



General Assembly

12/11/87

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.58  
11 November 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 6 November 1987, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)  
later: Mr. OLZVOY (Vice-President) (Mongolia)

- Question of Namibia [36] (continued)

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

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/42/24)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/42/23 (Part V); A/AC.109/916)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/42/596)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/42/698)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/42/24 (Part III) and (Part III)/Corr.1, chap. I)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/42/716)

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): The situation inside South Africa is critical. We are not talking of the sort of economic crisis confronting many drought-affected African countries, or of the type of crisis brought about by a war between two neighbouring countries, or a crisis as a result of a massive natural disaster such as an earthquake or floods. No, we are talking about a convulsion affecting the population of the entire country - a state of revolt and rebellion against decades of vile oppression, a human response to an inhuman situation, a legitimate reaction to an illegitimate structure, a valid opposition to an invalid system, a justified movement against unspeakably unjust racism and racial discrimination.

But, before I proceed further, let not the painful substance of my intervention preclude me from felicitating you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the forty-second session of the General Assembly.

I wish also at this plenary meeting to express my delegation's support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and its unceasing work for the liberation of the Namibian people.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

As long as Namibia remains under the illegal occupation of the racist Pretoria régime, as long as the Namibian people are denied the right to self-determination, as long as Namibia's human and natural resources are exploited by the apartheid régime to fuel the lifestyle of the minority whites of both Namibia and South Africa, as long as the international community in whatever form or manner tolerates this state of affairs, as long as one or two of the parties actively encourage the present situation, as long as the world allows such inhumanity and slavery to exist, so long will Namibia be a blot on the world's conscience, an embarrassment to the Charter and one of the most abject failures of the United Nations.

A cold hard look at the relationship of the United Nations to the question of Namibia is long overdue. The uniqueness of Namibia, in that it is legally the direct responsibility of the United Nations as Administering Authority, sets the question of Namibia and its resolution apart from other somewhat similar issues of decolonization and self-determination. It is this special legal relationship that puts a greater responsibility on the United Nations, and, correspondingly, the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist Pretoria constitutes a greater contravention of the United Nations constitution, the Charter.

The international community, in dealing with the racist régime of South Africa, is dealing with an illegitimate régime. Nowhere else can one see a régime opposed by the overwhelming majority of its people, who are not even considered citizens of their land; a régime which is an outcast, a pariah in the community of nations; a régime loathed on the continent of Africa; a régime which has alienated every country and people in southern Africa without exception, a régime which has violated all the principles of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations; a régime which continues to defy the mandatory resolutions of the United Nations Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Just last week the Security Council held a debate on Namibia. We were gratified that the debate ended in the adoption of a resolution which calls on the Secretary-General to undertake steps to bring about the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and a cease-fire between SWAPO and Pretoria. It was both puzzling and shameful that the apartheid régime's ally abstained on this most non-controversial resolution, although resolution 435 (1978) had been negotiated and unanimously adopted by a group that included that particular permanent member of the Security Council - the United States.

How long will the United Nations tolerate the insults and the intransigence of a Member State unfortunately represented by a minority régime whose apartheid and racism caused it to be expelled from the General Assembly, although not yet from the United Nations. Does not the corporate body of the United Nations, made up of all of us, realize that the delay in independence for Namibia is a serious weakening of the United Nations system, not to speak of what this delay means for the people of Namibia.

For over a month, since early October, South African defence forces have stepped up acts of aggression against Angola with the large-scale use of armoured cars, Stinger missiles and its air force. Reconnaissance air flights and bombings have taken place in the provinces of Kuando Cubango, Cunene and Namibe, and there has been stepped-up concentration of military aircraft and war material at the airports of Runtu, Grootfontein and Mpacha in northern Namibia.

The major objective of the racist Pretoria régime's aggression against the peaceful Angolan State is to destabilize and hamper the national reconstruction process in view of the efficiency of day-to-day combat against that régime by the glorious Angolan armed forces, FAPLA.

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Never before has the apartheid régime so clearly acknowledged the precise objectives of the invasion of Angola by its troops, with instructions to attack the forward positions of the Angolan national army, which seeks only to defend the territorial integrity and sovereignty of our national soil.

The continuing aggravation of the tension in this southern region of Africa may have unpredictable consequences, as it constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos, the President of the People's Republic of Angola and of the MPLA Worker's Party, presented in late 1984 a constructive platform of proposals which, if accepted, could contribute to a comprehensive solution of the problems besetting southern Africa and endangering peace. A few months ago some of these proposals were further refined by my President. So far there has been no response from the racist régime, whose policies and practices are the cause of the severe oppression of its own people inside South Africa and of the peoples of independent southern African States, as well as of Namibia. The presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola is the decision of two sovereign and independent Governments, those of Angola and Cuba.

On the question of Namibia, all the elements and conditions already exist for independence: a plan, a structure and unanimous agreement, as exemplified in resolution 435 (1978). The only missing factor is the will of the racist régime to allow implementation of this mandatory resolution to go forward.

Throughout these difficult, turbulent times, SWAPO has consistently displayed leadership of the Namibian people, statesmanship in its negotiations, flexibility in its attitude, restraint in its dealings, and wisdom and courage in confronting the mighty racist apartheid apparatus that is terrorizing southern Africa today.

The General Assembly should take concrete steps to force the hated apartheid régime to withdraw from Namibia and to join in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). And the only way now, especially in the face of the constant present

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

and potential veto of the apartheid régime's ally in the Security Council, is for the General Assembly to adopt its own equally binding, mandatory resolution on comprehensive sanctions. The procedures for such a step are set forth in the United Nations Charter.

If there is no specific movement soon, the United Nations will next year be in the sorry position of commemorating the tenth anniversary of its adoption of resolution 435 (1978) without success, as it is this year in the unfortunate position of commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the taking over by the United Nations of legal responsibility for Namibia, equally without success. This is a sad record for an Organization we all believe in and belong to - indeed must believe in and must belong to if we are to continue to exist on this increasingly smaller and more difficult planet.

My delegation fully supports the draft resolution. Indeed, the Angolan peoples' contribution and solidarity with regard to Namibian independence is a matter of record. This support will grow ever stronger until Namibia is free, at which point it will be a vindication of our revolutionary history to welcome independent Namibia to the grouping of southern African States. And, when apartheid has been finally demolished in South Africa, it will be a reaffirmation of our revolutionary principles to welcome the freedom of our southern African brothers from the chains of apartheid and racism.

Until final victory for the people of Namibia, until final victory for the people of South Africa, the struggle continues.

Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary): The question of Namibia has again been

brought to the forefront of international attention by a series of important meetings held recently. I refer to the Ministerial Meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the solemn meetings to commemorate the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the meetings of the Security Council. The statements made were almost unanimous, both in their assessment of the present situation and in setting the course of action to be followed.

The present situation has been characterized by the stubborn refusal of South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which held out the promise of self-determination for the people of Namibia through democratic, fair and free elections. Against this, we all have to face the stark reality that the Namibian people continues to suffer under oppression and domination by South Africa, which has been using every delaying tactic to prolong its illegal rule and to exploit the wealth of Namibia.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

Even if the human suffering of the Namibian people were not enough to stir the conscience of the international community, we certainly could not close our eyes to the dangers the present situation involves regarding peace and security in the region and, indeed, beyond. The repeated use of Namibian territory to commit overt and covert acts of aggression against the front-line States must not be allowed to continue. The international community must also reject most categorically the continued linkage of Namibian independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues, and condemn the imposition of the so-called interim government in Namibia.

