



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.55
9 November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 4 November 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)
later: Mr. KOUASSI (Vice-President) (Togo)
later: Mr. FLORIN (President) (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

- Elections to fill vacancies in principal organs [15] (continued)

- (c) Election of five members of the International Court of Justice

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

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/42/24)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/42/23 (Part V); A/AC.109/916)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/596)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/42/698)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1, chap. I)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Before I call on the first speaker I remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision taken at this morning's plenary meeting, the list of speakers in the debate on this item will be closed today at 5 p.m.

Mr. SHERVANI (India): My delegation renews to you, Sir, our felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of this session of the General Assembly. We recall your eloquent opening remarks on your election in the course of which you voiced the hope that an independent and non-aligned Namibia would emerge. It is a faith that augurs well for our discussion today.

Our overcast skies have brightened with the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) on 30 October 1987. South Africa has done its best to prove once again that there can be no silver lining without a cloud. One hundred and sixty-six resolutions and one hundred and nineteen months separate resolutions 601 (1987) and 435 (1978). Each resolution has demonstrated the capacity and the willingness of the Security Council to act in concert and with purpose. Each month has shown South Africa's complicity and culpability in the continuance of conflict, coercion and confidence trickery in the region.

(Mr. Shervani, India)

Let us look at South Africa's statement before the Security Council last week. It had learnt nothing and it taught us nothing. The representative of the emasculated régime, ironically named Manley, said only one thing that was new. "Botha" is pronounced "Bo-e-tha" and not "Botha". We are obliged for this lesson in diction from this purveyor of fiction.

What was the theme of his song? In his own words, the claim that

"An examination of the record of the Namibian issue during the past 40 years shows that South Africa has consistently sought the peaceful resolution of this problem".

(Mr. Shervani, India)

At another point we have an astonishing synthesis of sanctimonious smugness and deliberate duplicity when we are told that

"Inevitably the people of South West Africa/Namibia will have to decide on the future of their country themselves, and South Africa stands ready to facilitate a broad-based process of deliberation."

Mark those words: "South Africa has consistently sought the peaceful resolution of the problem"; "South Africa stands ready to facilitate a broad-based process of deliberation". Trick or treat?

But even Pretoria's pen-pushers nod. Its draftsmen, trained in the discipline of devious double meanings, let slip a reference which quoted the President of the Council for Namibia as having

"spoken of the desire of the people of Namibia for peace, dignity and the right to determine their own destiny." (S/PV.2757, p. 21)

So Pretoria has seen fit to quote the President of the internationally accepted sole, legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence. Is there some subterranean signal here? So Pretoria has seen fit, at least in one instance, to call a country by the name it has chosen for itself, rather than the anachronistic aberration its colonial rulers forced upon it and by which they have continued in every other instance in that specious speech to call it: South West Africa/Namibia. Is there a signal there? We believe there is. It is a signal of fear. It is a signal of desperation. It is a signal that the truths and lessons of history have finally begun to catch up with the red-faced, yellow-livered rulers of the white minority régime, who boast of having blood bluer than that of those whom they rule by force. It is a signal for the world to act.

(Mr. Shervani, India)

Twenty years ago Mr. Botha told the Security Council that

"what is considered anathema today may well become sound practical politics tomorrow, and vice versa".

Some hope! Apartheid, anathema then, is anathema now. Colonialism, anathema then, is anathema now. Brutality, anathema then, is anathema now. Theft, anathema then, is anathema now. Human values do not surrender to the politics of the moment, not for all Pretoria's wishes. The people's faith cannot be mortgaged to the politics of extraterritorial convenience, not for all Pretoria's wishes. The global responsibility epitomized by Namibia cannot be forsaken for the politics of accommodation, not for all Pretoria's wishes.

The Security Council has acted. On several occasions in the past it could not. Political wisdom was vetoed. Moral propriety was vetoed. The fulfilment of legitimate aspirations was vetoed. But one cannot veto a people's will. Security Council resolution 601 (1987) has commanded as much unanimity as one had dared to hope. It is possible to abstain from principle. It is possible to abstain from decency. It is possible to abstain from giving to others the rights and freedoms one so cherishes oneself. But one cannot abstain from history.

Even as resolution 601 (1987) was being printed by the United Nations press, South Africa was launching yet another assault within Angola using its troops which are still present in that sovereign country and in Namibia. That latest act of brazen bravado reflects the utter desperation of the discredited despot. Pretoria is proving powerless to preserve itself in the wake of the comprehensive moral and widespread political and economic sanctions of the world. It cannot survive the onslaught much longer. Enfeebled by a self-induced immune-deficiency syndrome, the racist régime can even now number the days of its survival.

This has been an eventful session of the General Assembly. Matters of direct

(Mr. Shervani, India)

concern to our 159 Members have been discussed and deliberated upon. But what of the 160th nation, which should have been among us years ago but still is not?

How can we talk of the environment, of the air and the water to him who owns not his land? How can we talk of the critical economic situation to her whose colour disables her from finding a job? How can we talk of disarmament to those who live in the shadows of weapons and fear? Each moment takes the rest of the world forward. The free, the fortunate, the unfettered chart new means for themselves and their peoples to explore more fully the riches and the wealth of this vast opportunity we call life. Each moment Namibia stays the same. Physically a part of our world, it seems to have been enshrined in the litany of legend and law that long-term issues in this institution inevitably immerse themselves within. How long can we in these later years deny to a people the rights and joys that we sought and cherished when we were young?

Allow me to place on record once again India's deep appreciation of the work being done by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the Commissioner for Namibia. The leadership of Ambassador Peter Zuze has given the Council for Namibia vigorous thrust and purpose in its actions. Many had thought that circumstances would force the Council to work in a vacuum. Bereft of the Territory for which it is responsible and denied the opportunity to talk to the people for whom it is responsible, the Council has found its mandate and responsibility exceptionally difficult of fulfilment. Yet it has endeavoured, and given strength and direction to international effort and concern. My delegation is proud to have a part in that endeavour, conscious that - as is its hope - the need for the endeavour will soon pass.

(Mr. Shervani, India)

We also welcome the new Commissioner for Namibia, Ambassador Bernt Carlsson, whose duties entail in so large a measure the consolidation of the human base for freedom in Namibia, a base which already exists and which international effort will help strengthen.

Resolution 601 (1987) of the Security Council gives once again a collective opportunity for each one of us to involve itself in Namibia's right to its future. India stands ready, as it has always done, to assist in whatever manner it can to help assure that right. India cannot do so on its own: none of us can do so on our own. For once, at least this once, we must be united nationa.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): The common assessment has been evinced in the recently concluded general debate that there have been changes for the better in international relations, that the process of dialogue and negotiation is strengthening and that ways and means are being increasingly sought to overcome the grave international situation. The positive consequences of this state of affairs are already being felt in some areas of international life and have brought about a certain relaxation of international tension. However, not all crisis spots in the world have been positively affected. Some continue to deteriorate. This is particularly true of the situation in southern Africa. The apartheid régime continues to spill the blood of the majority population, hold Namibia in colonial bondage and threaten the independence of neighbouring States.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Why has it not been possible to make any progress in resolving the problem of southern Africa and why has the international community not been able to initiate action to that end? The answers to these questions are to be found primarily in the absence of the political will on the part of some elements to take resolute steps and bring pressure to bear on the régime in South Africa. The Charter of the United Nations contains provisions envisaging appropriate concrete measures that could be taken against the policy of aggression and occupation of the régime in Pretoria. Yugoslavia considers that comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in Pretoria under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter are the most efficient and the only remaining peaceful means by which to bring about the elimination of apartheid, the liberation of Namibia and the maintenance of peace in southern Africa.

The arguments being put forward against the imposition of mandatory sanctions have long ceased to be convincing. In the current situation they cannot but serve to protect the aggressor and its policy of apartheid, colonialism and racial discrimination.

Economic and other interests cannot be more important than the freedom, independence and human rights of the people of southern Africa. The countries that continue to maintain relations with the régime in Pretoria should have understood by now that that is not the way to compel the racist régime to dismantle apartheid and terminate the occupation of Namibia.

The problem of Namibia is one of those questions on which there exists the broadest agreement in the international community concerning all aspects of achieving a peaceful and just solution. This was true 10 years ago when the United Nations plan for Namibia was adopted. Now that the electoral system has been determined, the last obstacle to the implementation of this plan has been removed,

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

and all countries continue to be in favour of it - all, that is, except the racist régime in Pretoria.

This is why all the expectations that a solution to the problem of Namibia will soon be found have failed to materialize. The strategy of the South African racists has always been to block all efforts and negotiations on the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia under such unacceptable pretexts as the so-called linkage between the independence of Namibia and the presence of foreign troops in Angola. Yugoslavia, like most other countries, maintains that the independence of Namibia cannot be made contingent upon irrelevant and extraneous issues. The presence of foreign troops in Angola is an issue to be considered and decided upon by independent Angola alone. What linkage has helped to perpetuate, however, is the continued enslavement of the people of Namibia and the intimidation of non-aligned Angola.

The recently concluded meetings of the Security Council and its decision are an important effort finally to start the process of the implementation of the United Nations plan. Yugoslavia supports and will become actively involved in the implementation of these initial steps and is ready to make its own contribution by participating in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

However, what we need to succeed is joint, unanimous action by the entire international community. But already at the meetings of the Security Council certain reservations were heard about the practicality of the mandate entrusted to the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire and undertake measures for the emplacement of UNTAG. Those that have voiced these reservations should realize that it is not only the implementation of these decisions that is at stake, but also their commitment to the United Nations plan for Namibia and the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, independence and freedom.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has a very important role to play in the efforts aimed at implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia, and Yugoslavia will continue to render its full support to his activities. His understanding of the problem and his personal commitment to the independence of Namibia will be invaluable assets in the efforts to implement the United Nations plan in the forthcoming period.

Particularly important in the present situation are the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Peter Zuze, the Council has launched many actions to assist the people of Namibia and its struggle for freedom and independence, which actions deserve our full support. The recently concluded meeting of the Council at the ministerial level adopted an important and constructive document. Yugoslavia supports its recommendations and will actively participate in their implementation.

