations plan.

(Mr. Ferm, Sweden)

If we all agree that Namibia must be free, if we all agree that South Africa has no right to occupy Namibia, if we all agree on the modalities for the transition of Namibia to independence, how come we have not acted? What stands in the way?

Is South Africa really so strong that it can openly defy the whole international community acting through the United Nations?

Why is it that we have not, after so many years, gone from words to actions? We know what actions can be taken to increase pressure on South Africa. These actions are spelled out in Article 41 of the Charter, that is, mandatory and comprehensive sanctions. The responsibility for non-action rests with the Security Council, and in particular with its permanent members. There is no doubt that the inability of the Security Council to implement its decisions on Namibia has damaged the authority of the Council as the primary organ of the Organization - and of us - responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We have discussed at length, in this Assembly and elsewhere, the efficiency of the United Nations and the need for reforms. But what is efficiency, after all? Is it to be measured only in budget levels and administrative terms? Is not the ultimate criteria of efficiency the ability of this Organization to deal effectively with the issues before it? With regard to Namibia the most important task is for the Security Council and its members to ensure that its own decisions will now finally be implemented.

Let us consider for a moment what message we are giving the people of Namibia. Are we telling them that they can rely on the Security Council for justice, for fairness and for protection against their colonial masters? No. What they see is a Security Council paralysed by the vetoes of certain of its permanent members.

(Mr. Ferm, Sweden)

In the meantime the main burden of the struggle for freedom and independence of Namibia is carried by the people of Namibia itself. It is therefore essential that the international community intensify its concrete support of the Namibian people. My Government appeals to all Members of the United Nations to contribute or, if they are already doing so, to increase their contributions to the various United Nations funds and activities intended for the people of Namibia.

Sweden for its part has continuously increased its humanitarian assistance to the people of Namibia and is one of the main contributors to the funds and activities just mentioned. In this context my Government would like to stress in particular the need to extend increased support to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Sweden has been providing humanitarian assistance to SWAPO ever since 1970. This fiscal year our contributions - the various health, food, transport and information projects - exceed \$US 10 million.

In conclusion let me just repeat that the last remnant of colonialism in Africa must come to an end. The people of Namibia should not have to wait any longer for their freedom and independence. The international community has a direct and unique responsibility to fulfil. It should at last try to live up to the expectations of the people of Namibia and make a decisive contribution to the elimination of one of the most long-standing and serious issues on the agenda of the United Nations.

Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Decolonization is one of the greatest achievements of the United Nations. The spirit and letter of the Charter have been the background against which many countries pursuant to the Charter itself have succeeded to independence and become full-fledged Members of the international community.

The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples provides one of the most valuable bulwarks of the United Nations in its

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

struggle for the essential rights of the human person. None the less, on the eve of the twenty-first century some peoples continue to be subject to colonial domination and others endure neocolonial régimes in their most varied forms. Decolonization is thus an incomplete task that requires the international community to exert its greatest efforts.

The case of Namibia is the most moving example. A German colony from 1884 to 1918, known then as South West Africa, Namibia suffered under a barbarous régime that decimated two thirds of its indigenous population. From 1919 to 1945 it was a Trust Territory of the South African Union through a Mandate of the League of Nations. That Trust was extended by the United Nations from 1946 to 1967.

However, the South African Government did not fulfil the task entrusted to it; indeed it attempted to absorb that Territory. If there is one thing that has continuously characterized the South African Government it is its disregard for international legality and refusal to comply with United Nations decisions.

The United Nations has not shirked its responsibility in this case. In its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the General Assembly decided to terminate the Mandate given South Africa over Namibia and the following year established the United Nations Council for Namibia in resolution 2248 (S-V). That body was entrusted with administering the Territory until independence, promulgating laws until a legislative assembly was established, taking all appropriate measures for the establishment of a constitutional assembly, providing the Namibian people with a Constitution, adopting all necessary measures to maintain respect for law and order in the Territory and transferring all powers to the Namibian people upon the declaration of independence.

Twenty-one years have passed since the United Nations assumed direct responsibility over the Territory of Namibia, and its people has not yet seen the

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

realization of its dearest aspiration: achieving independence. The open violation of the will of the Namibian people by South Africa and its cynical flouting of the resolutions of our Organization are preventing Namibia from acceding to independence. Pretoria has not only focused international attention on itself by the ignominious system of apartheid it applies throughout South Africa, but its hateful régime of racial segregation has been transferred to Namibia, a Territory it occupies illegally, as was declared by the International Court of Justice in 1971. South Africa is thus preventing that people from freely exercising its inalienable right to self-determination.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

Our Organization has not only brought about the unanimous condemnation of South Africa for its illegal occupation of that Territory and its imposition of the apartheid régime but, in addition, promoted the establishment of a set of rules and the adoption of several resolutions. These include Security Council resolution 385 (1976), and resolution 435 (1978), which contains a plan for the immediate independence of Namibia and provides the only internationally accepted basis for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia.

Mexico wishes to place on record its staunch support of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and we express in this Assembly our unwavering determination to continue to contribute to its work. Since the Council assumed direct responsibility for that Territory in 1967, it has been working tirelessly and has done everything within its power to comply with the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

However, despite these important achievements and the efforts of the majority of the States Members of our Organization, Namibia still is not independent. Not only is it being denied freedom to exercise its right to self-determination, but it as fallen victim to the most unjust oppression through the military aggression conducted by South Africa by the imposition of its ignominious régime of apartheid, with all its social implications, and by the untrammelled exploitation of its vast natural resources in complicity with the activities of many foreign economic interests.

Accordingly, the General Assembly has condemned the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, a condemnation in which Mexico has joined. The Assembly has placed on record its repeated appeals that those activities should be brought to an end. We welcome the fact that the Council for Namibia has initiated legal proceedings in the domestic courts of States whose corporations or subjects

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

participate in the exploitation, transport, processing or purchase of Namibian natural resources, a measure endorsed by the General Assembly.

The United Nations has likewise been struggling to try to ensure the territorial integrity of Namibia because South Africa has made continuing efforts to annex Namibian territory, such as Walvis Bay and the islands off the Namibian coast, attempts which Mexico views as lacking all validity. For this reason, we attach particular importance to the decision of the Council for Namibia to proclaim an exclusive economic zone of 200 nautical miles from the coast and to the provision that any measure related to this matter should be approved in consultation with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Mexico, of course, reiterates its strong support of the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, and we join in the appeal for providing it with greater and more varied assistance as a token of international solidarity and for recognition of its leadership and the sacrifices it has made to bring about the independence of Namibia.

The situation in southern Africa is growing worse every day. The attempts by South Africa to perpetuate its racist policy, to expand its colonial domination and to continue its untrammelled exploitation of the resources of the region are cause for great concern and consternation. Day by day, the Pretoria régime is intensifying its military activities not only against Namibia but also against the front-line States, and therefore world public opinion is increasingly urging the international community to take concerted action to compel South Africa to change its policy.

The General Assembly has vigorously condemned the South African régime for its use of Namibian territory as a springboard for armed action and for perpetrating subversive acts of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring independent States. Mexico vigorously condemns South Africa's flagrant violation

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

of the standards and principles of international law, which, in addition to increasing the tension in the area, endangers international peace and security.

Mexico rejects the persistent efforts being made to divert attention from the true problem of the question of Namibia and to distort its character. This is the case of the alleged linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We oppose that attempt and we note with concern the fact that the application of the resolutions of this Assembly and of the Security Council continues to be delayed. We should not allow the invoking of East-West confrontation to delay any further the Namibian people's exercise of its inalienable rights.

South Africa merits unqualified condemnation from the international community. The United Nations has unambiguously established the necessary framework to enable Namibia to live in independence. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should move forward without any further delay or pre-conditions. For this reason, we have also emphasized the need to impose broad and binding sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, as the sole means of giving effect to the resolutions of the United Nations.