During the important series of meetings referred to earlier it was also unanimously agreed that the international community should send a strong and unambiguous signal to South Africa to change its policy. A settlement plan exists, it is internationally recognized, and we have to act to ensure its implementation.

Security Council resolution 601 (1987), adopted on 30 October, points in the right direction. It authorizes the Secretary-General to undertake new initiatives to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and SWAPO and the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. It gives a new impetus to the efforts aimed at expediting the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

While we welcome resolution 601 (1987), we consider it necessary to augment it by keeping up pressure on South Africa. For instance, a date could very well be agreed upon by which implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should begin. South Africa must not be allowed again to engage in delaying tactics with no end in sight. In the event of the apartheid régime's repeating its past performance and refusing to co-operate, the Security Council should adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it.



(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

We support Security Council resolution 601 (1987) and the Secretary-General in fulfilling his new mandate.

Finally, I should like to reaffirm our full support for and active solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia in their just struggle for freedom and independence.

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Since the end of the Second World War and the foundation of the United Nations there have been very few international problems that have been studied, debated and examined as fully as the problem of Namibia.

During the early years of the United Nations countless measures were taken to achieve the independence of the Territory. Subsequently, initiatives were taken designed to ensure that the Territory of South West Africa would be subject to the application of the principles set forth in resolution 1514 (XV), well known as the Magna Carta of decolonization.

Twenty years after the United Nations had rejected the South African request to annex the Territory, on 27 October 1966, through its resolution 2145 (XXI), the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The following year, on 19 May 1967, the Assembly, pursuant to resolution 2248 (S-V), established the United Nations Council for Namibia so that it might, in its own name, administer Namibia until its independence.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua

Since then, despite the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the consultative opinion of the International Court of Justice and the valiant efforts of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, the Council for Namibia has not been able to fulfil its principal mandate to administer the Territory.

Thus, the international community is faced with the only solution that has the force and the ability to compel South Africa to agree to the independence of Namibia: the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. Such sanctions are the most effective peaceful mechanism available to the United Nations by which to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and dismantle the evil system of apartheid without further delay.

Faced with the repeated rejections by South Africa, the Namibia people's peaceful recourses have long since been exhausted. Therefore, at the end of a South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) document published on 18 July 1966 in Dar-es-Salaam the following statement appeared: "The only recourse that remains to us to attain liberation is an armed uprising."

The Security Council's adoption of resolution 435 (1978) marked a turning-point in the struggle of our Organization to achieve the independence and self-determination of the Namibian people. But, as history since 1978 has shown, the implementation of that resolution has repeatedly been thwarted by the machinations, pretexts and delaying tactics of South Africa and its allies which benefit from the colonial situation and the exploitation of the Territory.

Last week the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987), in which it decided, inter alia, to authorize the Secretary-General:

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

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

Even before the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), the representative of Pretoria had rejected it out of hand, including the arrangement of a cease-fire. Similarly, the United States, continuing its policy of boycotting the action of the Security Council and persisting in its widely rejected linkage policy, declared last Friday:

"until there has been agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban troops in Angola, ... it will not be possible to implement the United Nations independence plan for Namibia." (S/PV.2759, p. 68-70)

In view of this attitude, what can we hope for? We are told that negotiations are going on with Angola, as if this were a bilateral problem between the United States and Angola. This is a United Nations problem and it is through compliance with United Nations resolutions that it should be resolved.

The General Assembly has a direct and inescapable responsibility concerning Namibia. In order to fulfil that responsibility it must demand compliance with its resolutions and those of the Security Council. Accordingly, I shall quote from the final communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Administering Authority of the Territory, held here in New York on 2 October 1987, as follows:

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

"In the event of the Security Council's inability to adopt concrete measures to compel South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by 29 September 1988, the Ministers called upon the General Assembly to consider, at its forty-third session, necessary action in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, cognizant of the fact that this was a unique instance in which the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility for promoting self-determination, freedom and national independence for Namibia." (A/42/631, para. 20)

It is more than 103 years since the German Empire took possession of Luderitz Bay and, as was customary then, claimed the interior lands, which it called German South West Africa. Since then various colonizing Powers have faced the rebellion of the Namibian people, which, sometimes spontaneously and in the past 30 years in an organized way, from King Witbooi to SWAPO, has demonstrated its indomitable freedom-loving spirit and its determination to achieve independence, whatever the cost.

But South Africa stubbornly and arrogantly remains bent on continuing and strengthening its illegal occupation of Namibia, for two important reasons, among others. First, Pretoria is using the Territory as a pawn in its policy of a so-called total strategy of domination and destabilization of the whole region. Secondly, South Africa, in collusion with its allies, is exploiting the Territory's natural and human resources and deriving huge profits, without any benefit to the Namibian people.

Namibia possesses abundant natural resources, including metals and minerals such as lead, zinc, uranium, manganese, copper and diamonds. To facilitate the exploitation of those resources, Namibia's economic structure is typically colonial. It has been moulded to meet the needs of foreign economic interests

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

alone. Mining, agriculture and fishing, which represent 90 per cent of Namibia's exports, are controlled by foreigners, who export the profits generated by those activities. Moreover, the present system has put Namibia in a position of total dependence on South Africa, the intention being that when the Namibians achieve their independence they will inherit an economically captive territory; thus their progress and development will be impeded.

To justify their exploitation, the companies involved and certain Governments that benefit from their activities insist that their enterprises bring progress, development and technical knowledge to the population. However, as is well known, an apartheid system has been imposed in Namibia that in some cases is even more brutal than that in South Africa itself, and this excludes the black Namibian population from any benefit it might derive from those foreign corporations.

Some weeks ago we witnessed the strikes conducted by the members of the National Union of Namibian workers, who were demanding the most elementary labour rights and human rights from the Tsumeb Corporation and other corporations. To protect themselves the capitalist enterprises used Pretoria's military machine, which did not shrink from repressing Namibian workers with fire and sword.

To facilitate exploitation and protect the colonialists against the people's wrath, South Africa keeps more than 100,000 troops in Namibia - equivalent to almost 10 per cent of the Territory's population. A network of military bases, gaols and supply facilities for mercenaries, all surrounded by electric fences and barbed wire, covers the whole Territory. The Caprivi Strip strategic base, situated in the heart of southern Africa, constitutes a permanent threat to all the countries of the region.

In addition to its own troops, which it also uses to launch terrorist attacks from Namibia against the front-line States, South Africa has created Namibian

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

military units, recruited by force, which are used for repression of their own fellow citizens.

Similarly, mercenaries and death squads, such as the shadowy Koevoets, led by South African officers, roam the Territory indiscriminately repressing the Namibian population and sowing terror and fear.

It is against that State terrorism that the Namibian people is struggling, and it is against that terrorism that the international community and the Assembly must take action without delay, firmly and categorically rejecting force, hypocritical pretexts and false linkages.

While we apply the necessary measures against Pretoria, we must increase our material solidarity with the national liberation movements and the front-line countries through bilateral aid and mechanisms such as the Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid (AFRICA) Fund, created by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Acting with firmness and all the determination that the situation and our moral duty demand, the international community, through the Assembly and the Security Council, will ultimately succeed in putting an end to that shameful, disgraceful apartheid régime.

We must respond to the sacrifice and heroic struggle of the Namibian people, which, with SWAPO in the vanguard, decided 21 years ago not merely to continue hoping, but once and for all to shake off slavery by any possible means. If we want peace, we must remove the antithesis of peace, which is injustice. Therefore, let us recall the following words of Comrade Andimba Toivo ja Toivo, uttered in the dock in Pretoria 19 years ago:

"We shall not cease to struggle until we have attained independence. Only when our human dignity has been restored to us, as equals of the whites, will there be peace between us."