Equally important are the activities of the Council for Namibia for the protection of the human and natural riches of Namibia. South Africa and other foreign economic interests continue ruthlessly to plunder the human, mineral and marine resources of Namibia. This not only is contrary to Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia, but constitutes a flagrant violation of the right of the people of Namibia freely to dispose of their natural and economic potential. All countries should adopt legal and other measures to prevent their public and private enterprises from participating in the exploitation, processing, purchase or transportation of the natural riches of Namibia.

The international community is duty-bound to render political and material support and assistance to the people of Namibia and its sole authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in their struggle for freedom and independence. SWAPO has become a powerful liberation

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

movement and political organization. Its commitment to the principles and goals of the policy of non-alignment has ensured it wide international recognition and support.

The Government and peoples of Yugoslavia will continue to render unreserved support to the struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination, independence and freedom and to press for the eradication of apartheid and the vestiges of colonialism. Yugoslavia will also continue to render concrete material support to SWAPO and the front-line States and, as a member of the Committee of the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund, established by the non-aligned countries, pledges its best efforts to mobilize wide-ranging assistance to the victims of the aggression of the racist régime in Pretoria.

The United Nations and the entire international community have historical responsibility for the independence of Namibia. The settlement of this question would not only end the suffering of the people of Namibia and enable it to live in freedom but also represent an important contribution to a general relaxation of tension and the strengthening of the stability of international relations.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Once more consideration of the question of Namibia provides the General Assembly with an opportunity again to open the file on the South African régime. The rarely equalled regularity with which the various organs of the United Nations deal with the problems for which the apartheid régime is responsible is an eloquent expression of the serious concern of the international community at the unacceptable situations it has brought about.

As a sophisticated system of racial oppression, a phenomenon of colonialist exploitation, a constant source of tension and aggression, the Pretoria régime is the embodiment of everything against which mankind has fought and all the blots on its history that for more than 40 years now it has endeavoured to erase.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Whether it is a matter of debates on apartheid, on the repeated acts of aggression against States of the region or on Namibia, there is no relevant meeting of the Security Council and no session of the General Assembly at which, because of the obvious relationship between these problems, the serious and precarious political situation in which South Africa maintains the entire southern part of the African continent has not been stressed.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

In persisting in maintaining its illegal presence in Namibia, South Africa feeds a dangerous abcess which dooms the whole region to permanent insecurity and instability. Thus, international legality is defied and the global consensus on the necessary independence of Namibia is challenged.

Nevertheless, the question of Namibia has always been raised, and rightly so, by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, which have clearly set forth all the elements for its solution.

No one doubts the illegality of South Africa's occupation of Namibia. Similarly, the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people has been formally proclaimed and the representative nature of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) duly recognized. Everything points to the fact that for more than 20 years the United Nations has been striving to guarantee the legitimate independence of the Territory and has worked to that end.

That position supports the Namibian people in its glorious combat for national liberation. It placed even more hope in the adoption of an international plan, that had the seal of the unanimous approval of the Security Council through Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is now the point of departure for universal support.

However, while the ever mounting tide of international pressure would certainly have brought reason to a purely colonial design, it has been impossible so far to eradicate the expansionist ambitions of the Pretoria régime. That is because its system, correctly termed a crime against humanity, is a system of treachery and rebellion against the international community as a whole.

Immediately following the proclamation, in the United Nations Charter, of the principle of equality of the rights of all peoples and their right to self-determination, the Pretoria régime made known its intention to make Namibia its "fifth province".

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

That original sin still prevails and casts a dramatic light on the endless litany of South African illusions. From rejection of international authority over Namibia to undermining international conferences on the independence of the Territory, from the mockery of internal powers, condemned from the outset, to the attempt to link implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to irrelevant conditions, the whole South African approach has but one objective: control of Namibia by the apartheid régime and the establishment of a protective shield for apartheid throughout a Namibia in which freedom would be held hostage. The Namibian people is resolved to break this vice and the international community has undertaken to redress the situation.

As the fruit of the commendable political will of SWAPO, and the patient efforts of our Secretary-General, to whom we once again pay a well-deserved tribute, all the conditions for implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have now been met. Furthermore, in resolution 601 (1987), of 30 October, the Security Council gave the Secretary-General a mandate to enter into consultations with a view to implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia as soon as possible.

This historic step has focused our collective endeavours on renewed energetic action to give effect to the common will. We must all now redouble our efforts to ensure the independence of Namibia without further delay. Indeed, 40 years of joint combat for the independence of Namibia have paved the way that we have still to tread in order to triumph.

We must first step up material, political and moral support for the Namibian people in its national liberation struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole, authentic representative. We must then consolidate international authority in

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Namibia by strengthening the means of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its independence. Lastly, we must prepare for the imposition by the Security Council or, failing that, our collective authority of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime if, as may be feared, it persists in its rebellion against international order.

We must here highlight and condemn the recent act of aggression by South Africa against Angola, which cost the lives of more than 150 Namibian refugees. This new criminal act immediately following the Security Council's deliberations on Namibia is clear provocation by the apartheid régime and it strengthens our determination to do everything possible to ensure its elimination.

The work of renaissance, which is a symbol of the United Nations, is at one with the rule of law and the triumph of just causes. The Namibian people has already paid a heavy price for its independence and has been rewarded here only by broken promises and unfulfilled expectations.

Only through our common resolve will it be possible to redress the injustice inflicted on the Namibian people more than four decades ago and hasten the restoration of its rights and freedom.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The General Assembly is once again called upon to consider the situation in Namibia and the stalemate regarding the accession to independence of the Territory. We followed closely the meetings of the Security Council on this question and the debate demonstrated the importance accorded the international community to a problem that urgently requires solution.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

The deliberations of the General Assembly leave no doubt regarding the existence within the international community of the unanimity of view on all the fundamental questions regarding the independence of Namibia. The United Nations plan, approved by the Security Council through its resolution 435 (1978), of 29 September 1978, forms the universally accepted basis for the peaceful settlement of the question. The international community, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, has been able to resolve all outstanding questions and we all deplore the fact that a single country, under multiple pretexts, refuses to hand over to the Namibian people the power which it is retaining in defiance of the wishes of the whole world. Given the situation, we can only welcome the most recent decision of the Security Council, which we hope will mark the beginning of the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

While South Africa is dragging its feet and moving further and further away from any process of negotiation, we continue to feel acute concern regarding the rapid deterioration of the internal situation in Namibia, which is characterized by increasing repression, a new wave of violence unleashed by the South African occupation forces, and the persistence of apartheid.

Last August we were informed of South Africa's intention to organize elections in Namibia on the basis of ethnic groups, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

If these elections were carried out, they would strengthen South Africa's plan to impose an internal settlement on the Territory in order to establish a political structure subject to its authority.

Finally, South Africa's military activities and acts of aggression beyond the frontiers of Namibia and on the territories of neighbouring countries are also cause for serious concern. South Africa's large-scale military attack launched on Namibian territory two days ago is an arrogant challenge to the recent decision of the Security Council.

As long as nothing is done to put an end to this situation, southern Africa will not be able to enjoy a just and lasting peace. This situation can only exacerbate tensions with the serious consequences that that implies for the peoples of the region. The rapid deterioration of the situation created by South Africa not only threatens the peace and stability of the region but also raises fundamental problems regarding international norms of behaviour and ethics.

The time has surely come for all the Members of our Organization to redouble their efforts to create the necessary conditions for putting an end to this unacceptable situation.

Twenty-one years after the General Assembly ended the South African Mandate over Namibia, the United Nations must urgently take all necessary measures to enable Namibia immediately to accede to independence.

The Security Council's decision to authorize the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire, allowing for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia, doubtless marks a very important stage in resolving this problem. While expressing the hope that this initiative will be successful, I should like to convey to the Secretary-General my Government's gratitude for his tireless and wise efforts for the implementation

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

of resolution 435 (1978). We thank the Secretary-General for his personal dedication to the cause of independence for Namibia and we support the diplomatic activities he will be undertaking in the near future to bring about implementation of Security Council resolution 601 (1987).

The process of independence is now at a critical stage. All the Members of our Organization must give the Secretary-General all necessary assistance to facilitate his actions. In so doing, the international community should react immediately to the delaying tactics South Africa might use and should display vigilance against military or other actions that country might undertake to complicate the task entrusted to the Secretary-General.

At a time when international public opinion is more aware than ever of the policy of apartheid and the brutal wave of oppression raging in South Africa, the international community should exert sufficient pressure on the South African Government. If South Africa refuses immediately to apply the United Nations plan, measures currently in effect should be strengthened and additional effective measures should be envisaged. The onerous consequences of prolonging and exacerbating the present situation, as well as South Africa's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations, will require the taking of decisive and urgent measures, including under Chapter VII of the Charter. The strengthening and intensification of an effective multilateral process reminding South Africa in a convincing and binding manner of the urgent need to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would doubtless facilitate a solution to this problem. The independence of Namibia, like the question of apartheid, requires, in our view, firm and resolute pressure and, hence, the adoption of consistent policies by those that can and must exert such pressure.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Turkey energetically condemns all the delaying tactics of South Africa designed to delay the independence of Namibia, as well as efforts to link that independence with extraneous issues. The solution of the problem of Namibia should not hinge on the acceptance of conditions having nothing to do with the substance of the problem. Moreover, we can but condemn South Africa's persistent efforts to impose an internal solution on Namibia through an administration whose declared allegiance is to South Africa. Turkey considers null and void the establishment of the so-called transitional government and denounces the support it is receiving, support which can only undermine the actions of the United Nations and perpetuate the status quo.

Before concluding, I should like to reiterate the unconditional support of the Turkish Government for the efforts made to ensure the independence of Namibia. Attesting to its solidarity with the just cause of Namibia, Turkey will vote in favour of all draft resolutions submitted for our consideration. As a founding member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, my country will continue firmly to support all the Council's efforts to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to it as the legal Administering Authority in Namibia. The Council must continue to do all in its power to keep the question of Namibia at the focus of international attention. My Government subscribes to the fundamental premise of the Programme of Action adopted during the extraordinary plenary meetings of the Council held in Luanda from 18 to 22 May 1987. We especially appreciate the decisions arrived at protecting all the natural resources of Namibia. My Government also associates itself with the conclusions of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held in New York on 2 October last.