The members of the Security Council must assume their responsibilities and enable the Organization to take concerted action to secure the immediate independence of Namibia. We are encouraged by the recent adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), which assigns to the Secretary-General important duties in the search for a final solution. The Government of Mexico supports that resolution and declares its willingness to contribute to its implementation.

The case of Namibia is an affront to our civilization. So long as we do not put an end to the illegal situation prevailing in that Territory, the purposes of the United Nations will not be fulfilled. Hence the importance of our efforts.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

The struggle for the independence of Namibia has mobilized broad sectors of the international community. Africa has won the solidarity of many States, developed and developing, cutting across ideological differences and modes of social organization. We cannot forget that the struggle for decolonization is indivisible, not selective and dependent upon the particular interests of the administering Powers. Hence the situation prevailing in Non-Self-Governing Territories of other regions deserves a solidarity similar to that given Namibia.

Some day, which we hope will not be far off, we shall be welcoming into the international community an independent Namibia, free of colonialist oppression and racial discrimination. But to achieve that happy moment and to celebrate the total self-determination of the Namibian people, we in the United Nations must wage an arduous struggle to secure respect for the principles and norms of international law and of the San Francisco Charter and to secure the implementation of as yet unfulfilled resolutions in a demonstration of political will that we can no longer afford to postpone.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): The question of Namibia has been on our agenda year after year ever since the very first session, in 1946. It was also debated at the fifth, ninth and fourteenth special sessions, as well as at the eighth emergency special session, all devoted exclusively to this important matter. More speeches have been delivered from this rostrum on the question of Namibia than perhaps on any other item on the agenda of our Assembly, and this body has taken bold steps, assumed unique responsibilities and issued and reiterated its definitive call for the immediate independence of Namibia, as the expression of the overwhelming will of the international community. Those calls have been echoed at the highest summit level by the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, all of which have enunciated their clear, strong and unequivocal position in favour of the immediate independence of Namibia.

We are, therefore, well beyond the stage of consultations, the exchange of views and the search for acceptable texts and formulations. At this forty-second session, the General Assembly is called upon to reaffirm its commitment and rededicate its considerable energy, as an act of faith, to the immediate independence of Namibia, and in that spirit collectively to reassess the growing dimensions of the crisis looming over the subregion of southern Africa with a view to taking such actions as may be warranted for the speedy achievement of our declared common objective.

Since the beginning of this year, a small and frightened clique in racist Pretoria, exorcised from the soul of the country and relying on the most reactionary white fringe, has, like a cornered creature, lashed out with a campaign of intensified repression in a vain attempt to extend its twilight hours. The death, destruction and havoc wreaked in its wake is another ugly page in the continuing tragedy. The territory of Namibia remains illegally occupied and subjugated by over 100,000 South African troops and accomplices, who terrorize and

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

brutalize the local black population under the cover of emergency laws clamped down some 15 years ago. Innocent children and unionized labour have become the special targets of this wave of repression in which the most heinous crimes are perpetrated against the people. Meanwhile, Namibia's wealth is being mercilessly pillaged for the profit of foreign economic interests, and Namibia's territory is being used as a springboard for sabotage, destabilization and aggression against neighbouring sovereign States.

We are aghast with disbelief at the inhumanity of man towards man, and chastened before the monumental human tragedy that has befallen the black majority population of Namibia and South Africa. The international community must shoulder its responsibility and discharge without further delay its duty towards this brutalized people and their ravaged land. The vicious circle of violence feeding upon violence, which has pushed the region to the brink of the precipice, must be arrested and reversed before events in the region overwhelm efforts for peaceful change.

The question of Namibia is nothing less than that of decolonization through the genuine exercise by the people of Namibia of their inalienable right of self-determination in conformity with the letter and the spirit of resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960. The path ahead lies through the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the latter endorsing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which has the express agreement of all the parties directly concerned, including Pretoria, and which has been repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly as the only legal and internationally valid basis for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

In December 1983, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council for the first time that all outstanding issues connected with the implementation of the United Nations plan had been resolved and that only South Africa's intransigence stood in the way of Namibia's independence. Four years later, and almost a decade after the establishment of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the Secretary-General is still obliged, as is pointed out in his report to restate that successive attempts to finalize arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia, in order to commence implementation of the United Nations plan have been blocked by South Africa's insistence on the linkage pre-condition (S/19234, para. 25). The Secretary-General has already stated his total rejection of the linkage pre-condition (S/18767 of 31 March 1987); he suggests the way forward in his latest report of 27 October 1987, when he states that:

"If the question of Namibia is re-examined with realism and sincere concern for the well-being of the inhabitants of the Territory, it should be possible to open the way for implementation of the United Nations plan". (S/19234, para. 25)

We must also heed the words of the Secretary-General to the effect that the concerted action of the international community is needed to achieve this objective.

The sense of our debate, which is a barometer of the will of the international community, gives rise to the conviction that this year marks a turning point in the long and arduous march of the Namibian people towards freedom and independence. The hiatus of long years seems fractured by the strong urge for action as the forces of change are again on the march. The Programme of Action, adopted last May at Luanda, suggests new possibilities and perspectives for transforming ideas into concrete actions to be undertaken by the international community in favour of the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

The final communiqué adopted on 2 October this year in New York by the Council for Namibia, meeting for the first time in its 20-year existence at the ministerial level, was imbued with that spirit, and took the call for action one large leap forward. In its communiqué, the Council requests the General Assembly to urge Member States, at the forty-third session of the General Assembly, in keeping in keeping with Articles 10 and 12 of the Charter, to start the implementation and enforcement action envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter, against the Pretoria régime in the event the Security Council is unable to bring about the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) before 29 September 1988 (A/42/631, para. 20). For a number of years, Pakistan has called for fixing an early and definite date for the independence of Namibia and has underlined the need to take effective steps to compel Pretoria to comply.

It is beyond question that the Security Council, as the guardian of international peace and stability, bears a special moral and political responsibility to eliminate the root cause of tension in the region and to build a structure of durable peace in accordance with the verdict of the international community. By adopting its resolution 601 (1987) of 30 October, without a single negative vote, the Security Council reaffirmed its awareness of that responsibility and underlined its intention to resume its designated role of leadership for the establishment of legality in Namibia.

That resolution is balanced and non-controversial, and its thrust lies in giving direction and a mandate to the Secretary-General to bring about the implementation of the Council's own resolutions which have thus far gone unheeded. It authorizes the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO - for which SWAPO, in its usual positive and constructive manner, has already expressed its readiness - so as to make possible the practical steps

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We hope that the process to be set in motion by paragraphs 5 and 7 will be quick and productive, as the Secretary-General is enabled by the renewal of his mandate to deploy his efforts in a more result-oriented manner.

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its deep appreciation of the staunch and abiding attachment of the Secretary-General to the cause of Namibian independence, and to acknowledge and encourage the ceaseless and untiring efforts which the Secretary-General has always made and continues to make, in the face of implacable and unreasoned defiance, to bring freedom to Namibia.

Only last week, my country demonstrated, once again, our continuing solidarity with the people of Namibia and their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and a fortnight earlier, commiserated with the dissenters of conscience, the political prisoners, who languish without recourse, in the apartheid jails of racist Pretoria. The Prime Minister of Pakistan, His Excellency Mr. Mohammad Khan Junejo, in messages on those occasions, stated, inter alia:

"Born as a result of the exercise of its right of self-determination by its people, it is natural for Pakistan to support the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence."

...

"... at this critical juncture in the history of southern Africa, it is the political and moral duty of all those who value human dignity and freedom to extend effective support to the anti-apartheid struggle of the people of South Africa ..."