Mr. DANCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Like most members of the international community, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is seriously concerned by the fact that the Namibian problem has not yet been resolved and at the further deterioration of the situation in the Territory. Our attention has been drawn to this by the report to the General Assembly of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/42/24). The South African racist régime still has Namibia in its deadly grip and has extended to the Territory its policy and practice of apartheid. The repression of freedom fighters is becoming ever more ruthless and cruel.

In essence, Pretoria has unleashed against the Namibian people a campaign of genocide that is claiming a growing number of women and children among its victims. Occupation troops and punishment squads from South Africa are daily committing crimes that rival in their cruelty the crimes of nazism committed in the Second World War. The Territory of occupied Namibia is being used by the South African racists as a springboard for constant acts of aggression against neighbouring African countries. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic vigorously condemns the build-up of South Africa's military potential in Namibia, which represents a threat to international peace and security.

While stepping up repression, aimed primarily at the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the vanguard of the Namibian people, the Pretoria régime is substantially increasing its attempts to solve the question of Namibia along neo-colonialist lines, by illegal manoeuvres with the participation of puppet parties.

(Mr. Danchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

It has been announced that preparations for a so-called constitution are nearing completion and that new elements of a colonialist infrastructure of South African Namibia are being created. South Africa is bent on a unilateral proclamation of "independence" in the Territory, in violation of numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations and the Security Council.

What is the reason for such defiant behaviour on the part of the Pretoria régime in Namibia? The answer to that question has long been known to the world community: it is the continuing political, economic and military support which the racist régime receives from certain powerful Western protectors. The Governments of a number of Western countries, South Africa's partners, are doing everything in their power, in the United Nations Security Council and elsewhere, to prevent the adoption of effective comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime. They are doing everything possible to prevent a just solution of the Namibian problem by importing such extraneous and totally irrelevant issues as the notorious "linkage" between the decolonization of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces from Angola.

Furthermore, Western transnational corporations are continuing to consolidate the economic base for the illegal occupation and ruthlessly exploiting the natural and human resources of Namibia. The colonial occupation régime, together with the transnational corporations, is attempting, by the use of naked force, to crush the efforts of Namibian workers to obtain their rights. However, the Namibian people repudiates the overt and covert attempts by Pretoria and its patrons to replace a just settlement of the Namibian problem by a neo-colonialist farce produced and directed by South African experts in bantustanization.

A broad spectrum of the international community is unwavering in its determination to end the colonial occupation of Namibia and ensure that the people



(Mr. Danchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

achieves independence and freedom. That was demonstrated, inter alia, by the results of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held last year in Harare, the twenty-third session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held last July in Addis Ababa, last year's International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, in Vienna, the extraordinary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held in May this year in Luanda, and ministerial meetings of the Council, as well as other international meetings.

Year by year the General Assembly has, by overwhelming majorities, adopted resolutions calling for the cessation of all assistance to the Pretoria régime, the prompt withdrawal of South African occupation troops from Namibia and the immediate transfer of full power to the Namibian people through its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization.

On 30 October this year the Security Council adopted resolution 601 (1987), which requests the Secretary-General to take practical steps to implement the Council's resolution 435 (1978), which has been internationally recognized as the basis for a political solution of the Namibian problem. Procrastination in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) only makes the wretched position of the Namibian people even worse. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic unwaveringly supports all steps on the part of the international community to end the occupation of Namibia and the sufferings of its people.

---

(Mr. Danchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Speaking last week at a meeting of the Security Council on the question of Namibia the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic pointed out that the Ukrainian SSR strongly favours the immediate, unconditional cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, the withdrawal of the armed forces and administration of South Africa, and the free and unimpeded exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence in a single territorially integrated State, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

The elimination of the racist system in Namibia and South Africa by means of a political settlement would be in keeping with the interests of all peoples, and ways and means of bringing about such a settlement should be sought. We must enhance the role of the United Nations, the Security Council, the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in this area.

In urging the immediate granting of independence to Namibia we should like to express our high appreciation of the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, headed by its Chairman, Peter Zuze. We support the work of the newly elected Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Carlsson, and wish him every success.

We also take a favourable view of the efforts in the interest of a Namibian settlement made by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari.

A solution to the Namibian problem is inseparable from an all-round improvement in the global political climate and the efforts to create a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The true path to the solution of the problem has long been known. It has been set forth in resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the subject, including Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Only prompt and unconditional compliance

(Mr. Danchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

with the decisions of our Organization in their entirety will make it possible to ensure a just solution to the Namibian problem.

The time for exhortations to the Pretoria régime is past. If the Namibian people is to be able to associate itself with the great family of independent States, radical measures are needed, including the cessation by all States of any co-operation with South Africa and the introduction of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

(Mr. Danchenko, Ukrainian SSR)

We are ready to participate in effective action by the United Nations to ensure the independence of Namibia, equality for the peoples of South Africa and peace for the countries of the African continent. The Ukrainian SSR has always steadfastly abided by all decisions and recommendations of the United Nations aimed at the boycotting of the South African racist régime and has provided assistance of every kind for the just cause of the Namibian people. In this an important part is played by our public organizations and educational institutions and the Ukrainian mass media, which give broad publicity to the struggle for the prompt liberation of Namibia.

The Ukrainian delegation calls for international pressure on the racist régime of Pretoria to be increased so that the United Nations decisions aimed at bringing about the true independence of the people of Namibia may be implemented as soon as possible.

Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): The question of Namibia indisputably represents one of the darkest unfinished chapters in the annals of this world forum. It is simply outrageous that, two decades after assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility over the Territory and nearly 10 years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the prospect of ending the suffering of the Namibian people and securing their freedom and independence remains as elusive as ever.

In arrogant defiance of the will of the international community, racist South Africa persists to this very day in its illegal occupation of Namibia. Indeed, through terror and brutal force it has further entrenched the repressive structure of its colonial domination and extended its odious system of apartheid to the Territory. With the connivance of foreign economic interests, Pretoria's plundering of Namibia's mineral, marine and human resources continues unabated.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

The lawless, predatory nature of the régime is further reflected in its incessant acts of aggression, political destabilization and economic strangulation against its neighbours, in particular the front-line States, thus posing a constant threat to regional and international peace and security.

At this juncture there is no need for me or any of us to detail South Africa's blatant and repeated violations of every norm of international law and every tenet of civilized behaviour, for these have been fully documented in the voluminous reports and scores of resolutions and decisions adopted by this world body over the past 40 years.

Almost a decade ago the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed a plan for Namibian independence through free elections under the supervision and with the assistance of the United Nations. This plan, to which even South Africa initially gave its grudging concurrence, remains the only internationally accepted basis for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. But when it came to the plan's implementation the Pretoria régime reneged on its own assurances and, true to form, shamelessly indulged in its usual ploys of prevarication and subterfuge. Since then the Namibian case for independence has relapsed into a sordid saga of duplicity, hypocrisy and betrayal.

Instead of co-operating in good faith with the Secretary-General on the detailed aspects of the plan, the Botha régime has feverishly stepped up its efforts to impose its own designs for a neo-colonial fait accompli in Namibia. It has doubled its military forces of occupation, thus transforming Namibia into one huge military camp, over which the harshest form of martial law reigns. Aided and abetted by the transnational corporations of some of its trading partners, it has ruthlessly pursued the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, in total disregard of the Council for Namibia's Decree No. 1. It continues to hatch various

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

schemes and create pseudo political parties and institutions in order to prop up a puppet régime of its own making. At the same time, it has not ceased its vain attempts to destroy the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic liberation movement of the Namibian people.