Namibia must be independent. That is both a challenge to and a noble objective of the United Nations. Turkey's support for the just cause of the Namibian people is and will remain unswerving.

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): When we speak of

what the Pretoria régime is doing to the Namibians and the peoples of southern Africa, we speak of the doings of a brutal tyrannical force which makes a mockery of every norm known to man, not only in war and peace but, most heinously in the very exercise of man's right to be treated as a human being. South Africa does not recognize any such right in its headlong rush to stamp out the very humanity of men under the sheer weight of savage aggression, brutal repression and the confiscation of property and wealth.

One of the most barefaced crimes of our age is the plundering of the wealth and resources of the Namibian people and the occupation of their territory by South Africa, which persists in its damnable and criminal colonialist aggression against all the peoples of the area and the owners of the lands over which it is trying to impose a fait accompli situation.

Disregard for the lessons of history and the implications of the very basics of human nature blinds the racist Pretoria régime to the simple fact that extinction is the inescapable fate of any alien power that tries to dominate and coerce a homogeneous majority. If there is any one who would doubt that, let him refer to the history of any nation on our globe and benefit from the lessons that history taught traditional colonialism.

Since my country at present chairs the Organization of the Islamic Conference, it is my duty to present the Islamic view on this question. Nothing could express that view more tellingly than the resolutions adopted by the Islamic Summit Meeting held in Kuwait and the statements made by those who took part in it. I refer to those resolutions and statements in order to draw the attention of members to the prominent position given in the Islamic world to the Namibian question and the questions relating to southern Africa. This is only natural. Our concern with

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

Africa is sincere and it is dictated by the principles of Islam and takes its point of departure from the principles of the Charter of our Organization.

The Islamic Summit in Kuwait announced this year its rejection once again of the Pretoria régime's insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola as a pre-condition for the independence of Namibia. Kuwait has always affirmed that rejection. We are all prompted in this respect by a basic conviction that the international community should forestall any attempt to dilute the question of decolonization through the introduction of irrelevant questions and also by any attempt to portray the question as part of the conflict between East and West.

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

We reiterate, on behalf of the Islamic Conference, that all the attempts by Pretoria to impose an internal settlement on Namibia that would serve Pretoria's colonialist designs have never deceived and will never deceive anyone in the international community. It is quite obvious that all this is nothing but an attempt at perpetuating Pretoria's illegal occupation under a different mask.

On countless occasions, the international community has stated that any political settlement of the Namibia problem must be based first and foremost on the immediate and unconditional termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the withdrawal of its armed forces from Namibia, in order for the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence without hindrance, in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We also wish to stress that Namibia's independence must be achieved without any prejudice to its territorial integrity. This means that independence should embrace, as part of Namibia's territory, Walvis Bay, Penguin and the other islands. Any attempt by the Pretoria régime to annex those parts would be considered null and void.

The latest occasion on which the international community affirmed its position vis-à-vis the question of Namibia was the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), last Friday. In that resolution the Security Council has agreed to implement the last stage of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. It authorizes the Secretary-General to arrange for a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) so that administrative arrangements can be made to allow for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. Thus, international

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

legitimacy will have taken another step forward towards enabling the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

While the resolution pays tribute to the willingness of SWAPO to commit itself to a cease-fire agreement with South Africa, it strongly condemns Pretoria's continued illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. But there is nothing new, in all this for the racist Pretoria régime's consistent stance has been one of arrogance, tyranny and disregard of the will of the international community. The latest manifestation of that arrogance was the aggression by its occupation forces last Monday against Angola and the killing of more than 150 SWAPO militants.

In spite of the fact that most of the credit for obtaining the release recently of some of the leaders of SWAPO and trade unionists in Namibia is due to the pressure exerted by world public opinion, we still await the day when Pretoria will take such initiatives of its own accord on the basis of conviction and far-sightedness, and not as a ploy which soon fizzles out and ends in re-arrest. We hope that Pretoria will genuinely renounce its intransigence and desist from its repression of a whole people for material and hegemonistic ends.

Hence my delegation would like to call once again upon all the leaders of the international community and people of good faith in the world to continue their pressure on South Africa and support for the just aspirations of the Namibian people. We should intensify all campaigns aimed at forcing South Africa to acquiesce to the international will and desist from the heinous crime it has been committing against Namibia for years.

Based upon our conviction that it is necessary to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as an effective means of ending the illegal occupation of Namibia and the practices of apartheid, we welcome the limited preliminary steps taken so far by some industrialized countries and the

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

withdrawal of some of their companies from South Africa. At the same time, we condemn those entities, circles and institutions which continue to bolster the economy of Pretoria and thereby encourage it to persist in its occupation and aggression.

My delegation cannot but pay tribute to the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in trying to protect the interests of the Namibian people, and laud the role the Council plays on behalf of our international Organization in the service of the Namibian cause until the Namibian people achieve their independence.

Before concluding, I should like to refer to the signs which appeared on the horizon recently and which give rise to the hopeful expectation that the two super-Powers may be embarking upon a stage of genuine co-operation and true and genuine use of our Organization in the manner intended by its founders to achieve peace and security. All we hope for, when talking about Namibia today, is to see soon the achievement of that great dream, and the translation of this historic opportunity into an ultimate destruction of the last vestiges of neo-colonialism in southern Africa and Palestine, vestiges that we have seen grow in a regrettable climate of conflict and rivalry between the two super-Powers.

Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Let me stress at the outset that Namibia continues to be a matter of highest importance. The international community's commitment to the cause of Namibia's independence and freedom is unequivocal.

It is indeed a tragedy for the Namibian people - and we regard it also as one of the major shortcomings of contemporary world politics - that nine years after the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) the sovereignty and independence of Namibia still remain to be accomplished.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) set out the way by which the people of Namibia might at last be free to decide their own future. This resolution endorsed a settlement plan for the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. It is the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence for Namibia. Yet, despite its endorsement by the international community and its acceptance by the Government of South Africa and by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) it was not possible so far to start with the implementation of this plan.

In these nine years we witnessed strenuous efforts to bring about its implementation by the Secretary-General, his Special Representative, the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the contact group. Other initiatives were undertaken or supported by SWAPO, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement. However, all these commendable endeavours have not succeeded owing to South Africa's attitude.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

For Austria as well as for many other countries it is a matter of deep regret that South Africa has not seen fit to open the way to implementing in good faith the principles and procedures laid down in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Whenever certain technical difficulties have been resolved, new and extraneous issues have been raised by the South African Government, thereby further prolonging its illegal occupation of Namibia.

In defiance of the international community and in disregard of the will of the Namibian people, South Africa established a so-called transitional government in Namibia, a measure which Austria considers to be null and void. In our view, this was just another attempt to contrive a unilateral solution.

My country also strongly deplores South Africa's continued insistence on the linkage of Namibia's accession to independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. As the Secretary-General has pointed out in his latest report to the Security Council, and as has been affirmed by the Security Council itself, all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have now been resolved.

We are well aware of the need for all States to aspire to a high level of security, but the security of one State cannot be achieved at the expense of the security of others, and certainly it can never be the price to be asked for the sovereignty and independence of a nation. One of the pillars of national security is a policy of good-neighbourliness. Therefore a policy of destabilizing neighbouring countries runs counter to national security. Austria, in this context, deplores the fact that the territory of Namibia is misused as a springboard for military attacks against neighbouring States.

South Africa's persistent military attacks from Namibian soil are inseparably connected with the intensified repression of the Namibian people by South African

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

forces throughout the Territory, including the so-called operational zone in northern Namibia. My country shares the grave concern expressed by the Security Council in its statement of 21 August over the continuing deterioration of the situation in Namibia and its condemnation of all acts of repression and brutality against the Namibian people. Austria welcomes the recent adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) as yet another expression of the determination of the international community to bring about the speedy resolution of this issue. We strongly urge the parties to the conflict to co-operate closely with the Secretary-General in the implementation of this resolution.

The question of Namibia is not only a burning political problem, but must also be understood in its economic, social and human dimensions. The economic consequences of South Africa's continued occupation have been devastating. Despite the natural wealth of Namibia in minerals, in agriculture and in fisheries, its economy is going through a period of severe crisis. Foreign exploitation of the natural resources, unemployment, inadequate educational and health services, the militarization of the Territory, human rights violations and repression are among the manifold hardships which overshadow the lives of the Namibian people. This situation will change decisively only when Namibia achieves its rightful place as a sovereign and independent State.

In the meantime the Namibian people must be able to rely on the assistance of the international community. My Government welcomes and supports the efforts of the United Nations to help the victims of South Africa's policy in Namibia. For many years Austria has, therefore, contributed to the funds and programmes of the United Nations for Namibia.

It is the common responsibility of the international community to reach an early settlement of the Namibian question. I should like to pay special tribute to

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

the constructive policies of the front-line States, which, also under adverse circumstances, have never flagged in their commitment to Namibia's independence.

As the Secretary-General pointed out in his statement to the special ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the importance of the Namibian situation can be fully appreciated only in the context of the wider strife affecting the whole of southern Africa. Namibia's peaceful transition to independence would go a long way towards defusing the tensions pervading relations between the States of the region and South Africa. Thus, a rapid settlement of the Namibian problem would not only deliver its inhabitants from further deprivation and despair but also contribute significantly to the restoration of peace and security in southern Africa.

The international community must not acquiesce in the present situation. Austria, for its part, remains strongly committed to the expeditious and peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. My country has therefore adopted a number of concrete autonomous national measures in accordance with Security Council resolutions 566 (1985) and 569 (1985).

We hope that the full implementation of the United Nations plan will soon be achieved so that the people of Namibia may take their rightful place in the community of free nations, in peace and self-determination.