...

"... Justice, equality and human dignity would finally prevail ..."

In conclusion, we pay a tribute to the valiant struggle waged by the fraternal people of Namibia and to the dynamic leadership provided by SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people. My delegation is privileged, as a

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

member of the Council for Namibia, to bring our solidarity, support and contribution to the noble cause of winning freedom for Namibia.

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The question of Namibia is rightly given the highest attention in the United Nations. Many useful initiatives have been launched by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Council for Namibia, the Committee of 24 and other bodies, all aimed at ending the colonial suppression of the Namibian people. The German Democratic Republic highly appreciates these activities and will always support those who favour a lasting and just settlement of the question of Namibia.

There can be no doubt that the courageous people of Namibia will one day gain its independence and implement its right to self-determination. And there is no doubt that one day the representative of a free Namibia will occupy his place in the United Nations. Lest this "one day" come to mean a far-off future, we will raise our voice wherever the cause of Namibia, the cause of progress and peace is at stake. The explosive situation in southern Africa, which was brought about by the policy of the apartheid régime must not be passed over in silence. It requires resolute and united action on the part of States and peoples. We consider that it is in the interest of all to seek a political settlement of the conflicts in the region.

This is a basic position in socialist foreign policy, as reaffirmed also in the communiqué of the meeting of Foreign Ministers of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty held at Prague on 30 October 1987. It was stated there that the early, peaceful settlement of existing regional conflicts and the prevention of new ones were basic pre-conditions for ensuring the security of the peoples.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The debate in the Security Council last week and the discussion of the agenda item "Question of Namibia" so far here in the Assembly have shown that it is imperative to arrive at the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, if the far more dangerous consequences of not solving the problem are to be prevented.

The conditions that led to the termination of South Africa's mandate over the Territory 20 years ago have still not been eliminated. The international community is, as before, challenged by the colonial occupation of the country by South Africa, by the suppression of the Namibian people, including the imposition of the laws of apartheid, by the plundering of the natural and human resources by the colonial Power and the transnational corporations in Namibia. The Territory of Namibia is being used by South Africa as a springboard for continuing acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other sovereign neighbouring States.

Thus the Pretoria régime is seriously threatening international peace and security. Moreover, it is obvious that all those who are economically active in Namibia become accomplices to those crimes. With its Decree No. 1 and other documents the United Nations has adopted clear decisions in the interest of the people of Namibia. We strongly reject all activities that violate the relevant United Nations decisions, in particular Decree No. 1.

With regard to these positions the German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of States. Together with them we also condemn the insistence of South Africa and its closest ally on the notorious "linkage". We call for the immediate implementation of the United Nations decisions on Namibia, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), without any pre-conditions. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic welcomes Security Council resolution

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic
Republic)

601 (1987) as a possible means of initiating the process of solving the problem of Namibia within the framework of the United Nations. What is required is for the Western permanent members of the Security Council to show their readiness at last to take appropriate action, if Pretoria continues not to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

What we have in mind is to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions on South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. There is no reason to shelve such a decision. The racists' policy of obstruction, which was proved again in the Security Council's debate last week, is only too well known. It is also well known that the régime presents a dangerous threat since in its desperation it would resort to any means it saw fit to help prolong its existence and the illegal occupation of Namibia. The statements that have been made reflect the growing concern that South Africa obviously possesses nuclear-weapon capability. Pertinent references are also contained in United Nations documents such as the latest report of the Council for Namibia (A/42/24 (Part I)). In view of that, any military collaboration with Pretoria is extremely alarming.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The tenth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 418 (1977), imposing an arms embargo, is an occasion for us to pay closer attention to that aspect. It cannot be overlooked that the statements of certain States' representatives contain a contradiction, in that on the one hand, they declare their willingness to help the people of Namibia in gaining genuine independence while on the other they actively support the régime in maintaining its apparatus of military suppression.

We are on the eve of the seventieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The October Revolution was the beginning of a new epoch in the life of mankind and it paved the way to the social and national liberation of the peoples, to a world free of wars and weapons. The Namibian people also will, by necessity, take that road and we stand firmly at its side in that process.

The German Democratic Republic has for many years given manifold and broad assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and to the people of Namibia which it represents. This relates in particular to humanitarian help for Namibian refugees, the medical treatment of wounded liberation fighters, vocational, college and university qualification for cadres and many other items.

The German Democratic Republic advocates that the Council for Namibia and other United Nations bodies be strengthened in their efforts to mobilize world public opinion against the apartheid régime. In the twentieth year of the existence of the United Nations Council for Namibia we wish to express our high appreciation for the broad activities of that body in the interest of the Namibian people. The time is more than ripe for the Council to deal with its proper task, namely, to take over the administration of the Territory of Namibia and prepare for its independence.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

The German Democratic Republic is ready to do everything, together with peace-loving forces all over the world, to ensure that Namibia's independence is achieved without any further delay or reservations and that a climate of lasting security is created in southern Africa.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): My delegation welcomes the adoption by the Security Council on 30 October last of resolution 601 (1987) on Namibia, designed to facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), containing the plan for the independence of Namibia. This new attitude on the part of the Security Council, which was demonstrated by 14 votes in favour and one abstention on resolution 601 (1987), is significant on more than one ground and should be examined in depth by the General Assembly with a view to its full and immediate implementation.

Indeed the Security Council, which had been accustomed to the blocking of decisions in favour of Namibian independence through the abuse of the veto, has now finally aligned itself with the concerted will of the international community to see Namibia become independent, a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and perhaps the 160th member of the United Nations.

Asserting that all unresolved questions regarding the application of its resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved, the Security Council has identified the direct juridical responsibility of the United Nations with regard to Namibia and also the responsibility of the Member States to give the Secretary-General and his staff all the necessary practical assistance to put the resolution into effect.

The essential element of resolution 601 (1987) is, of course, the decision contained in its paragraph 5, which authorizes the Secretary-General to proceed to

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

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).

For its part SWAPO has stated its readiness to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa in order to open the way for the application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The racist minority régime of South Africa, through its representative, stated in the Security Council on 29 October last that his Government was not at war with any of the parties in South West Africa and that the moment SWAPO ceased its violence against the Territory the need for action against it would fall away. Does that ambiguous statement on the part of its representative mean that the régime accepts the idea of a cease-fire, as proposed in the resolution?

By stating that the only obstacle to the application of resolution 435 (1978) was the refusal of Angola to take a serious stand with regard to the threat to the security of the region posed by the presence of military personnel from Cuba and the Soviet Union on its territory, the representative of the racist minority régime of South Africa concluded that the conditions laid down in resolution 435 (1978) could not be met as long as those extra-continental forces remained in Angola.

It should be recalled in this regard - and the South African racist minority régime should be reminded - that all these delaying tactics constitute, to say the very least, so many subterfuges and spurious arguments to evade and prevent implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

Almost 21 years ago the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia was revoked and the United Nations decided on that occasion to take over the administration of Namibia itself until independence.

It was in the spirit of resolution 1314 (XV) that the United Nations General Assembly, reaffirming that the provisions of that resolution were fully applicable to the people of the Mandated Territory of South West Africa, recognized in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 the right of that Territory to self-determination, freedom and independence in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

In the same resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly declared that South Africa had failed to live up to its obligations with regard to the administration of the Mandated Territory, denounced the Mandate and decided that the Mandate entrusted to His Britannic Majesty, to be exercised on his behalf by the South African Government, was terminated and that South Africa had no longer any right to administer the Territory, which thenceforth became the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The Ad Hoc Committee on South West Africa, entrusted with the task of recommending practical arrangements for the administration of the Territory, was established to that end.