More directly, South Africa has concentrated its devious attempts to subvert the letter and spirit of the United Nations plan on creating artificial obstacles and fabricating pretexts to forestall its implementation. For the past seven years it has tried to distort what is essentially a decolonization question and recast it as a regional conflict and an issue of East-West contention, inter alia, by insisting on pre-conditions extraneous to the United Nations plan, such as linking the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. It has insidiously played up so-called geostrategic interests, which it knew would strike a resonant chord among some of its Western patrons.

Faced with these dilatory manoeuvres, the Security Council, in its resolutions 539 (1983) and 566 (1985), unequivocally rejected those conditions. Most significantly, resolution 566 (1985) explicitly warned South Africa that non-compliance with its provisions would result in the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

As we all know, the Secretary-General already in 1985 reported to us that the last outstanding issue relevant to the plan, that concerning the electoral system, had been resolved and that only South Africa's intransigence on linkage stood in the way of Namibian independence. Again in March and October of this year he underscored the continuing deadlock and concluded that only concerted international action could open the way for the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan.

Yet, when the Security Council was called upon in November 1985 and last

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

April to respond to South Africa's continuing defiance, it failed to make good on its own warning. It is particularly deplorable that on both those occasions the Security Council was prevented from adopting effective enforcement measures because of the use of the veto by some permanent members.

It is quite clear to us that South Africa's stubborn resistance could be sustained only with the open or implied support of some major Powers. In this context, contrary to its purported aims, the discredited policy of "constructive engagement" has in effect reinforced Pretoria's arrogant intransigence.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

To condone or rationalize the perpetuation of the status quo in Namibia is tantamount to being an accomplice to the crime of keeping Namibia enslaved in the most brutal form of oppression and exploitation. We believe that for the sake of their own credibility they must now in deeds, and not only in words, reject the interjection of extraneous issues, desist from giving any further support and encouragement to the Pretoria régime and join the international consensus on the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan.

In sum, despite the fact that all issues relevant to the plan have long since been resolved, progress towards its implementation, and even the necessary preparations to begin that process, continues to be blocked.

The mounting anger and exasperation of the international community over this state of affairs was reflected in the decision of the Council for Namibia to convene an unprecedented ministerial-level meeting of the Council in order to devise a course of action to overcome the impasse that has persisted. At that meeting, which was held just last month and in which my Foreign Minister participated, the Ministers expressed their profound concern and indignation over the interminable delay in the attainment of Namibia's liberation. Most significantly, the Ministers adopted a final communiqué containing provisions which, in the view of my delegation, should set the stage for determined action by our Organization from now on. Essentially, the communiqué calls on the Security Council to set an early date for the commencement of the implementation of the United Nations plan, no later than 31 December 1987; to commit itself to the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions; and to undertake forthwith consultations for the composition and emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. In the event of Security Council inaction,



(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

and in the light of the unique nature of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for the decolonization of Namibia, the communiqué also envisages direct action by the General Assembly, consistent with the provisions of the Charter.

Indonesia firmly believes that those are indeed the elementary requirements for overcoming the stalemate that for too long has plagued our Organization's efforts on this issue.

In this context, my delegation has been encouraged by the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987), authorizing the Secretary-General to proceed to arrange a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of UNTAG in Namibia. We commend SWAPO for having repeatedly expressed its readiness to co-operate on this score; but so far South Africa has adamantly refused to do so.

We would like to believe that the initiation of the decolonization process will now go forward. Past experience, however, has made us wary of harbouring any illusions about the response that can be expected from South Africa. In fact, its representative confirmed before the Security Council only a week ago that there has been no change in the position of South Africa on the linkage pre-condition, nor on its presumptuous demand for the unilateral termination by SWAPO of its legitimate national liberation struggle, including armed struggle. Consequently, South Africa can be expected to resort to further delaying tactics unless and until the Security Council gives a concrete manifestation of its firm determination and unity of purpose.

In these circumstances, there is no doubt that for the Secretary-General to succeed he will need the full co-operation of the international community and

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

especially of all permanent members of the Security Council. However, in the event South Africa persists in its reckless obstruction of the peaceful transition towards Namibian independence, then we assume that the Security Council will no longer hesitate and will apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The international community has shown enough patience in the face of South Africa's double-dealing. When flexibility and accommodation are continually met by equivocation and bad faith, when painstaking negotiations are systematically undermined, then it is time for South Africa's friends to realize that only the application of strong and effective enforcement measures can bring South Africa to its senses.

The fate of Namibia and its brave and long-suffering people is held in sacred trust by the United Nations, and thus by the international community as a whole. For far too long that trust has been betrayed and trampled upon by a renegade régime, a régime internally blinded by racist obsession and externally bolstered by the forces of cynicism and greed. This blot on the collective conscience and reputation of our Organization must be removed. Namibia should no longer remain a pawn in the clutches of great-Power politics and transnational economic interest. It is now more essential than ever before for us to bring up the commensurate political vision and determination to start the process that will finally enable the Namibian people to achieve their birthright: true and complete independence in a united Namibia.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): I wish to start my brief remarks by congratulating the Council for Namibia on producing a most comprehensive and lucid report on the question of Namibia, as well as for the most exhaustive set of resolutions

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

contained in document A/42/24 (Part III). Furthermore I should like to take this opportunity to thank our Secretary-General for his commendable efforts and his perseverance and dedication in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. We admire his courage and his commitment and urge him to continue to exert all his efforts for this noble cause.

In 1978, when resolution 435 (1978), on the settlement plan for the independence of Namibia, was adopted by the Security Council and accepted by both the Government of South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, we of the international community were delighted to feel that at last the question of Namibia - which had occupied the minds of many since 27 October 1966, when the General Assembly by resolution 2145 (XXI) had terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations - would no longer have to appear on the agenda of this body.

We were indeed very happy and went about congratulating each other and our brothers from SWAPO on the approaching independence of Namibia. Most of us were looking forward to participating in the independence celebrations in Windhoek.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

Our hopes were further raised when the contact group of five Western countries was created for the purpose of hastening the process laid down in resolution 435 (1978). We had no doubt then that the long-awaited independence of Namibia was not far distant. At last the 12 years of illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa was approaching its end. None of us foresaw any difficulty in the implementation of the resolution, since it enjoyed the full support of the overwhelming majority of Member States, which recognized it as the only viable method of bringing Namibia to genuine independence, and was accepted by both the parties directly involved in the conflict. However, two years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and the creation of the contact group, our initial hopes were cruelly dashed by the fact that, out of the blue, in the mind of one of the members of the contact group a devilish child was conceived, which is to this day holding to ransom the independence of a people that has already suffered too much under the brutal system of apartheid.

The name of that devilish child is "linkage": in other words, parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the extraneous and irrelevant issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The idea of linkage has been introduced to cloud the central question, which is the right of self-determination and independence of the Namibian people, and to inject a concept of East-West confrontation into an issue far removed from that context. My delegation fails to comprehend why an agreement between two independent States, Angola and Cuba, should be a hindrance to the implementation of a resolution of the highest and most important organ of our Organization. It is regrettable that the Organization is not in a position to force the implementation of its resolutions, even those emanating from its highest organs.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

My delegation condemns Pretoria's pernicious policies of puppetry and procrastination regarding the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We cannot and will not accept that the implementation of this resolution should be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola and we appeal to those who have conceived this idea of linkage and introduced it as a condition of the implementation of the Security Council resolution to withdraw this extraneous and irrelevant issue. The people of Namibia must be free. The agony and suffering of this people must cease henceforth.

The illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa has to be ended by permitting the people of that Territory to exercise its right to self-determination through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in accordance with the settlement plan under resolution 435 (1978). It is important that South Africa and its friends should not continue to subordinate the implementation of the settlement plan to the fulfilment of conditions which are extraneous to the independence of the Territory or inconsistent with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In conclusion, my delegation believes that the efforts of the Secretary-General need the solid support of the international community. Pressure should be exerted on South Africa, particularly by Western countries which have regular contact with South Africa. We further believe that the time has come to revive the work of the contact group of the five Western countries, and therefore appeal to the member countries that form the contact group to study the possibility of reviving the group. Those five countries have the moral obligation to see to it that their initial goal in creating the group is achieved and that resolution 435 (1978) is implemented without further delay.

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

There is a need for them to inject a new momentum and new ideas into the initial process of bringing South Africa to implement resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, they have the collective power to force the removal of that major obstacle, linkage.

Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): This debate over Namibia's future has, regrettably, become an annual ritual; it is a debate which reflects the disappointed dreams and frustrated hopes of a proud people, the Namibian people. In speech after speech representatives express their Governments' attitudes on this question and show near unanimity, something that is rare in this body. Yet the situation in Namibia itself remains unchanged, with an intransigent South Africa continuing to defy the United Nations and continuing to deny to the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence.

This continuing stalemate must call into question in some minds the value of this debate, but the Australian delegation believes that it is important that countries continue to speak out and reiterate their views on this important issue. South Africa must never be allowed the luxury of imagining that the pressures against it and the feelings of outrage over its actions in Namibia are in any way diminishing.

Indeed, the evidence points in the other direction. This has been a year of significant activity and achievement in the fight for Namibia's independence. Once again the United Nations Council for Namibia has played an important role, and I wish to express my delegation's particular gratitude to its President, Mr. Peter Zuze, for the energy and sense of purpose he has shown in leading the Council.

The Council's extraordinary plenary meetings in Luanda from 18 to 22 May of this year were particularly significant, because of Angola's own unique contribution to the fight for Namibia's freedom and because it is the provisional

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

headquarters of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has played such a major role in the struggle. As a member of the Council for Namibia, my delegation participated actively in the meetings and was a party to the adoption of the Luanda Declaration and Programme of Action.

One outcome of the Luanda meetings was the Council's decision to hold a meeting at ministerial level. That meeting took place on 2 October this year. Regrettably, the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Mr. Bill Hayden, was unable to be present as he had to return to Australia because of developments in our region, but we were encouraged by the unity of approach displayed by speakers at that meeting.

The Council's work for Namibia's independence has been ably underpinned by the efforts of the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. My delegation welcomes Mr. Bernt Carlsson as the new Commissioner and pays tribute to the enduring legacy of his predecessor, Mr. Brajesh Chandra Mishra.

Representatives who listened to that distinguished African and Commonwealth statesman, President Kenneth Kaunda, in this Hall on 8 October - to take but one example - cannot fail to understand and to feel moved by the anger and frustration which all Africans, especially those who live beside an intransigent and unrepentant South Africa, feel, not only about Namibia but also about the continuation of the repellent policy of apartheid, of which the continued occupation of Namibia is the most serious manifestation.

(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

The basic paradox surrounding Namibia is the universal acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the blueprint for Namibia's independence on the one hand and that resolution's continuing non-implementation on the other. My delegation hopes, therefore, that the Security Council's adoption last week of resolution 601 (1987) will constitute a step forward in implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia. We call again on South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in this regard. We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, for their sustained efforts to bring about Namibia's early independence.

Since last year's debate on Namibia South Africa has continued its efforts to bolster the so-called transitional government of national unity in Windhoek. It has also held out the prospect of some form of internal settlement outside the framework of resolution 435 (1978).

I should make it quite clear the the Australian Government refuses to accord any legitimacy to the authorities in Windhoek and that it continues to support resolution 435 (1978) as the only basis for Namibia's independence. In our view, the United Nations plan is self-contained and has all the elements necessary for a solution. This is why we cannot accept the linkage of Namibia's independence with such extraneous issues as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Those matters are quite separate and there is no sustainable parallel between them.

Australia has consistently supported the United Nations in its campaign to give Namibians their right to self-determination and independence. In the context of Australia's strong support for Namibia's self-determination and independence, we also look to all the African countries, especially those which have experienced colonial rule, to support the same general principles of decolonization and genuine self-determination in our region of the world, the south-west Pacific.



(Mr. Woolcott, Australia)

Australia has been an active and fully committed member of the United Nations Council for Namibia for many years. We continue our voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. During our membership of the Security Council in 1985 and 1986 we played an active role in the Council's discussions of Namibia, and we supported the adoption of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa by the Council.

I visited Namibia in 1983. I was convinced then that the South African Government would not give up its control over Namibia except under the greatest international pressure. So, if we all really believe in the principles of the Charter as we profess to do, if we all really believe in the freedom, rights and dignity of all peoples as we profess to do, we have no option but to maintain and increase the pressure on South Africa to cease obstructing Namibia's independence. Australia will not be diverted from this course.

My Government has taken a series of concrete measures against South Africa, including a ban on air links, a ban on the import of agricultural goods from South Africa and a ban on the import of uranium, coal, iron and steel from South Africa. Since 1 June 1987 those measures have been applicable also in respect of Namibia.

By taking this action, the Australian Government has renewed and re-emphasized its rejection of South Africa's continuing intransigent refusal to give independence to Namibia. Until that independence is assured and resolution 435 (1978) is implemented, my Government will maintain and apply those measures in the belief that the growing international pressure on South Africa will finally and inevitably lead to Namibia's liberation and independence.

Mr. KAM (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Panama was one of the 114 countries which, on 27 October 1966, voted in favour of terminating South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of South West Africa, today known as Namibia. In so doing it was our hope that that historic decision of the General Assembly

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

would open up promising prospects that would promptly lead the Namibian people to the independence for which they yearned.

We note with regret that 21 years later we are still debating what should have been a reality a long time ago. Until that noble ideal is realized the independence of Namibia will remain a cause that takes pride of place in the international policies of my country. This is because Panama recognizes that in the question of Namibia are united essential principles which mankind has been forging through its constant endeavour to bring about a world of freedom, justice and peace.

Since the General Assembly adopted, in 1946, its first resolution on Namibia countless resolutions and decisions have been adopted on this item, in the United Nations as in other international forums. These all bear the distinctive mark of support for Namibian independence and have as their common denominator condemnation of South Africa's illegal occupation of that Territory. Few causes have attracted such complete solidarity in the international community.

None the less, as pointed out by the Secretary-General

"The most urgent remaining problem of decolonization is certainly that of Namibia (A/41/1, p. 5). But Namibia is also a sad reminder of the continuing existence of fallacious policies in which strategic reasons of dubious authenticity predominate over the sacred rights of peoples and in which the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter are reduced to a dead letter because of unspeakable hegemonistic greed.

In keeping with the traditional anti-colonialist policy of its people, Panama continues to believe that the question of Namibia is essentially colonial in character. Therefore, its solution must be based on the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of South Africa from that Territory so that the people of Namibia can

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence without limitation or qualification, in conformity with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) - which is fully applicable in this case.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

That Declaration also establishes that any attempt to destroy partially or completely the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the United Nations Charter. We therefore insist that Namibia must attain independence with its territory intact, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands of Namibia, which are an inseparable part of its territorial heritage and cannot be permitted to be annexed by South Africa in any circumstances.