Mr. KATEKA (United Republic of Tanzania): As preceding speakers have observed, it is now 21 years since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The termination of the Mandate was an assertion of Namibia's inalienable right to self-determination in accordance with the United Nations Charter and resolution 1514 (XV). However, to date the people of Namibia are not

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

yet free. They are faced with a most brutal régime which continues to occupy that international Territory in total defiance of the international community. The apartheid régime has intensified its oppressive measures in Namibia by unlawful detentions, endless states of emergency, curfews and massacres of the indigenous people. To the total shame of the United Nations, the impudence and intransigence of South Africa have remained unanswered by commensurate meaningful action.

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

It is astonishing, disappointing and disgraceful that the legal authority of the United Nations over Namibia has not been asserted through the implementation of the United Nations plan which was adopted by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) almost a decade ago. The Security Council, whose decisions are binding, has remained paralysed and impotent in the face of South Africa's wanton challenge. The apartheid régime has increased its arrogance and stubbornness because it knows that it has powerful backers. Only last week, we were treated to a charade of such disdain during the Security Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia which led to the adoption of resolution 601 (1987). Instead of giving any explanations and agreeing to implement resolution 435 (1978), the representative of the apartheid fascists in Pretoria used the usual diversionary antics of offensive defence.

It is now two years since agreement was reached by the concerned parties on all outstanding issues regarding the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Pretoria régime accepted that resolution and chose the electoral system of proportional representation. But the régime has, with the support of a major Power, invoked the linkage question to obstruct the implementation of the resolution. Only last week, the Secretary-General in his report (S/19234) to the Security Council informed the Council of South Africa's continued insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola as a pre-condition to Namibia's independence. In the same report, it is stated that the bogus Foreign Minister of the apartheid régime alleged that

"the presence of Cuban troops in Angola constituted a serious threat to Namibia, making free and fair elections impossible". (S/19234, para. 19) Such an assertion is mind-boggling. One wonders what foreign troops were present in South Africa during the sham elections which were held by the Boers in May this

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

year. What foreign forces prevented the régime from holding free and fair elections, with the participation of the African majority? The white minority should put its own house in order before lecturing others on democracy.

At any rate, as most of us have stated in several forums, the question of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a matter between the two sovereign and independent countries. It has nothing to do with the independence of Namibia. We regard the continued clinging to the linkage question as an insult not only to the sovereignty of Angola but to Africa as a whole. It is an insult to the Namibian and South African patriots who have sacrificed their lives to gain freedom. It is an affront to the front-line States, which regularly are victims of South Africa's destabilization efforts. If we were to use the criterion of the presence of foreign troops as a prerequisite for the negotiation of conflicts, then no region would be able to do anything. The same Power which is peddling the linkage business has its troops stationed all over the world. Should we then say that before any bilateral issue involving a country where these troops are stationed and a third party is resolved, it should be held hostage to the withdrawal of these troops?

Unfortunately, the apartheid régime does not run out of excuses for not abandoning the linkage stuff. If linkage had not existed, South Africa would have invented it. But, fortunately for the South African régime, this issue was fabricated by its main supporter.

The desperate régime in South Africa will go to any length to ensure its survival by buying more time. It forgets that while it can delay Namibia's independence, it cannot deny that Territory freedom indefinitely. However, if South Africa is allowed to have its way, it will not of its own volition grant independence to Namibia. That is because South Africa needs a buffer zone in order

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

to perpetrate its odious policy of apartheid inside South Africa. Let those who still have illusions about South Africa learn from the régime's aggression against its neighbours.

Because oppressors thrive under more oppression - on the theory of "the more, the better" - and because freedom abhors injustice, just as light and darkness cannot coexist, the apartheid régime has gone to great lengths to maintain its minority rule. It has created, supported and financed the UNITA bandits and traitors that have brought untold suffering to Angola. It is estimated that the damage resulting from South Africa's invasion of and carnage against Angola amounts to over \$10 billion. The South African régime is also behind the murderous MNR bandits in Mozambique. It has created puppet entities in Namibia by establishing the so-called interim government. These criminal and vicious acts by South Africa deserve unreserved condemnation by the international community. If nothing is done, there will be a threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

South Africa's total contempt and arrogance further manifest themselves through the slanderous campaign that the régime has mounted against its neighbours. Document S/19240 contains a letter from Pik Botha to the Secretary-General in which that racist says that

"States Members of the United Nations should take note of the serious consequences of foreign intervention in Angola and the deteriorating security situation".

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

He goes on to say that

"South Africa is not at war with Angola; nor is it at war with any of the parties of Namibia ... The South African Government has the duty to protect the inhabitants of Namibia ... against terrorist incursion and accordingly acts in a protective capacity in the Territory". (S/19240, p. 2)

This kind of laughable stuff shows the insular mentality of the apartheid régime's rulers and the fools' paradise in which they live. The South African fascists assume a condescending attitude and believe the rest of the world to be as blind as they are to such meaningless claims. In a statement by the apartheid régime's Department of Foreign Affairs which was issued yesterday -

3 November 1987 - we read the following:

"The South African Government takes the strongest exception to the Mozambican Politburo's accusation of South Africa's involvement in an attack on a convoy near Palmeira".

The same statement goes on to make the threat to Mozambique that the rehabilitation of the Cabora Bassa hydroelectric power scheme could be affected by "these accusations which are singularly offensive".

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

This kind of Humpty-Dumpty New-speak should not be entertained by the United Nations. While the South African régime is involved in killing Angolans and Mozambicans, it still has the audacity to try to deceive the world in order to cover up its evil deeds. The Commonwealth Heads of Government at their recent meeting in Vancouver underscored that:

"the need for action to counteract South African propaganda and censorship by exposing the truth about apartheid has been made more pressing by the Draconian curbs imposed on the press at the beginning of 1987".

The United Nations should refuse to be used in South Africa's deception strategy. United Nations rostrums and paper should not be abused and wasted by these diehard racists.

Because South Africa will not terminate its illegal occupation freely, it has to be forced to do so. The international community has to insist on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. Comprehensive economic sanctions are a less painful alternative and the only peaceful means to force South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted in May this year, and the Okanagan Statement and Programme of Action, adopted in October this year by the Commonwealth Heads of Government, both call for quick action in order to avert a major catastrophe. It is time the United Nations collectively lent its voice to these efforts. We need action. The mobilization of humanitarian, financial and military assistance can and should be undertaken by most of us, at the national level, who have Namibia's independence at heart.

Unfortunately and tragically, the viable alternative is armed struggle in the face of the recalcitrance of the South African régime. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

Namibian people, has, through its military wing, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), carried out an effective war for the past 21 years against South African invaders and occupationists. We laud and congratulate these heroic, selfless and inspiring freedom-fighters. Their struggle deserves our whole-hearted support because it is also our struggle. As my President stated last month when addressing this Assembly:

"I wish to stress that the people of Tanzania - and, indeed, the people of the whole African continent - feel deeply grieved by the plight of the oppressed majority in South Africa and Namibia. We consider our own independence and freedom incomplete so long as there is apartheid in South Africa and brutal colonialism in Namibia". (A/42/PV.30, p. 7)

Tanzania will make all efforts within its power to help to bring to an end the occupation of Namibia by the South African racists who are plundering and raping the resources of Namibia.

We condemn those Powers which continue to support and collude with the apartheid régime to deny Namibia its independence. These collaborators and apologists for the Pretoria régime must know that the Namibian people are watching to see who their friends are. The time of reckoning will come one day. If these Powers cannot help to bring about the independence of Namibia, the least they can do is not to stand in the way by abusing the power of veto as they did in April this year. These Powers should not use the pretext of defending their geostrategic interests and urge us not to use intemperate language and to be moderate. If they expect us to adopt the policy of turning the other cheek they are mistaken. We have been slapped too many times to fall for this ploy of reasonableness and moderation. As the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe said during the Security

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

Council debate last week, the only veto that we, the weak nations, have is the right to scream against injustice by the powerful nations. We keep quiet to our own peril. In the same vein, we say to the lesser Powers that are flirting and consorting with South Africa that they are riding a tiger and will end up in its stomach. The Boers are like a wounded animal which is ready even to swallow chickens. In the meantime, we hope that with the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) common sense and self-interest will prevail by South Africa reaching a cease-fire agreement with SWAPO and accepting the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG).

In this regard, we wish to commend the Secretary-General for his unceasing efforts to find a negotiated settlement to the question of Namibia. The Secretary-General rightly states in his report to the Security Council,

"I remain convinced 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. The people of Namibia must be permitted to enjoy the freedom and independence that is their right. The concerted action of the international community is needed to achieve this objective."

(S/19234, para. 25)

I should be remiss if I were to end this statement without paying tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, to its indefatigable and resourceful President and to its dedicated secretariat. We commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for its efforts as the Administering Authority fighting to bring about Namibia's independence. When the history of Namibia is written, the Council will stand tall for having consistently and correctly advocated the truth. The Council's report observes that:

(Mr. Kateka, United Republic
of Tanzania)

"only intensified international pressure will compel South Africa to accede to the speedy independence of Namibia." (A/42/24 (Part I), p. 9)

Let us all work with dedication in this noble cause.

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The

Government of Bolivia, in keeping with its traditional solidarity with the people of Namibia and its liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in their cause, once again expresses its concern that full implementation has not yet been achieved of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the only international basis for a peaceful settlement of this question in a climate guaranteeing the well-being of its people and the security and protection of its natural resources.

In like manner the Government of Bolivia wishes to reaffirm the legitimate, inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and to form an independent and sovereign State, with territorial integrity, which in the view of my Government and on the basis of historical fact should include Walvis Bay and the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands.

Bolivia commends the efforts of SWAPO to achieve the immediate liberation of its people, who are suffering in a situation which is incompatible with the present historical stage in international relations when the peoples of the world are calling for and demanding the rule of justice and the disappearance of all forms of domination and discrimination and of outdated imperialist and colonialist acts, which violate the most basic principles of the coexistence of nations and endanger international peace and security.

I also express the gratitude of my delegation to the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tireless efforts to bring about the long-awaited liberation of the Namibian people. We also wish to congratulate the Council on the adoption of the Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

Twenty-seven years have gone by since the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the States Members of this Organization could almost say that colonialism has disappeared. We should have been satisfied with the work done. However, since the SWAPO liberation movement has been defending the just cause of the Namibian people for 27 years now, that cause continues to be hampered because of the existence of the Government of South Africa, which, disregarding all the principles of international law and United Nations resolutions, persists in ignoring the call of the international community so as to be able to maintain its colonial domination over the people of Namibia.