Even before the United Nations Council for Namibia was established, the racist minority régime of South Africa installed its odious system of apartheid in Namibia in the areas of education, land holding, health, housing, repressive legislation, violation of human rights and the shameless exploitation both of the resources of the country and of labour.

When its representative says in the Security Council that South African taxpayers have made considerable sacrifices in order to contribute generously to the development and management of Namibia's infrastructure, it should be pointed out to him that the Namibian people above all want dignity, freedom and independence, rather than having to rely on the generosity of that régime, tainted as it is with discrimination.

The minority racist régime of South Africa should take inspiration from the statement of a great African statesman during the forty-second session: "If every man could choose the colour of his skin before he was born, he could have chosen the colour black." This adage confirms, if need be, the correctness of the decision of the General Assembly to consider apartheid as a crime against humanity,

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

for humanity was created, and no one in the world can claim any superiority over any other human being solely on the basis of the colour of his skin.

Namibia possesses mineral and agricultural wealth and does not need the generosity of the minority racist régime of South Africa.

We are on the eve of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), which contains provisions for democratic, free and fair elections, and it is now the duty of the General Assembly to encourage the Secretary-General and to make available to him the necessary resources for establishing the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. Let those countries which have special relations with the racist minority régime of South Africa bring to bear their influence and intervene in order to hasten the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group, the major objective being the immediate independence of Namibia without any pre-conditions or unjustified linkage.

My delegation believes that resolution 601 (1987) constitutes a good point of departure to permit the United Nations to shoulder its responsibilities and take over the administration of Namibia and not to truckle to the minority racist régime. The credibility of our Organization requires this, as does the credibility of the other 158 Member States which make up our Organization - with the exception of South Africa.

The permanent members of the Security Council, which bear particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, can no longer tolerate indefinite delay on the part of the South African minority racist régime in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

All questions relating to the special arrangements for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) having been resolved, the Security Council

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,
Zaire)

having also given the Secretary-General a mandate to begin implementing that resolution, it is thus indispensable that, in the event of refusal or obstruction on the part of the racist minority régime of South Africa with regard to this process, the Security Council contemplate adoption, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, of binding sanctions against it. Otherwise my delegation believes that resolution 601 (1987) could open the way to the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in resolution 1514 (XV), emphasizes the right of peoples to self-determination and independence. Resolutions and decisions adopted by this Assembly have reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence within a united Namibia, whose territory includes Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the other offshore islands. United Nations resolutions have reaffirmed also the legitimacy of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, legitimate representative, and emphasized the direct responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory of Namibia until it accedes to independence in accordance with resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted in 1966, in which the General Assembly declared illegal South Africa's presence in the Territory.

Regular and special sessions of the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the Special Committee of 24, and many international conferences and regional organizations as well as the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have been seized of the question of Namibia and have adopted numerous resolutions, declarations, decisions and recommendations which stress the

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

illegality of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia, call for the immediate independence of the Namibian people and urge the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions on South Africa because of its failure to implement the Council's resolution 435 (1978) which contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. At long last, in its resolution 601 (1987), the Security Council has strongly condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its refusal to comply with the Council's decisions and resolutions, notably resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

The national war of liberation being waged by the Namibian people under the guidance of SWAPO is growing in intensity. The forces of occupation are stepping up their efforts to repress the national liberation struggle. Savage measures of repression and intimidation, including the murder of innocent civilians, barbaric torture, mass detentions, banning orders, disappearances, arbitrary executions and every form of brutality have become permanent features of life under a régime that wallows in detentions, imprisonment and torture even of women, old people and children. While it pursues its policy of banning public meetings, imposing martial law, creating security zones and ordering curfews, South Africa continues to mobilize Namibians and use their territory as a launching pad for aggression against neighbouring African countries, a practice which threatens international peace and security.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab
Republic)

The Pretoria régime's continued occupation of Namibia is an act of aggression. That régime's continued obstruction of the restoration to the Namibian people of their usurped rights, principally the right to freedom, independence and territorial integrity, is the greatest challenge facing the international community today.

Pretoria has aborted every effort by the United Nations to implement the plan contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has, among other things, tried to contrive a linkage between the withdrawal of the Cuban forces that are legitimately present in Angola and the withdrawal of the racist forces from Namibia. Such a linkage has been persistently rejected by the international community.

General Assembly resolutions declare that the natural resources of all the Territories under racist or colonial domination are the heritage of the peoples of those Territories. Foreign interests which exploit those resources, in collaboration with the racist South African régime, do so in direct violation of the rights of the peoples of the regions, the principles of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions.

The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia describes in detail the violations of the rights of the Namibian people, the plundering of Namibia's resources and the strengthening of Pretoria's military presence in Namibia. It states that the numbers of occupation forces and mercenaries in the Territory have increased and that the South African authorities have resorted to the recruitment of Namibians themselves - by force. The report also includes information on the proliferation, strengthening and fortification of military bases in Namibia and

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab
Republic)

reveals that their number has now reached 76. It also contains astounding information on the number of homeless, refugees and other victims of the colonial war waged by the Pretoria régime against the Namibian people.

The Pretoria régime would not have been able to indulge in such practices with impunity, in defiance of the will of the international community, were it not for the political, economic and military support and collaboration it receives from certain States - and particularly from its twin, the Tel Aviv régime. The collaboration of the two régimes is built on the solid basis of a shared racist, expansionist dogma which calls for the savage repression of the peoples of Africa and the Arab homeland alike.

The New York Times of 29 January 1987 stated that, during the past 15 years, Israel had sold South Africa a variety of military equipment, including light weapons and communications gear and, more important, technology-data packages containing the designs for several major Israeli weapons systems, that were subsequently assembled by South Africa's own military industry. These reportedly included the Saar-class missile boats, the Gabriel sea-to-sea missile and avionics electronic counter-measures for South Africa's Air Force, as well as air-to-air refuelling abilities for that Air Force. Israel and South Africa are also known to co-operate in developing nuclear weapons technology. Moreover, Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, Minister for Defence of Israel, visited Pretoria a few weeks prior to the press disclosures.

South Africa and Israel also collaborate in the area of developing nuclear-weapons technology. That is well known. Mr. Rabin, Israel's Minister of Defence, had visited Pretoria before the media revealed all this information.

(Mr. Arnouss, Syrian Arab Republic)

On 7 June 1986 the Financial Times of London reported that South African patrol boats that participated in the raid on the port of Namib in Angola on 4 June were equipped with Scorpion missiles made in Israel.

My country has consistently condemned South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia and its abhorrent practice of apartheid. We have always condemned South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against its neighbours, aimed at destabilizing those African countries, and its occupation of parts of their territories, with the purpose of imposing its hegemony on the region. South Africa's grudge against its African neighbours stems partly from the fact that those countries support the Namibian people's struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

My country condemns the ongoing collaboration between the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes on the political, military, economic and technical levels. We call on the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, to compel Pretoria to renounce these policies.

We in the Syrian Arab Republic support the liberation struggle, including the armed struggle, waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for Namibia's freedom and independence. We support all the efforts of the Council for Namibia, under the chairmanship of Peter Zuze.

We hope that the Namibian people will accede to independence in the near future. Peoples that struggle for freedom always triumph in the end.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): The question now being discussed by the General Assembly is as old as the international Organization itself. It has been the focus of the Organization's attention since the very first session of the General Assembly. Indeed, the Assembly has considered the question of Namibia for more than four decades, and, like the Security Council, has adopted many resolutions on the question since, by resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, it terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and shouldered the direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory until independence, including the responsibility for preparing the people to shoulder their own responsibilities once their usurped rights to self-determination and freedom had been restored.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was accepted by all, was the culmination of the international Organization's efforts to settle the question of Namibia peacefully, restore the usurped rights to their legitimate owners, and contribute to the establishment of peace and security in an important region of the African continent and the world.