In resolution 2145 (XXI), of 1966, which terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, the Assembly decided that Namibia was the direct responsibility of the United Nations until it attained self-determination and national independence.

In order to give effect to the majority mandate of the international community, the Security Council, in 1978, adopted resolution 435 (1978) on the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which is the only internationally accepted basis for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. For two years now the Secretary-General has made it clear that all pending issues relating to that plan were resolved when agreement was reached in November 1985 on the adoption of the electoral system.

Nevertheless, to date the racist régime of South Africa, with the complicity of its allies, has continued stubbornly to resist the full implementation of that plan, using unjustifiable arguments and introducing improper, alien elements into the question of Namibia to evade compliance. That is Pretoria's true purpose in putting forward the discredited theory of "parallelism" or "linkage" between the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola and the independence of Namibia.

The presence of Cuban forces in Angola is a matter that falls exclusively within the purview of the two sovereign States, whereas the presence of South Africa in Namibia constitutes an illegal occupation that has been repeatedly condemned by all the relevant United Nations organs, including the Security

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

Council, whose decisions are binding pursuant to Article 25 of the Charter.

Consequently, sophistry about parallelism is completely improper.

Moreover, it revolts our conscience that the Pretoria racist régime has sought to hold the freedom of the people of Namibia hostage as a bargaining counter in exchange for the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. We categorically reject these manoeuvres. They seek to satisfy the strategic interests of certain world Powers which, in 1978, committed themselves to promoting the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, but which today, unfortunately, seem determined to go back in history and isolate themselves from contemporary thinking. Those Powers, bound by their anachronistic Manichaeic vision of the world, are the very same ones as are trying to distort the anti-colonialist essence of the noble struggle of the people of Namibia and to present it as part of the East-West confrontation. We reject this tendentious approach, the ultimate aim of which is to delay still further the independence of Namibia.

We have affirmed that the only accepted international framework for the settlement of the question of Namibia is to be found in the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia under Security Council resolution 435 (1978). For that reason, we denounce South Africa's neo-colonialist plan to proclaim a false independence for Namibia outside the framework of resolution 435 (1978) with the purpose of perpetuating its domination over the Territory. We vigorously condemn any attempt by South Africa to impose an internal settlement in Namibia, whether it be called a provisional government or a multi-party conference, and any other fraudulent formula that does not respond to the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to freedom and true independence in conformity with United Nations resolutions.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

South Africa has not confined itself to occupying and illegally administering the Territory of Namibia. Pretoria has imposed upon the Territory its policy of apartheid, is systematically violating human rights and the fundamental freedoms of the population and recently has stepped up its brutal repression and violence against the Namibian people. The persecution of leaders, members and sympathizers of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) has been particularly ruthless with the infamous purpose of intimidating them and breaking their will to fight. But we are certain that those attempts are historically foredoomed to failure. As has been well stated by our never-to-be-forgotten General Omar Torrijos, no bullet has been invented that can kill the ideal of freedom.

We reaffirm our brotherly support for SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the people of Namibia, with which we countries that cherish peace and freedom are committed to stand until final victory. During his recent visit to Panama, my Government had the privilege of personally conveying to the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, these feelings of solidarity towards his people that I now reaffirm before this Assembly.

The increasing militarization which the Pretoria régime is carrying out in the Territory of Namibia constitutes a threat to international peace and security. South Africa uses Namibian territory as a springboard for its continuing armed invasions and acts of subversion, destabilization and aggression against independent African States, particularly Angola, but also Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Panama affirms its solidarity with those countries and commends them for the invaluable contribution that they are making day by day, in a spirit of sacrifice and dignity, for the independence of Namibia and the elimination of apartheid.

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

In the past, my country had the benefit of two visits from the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose activities it follows very closely. We reaffirm our support to the Council as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence, and express our deep appreciation for their efforts to promote the independence of Namibia. The extraordinary plenary meetings held by the Council in Luanda, Angola, from 18 to 22 May of this year, and the Declaration and Programme of Action it adopted, confirm the great depth and dedication with which the Council is fulfilling the mandate given to it by the community of nations.

The Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, a distinguished Latin American, deserves unanimous recognition for his tireless efforts and exemplary contribution to the cause of Namibia. The two reports he has submitted this year to the Security Council on the question of Namibia endorse our opinion that his contribution is indispensable in giving impetus to the complete fulfilment of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in conformity with the parameters expressly decided therein.

We believe that, at this time, the international community should strengthen support to the Secretary-General for him effectively to fulfil the mandate entrusted to him last week by the Security Council in resolution 601 (1987) to bring about a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary in order to give effect to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

We emphatically support the Secretary-General in this new task, but we should be prepared to respond vigorously to the arrogant stubbornness with which the Apartheid régime continues to defy the international community and with impunity to violate underfoot the United Nations Charter. Let us also be prepared to unmask and denounce those Powers which, by their political, economic and military support

(Mr. Kam, Panama)

have encouraged South Africa to continue with its intransigent attitude. Having explored all avenues to an orderly, peaceful solution of the question of Namibia, there remains no alternative but to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions on South Africa, in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, because of its illegal occupation of Namibia, its refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions and its systematic violation of the Charter. I emphasize the essential role and responsibility that fall to the five permanent members of the Security Council in this connection.

In conclusion, I should like to ask how much more blood must be shed by the sons of Namibia? How much more oppression must be borne by that people? How many more countries must endure aggression from South Africa? How much more plunder of the natural resources of Namibia must be allowed? How many more outrages must be accepted to the international legal order at the hands of South Africa? How much more ignominy must South Africa be allowed to cause the international community before we decide, once and for all, to act together with firmness, determination and effectiveness, in order to put an end to the offensive conduct of the Pretoria régime?

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): There is a clear fact which faces the international community when it again reviews and debates the two-decades old question of Namibia in all its dimensions, with a view to solving the problem and putting an end to the abhorrent occupation and the brutal violations of human rights and human dignity at the hands of the hateful apartheid régime of South Africa.

If we examine the United Nations resolutions and decisions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and those adopted by other international forums, such as the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and take account of the resolutions and recommendations of the special



(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

sessions of the United Nations Council for Namibia and those adopted by the General Assembly at its 1986 session, and the many world conferences and meetings held on the subject; if we examine all of those resolutions and the concepts and views they reflect; we must observe that they bring into focus the international community's conception of the essence of the Namibian question. Through that objective prognosis, the appropriate solutions to the problem have emerged. Those resolutions, especially Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and resolution 418 (1977) concerning the arms embargo against South Africa and resolution 601 (1987) adopted by the Security Council last week, reflect the will of an international community which has based its thinking on the principles of international law, the right of peoples to self-determination and the right to a dignified existence.

The crisis does not stem from the formulae of those resolutions or the concepts through which the international community has striven to enact its just and benevolent will, or the struggle of the Namibian people and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the crisis stems from the racist nature of the Pretoria régime, and its bent for aggression, expansion, exploitation and oppression.

The Pretoria régime continues to escalate its excesses and hateful racialism against the people of Namibia. Not only does it defy the international community's resolutions and refuse to vacate Namibia, but it tries to create entities, structures and institutions designed to perpetuate its occupation and more firmly to entrench its illegitimate presence in Namibia.

In this context, we must condemn the illegitimate transitional Government set up by the racist Pretoria régime in 1985, because it is no more than another manifestation of occupation. We also condemn the Pretoria régime's attempts to

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

mobilize young Namibians into a ragtag army designed to make Namibians kill each other.