The United Nations has already in several resolutions firmly supported the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. It was to be presumed that those efforts would have reached fruition with the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), which set forth the modalities by which the people of Namibia would decide its future. How wrong the international community was to believe that the Pretoria régime would accept and comply with that resolution. The Security Council has adopted other resolutions, such as resolutions 532 (1983), 539 (1983), 566 (1985) and, just a few days ago, 601 (1987), which strongly condemn racist South Africa for its stubborn refusal to abide by Security Council resolutions and decisions on this question.

The latest resolution constitutes proof of SWAPO's readiness to contribute to a cease-fire and to allow the United Nations Transition Assistance Group to begin its work. My delegation is certain that the Secretary-General and the Member States will dedicate all their will and energy to settling the question of Namibia once and for all. My delegation believes that the Security Council must ensure immediate compliance with resolution 435 (1978) and subsequent resolutions, in

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

particular resolution 601 (1987). If South Africa refuses to comply, the Security Council should impose the strictest sanctions provided for in the Charter against the racist Pretoria régime. That racist régime continues to challenge the international community on three important aspects which, although independent, are closely interrelated. This infamous trio on which South Africa bases its challenges consists in the racist apartheid system, the continuing aggression against the front-line States and the colonial domination of Namibia.

In reaffirming the moral support of this world Organization for Namibia we put on record the hope that the solution of this problem will be an integral part of the solution, of the other problems which the Pretoria régime creates for the international community in southern Africa.*

Mr. KANE (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): The history of Namibia, as we have known it up to now, has been a succession of repeated tragedies and betrayed hopes. It is one of those human tragedies that revolt the conscience of mankind. In fact, after the colonization period Namibia fell under the yoke of a cruel, bloody, fascist régime, which, far from seeking the emancipation and well-being of the people of Namibia and to lead them on a peaceful path towards independence and freedom, in accordance with the League of Nations Mandate entrusted to it, has created all kinds of obstacles to a peaceful evolution and has tried to delay indefinitely the exercise by the Namibian people of their right to freedom and development.

This monstrous apartheid régime of racist South Africa, after having betrayed its initial Mandate, is now extending its arrogance and insolence by challenging international bodies, in particular the organ charged with the maintenance of

*Mr. Kouassi (Togo), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Kane, Mauritania)

international peace and security, the Security Council. Indeed, the history of the prolonged illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa has been a succession of challenges and faits accomplis presented to the community of nations in the confident assurance that nothing would happen to it which could force it to change its policy.

How else can one understand that fact that in the face of the successive repetitions of this unilateral action and these barbaric acts of repression no sanction whatsoever has ever been imposed against South Africa, while everyone sees and takes note of the continuous failure to fulfil its commitments and its numerous violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent countries.

I shall cite only a few examples of this which have aroused the indignation of the international community, as follows: first, the refusal of South Africa after 1949 to supply the United Nations with reports on Namibia in accordance with the terms of its Mandate; second, the introduction of the policy of apartheid into Namibia as from 1964, contrary to the right to emancipation and the interests of the Namibian people; third, its refusal to heed the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, of 1971, declaring its occupation of the Territory of Namibia to be illegal and enjoining it, consequently, to withdraw its administration immediately; fourth, its continued refusal to apply the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, in particular resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), despite its acceptance of those resolutions; fifth, the invasion of independent Angola in 1975; sixth, the repeated acts of State terrorism carried out in all the front-line States - Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana - not to mention the blackmail of others;

(Mr. Kane, Mauritania)

and, seventh, the Kassinga massacres in 1976 carried out by its own troops and through its agents, the latest massacre having occurred only a few days ago, in Mozambique.

It might be tedious - and run the risk of trivializing - to go through the complete list of barbarous acts perpetrated by this cruel and monstrous régime, which nevertheless boasts of belonging to the civilized world. Given all of these facts and actions, the universal conscience of peoples has been mobilized to render assistance to the martyred Namibian people. Thus for nearly 50 years now it has been the continued concern of the international community, which on this question more than on any other has adopted decisions and resolutions which, had they been followed up, would today have resulted in an independent Namibia within the community of nations. Unfortunately, those provisions and good intentions on the part of the international community have run up against the intransigence of the racist Republic of South Africa. It does all in its power to torpedo any attempt to restore to the Namibian people the enjoyment of its inalienable right to freedom, independence and social and economic well-being. Despite the termination of its Mandate in 1976, it continues to occupy that country in which today it stations more than 100,000 soldiers, who are a threat not only to the oppressed Namibian people but also to neighbouring peoples. Faced with the international community's unceasing demands to end this illegal occupation and the suffering of the Namibian people, South Africa's response is stepped-up repression and unjustified delaying tactics, such as linking the independence of that Territory to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. My country cannot subscribe to this policy of linkage; it insists that the independence of Namibia not be hostage to considerations which are totally extraneous to the Namibian people.

(Mr. Kane, Mauritania)

The international community which, through the mandate system has assumed a historical responsibility towards that people, must fulfil that task until its natural conclusion, that is, independence. It must not allow itself to be hoodwinked by the procrastination of South Africa and its supporters. To be sure, the road towards that goal will not be easy, but the community must remain vigilant and firm.

Here we wish to hail the courageous and heroic struggle of the Namibian people, under the responsible leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). Despite innumerable obstacles and challenges, this courageous movement and its leader Sam Nujoma, have maintained a sense of responsibility and demonstrated high moral and intellectual qualities by associating themselves with the efforts of the international community. Their just struggle, whose sole objective is to free its own country from the yoke of colonialism and oppression, must be supported by all peoples that cherish freedom and justice.

Since the international community assumed a more direct responsibility for that Territory, through the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia, 20 years have elapsed without significant progress towards the independence of the Territory. Those 20 years have been marked by numerous undertakings, all of which have been frustrated by South Africa's intransigent and arrogant attitude. Despite resolutions and decisions, any hope for a speedy end to the Namibian tragedy has been so often postponed that the credibility of our Organization is now at stake. Its inability to implement its own decisions only serves to undermine its authority. It is high time to stop this erosion by resorting to the clear provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter and imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Indeed, what other peaceful means do we have left to ensure respect for our Organization and force the

(Mr. Kane, Mauritania)

supporters of apartheid to change their policy? If condemnation and exhortation alone were sufficient, then peace would have been restored to the region a long time ago. More than a quarter of a century of resolutions and condemnations have led to nothing. It is therefore the duty of the international community and of our Organization to exercise ingenuity in order to achieve the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as adopted. That resolution in fact remains the sole acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of independence for Namibia, for it contains all of the elements likely to guarantee movement towards that objective we all wish to see achieved - independence.

My country cherishes the hope that the Security Council's latest resolution, adopted last week, will finally open up the path towards that objective. We are all the more hopeful since all the obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) have now been overcome.

Dame Nita BARROW (Barbados): The question of Namibia was one of the very first matters to which the Government of Barbados directed its attention as a State Member of the United Nations.

In October 1966 the United Nations formally terminated the Mandate given South Africa to administer the affairs of Namibia. In October 1966 Barbados stood ready to terminate its colonial status and in November of that year formally became a sovereign State. We could not then, and we cannot now, ignore the intense irony of events which, on the one hand, have brought Barbados and Namibia close together and, on the other, have set them so far apart.

For Barbados, sovereignty was achieved with the mere stroke of a pen; for Namibia the struggle for sovereignty has been a bloody confrontation with brute force. For Barbadians the past 21 years have been productively spent in marshalling their resources and placing their island-State on the course of steady

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

social and economic development. For Namibia these years have been lost in a bitter struggle to protect the country's resources, human and material, from plunder by Pretoria and its international agents.

In circumstances such as these Barbadians cannot help but feel a deep and saddening kinship with the people of Namibia.

In reviewing the events of the past two decades we cannot avoid the question: how could it have happened? In a period during which no fewer than 37 States became sovereign Members of this Organization, how could a country four times the size of Great Britain, with an abundance of mineral and other natural resources - more than enough to support its independence - have been left to the mercy of a barbaric colonial machine?

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

We all know the answer. The story of Namibia is the story of greed. In a natural extension of the logic of apartheid the Government of South Africa has set in place an international arrangement intended to ensure that the people of Namibia will never enjoy the wealth of their country. We find ourselves face to face with the bizarre fact that were Namibians not so well-equipped to exercise their own economic independence the question we discuss today might never have arisen. The implications of this are such that we dare not overlook them, because they challenge the very idea of the United Nations. It points to the disturbing possibility that side by side with the currents of political freedom which submerged colonial rule there run counter-currents whose thrust, just as forceful, is the return of the world to a system in which a few dominate and determine the future of the many. Namibia holds lessons for us all.

Is it mere chance that some 1,000 transnational corporations are active collaborators with the Government of South Africa? Is it mere chance that the two largest banking organizations in Namibia are affiliates of transnational groupings, that transnational banks provide the credit for the \$20 billion South Africa carries in foreign debt?

Is it a coincidence that all but one of the vital oil refineries operating in South Africa are owned by transnational corporations, or that transnationals account for more than half of South Africa's electronic imports and all of the country's automobiles?

In Namibia three transnational corporations own 90 per cent of the country's mining assets, account for half of Namibia's gross domestic product as well as three quarters of its exports.

I have not mentioned the international armaments industry. I have not done so because I do not need to. We all know how the rulers of Pretoria nourish and

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

sustain the military might of which they openly boast. These facts tell us that while South Africa's leaders are international outlaws, they are not international outcasts. To whom then must Namibians turn in their struggle for freedom, for their enemies seem everywhere?