The international community welcomed that resolution and saw in it the only internationally accepted plan that would enable the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty over their homeland, natural wealth, and economic resources.

However, ten years after the adoption of that resolution, the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has not been translated into actual fact. Fundamentally, that is due to the intransigence of the South African Government, its defiance of the international will, its contempt for the United Nations resolutions and its flouting of the principles of the Charter.

Year after year, the reports of the Secretary-General reaffirm that all outstanding matters obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been settled since 1985, when agreement was reached on the modalities of conducting a referendum in the Territory under the supervision of the United Nations in the light of the experience gained and practices in previous similar cases.

Nevertheless, South Africa continues to prevaricate and invent excuses and pretexts for its refusal to heed the call for peace. It persists in trying to introduce irrelevant, extraneous matters that have no real purpose but to perpetuate its occupation of the Territory.

In actual fact, that arrogant defiance has its roots in pillage and plunder by the racists, in collusion with foreign interests, of the natural wealth and human

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

resources of Namibia. This should make it clear to all that Pretoria will never evacuate Namibia voluntarily.

The international community has reiterated its rejection of the contrived linking of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola. This linkage has been considered as extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Similarly, the international community has repeatedly condemned the alliance between South Africa and certain suspect foreign interests which are selfishly and greedily depriving present and future generations of the Namibian people of their country's wealth and resources.

Egypt condemns anew those interests no matter under which flag they operate for their involvement in these sinister racist schemes. Egypt calls upon all States to adopt the administrative and legislative measures that would ensure respect for and the implementation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia which is the legitimate Administering Authority of the Territory until independence.

Pretoria has not only defied the international will and continued to occupy Namibia without any basis in law or international norms, but has also extended to that Territory its abhorrent racist policies and practices which trample every human right, and which have been denounced and condemned unanimously by the international community as a crime against humanity. Moreover, South Africa has used Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression, intimidation and blackmail against neighbouring African States and their innocent peoples whose economies and infrastructures it has continued to destroy and subvert and whose efforts at development and progress it has continued to obstruct.

That has led to serious instability in the whole region with the attendant threat to peace and security in that region. It has also opened the door wide to

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

the possibility of foreign interference in the affairs of Africa, a continent that has always been interested and successful in keeping itself away from the conflict and polarization of the great Powers. The African front-line States are being subjected, at the hands of their evil neighbour, to pressures with which they cannot cope.

While paying tribute to the steadfastness and heroic stance of those countries, we call on the international community to provide them with every possible support, in order to make it possible for them to stand up to the continued racist terrorism and aggression of South Africa.

Egypt has made a modest contribution to the Fund for the support of the front-line States, which was established at the eighth summit meeting of the Non-Aligned Countries in Harare in September 1986. We expect all peace-loving forces to make generous contributions to the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid Fund (AFRICA) so as to enable it to fulfil its noble mission on behalf of the struggling peoples in the front-line States.

The Security Council last week was able to adopt a long-awaited important resolution to make progress in the process of peace and justice in Namibia. The resolution calls upon the Secretary-General to initiate the necessary steps for the unconditional, immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). While paying tribute to the Secretary-General for his sincere, tireless efforts to restore peace and justice to Namibia, we look forward to further success in discharging the important historic responsibility entrusted to him by Security Council resolution 601 (1987). We have great hopes that success will be achieved in light of the position reiterated by the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) before the Security Council a few days ago, namely, its sincere readiness to sign an immediate cease-fire agreement and its desire sincerely to co-operate with international endeavours, thus enabling it to make the

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

necessary arrangements to ensure the presence of the United Nations in the Territory and initiate preparations for the referendum which will enable the people of Namibia to express freely their will and their choice for the future.

While paying tribute to the Namibian leadership for the political wisdom and flexibility it has constantly shown and which have earned it the respect and admiration of all, we call upon the other party to respond to international endeavours and heed the call for peace in good faith. Otherwise, the only peaceful alternative left open to the international community would be the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against it, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. In that case, such a resolution would be an urgent and necessary universal demand that should be met without prevarication or delay.

Egypt has always supported African liberation movements and has provided them all with every assistance and support in their struggle to restore the rights of their peoples to independence, freedom and sovereignty. SWAPO has been one of those liberation movements which have found in Egypt a haven and a source of support. Egypt was the first State in the world to recognize it as the sole, legitimate and authentic representative of the aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and dignity. It is a source of pride for Egypt that the first foreign office of SWAPO was established in Cairo and that it was from the Egyptian capital that the Namibian political struggle was launched to complement and support the popular struggle of brothers in the occupied Territory and inform international public opinion of the justice of their cause.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Egypt will continue to provide all possible support and assistance to the fraternal people of Namibia, as a manifestation of its belief that Africa's independence will remain incomplete until the last bastion of colonialism in our continent has been eliminated and of its conviction that the freedom and dignity of Africans will not be fully achieved until Namibia attains independence. We have no doubt that that day is close at hand, in the light of the Namibian people's determination to attain its rights, its steadfastness in its legendary struggle against the forces of occupation and colonialism and its maintenance of united ranks behind its leadership.

We believe that that struggling people, whose determination and will to achieve freedom has remained undiminished for more than a century, will achieve victory.

Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) (interpretation from French): Mr. President, the work of the forty-second session of the General Assembly has been conducted so decorously, so skilfully and so competently, to the satisfaction of every one, that my delegation cannot refrain from highlighting this and congratulating you, Sir, on this performance, which does you great credit.

I should also like to extend this well-deserved tribute in his absence to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Reed, whose tact and mastery of questions of substance and of procedure have created such a propitious atmosphere for our work.

One could not expect more from the harmonious union of East and West which we had hoped to see manifesting itself more frequently in all the questions which come up for discussion, but particularly over the question of Namibia.

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

When history comes to be written in the future by one of our great-grandsons, either with blue eyes or with frizzy hair, and he comes to study international practices and the conduct of men and governments in the course of the second half of this century, there will be many questions which will strain his intelligence and understanding.

In his perplexity, he will be wondering why all human life did not have an equal value on this Earth, why unjustified provocation bringing about untold suffering has aroused only selective expressions of compassion. He will be wondering why certain peoples have succeeded, with aid of certain Powers, in carving out a place in the sun for themselves, finding within the framework of statehood the long-sought opportunity to take their proper place in international life, while others, in spite of their heroic struggle on all fronts and their moving appeals, are kept on the sidelines of history, constantly frustrated in their legitimate aspirations to independence. Perhaps this chronicler of the future will find a hint of explanation in these lines of Brecht:

"Some are in the light
Others in the dark,
We see those in the light
But not those in the dark."

The record of Namibia will be a source of consternation and bewilderment for the generations to come. In the criss-crossing of divergent strategies and promises which will not be kept, it testifies to the structural limitations of our institution and the lack of a single vision and a single political will. Without unity of view, action and effort are fragmented and become ineffectual.

More than 20 years have gone by since the United Nations, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, terminated South Africa's mandate over

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

the Territory of Namibia and decided to assume direct responsibility for its administration until independence. More than 16 years have gone by since the International Court of Justice handed down its advisory opinion condemning the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

To this very day, however, right and might have been pitted against each other in a combat without end, which the proliferation of resolutions and speeches seems powerless to resolve. Pretoria does whatever it wants, without concerning itself about the views and demands of the international community, the rights of man and the norms of conduct imposed by law and morality.