It is in this way that the issue of Namibia has been complicated and transformed into one of the most irking questions that the conscience of the international community has had to face. In fact, it has become a problem that symbolizes the struggle between good and evil, between colonialism and freedom.\*

---

\* Mr. Olzvoy (Mongolia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

The essence of the problem is the non-implementation of United Nations resolutions and attempts by the world's racist régimes to sidestep them and make them devoid of all meaning. It would not have been possible for the racist régime of Pretoria to maintain its policy of aggression and racism, defying the will of the international community, as embodied in the historic 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the resolutions of the Security Council and other bodies, but for the protection, support and direct or indirect co-operation given it by certain other régimes.

It is in that light that we see very clearly the essential support provided by the Zionist racist régime of Tel Aviv to the Pretoria régime. That is not surprising: there is close collaboration between the two régimes because of the similarity of their ideologies and their common efforts to perpetuate racism in Africa and the Arab region by means of settlement colonies based on the expropriation of land belonging to others and the imposition of occupation by force. They thus commit acts of aggression against neighbouring countries and continue to apply a policy designed to create problems and to destabilize the countries of their regions. The two régimes apply a policy designed to create international conflicts and keep wars going so that they can impose their hegemony upon the African continent and the Arab countries. The collaboration between Pretoria and Tel Aviv is thus an aggressive alliance designed to deprive the African and Arab peoples of their freedom, weaken their capacity to become independent and exhaust their resources, resources that should enable them to achieve their economic, social and scientific development.

There is an identity of view between the Pretoria and Zionist régimes, which is similar in their behaviour, practices and world-wide objectives. Their first principle is mankind, with everything that man represents in terms of nobility, justice and peace - everything that is directly contrary to aggression and expansion.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

The Arab citizen, who is the principle butt of Zionist racism, suffers in the same way as the African citizen in Namibia and South Africa suffers. As an Arab, I understand that fully, because we are still facing Zionist aggression, with all its crimes, hatred and racist policy. We understand that suffering, because we have faced the aggression of the Iranian racist régime since 4 September 1980. That régime does not differ at all from those to be found in Tel Aviv and Pretoria in its hatred of everything Arab and its attempts at expansion aimed at Iraq and the territories of other Arab States. All three régimes use war, brutality and terror to impose by force the solutions that they see fit. There is collaboration between them to maintain aggression and oppression against the peoples of Africa and the Arab region.

The Zionist régime is giving military and nuclear aid to the Pretoria régime to enable it to continue its occupation of Namibia. It supplies weapons to Iran so that it may continue its aggression against Iraq and other countries of the region.

Based on its position of principle, as a member of the Special Committee on decolonization, Iraq supports the efforts of the international community to aid the struggle of peoples to exercise their legitimate rights and to affirm their national sovereignty. Accordingly, we favour the independence of Namibia and support the people of Namibia in its struggle for independence, under the guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

The United Nations has direct responsibility for Namibia, and should discharge that responsibility without putting the question of Namibia in the context of the East-West confrontation.

My delegation repeats that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice stated that article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

emphasized the need to ensure the prosperity of peoples placed under trusteeship and said that their sovereign rights must be ensured, pursuant to the principle of self-determination, which is the basis of international law. That advisory opinion, given in 1966, indicated that the occupation of Namibia was illegal, and that any collaboration with the régime of the Union of South Africa constituted a violation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. That confirms in legal terms that the Namibian question has nothing to do with the East-West conflict, but is a matter of liberation and liquidation of colonialism, implanted by the racist apartheid régime of Pretoria against the will of the Namibian people.

We favour the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), so that the people of Namibia may accede to independence, dignity and freedom, under the guidance of SWAPO. We take this opportunity to hail the efforts of the Council for Namibia in seeking the realization of Namibia's independence. We also hail the countries that are supplying military and material aid to the militants of Namibia, countries that must endure a policy of brutal oppression. We condemn acts of sabotage and destabilization, and totally support the efforts of the front-line countries which are seeking to achieve Namibia's independence.

Iraq is in its eighth year of suffering the scourge of war, a war which has restricted the aid that we can supply to Namibia and other struggling peoples, but, through the League of Arab States and by taking part in other Arab efforts, Iraq continues to attach the greatest importance to solidarity with struggling peoples. The support we have been able to provide as part of our efforts in the Non-Aligned Movement amounts to \$5 million.

The people of Iraq, who have borne great sacrifices in order to achieve economic and social progress, aspire to a just, legitimate and lasting peace, and

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

firmly condemn all acts of aggression and expansion. We stand side by side with the Namibian people struggling for their independence, dignity and territorial integrity.

Finally, on behalf of the people and leaders of Iraq, we salute the people of Namibia, struggling under its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

We call for concerted efforts in the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council enabling the people of Namibia to live a free and dignified life, as is their right.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): The international community has once again reaffirmed its position vis à vis the illegal presence of the racist Pretoria régime in Namibia. Through General Assembly resolution 41/39, in which the Assembly supported the resolutions and decisions of the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, held in Vienna in July 1986, the Assembly urged all Member States to implement those resolutions. It has also reaffirmed its resolution, adopted at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, concerning the administration of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority.

The Assembly has denounced the prevarications of the racist régime as regards its withdrawal from Namibia and decided that the independence of Namibia cannot be linked to other extraneous, irrelevant elements. The General Assembly has also decided to declare as fully and completely illegal the presence of South Africa in Namibia. It has declared Pretoria's attempts to impose a puppet régime as a thinly disguised illegal presence in the Territory. Nevertheless, and this is a matter deeply to be regretted, South Africa has completely ignored that resolution, as it has ignored similar resolutions in the past adopted since the thirty-first session, and has totally disregarded the resolutions of all the organs of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, and has continued to defy the international community as a whole, thus gravely undermining the credibility of the United Nations.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

Indeed, South Africa's continued defiance of the will of the international community has become a blight from which the Organization has been suffering for more than 20 years.

The establishment of peace in southern Africa can be achieved only through two steps by which the United Nations continues its endeavours, namely, the elimination of the apartheid régime of South Africa, and the liberation of Namibia from the illegal occupation of the Pretoria régime.

We call on all Member States to shoulder their responsibilities and fulfil their historic duty to enable the Security Council to adopt an obligatory resolution, accompanied by enforcement measures, to force the Pretoria régime to implement the resolution terminating its Mandate over the Territory of Namibia adopted in 1966, as well as to force it to terminate its occupation of the Territory and its domination of the destiny of its struggling people.

My country has participated in all conferences pertaining to the liberation of Namibia as a manifestation of its continuing support for the right of that people to independence and freedom. Once again I reaffirm my country's solidarity with that African people in its struggle, and its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization. We look forward to the day when that African country attains freedom, the day when an end is put to the continued defiance of United Nations resolutions by the racist régime of Pretoria.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil): Year after year the international community gathers at the General Assembly of the United Nations to condemn South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia and, in so doing, to express its solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as well as the hope of seeing an independent Namibia take its rightful place among us without further delay.



(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

During the last few years, we have had the opportunity to dedicate to the cause of Namibian independence special sessions of the General Assembly and meetings of the Security Council, such as the one held last week.

It seems almost automatic for us to come here every year in order to reiterate our points of view and express our frustration at the survival of a colonial situation that was formally declared illegal by the international community over 20 years ago.

As far as Brazil is concerned, it is never too much for us on occasions such as this to reiterate our continuing concern at the suffering of the Namibian people and reaffirm our heartfelt sympathy for them in their struggle to achieve their independence as quickly as possible. It can never be too much for us to restate our recognition that the cause of the South West Africa People's Organization, as the legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, is one that fully deserves our support, prepared as we are to develop with a fully independent Namibia the same friendly and mutually profitable relationship as Brazil already enjoys with other African countries, our neighbours across the sea.