Emboldened by its ignoble alliances South Africa has made it clear that it would dare anything rather than surrender its illegal hold on Namibia. South Africa has defied and undermined United Nations resolution 435 (1978) which offers a formula for the peaceful solution of the Namibian question. It has established a spurious linkage between the presence of foreign troops in southern Africa and the withdrawal of its own troops from Namibia. With arguments common to the politics of paranoia, the rulers of Pretoria have transformed Namibia into a strategic beach-head from which to launch armed attacks upon neighbouring States. Pretoria's intelligence and security forces are actively engaged in systematic sabotage against the Governments of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Far from reining in its forces of oppression, South Africa shows signs of converting an entire region into a colony of its own. The policy of homeland settlements tells the extent to which the creative arrogance of Pretoria would go if permitted and supported.

Colonialism and imperialism are not strangers to this Organization. They have been regrettable but very real aspects of government in a world in which right has often been usurped by might.

For some of us in the Assembly freedom and sovereignty have come easily and peacefully. For others, including some of the most powerful in our midst, freedom and sovereignty have necessitated a call to battle and the shedding of blood. The cause of Namibia should bring us no difficulty therefore.

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

The wish of a people to have free access, use and enjoyment of their resources needs no promotion. It is a fundamental right of all mankind and should not now be subjected to ambivalence. Or have some of us chosen to forget our history?

Namibia is an example of the capabilities of international finance when it is effectively deployed with a clear objective. For more than 20 years that capability has been placed at the disposal of the Government of South Africa and its policy of apartheid.

The Government of Barbados wishes once more to persuade those Governments now in a position to influence the operations of transnational corporations to take the political steps necessary to release the South African stranglehold of Namibia.

At the recently concluded meeting of Heads of Government of the Commonwealth held in Vancouver, referred to before, there was a clear determination of a majority of delegates to bring increased economic pressure upon South Africa.

This attitude was reflected at the meeting of Foreign Ministers of African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries held one week ago in Jamaica.

Much has been said in recent times of the relinquishment by some interests of their investments in South Africa and Namibia. We issue a cautious commendation of these efforts. We would wish to be assured, however, that these steps are not merely superficial time-biding devices designed to conceal continued investment and support for Pretoria.

The meeting of Commonwealth Heads, mindful of this, has recognized the need for skilful scrutiny of the application of sanctions against South Africa.

It is obvious that without the genuine application of broad-based sanctions against Pretoria, apartheid will be guaranteed a lifeline and the time of the Organization will continue to be wasted.

(Dame Nita Barrow, Barbados)

The Government of Barbados wishes again to align itself publicly with those States which have taken financial and other initiatives necessary to protect the front-line African States from the declared hostility of Pretoria. We call on others which have not done so to come to the aid of those threatened countries. We call for increased support for the South West Africa People's Organization.

The policies of the Nationalist Party of South Africa are identical to another which plunged the world into a grievous conflagration. They are policies which can neither be appeased nor ignored. If they are not contained, we may again pay a price which none can afford.*

Ms. CHEE (Singapore): My delegation welcomes this opportunity to express solidarity with and support for the Namibian people in this debate before the General Assembly. Namibia encompasses, and in fact has come to symbolize, many of the most critical moral and political struggles of our age - between colonialism and self-determination, racism and human rights, apartheid and equality, minority rule and democracy.

Yet if members were to look at the headlines in all the world's leading newspapers, Namibia has all but eluded media attention. Instead, it is the Middle East, Central America, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, North East Asia and South Africa that captivate our journalists and readers.

*The President returned to the Chair.

(Ms. Chee, Singapore)

Why does the media rarely prioritize Namibia as the leading issue on the international agenda? Is this because its population is small? The population of Namibia is only 1.5 million. Perhaps this is too few a number to attract world interest. Or is it because Namibia is overshadowed by the horrors of the apartheid system in South Africa, where 25 million people live without a sense of human dignity? Namibia is frequently seen as an extension of the South African problem. There is no doubt that the people of Namibia, of South Africa and southern Africa face a common enemy - apartheid. None the less, the question of Namibian independence is a separate issue and must be treated on its own terms to force the pace of the solution.

For these reasons, it is critically important that at this Assembly session we should focus our attention on the Namibian question and send strong signals to South Africa and its supporters that the international community has not forgotten the plight of the Namibian people and their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

The problem of Namibia is South African aggression and defiance. It has been 21 years since the United Nations declared South Africa's occupation of Namibia illegal and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. However, South Africa has used every means possible to frustrate the efforts of the United Nations at finding a political solution to the Namibian question. South Africa's insistence on linking the question of independence for Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues is totally unacceptable. The independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are alien to resolution 435 (1978), which embodies the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

(Ms. Chee, Singapore)

In its determination to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and its abhorrent policy of apartheid, the Pretoria régime has installed a so-called transitional government of national unity in Windhoek, on 17 June 1985. This action, taken even while the Security Council was in session, constituted a direct affront to the Council and a clear defiance of its resolutions. The international community has rejected this attempt by South Africa to set up a puppet administration in Namibia and has declared its actions illegal, null and void.

Moreover, the Pretoria régime has intensified its militarization of Namibia and stepped up its campaign of terror and intimidation to suppress the popular resistance, promote the illegal "internal settlement" of the Namibian question and destabilize the neighbouring countries. According to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the South African Government has used a series of statutes, administrative regulations and proclamations to give the police and military forces sweeping powers to arrest, interrogate and torture the Namibian population. These proclamations also provide for preventive detention, the banning of meetings, the imposition of martial law and the establishment of "security districts" in order to stifle the political struggle of the Namibian people.

South Africa's efforts to subjugate the people of Namibia have also resulted in more than 100,000 Namibians being forced into exile in Angola, Botswana and Zambia as a result of the pervasive war situation in the Territory. Even in those countries, the refugees cannot feel safe. That is because the South African Government does not hesitate to take its colonial war across the borders into these countries. Such acts of military aggression not only threaten the safety of the refugees but also contribute to the destabilization of the front-line States.

(Ms. Chee, Singapore)

Why is South Africa so unwilling to relinquish its hold over Namibia? The world knows that Namibia is a territory endowed with vast mineral resources, rich offshore fishing grounds and tremendous agricultural potential. It is the fourth largest mineral exporter in the world, producing approximately one fourth of the world's gem-quality diamonds and possessing the largest open-pit uranium mine. The coastal waters of Namibia are also one of the richest fishing grounds in the world. With all these resources, Namibia's per capita gross domestic product is one of the largest in Africa. South Africa's objective is clearly to continue the plunder and exploitation of Namibia's resources for its own benefit.

So far, South Africa has acted with impunity because it can count on its supporters to ignore its intransigence and immorality in this particular situation. It is imperative that the international community put pressure on South Africa to force it to its senses and restore to Namibia its long delayed and denied independence. The international community must reinforce condemnation of South Africa by taking appropriate actions to hit the Pretoria régime where it hurts.

I should not like to leave this rostrum without drawing attention to the issue of Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, sources of important oil reserves, which South Africa annexed in 1977 and which it has sought to rule independently of Namibia. Here we see a devious strategy to exclude these territories from the negotiations over Namibia's independence. Walvis Bay is geographically part of Namibia. It is Namibia's only deep-water port. Without it, Namibia would be a landlocked country and subject to Pretoria's stranglehold. Moreover, with recent confirmation of a sizeable gas find in the Kudu field, the importance of Walvis Bay has been further enhanced.

(Ms. Chee, Singapore)

This morning we heard the leadership of the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, reiterate its willingness to sign a cease-fire agreement and accept the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. We know these attitudes are not of recent conversion nor a sign of weakness. They were communicated to the Secretary-General in August 1978 and were embodied in resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO has over and over again demonstrated its desire to find a rational, peaceful and binding solution to the Namibian problem.

My delegation fully supports the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Secretary-General in all their efforts to further the independence process and to end the subjugation of the Namibian people. We wait to welcome Namibia into this assembly to take its place with all of us as a free nation.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Denmark, who will speak on behalf of the States members of the European Community.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community.

It is a sad fact that the question of Namibia remains on the agenda of the United Nations. The Territory has been an acknowledged international responsibility since the time of the League of Nations and has been before the United Nations virtually since its inception. Despite considerable efforts on the part of the international community to bring Namibia to independence, the people of the Territory are still prevented from exercising their right to self-determination. The Twelve share the grave concern and frustration felt by the international community at the long-lasting impasse with regard to Namibia's future.

The responsibility of the United Nations and in particular of the Security Council for the independence of Namibia has been clearly established. Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), as confirmed by subsequent resolutions of the Council, remain the essential basis for a lasting solution. The settlement plan endorsed by resolution 435 (1978) embodies the only internationally acceptable framework for Namibian independence: through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

Over the years the policy of the Twelve on the question of Namibia has been clear and unequivocal. The Twelve have repeatedly condemned South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and demanded that it be brought to an end. We firmly believe that the people of Namibia must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination and we remain committed to a peaceful solution through the implementation, without pre-conditions or pretexts, of the provisions of the settlement plan. We note with deep concern that South Africa has chosen to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia and in so doing to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which has been accepted,

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

inter alia, by the South African Government itself and by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

The Twelve once more urge the Government of South Africa to cease its illegal occupation of Namibia immediately and to co-operate in the implementation of the settlement plan. We categorically reject any unilateral move by South Africa to transfer power in Namibia contrary to the plan. In particular, the Twelve consider as null and void the establishment by the South African authorities of a so-called transitional government in Namibia in violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution does not authorize the South African Government to delegate its responsibilities in the implementation of the settlement plan in any way. Any unilateral South African manoeuvre designed to circumvent the United Nations or to exclude the United Nations from the settlement process is unacceptable. Similarly, the Twelve do not accept that the settlement plan should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with resolution 435 (1978).

While maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of the international community, South Africa continues its policy of repression against the people of Namibia and its aggression against neighbouring States. Within Namibia itself, South Africa is pursuing its policy of intimidation and oppression. Apartheid is still enshrined in the legislation in force in the Territory, and serious abuses of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms continue to take place. The Twelve particularly deplore the practice of arbitrary arrests and detention without trial, including the arrest of a number of SWAPO and trade-union leaders in August this year, as well as forced conscription of Namibian adults into the occupation army.

The Twelve strongly condemn South Africa's armed incursions into neighbouring States, particularly those launched from Namibian territory into Angola. South

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

Africa's policy of destabilization, including the use of direct or indirect armed action against neighbouring States, seriously undermines peace and stability in the region. It makes even more necessary the maintenance of the general and primary duty of the United Nations to promote peaceful solutions in conformity with the Charter, thus avoiding any encouragement of the use of force.