Even though apartheid has been categorized as a crime against peace and humanity, the leaders of South Africa have made it a principle of government and indeed, made it the very buttress of their policy of segregation and violence. That racist policy has kept Namibia immobilized in the status quo and has deprived it of the benefits of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

In the final analysis, it is a concern for bringing independence to Namibia which has determined the action of the United Nations, and it is the perverse determination to delay it indefinitely which has motivated at every turn the reactions of Pretoria. The building of the Namibia of tomorrow is thus being criminally obstructed. That obstruction is so persistent, so obstinate, that even the hardiest would yield to discouragement, were it not for the indignation and repugnance aroused by the medieval barbarism which is rife in Namibia.

Blood is shed, freedom fighters mustered under the banner of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) are ruthlessly felled, women, old people and young people indiscriminately.

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

In the Namibian village of Okathitu, we are told by an Anglican priest, racist forces searching for members of SWAPO broke into houses, revolvers in their hands, robbed the houses, burned schools, raped women. Andreas Shikongo and his 17-year-old daughter were tortured by electric shock treatment for a whole night. The priest added:

"It was terrible. People were screaming all over the place. Wherever one went, one could hear people groaning."

No one is spared. When children die, the adults governing the world can no longer lose themselves in the intoxication of their own words. They must stand up like men.

In the face of so much suffering, which the passage of time is doing nothing to allay, in the face of Pretoria's mounting defiance, the immediate independence of Namibia is an urgent necessity.

My delegation has noted with interest that thoughtful initiatives have been taken to revive the plan for the independence of Namibia and to enable Security Council resolution 435 (1978) - the only legitimate basis for an acceptable settlement of the problem - to get its second wind.

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

In this regard, the position taken by representatives of member States at the ministerial meeting held here on 2 October last by the United Nations Council for Namibia should be maintained.

The illegal occupation of the Territory, the plundering of its resources in violation of the Council's Decree No. 1, the persecution, torture and arbitrary arrest to which the Namibian people have been subjected have been categorically condemned. The implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) has been called for by the Security Council; failing that, it has called for the application of the relevant provisions of the Charter, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII.

The draft resolution adopted almost unanimously by the Security Council, which met last week at the request of the African Group, has renewed the Namibian independence process and thus revived in all relevant quarters a hope which is indeed fragile but nevertheless encouraging.

The vulnerability of Africa itself, accompanied by economic, ecological and natural problems, requires an immediate solution of those gratuitous difficulties that have diverted its attention, energies and resources from the essential problems of food self-sufficiency and sustained development.

The damage done to the infrastructure and to human, natural and agricultural resources, not to mention the money spent on arms and training to resist the devastating raids of South Africa and its henchmen, have rendered ever more precarious the equilibrium not only of the front-line States but also of the whole of Africa.

The repercussions of the Namibian problem are spreading throughout the continent. We hope that there will be an early solution enabling African States to bind their wounds and step up production in order to stave off the threat of

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

famine, concentrate on the revival of their economies, and organize among themselves - including a South Africa which has finally seen the light - mutually advantageous trade on the basis of a balanced division of labour. The problem of displaced persons and refugees, which is such a serious drain on the resources of the host countries and the United Nations budget, would be greatly reduced.

My delegation fully supports both the preamble and the operative part of Security Council resolution 601 (1987). The mediation effort which the Secretary-General has been requested to continue - the first stages of which are recounted in his report S/19234 of 27 October 1987 - must be supported and promoted by all Member States without exception and all the parties directly concerned.

The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) should be congratulated on having come out so unreservedly in favour of the cease-fire. It is now up to Pretoria to display some good faith by forswearing its policy of violence inside the country and destabilization abroad and, above all, it must abandon its specious arguments and delaying tactics which have kept the Namibian question deadlocked for so long.

The question of independence must be cleared of all extraneous issues, such as the artificial insertion of extraparties into the conflict and the equally artificial preconditions to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

The sine qua non of regional security, which amounts to an imperative, must be immediate independence for Namibia and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). It is only on that basis that the other problems - extraneous as they are to the tragedy of the Namibian people - will, within the framework of negotiations among sovereign States, find a solution that

(Mr. Auguste, Haiti)

will attest to respect for law, morality and the objectives of peace and collective well-being which are the goal of the United Nations. Any other approach only obscures the essential issues and betrays mental reservations, if not indeed suppressed intentions.

Mr. GYI (Burma): The question of Namibia is an issue that has been under consideration by the United Nations ever since it was established. This year the General Assembly is again required to continue its concern and commitment to the cause of the Namibian people's right to self-determination and freedom, which they have been denied for so long as a result of the illegal occupation of their country by the South African régime.

The General Assembly continues to face a situation where South Africa has not shown the slightest inclination to heed the aspirations of the Namibian people and the will of the international community. There is indeed a further deterioration of the situation and the people continue to suffer under the colonial yoke of the apartheid régime and no prospects are as yet in sight of that régime's willingness to withdraw from Namibia. There is also a continuing deterioration of the security and stability situation in the southern African region and Namibia is being used as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. The policy of apartheid practised by South Africa can be held responsible for the illegal occupation of Namibia and the destabilization of the region's security.

It is now well over two decades since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, but its people are still being denied the right to self-determination. Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is universally accepted, constitutes the framework for a peaceful settlement whereby the Namibian people would be able to exercise their right to freedom and independence. However, South Africa's intransigence and refusal to comply with the United Nations plan for Namibia constitutes the obstacle to its implementation.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

It has been said that there are now no insurmountable problems standing in the way of the United Nations plan for Namibia; however, preconditions insisted upon by South Africa which are issues of an extraneous nature and fall under the sovereign jurisdiction of Angola now stand in the way as obstacles to Namibian independence. In this connection, in his report of 31 March the Secretary-General has stated:

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

"This linkage pre-condition, which dates back to 1982, now constitutes the only obstacle to the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia."

(S/18767, para. 32)

As we all know, the United Nations holds direct responsibility for the independence of Namibia; and the United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority until the attainment of independence, must continue to exercise its responsibilities for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Since its inception the Council has been conducting activities to assist the people of Namibia to achieve their independence. The Council recently held a meeting at the ministerial level and the final communiqué it adopted on 2 October recommended a further course of action by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

It is important to note that in that communiqué the Council requested the Security Council to set an early date for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), that is, no later than 31 December 1987, bearing in mind that all the necessary conditions had already been fulfilled, and to commit itself to applying the relevant provisions of the Charter, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII in the event that South Africa continued to defy the decision of the Security Council.

In this regard we should bear in mind that Security Council resolution 566 (1985), inter alia, strongly warned South Africa that its refusal to co-operate in ensuring implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would obliged the Council to have recourse to appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. Consistent with this resolution, it is incumbent upon the Security Council to take the necessary measures if the South African régime continues to refuse to comply with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

We believe that the United Nations must continue to persevere in its efforts for the freedom and independence of Namibia; and the Security Council, in keeping with its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should effectively exercise its authority.

At the same time there should be recognition of the important role the General Assembly can play in taking the necessary course of action in accordance with the recommendations contained in the final communiqué adopted at the recent ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Recent developments in the Security Council should give us cause for encouragement, for the Council has indeed taken a step that is positive, and its realization would make it possible to begin implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. In this context we refer to resolution 601 (1987), which was adopted by the Security Council less than a week ago. In accordance with his recommendations, which are commendable, the Secretary-General has been given a mandate to proceed with the arrangements for a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). We believe that such arrangements are essential for the realization of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The General Assembly debates the Namibian question in a situation that is all too familiar to all of us. The illegal occupation of this territory by South Africa continues. Despite numerous special meetings and conferences - of which I should like to mention by way of example the recent ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia on 2 October this year - no change is within sight.