For our part, the Twelve will continue to press South Africa to co-operate in finding peaceful solutions to the problems of the region in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia, and to co-operate in the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The European Community and its member States remain ready to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia. Meanwhile we will continue our aid to the Namibian people, in particular through our support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

Since 1978 strenuous efforts have been made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the Contact Group, the front-line States and SWAPO to achieve the implementation of the settlement plan. The Twelve will continue to give their strong support for those efforts and hope that the endeavours of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative will finally result in a just and lasting solution. In this context we welcome the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987) and hope that the Secretary-General's negotiations with a view to arranging a cease-fire will meet with success.

The independence of Namibia is long overdue and the world community must spare no effort to bring peace and freedom to this troubled Territory.

Mr. DIATTA (Niger) (interpretation from French): The Programme of Action on Namibia, contained in the Declaration adopted in July 1986 by the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, opens with the significant words:

"Namibia summons up the image of a heroic fight against foreign domination and exploitation and of humanity." (A/CONF.138/11, para. 168)

The substance of that sentence remains valid today because Namibia continues to be illegally occupied by the South African racist régime, and the fate of the Namibian people also continues to be a matter of concern.

We should bear in mind that 21 years after the United Nations decided to end South Africa's mandate over Namibia and to assume direct responsibility with respect to the Territory, we are still debating the issue. The historic decision taken at that time gave rise to legitimate hopes in the hearts of Namibians that the international community as a whole was determined to work in concert for the implementation and the triumph of a sacred principle that has been of benefit to so many nations and peoples who have suffered under the colonialist yoke: the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, in keeping with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

However, it is unfortunate that 21 years after the adoption of that decision by our Organization, which we have termed a historic decision, that right has not yet materialized for the Namibian people and it is even being trampled under foot. The deterioration of the situation in the Territory is continuing uncontrolled today and calls for effective and urgent action to put an end to the denial of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people and to the untold sufferings they endure.

Indeed, access to independence by Namibia is still being blocked by the intransigence and arrogance of South Africa's racist régime, to such an extent that the fate of that Territory and its people represents at present one of the most tragic situations facing the international community, for it is a situation based on an act of colonial domination committed in violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter as well as of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

Year after year, the Pretoria régime has stopped at nothing to maintain its colonial domination over that Territory. It has in particular strengthened its occupation army, to which it has entrusted, along with its police force, the shameful task of committing acts of repression and terrorism in order to block and eliminate any semblance of a liberation struggle among the Namibian people. Thousands of Namibians, including women and children, are being subjected to all sorts of exactions and atrocities. Imprisonment, torture and dastardly assassinations form part of the daily lot of Namibians, and it is no exaggeration to say that a veritable tragedy of incalculable dimensions has befallen them.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

The Pretoria racist régime has also resorted to delaying tactics in order to delay the independence of Namibia, the most spectacular of which has been the establishment of a so-called interim Government. Such fraudulent constitutional and political tactics resorted to by Pretoria are nothing but vain attempts to settle the question of the independence of Namibia by imposing a puppet régime which would guarantee South Africa's political domination and perpetuate into the future the systematic plundering of the many natural resources to which it has access today. In this connection, we welcome the vigilance of the international community as a whole, which has categorically refused to recognize the so-called interim government imposed in November 1985 by the apartheid régime.

The short-sightedness of the South African minority régime in shamelessly pursuing its ignoble designs on Namibia has also led it to take action against the independent States of southern Africa, which are making important contributions to the liberation struggle of the Namibian people. In fact, the Pretoria régime does not hesitate to use Namibian territory continually for acts of aggression and acts of political and economic destabilization against the front-line States. These are criminal acts which create enormous economic and social problems for those countries and which at the same time constitute a threat to their own security. We must in particular note and condemn, in this connection, the occupation at the present time of certain parts of the territory of Angola by the South African régime, an occupation which adds a new dimension to the deterioration of the situation in southern Africa.

This situation we have just described, which is pressing and dramatic for more reasons than one, without doubt constitutes a serious danger to the peace and security of southern Africa and a growing and direct threat to international peace and security. The Namibian people, for its part, resolved not to remain idle in the face of the deliberate and persistent refusal of the South African racist

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

régime to grant its legitimate aspirations, decided to take its future into its own hands and at a very early stage it began a bitter struggle against the racist oppressor, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, its legitimate and authentic representative - a struggle which has won the admiration and respect of all freedom- and justice-loving nations. The Namibian people and the oppressed black majority of South Africa are without doubt a shining example for all peoples that aspire to freedom and that will go to any lengths to wrest it from the grip of the most abject kinds of colonialism and oppression.

The international community as a whole is today fully aware that it is the maintenance of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa that is at the root of the untold sufferings and the critical and inhuman situation of the Namibian people. Thus everywhere in the world we can see that there is an increasing mobilization of effort to bring justice to the Namibian people, which has suffered far too long in the struggle to accede to full freedom and independence. Therefore we wish to reaffirm the support and solidarity of Niger and its people with regard to the people of Namibia in its courageous and determined struggle to free itself from the nefarious yolk of colonialism, as well as with regard to the front-line States, which have been the victims of repeated aggression on the part of Pretoria's racist minority régime.

Our Organization, in which our States have decided to unite their efforts to bring about the triumph of freedom, independence and human dignity wherever the need is indicated, must actively respond to all the noble appeals emanating from the various regions of the world, in order to find the most appropriate ways and means to permit it to exercise fully its direct responsibility with regard to Namibia, in accordance with the decision it adopted 21 years ago. Pretoria, in fact, has for only too long shamelessly disregarded the demands of the international community and the most fundamental norms of international law.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

The recommendations contained in the Programme of Action on Namibia in the Final Document adopted at Vienna in July 1986, to which we referred earlier, not only should serve as the basis for our action to bring about the withdrawal of the racist régime from Namibia but should also be effectively implemented by us all if we truly wish to meet rapidly the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence on the basis of the United Nations peace plan for the independence of Namibia adopted a little over nine years ago by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). It must also be recalled that racist South Africa has obstinately thwarted the implementation of that peace plan by resorting, as usual, to political delaying tactics and fallacious arguments, such as that with regard to the linkage pre-condition, which, fortunately, has finally been rejected by the international community, inasmuch as it represents a separate question of interest to the parties directly concerned acting within their sovereignty.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in the further report which he submitted to the Security Council on 27 October 1987 concerning the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the question of Namibia, also emphasized that:

"all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations plan had been resolved in November 1985, when agreement was reached on the choice of the electoral system." (S/19234, para. 12)

Therefore, since then it has been up to racist South Africa to co-operate fully towards the final implementation and adoption of all the necessary arrangements for bringing about the independence of Namibia. However, as we have already said, racist South Africa continues to refuse to co-operate and prefers to revert to its political delaying tactics and procrastination.

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

We are now at a crucial, decisive stage in the Namibian people's struggle to regain its freedom and independence. There is a fact that no one can deny: verbal censure and political condemnation of South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia have not made a dent in its rigid, intransigent position. Furthermore, such political condemnation and verbal censure will not make South Africa co-operate in the implementation of the important resolution 601 (1987), which was adopted on 30 October last by the Security Council and, which, among other things, authorizes the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire in order that the necessary measures may be taken for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.

That is why my country is among the very many which believe that it is high time that stronger action were taken to deal with this extraordinary situation in Namibia - and in particular mandatory measures against the Pretoria régime to bring it to reason. In Niger's opinion, the adoption of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions is one of these appropriate means that could speed up Namibia's independence. Such sanctions are, under the Charter of our Organization, within the purview of the Security Council. By adopting sanctions of that kind, the Security Council would directly respond to the acts of aggression committed by racist South Africa against the people of Namibia and, at the same time, would face up to the persistent challenge to the Council's authority constituted by racist South Africa's non-implementation of and contempt for all the resolutions the Council has adopted in regard to Namibia.

In conclusion, we express our deep gratitude to the United Nations Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tireless and praiseworthy efforts to ensure the rapid achievement of independence by Namibia. We also express again the firm condemnation by Niger and its people of the racist

(Mr. Diatta, Niger)

Pretoria régime for maintaining its illegal occupation of Namibia, despite the relevant United Nations decisions and resolutions and the incalculable inhuman suffering inflicted on the courageous Namibian people, whose heroic struggle will without any doubt triumph in the end.

Mr. MOREL (Seychelles): Since I am speaking here for the first time, it gives me great pleasure, on behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Seychelles, to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on your unanimous and well-deserved election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its forty-second session. We have no doubt that your diplomatic skills, great experience and able leadership will contribute to making this session a great success. I should also like to extend to your predecessor, Mr. Choudhury of Bangladesh, our appreciation for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the business of the forty-first session.

It is now 21 years since the General Assembly unanimously terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its accession to independence. Today, 21 years later, South Africa continues to hold Namibia under colonial occupation. The people of Namibia are not able to enjoy their inalienable right to self-determination, independence and freedom. The racist régime continues to pursue its policy of apartheid and racial discrimination, in flagrant violation of the human rights of the people of Namibia. Repression, militarization and economic exploitation have reached intolerable, unprecedented levels. The general situation in southern Africa is rapidly worsening. Namibia is being used to launch acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States, in particular Angola, thus causing incalculable human suffering and material losses.

The independence of Namibia is long overdue. The rights of the people of Namibia were given a big boost by the adoption of Security Council resolution

(Mr. Morel, Seychelles)

435 (1978), which laid down the internationally accepted United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Unfortunately, almost 10 years later, the hopes that the plan would bring about a solution are still not fulfilled. For 10 years now the Pretoria régime, using the most transparent and unacceptable pretexts, has blocked all the efforts to ensure the implementation of the plan. It continues to link Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues. The insistence on linking the implementation of the United Nations plan to the presence of foreign forces in independent Angola is a matter of concern to the international community.