The international community should continue to exercise the necessary pressure on South Africa in order to speed up implementation of Security Council resolution

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

435 (1978). Finland, like the other Nordic countries, believes that effective mandatory sanctions would be the best means to this end. However, we welcome Security Council resolution 566 (1985) as a step in the right direction. We should now unite our efforts in order to put the plan into effect. No pretext to put new obstacles in the way of Namibia's independence can be accepted. My Government rejects any unilateral solution to the Namibian question by South Africa outside the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We fully support Security Council resolution 601 (1978), adopted last Friday, authorizing the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire agreement 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). We must however recognize that this task of the Secretary-General is not easy to fulfil in view of South African obstinacy in this matter.

Finland, like the other Nordic countries, stands ready to play its part in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and in assisting the people of Namibia. We have, along with others, offered to contribute to UNTAG. Pending effective sanctions by the Security Council, Finland, together with the other Nordic countries, has adopted a wide range of measures against South Africa, including a total ban of trade relations between Finland and South Africa. All these measures have been extended to cover Namibia also.

The question of Namibian independence is not only an agonizing political problem; it also has economic, social and human dimensions. The reckless economic exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, both marine and mineral, has continued. Despite Namibia's natural wealth, its economy is in severe crisis. The profits from the local tin mining and fishing industries go to outside parties without benefiting the Namibian people. The Council for Namibia bears a major responsibility for counteracting this exploitation.

(Mr. Korhonen, Finland)

It is of crucial importance to continue work to promote developmental, economic, social and educational institutions supporting the future independence of Namibia. Finland's continuing dedication to the cause of the people of Namibia has been manifested in our annual contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. In addition, we support the Namibia extension unit.

We look with satisfaction at the activities of the United Nations Institute for Namibia, in Lusaka. We, as one of the initiators of this decade-old institute, are also contributing to its work effectively. We are confident that the expansion and diversification of the programmes of the Institute on the basis of the recent substantial review of its work, as well as the improved efficiency of its work, will lead to continued and increased support for the Institute, not only by Finland but by other countries as well.

Education and training have been regarded as the key elements in building up self-reliance and the needed resource base for an independent Namibia. Finland has continued humanitarian assistance to the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in the field of education, training and health. Nearly 200 Namibians have been trained in Finland in technical, social and medical fields. As part of the humanitarian assistance, Finland has also supported the production of school books and educational material to be used at the primary school level.

By participating in these activities, we are looking to the future and towards an independent Namibia. Our objective is to contribute to the immediate need to develop the educational and training personnel the new nation will need at the time it gains its independence.

Mr. RICALDONI (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): If we examine the history of relations between the United Nations and South Africa with regard to the question of Namibia, there can be no doubt that this has been a history of

(Mr. Ricaldoni, Uruguay)

persistent and systematic disagreement. If we divide those relations into two stages, we can clearly see that the first phase - the period 1946 to 1966 - was marked by a prolonged and obstinate refusal by South Africa, in its capacity as administering Power, to comply with the international obligation of informing the United Nations about the situation in the administered Territory. That refusal persisted, although this obligation was emphatically affirmed in 1950 by the International Court of Justice and although the overwhelming majority in the General Assembly supported the Court's opinion.

In the second phase - the current phase, the question of Namibia has become a pending bilateral problem between the United Nations and South Africa or, putting it in other words, between the international community and the Government of Pretoria. Since the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory in 1967, following the Assembly's termination of South Africa's mandate and creation of the Council for Namibia as its sole legitimate Administering Authority, South Africa's unco-operative attitude has become one of permanent and unequivocal disregard of the authority of the United Nations itself and of its continual appeals and recommendations in support of Namibian independence. That disregard is purely and simply a direct and categorical challenge of the will of the international community.

Throughout this lengthy process of more than 40 years - one that has been especially frustrating for a country such as mine that believes firmly in the rule of international law - the Security Council's most significant contribution has unquestionably been its unanimous adoption of resolution 435 (1978), which was inspired by the plan submitted by what was then known as the contact group. That resolution has not only been recognized as the true United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, but indeed carries the great moral and political force of being the sole universally accepted approach for a negotiated, stable and just

(Mr. Ricaldoni, Uruguay)

solution of the Namibian question.

Hence the four principal constituent elements of that plan have been and remain the four great undertakings the United Nations, as the institutional expression of the world community, has proposed and continues to propose for the attainment of Namibian independence. I should like to recall those elements, because their validity is undeniable and their implementation cannot be postponed: first, the holding of free elections, without any exclusions, sponsored by the United Nations for a constituent assembly; secondly, the freeing of all Namibian political prisoners; thirdly, the return of refugees; and, fourthly, the cessation of hostilities by all parties and the subsequent withdrawal and concentration of the armed forces of South Africa and SWAPO to previously defined geographical areas.

Nevertheless, despite the unanimity achieved for the adoption of the plan and the fact that the Council has focused its attention on the item during the past eight years, attempts to implement resolution 435 (1978) have proved fruitless.

While SWAPO has accepted the cease-fire and the establishment of a demilitarized zone, South Africa continues to insist on the imposition of extraneous conditions not provided for explicitly or tacitly in those four constituent elements of the plan. Moreover, in a kind of reaction that is directly proportional to the intensity of the conclusive pressures and pronouncements of the international community, the Government of Pretoria has decided to carry its illegal activities to their logical conclusion: it has consolidated its colonial occupation with a permanent military presence of 100,000 troops - that is to say, one soldier for every 12 Namibians; it has extended the shameful system of apartheid to Namibia; it has managed to fragment the local population along tribal lines through its policy of Bantustanization; it has converted Namibian territory into a springboard for frequent acts of aggression against neighbouring States;

(Mr. Ricaldoni, Uruguay)

and, indeed, it has attempted to establish a so-called transitional government in Windhoek in flagrant violation of resolution 435 (1978).

The Minister of External Relations of my country, in his statement in the general debate in this Hall two months ago, stated the following:

"History teaches us that the most serious disputes and wars of the past were almost always caused by authoritarian, expansionist and colonialist régimes. This is illustrated at the present time by the persistence of the Government of South Africa in continuing its intolerable policy of apartheid and the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, which is a clear threat to peace and an infringement of human rights, against which the formal repudiation of the international community seems not be a sufficient reply."

(A/42/PV.5, p. 41)

(Mr. Ricaldoni, Uruguay)

Faced with this persistent bilateral tension with South Africa, the United Nations has employed a broad range of international remedies, including the following: constant appeals to Member States by the General Assembly and the Security Council to adopt various kinds and degrees of punitive measures against the Pretoria Government; the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and its conclusive and final judgement on the illegality and invalidity of the occupation by South Africa and on that country's full international responsibility for all violations of the rights of the Namibian people and the exploitation of its natural resources; non-recognition of so-called bantustans; the finding that South Africa's decision to establish a provisional Government at Windhoek was null and void; the acknowledgement of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as representative of the Namibian people; the rejection of South Africa's credentials and the consequent prevention of its participation in the General Assembly; the adoption of international conventions against apartheid; persistent appeals for multilateral assistance to the African front-line States, which have been the victim of acts of aggression by South African forces; the proclamation of Namibia Day; the imposition of a mandatory arms embargo against Pretoria; and the international proclamation of a 200-mile exclusive economic zone for Namibia. I could continue with that very lengthy list.

None the less, the South African Government is irrationally attempting to defy modern history, which has shown and continues to show that the world process of decolonization is inexorable, and has invariably chosen tacitly or expressly to ignore the tough, indefatigable, emotional and intense series of calls, appeals, declarations, resolutions and decisions favouring Namibian independence and the total eradication of apartheid.

(Mr. Ricaldoni, Uruguay)

That defiance continues unabated, and has led to heightened awareness on the part of the world at large and to illegitimate obstinacy on the part of South Africa, which is engaging in dilatory and illegal disregard of an inevitable process leading to the independence of Namibia and to the elimination of apartheid.