I should like to stress once again that my delegation believes that Namibia's accession to independence should not be made contingent on anything unrelated to the United Nations plan for Namibia. The presence of foreign forces in Angola is a question which only independent Angola can decide. The linkage, or constructive engagement, therefore is, for my delegation, an obstruction of the implementation of the United Nations plan. Resolution 435 (1978) is the indispensable basis for a settlement of the question of Namibia. The resolution is and will remain the only foundation for Namibia's achievement of its internationally recognized independence. In accordance with that resolution, the constitution of an independent Namibia is to be adopted by a constituent assembly elected in free and fair elections, under United Nations supervision.

South Africa remains intransigent on the question. It continues to block the way envisaged by the international community for leading Namibia to independence. It has for too long defied and undermined international morality and the influence and authority of the United Nations. In such circumstances, what should be done? My delegation believes that all measures of pressure should be applied on South Africa, including actions under Chapter VII of the Charter. We consider that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in South

(Mr. Morel, Seychelles)

Africa is the most efficient means to eliminate apartheid, liberate Namibia and maintain peace and stability in southern Africa.

My delegation reaffirms our unqualified support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, in their just struggle for the attainment of their right to freedom and independence.

We commend the Secretary-General for his efforts to find a solution to the question of Namibia. We also commend the United Nations Council for Namibia for initiating numerous actions aimed at assisting the people of Namibia to achieve their independence. The 2 October Ministerial Meeting of the Council suggested a course of action in its recommendation which my country fully supports.

My delegation welcomes the adoption last week by the Security Council of resolution 601 (1987), authorizing the Secretary-General to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO and to take steps for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in the Territory. We hope that the resolution will give a new impetus to the quest for a long-lasting solution to the question.

The people of Namibia do not deserve linkage: they deserve peace, dignity and, above all, the right to determine their destiny. The United Nations, in particular the Security Council, has an obligation to ensure that the people for whom it is responsible attain a measure of self-determination and independence.

Mr. BASENDWAH (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): As I am speaking for the first time, allow me to express my congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly, even though my Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Abdulkarim Al-Eryany, expressed his congratulations to you in his statement on 8 October last.

The question of Namibia, which we are taking up once again at this session, is not new or unfamiliar to any of us. It is as old as the United Nations itself. For decades the heroic people of Namibia has been struggling for its independence, exploring every avenue and using every method to make its just cause more widely known. That people has undergone sufferings and hardships. It has been subjected to oppression. It has made many sacrifices and offered many martyrs. The number of prisoners has increased to such extent that the racist Pretoria régime does not have enough prisons to hold them all.

This question has been considered on many occasions - in the General Assembly, the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia - and many representatives have made statements. Nothing new can be said, so our consideration of this question once again is an expression of our solidarity with and support for the cause of that struggling people.

Recurrent and frequent consideration indicates the importance that the international community, reflected in the United Nations in particular and in international regional organizations in general, attaches to this just cause. The persistence of this problem and the other unsolved twin problems of South Africa and Palestine is an affront to our age, an example of injustice and proof of defiance of the United Nations on the part of the racist and Zionist forces.

How can that obnoxious racist régime in South Africa continue its occupation of Namibia 21 years after the United Nations terminated its mandate on Namibia,

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

20 years after the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the sole Administering Authority of that Territory pending independence, and nine years after the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of a plan for a settlement of this question? The perverse Pretoria régime would have not have defied international will were it not for the assistance and support of those who keep repeating litanies for freedom and human rights while acting in a manner that undermines their slogans and ideals.

The racist South African régime is continuing its occupation of Namibia by relying on physical force and thus ignoring the lessons of history. More powerful nations have been forced to surrender by the heroic struggles of colonized peoples. To see that that is so, that régime need only consider the colonies that have become independent and whose representatives now occupy seats in this very Hall and in other major international organizations. Force in defence of a just cause can lead to victory, but force in support of a wrong cause is inevitably defeated simply because justice increases strength. Those who are available to a wrong cause are bound to be defeated.

The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has declared its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement. It has done so not out of weakness but out of its desire to make it possible for international efforts to facilitate a just settlement of the problem through the termination of occupation and the achievement of independence.

It is only natural to refer to the close relations existing between the Pretoria régime and that in Tel Aviv. They are drawn to each other by their similarity. Everyone knows the common characteristics and traits of the two régimes.

(Mr. Basendwah, Yemen)

Finally, I hope that before the forty-third session of the General Assembly the people of Namibia will have achieved self-determination and independence. We salute the people of Namibia and its heroic leadership, SWAPO, which is at the helm of its struggle for freedom and independence.

Let the coward racists have no peace at any time, anywhere.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): In accordance with resolution 3369 (XXX) of 1975, I now call on the Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

Mr. ANSAY (Organization of the Islamic Conference): It is getting late and this is not the first time during this session that I have had the honour to address the General Assembly, yet I should not like to miss this opportunity to pay tribute to you, Sir, once again for the exemplary manner in which you are conducting the deliberations of this body.

Since the adoption of resolution 1514 (XV) and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples almost 27 years ago, more than 80 countries and colonial territories of Asia, Africa and Latin America have regained their freedom. But the people of Namibia, still languishing in colonial bondage, are deprived of their most fundamental rights and have yet to gain their freedom.

Twenty-one years ago, on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), to terminate South Africa's mandate over Namibia. Since that time, in defiance of numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the racist régime of South Africa has continued to occupy Namibia illegally. That policy represents a challenge to the authority of the United Nations and to the will of the international community. Furthermore, it constitutes a permanent threat to regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Ansay, Organization of
the Islamic Conference)

Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the only acceptable basis for a final and lasting settlement of the question of Namibia. South Africa cannot and must not be allowed to continue to hold the implementation of these resolutions hostage to some irrelevant issues, such as its linkage of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

That racist minority régime seeks to preserve its domination over Namibia by the use of the most repressive measures and the pursuance of policies of intimidation and terror against the Namibian people.

(Mr. Ansay, Organization of
the Islamic Conference)

South Africa has never demonstrated its willingness to respect any of the United Nations Security Council or General Assembly resolutions or to transfer power to the people of Namibia. Instead it has openly tried to impose its own solution by setting up a so-called interim government and committing other illegal acts which the Organization of the Islamic Conference, like the Members of the United Nations, considers to be null and void. At the same time, the régime in Pretoria has intensified its sinister encroachment on neighbouring countries through increasing political pressures and constant acts of aggression and destabilization. Unfortunately South Africa has been encouraged to continue these terrorist policies through the collaboration and collusion of certain other States in the political, military, economic and nuclear fields.

With the support and assistance of foreign economic interests, and in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and Decree No. 1 for the protection of the national resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was approved by General Assembly resolution 3295 (XXIX) of 1974, that régime continues to exploit the natural and human resources of Namibia, which constitute the inviolable heritage of its people.

The racist South African régime has not only continued its illegal occupation but also extended its pernicious apartheid policy to Namibia. The people of Namibia have waged a heroic struggle against intimidation, torture, imprisonment and murder, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic legitimate representative. The Namibian people, like all other peoples, are entitled to the exercise of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence as a sovereign State. The Organization of the Islamic Conference has vigorously and unequivocally supported the heroic struggle of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Ansay, Organization of
the Islamic Conference)

The Fifth Islamic Summit Conference, held in Kuwait from 26 to 29 January 1987, inter alia, solemnly affirmed the legitimacy and justness of the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia against the apartheid régime; strongly condemned the South African régime for its plundering of the national resources of Namibia in flagrant violation of Decree No. 1; condemned and rejected the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops in Angola; appealed to all countries which had diplomatic relations with South Africa to exert pressure and implement real economic sanctions against the racist South African régime in order to hasten the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978); expressed full support for and solidarity with the front-line and other neighbouring countries against racist South Africa's aggression; urged the Security Council to impose comprehensive and effective sanctions against South Africa in conformity with the provisions of Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter; and reaffirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained the only basis for the accession of Namibia to independence.

By a decision of the Fifth Islamic Summit, under the auspices of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, a Ministerial Committee composed of six members was established on South Africa and Namibia. The Committee had its first meeting on 28 September 1987 at United Nations Headquarters in New York. The Committee submitted several recommendations to the Co-ordinating Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which was held on 1 October 1987. These recommendations were upheld by that ministerial meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in its final communiqué.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference unconditionally endorses the communiqué adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its ministerial

(Mr. Ansay, Organization of
the Islamic Conference)

meeting held at United Nations Headquarters on 2 October 1987 and the recent Security Council resolution 601 (1987). The Organization of the Islamic Conference also welcomes the readiness of SWAPO to sign and observe a cease-fire agreement with South Africa in order to pave the way for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In conclusion I should like to reiterate before this Assembly that my organization, which has actively participated in all efforts exerted by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the Non-aligned Movement and a number of other international bodies and organizations for bringing the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa to an end, reaffirms once again its unreserved support for the prompt and unconditional independence of Namibia. We fully believe that the day is not far off when Namibia will occupy its rightful place as an independent State in the comity of nations.

AGENDA ITEM 15 (continued)

ELECTIONS TO FILL VACANCIES IN PRINCIPAL ORGANS

(c) ELECTION OF FIVE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I have an announcement to make in connection with the election of the five members of the International Court of Justice, which is scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 11 November. I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the relevant documents.

First, document A/42/588-S/19155, dated 8 October 1987, sets out the composition of the Court and the procedure for the election in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Secondly, document A/42/591-S/19158, dated 8 October 1987, contains the curricula vitae of the candidates. Thirdly, document A/42/589-S/19156, dated 8 October 1987, contains the list of candidates submitted

(The President)

within the required time for submission; and, finally, document A/42/590-S/19157, dated 8 October 1987, contains additional nominations received after 15 August 1987.

As members are aware, additional nominations are submitted in support of candidatures presented within the established deadline. In this regard an additional nomination has been received since the issuance of the documents I have just mentioned.

In order to facilitate the preparation and conduct of the election procedure it would seem desirable that the Assembly have before it, as it has had in the past, a consolidated and updated list of candidates. Accordingly, if there is no objection I shall request the Secretariat to issue a consolidated and updated list of candidates so as to reflect all the information received since the issuance of the original list, thus facilitating the election for all representatives.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly so decides.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.