Since the inauguration of its constitutional Government on 1 March 1985, Uruguay has stated with special emphasis, in many and varied forums, that it clearly identifies with that world-wide awareness, whose goal has been and remains unchanging: to ensure the exercise by the people of Namibia, with full international guarantees, of its inalienable right to the establishment of a free and independent State. International law and morality have already laid down their categorical and unqualified judgement in favour of that goal. History has already reached the same verdict; all that remains is compliance, and there shall be compliance.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): For this Assembly, Namibia is once again a test of our principles, of our political commitment and of the maintenance of the legal order we ourselves established. For more than 20 years South Africa has been defying the authority of the United Nations, protected and buttressed by ambiguous policies that have consolidated colonialism, racism, oppression and the systematic violation of human rights in Namibia.

South Africa's attempt to feign a process of transition to independence is failing, even in the framework of South Africa's own plan; there is no acceptance of election formulas devised by the South African authorities to perpetuate their colonial domination. That is the backdrop to the Security Council's adoption of a resolution calling for an immediate beginning of the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia; my delegation had the honour to participate in the debate and to support the draft resolution.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The Security Council's decision to request the Secretary-General to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan implied a collective rejection of the extraneous pretexts and preconditions put forward by South Africa. If it does not comply with this decision, South Africa will be committing a further crime against the authority of the international community and would once again be subject to sanctions appropriate for this new violation of the mandate of the Organization.

We trust that the firm international support for the plan for the independence of Namibia will enable us to repair this serious damage to international law and re-establish the authority and prestige of the United Nations, which the unpunished rebelliousness of the South Africa has undermined.

The persistence on the modern political scene in Africa of so grave a colonial situation is a historical aberration that no strategic or commercial argument can justify and that must lead to serious political consequences for those bent on maintaining and supporting a state of affairs that is repugnant to the conscience of mankind, that has been repeatedly condemned by the international community, and that infringes the self-determination of peoples. The time for action has come. The re-establishment of international legal order has once again been the subject of a decision of the Security Council. Those who resist that decision must bear the consequences.

We believe in the irresistible force of history and in the ultimate success of just causes. We believe in the freedom of Namibia. We believe that by our actions we are generating a political process irreversibly leading us to the goal of ending the illegal occupation of Namibia and finally bringing about its independence.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

Peru is commemorating Peruvian-African Friendship Day, and both at home and in our embassies in African countries we are reaffirming our common values and our identification with the just cause of African peoples; we reiterate our unconditional support for and solidarity with the people of Namibia and its liberation movement led by the South West Africa People's Organization. We pay a tribute to Namibian fighters and to the men, women and children who have fallen in this struggle for freedom, dignity and justice; it is our struggle too.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): More than 40 years ago, the General Assembly rejected a South African proposal to incorporate South-West Africa, now Namibia, into the Union of South Africa, and it recommended that the Territory be placed within the United Nations Trusteeship System. Twenty years later, in 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and assumed responsibility for administering the Territory until independence.

Regrettably, those landmark decisions have not led to a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue. For more than 40 years this Assembly has adopted resolutions on the issue, unfortunately to no avail. The Namibian people is still fighting for basic issues affecting the very nature of their existence: self-determination, independence, human rights and dignity.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Norway is convinced that the settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978) offers the only internationally acceptable basis for the achievement of independence for Namibia. The modalities for the transition to independence have been agreed. The Namibian people must now be allowed to determine their own future through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control in accordance with the settlement plan.

All delaying tactics by the South African Government must be condemned. Norway rejects the attempts of the South African Government to obstruct progress by introducing extraneous issues. Furthermore, my delegation shares the deep concern of the international community over the illegal occupation of Namibian territory and its use for launching unprovoked aggression against neighbouring countries, particularly Angola, with the consequent implications for international peace and security.

South Africa continues to ignore the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and to challenge the will of the international community. The installation of an "interim government" is yet another unacceptable scheme for consolidating South African dominance over Namibia. Any action taken by the so-called interim government must be considered as null and void ab initio. Norway categorically rejects any unilateral move by South Africa to transfer power in Namibia.

We continue to believe that comprehensive mandatory sanctions would constitute the most effective instrument for exerting pressure on South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Security Council's deliberations in April this year, however, regrettably demonstrated that this approach is not at present acceptable to all members of the Council. As a way out of the impasse arrived at in April, Norway welcomes Security Council resolution 601 (1987) adopted last Friday. While we commend the readiness of the South West Africa People's

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Organization (SWAPO) to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa, we regret the intransigent attitude demonstrated by South Africa in the debate before the Security Council last week. Norway fully supports the resolution, and we call on the parties to co-operate with the Secretary-General in arranging a cease-fire and undertaking administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). Norway stands ready to play its part in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and in assisting the people of Namibia. We have offered to contribute to UNTAG, and in co-operation with our Nordic neighbours we have developed a plan for concerted action on development co-operation once Namibia is a free and independent country. Pending a peaceful solution to the conflict, we will continue our efforts to advocate effective and comprehensive sanctions by the Security Council. My Government is ready to pursue its policy of a total economic boycott against South Africa and Namibia, as evidenced by the Law on Economic Boycott, whose provisions took effect on 20 July of this year.

Namibia is potentially one of the wealthiest countries on the African continent. The rights of the Namibians to their natural resources must be scrupulously respected by all. Norway shares the concern of the international community over the rapid and unjustifiable depletion of the Territory's wealth by foreign interests. My delegation is alarmed at the serious over-fishing off the coast of Namibia, and we expect all United Nations Member States to show regard for the interests of the people of Namibia and ensure that their marine resources will be used to their benefit. The Norwegian Government continues to believe that a thorough mapping of the marine resources off the coast of Namibia would be useful. We stand ready to offer practical assistance in this regard.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Norway remains deeply committed to alleviating the plight of the Namibian people. I should like to reiterate here today my Government's unequivocal support for efforts made and measures taken by the United Nations to correct the grave injustice inflicted on the Namibian people. We have had the privilege of contributing to the various United Nations activities benefitting the Namibian people, such as the United Nations Institute for Namibia at Lusaka and the Namibia Nationhood Programme. We also support SWAPO for the benefit of Namibian refugees, and this assistance will continue as long as it is required. Norway appeals to all States Members of the United Nations to contribute generously to these funds and activities.

Allow me in this context the opportunity to make a few brief comments on the activities of the most important United Nations body in this respect, that is the United Nations Council for Namibia. Although commending the main thrust of the Council's activities, my delegation cannot but express its concern at certain aspects of the draft resolutions or recommendations presented by the Council to the General Assembly. Thus, my delegation questions the wisdom of adding new paragraphs to the already overloaded draft resolutions. For instance, last year's resolution on the situation in Namibia contained 79 operative paragraphs, a number which in this year's draft has been increased to 85. I exhort the Council to consider a different approach to the drafting of resolutions. Our objective should be to formulate and to adopt a text that demonstrates the broad support for the Namibian cause, a text which commits all nations to increase their efforts to accelerate the process of independence for Namibia.

May I also, on a more general note, and bearing in mind the recent statement made by the Secretary-General on the programme of activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia for 1988, reiterate that in the current difficult financial situation, all United Nations activities, including those of the Council for

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Namibia, should be carefully scrutinized to secure effective and appropriate utilization of resources. In this context, my Government is concerned about the level of the Council's expenditure on seminars and conferences, and we again suggest that the Council should concentrate its efforts on direct and practical assistance to the Namibian people.

Having addressed these concerns, I must stress in concluding my remarks the importance of not letting our ultimate goal fade.

My delegation looks forward to the day when Namibia will take its rightful place in the family of nations. We call upon the international community to contribute effectively to the building of a free, united and independent Namibian nation-State. The Namibian people have suffered long enough. The situation in Namibia has reached a most serious stage. Any further delaying of effective action can only have an adverse effect on international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.