It is within the context of that framework that the Government of Brazil was pleased to extend an invitation to President Sam Nujoma to visit our country in March of this year.

President Nujoma's visit to Brazil should be seen as a clear indication of the Brazilian Government's endorsement of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to independence. During Mr. Nujoma's stay in our country, the Brazilian authorities had occasion to signify to our illustrious guest our willingness to continue to co-operate with SWAPO, strengthening the ties that have existed since 1984, the year in which a seminar was held in Rio de Janeiro to familiarize the leaders of SWAPO with the way in which Brazil deals with multinational enterprises and government-run companies in mineral exploration and fishing.

(Mr. Nogueira-Batista, Brazil)

We realize that our co-operation, as well as our contributions to the main organs of the United Nations for Namibia, might seem modest in comparison with the resources needed to accelerate the process of Namibian independence; they reflect, nevertheless, the firm will of the Brazilian people to see the Namibian cause meet with success within the shortest possible period of time.

Brazil has always encouraged the Secretary-General of the United Nations to carry out his task of ensuring the conditions for implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In the same vein, the Brazilian Government fully supports resolution 601 (1987), just approved by the Security Council. We trust that the Secretary-General's mission will be crowned with success and that we shall soon see the day when there will be an end to the international community's frustration at the reluctance of the South African Government to resign itself to the independence of Namibia, without dilatory tactics and pre-conditions.

In concluding, I should like to state that Brazil will support the five draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia for approval by the General Assembly at the current session.

Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again the General Assembly is considering the plight of the Namibian people. Since the General Assembly discussed the question of Namibia at the last session, the racist régime in South Africa has persisted in its systematic and arbitrary repression of the Namibian people. Although 21 years have passed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia, the Namibian people are still deprived of their inalienable rights to freedom, independence and self-determination, affirmed in the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted on 25 October 1966 and other relevant resolutions.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

Since 1966, the year of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the territory of Namibia by the United Nations, the international community has continued its concerted and sustained efforts to bring about the independence of Namibia. To that end, the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted numerous resolutions on Namibia, especially Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which includes the United Nations blueprint for Namibian independence, the only internationally accepted solution for the Namibian problem.

Regardless of all this, the racist régime in South Africa has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia. The Namibian people in the Territory are being subjected to more repression, suffering and acts of oppression, exploitation and intimidation by the apartheid régime of Pretoria. Worse still, that régime continues its barbaric policy of aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring African countries through repeated military attacks.

In addition, the Pretoria régime has continued to frustrate every effort made by the international community to implement the said Security Council resolution, and ensuing resolutions, especially those relating to preparations for the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia as a prelude to the implementation of the United Nations plan, as defined by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Although there remain no pending questions that may impede implementation of the United Nations plan in accordance with the provisions of the Security Council resolution, the racist régime in Pretoria persists in its prevarication and intransigence and obstructs every step that may lead to an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia. The prevarication and procrastination of the Pretoria régime against the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, have taken the form of a pre-condition that links Namibia's independence to totally

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

irrelevant questions that have absolutely nothing to do with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This is especially apparent in Pretoria's insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. All this can only lead to the prolongation of the conflict in southern Africa and aggravation of the suffering of the Namibian people and the peoples of the neighbouring countries. Needless to say, the Security Council has repeatedly rejected that linkage as contradictory to its resolution 435 (1978).

Bahrain supports the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and those of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the achievement of the immediate and complete independence of Namibia. There is no doubt that the inability of the Security Council to take effective and decisive action against the racist régime in accordance with the Charter has delayed the efforts of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia to implement the United Nations plan for Namibia and encouraged that régime to persist in its intransigence and total disregard of the Security Council resolutions on Namibia.

My delegation believes that there can be no implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia without the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the racist régime in South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. The imposition of sanctions will force that régime to end its illegal occupation of Namibia. In this regard, we find that Security Council resolution 601 (1987), adopted on 30 October 1987, in which the Security Council decided to make the necessary arrangements for a cease-fire and to form and deploy the United Nations Transition Assistance Group, is an important step towards the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) that could lead to the achievement of the independence of Namibia, and enable the Namibian people to achieve their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence without further delay.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

The credibility of the United Nations, particularly of the Security Council, is at stake. So long as their resolutions continue to be flouted, the authority of the United Nations will be in doubt. In order to maintain the authority of the United Nations, considering that it has a special responsibility towards the destiny and independence of the Namibian people, it is incumbent on the international community to move swiftly in order to discharge that special responsibility in such a way as to rid the people of the usurping racist régime of Pretoria. There is no excuse for any delay now that all the necessary requirements for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia have been met.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

My delegation shares the conviction set out in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia that intensified international pressure must be brought to bear on South Africa to force it to speed up Namibia's independence; that this pressure must be exerted through the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter; and that support must be extended to the Namibian people's armed struggle, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia.

Mr. WIJewardane (Sri Lanka): The question of Namibia is once again before the General Assembly for its annual consideration. That question still appears on our agenda because of the intransigent attitude South Africa continues to hold. In 1965 South Africa started defying the decision of the General Assembly against the partition of the Territory and against any unilateral action that would be in violation of the Mandate for South West Africa and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. We recall South Africa's callous disregard of the decision taken in 1966 - 21 years ago - by the Assembly that South Africa had no right to administer the Territory, and placing the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

The sordid narration of South Africa's defiance of international opinion - and more particularly the authority of the Security Council in 1970 and the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971, which stated that

"the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory" (Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, 21 June 1971, para. 133) -

is too well known to merit anything more than this passing reference.

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

South Africa, in cynical disregard of those decisions, has proceeded to impose its policy of apartheid on Namibia, concurrently with its unconscionable policy of apartheid in its own territory. With ruthless repression, South Africa started the systematic exploitation of the labour and resources of Namibia. Ninety per cent of the black Namibians were dispossessed of their lands and forced to settle down in 11 separate homelands or bantustans; the remaining land became white areas - in effect, another province of South Africa. By its entrenched authority, Pretoria converted the dismembered Territory into a whites-only reservation to serve only the 10 per cent of the population that is white. The white area of the Territory has rich natural resources - diamonds and uranium in particular. It has the best commercially active agricultural and fishing sectors, which include Walvis Bay - Namibia's only deep-water port and chief commercial centre.

Recalling that period, one hails the liberation struggle which began in 1966 under the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), with the distinguished leadership of Herman Toivo. The Namibian people placed their trust and confidence in SWAPO as their sole and authentic representative. It has relentlessly carried on the struggle, exerting increasing pressure for Namibia's decolonization and accession to independence. Security Council resolution 385 (1976) affirmed the Namibian people's right to freedom and independence in a sovereign State.

Despite those resolutions and affirmations, the situation on the ground remains abhorrent and intolerable. The racist régime of Pretoria continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. Its occupation army continues to harass, repress and murder Namibians, in its attempt to throttle the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people, under SWAPO.

This unhappy situation could have been ended if South Africa had proceeded to co-operate honestly with the purpose of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), to which it had acceded. But it is a tragic irony that South Africa soon backed down,

(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

on the pretext of an extraneous factor - namely, the presence of Cuban troops in Angola - and thereby vitiated both the effect of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the flexibility and accommodation displayed by the South West Africa People's Organization.

A new dimension in political thinking was introduced by the abuse of the word "linkage" as a pre-condition to the independence of Namibia. By bringing in such extraneous considerations, South Africa was only deceiving itself into believing that the rest of the world would fail to recognize that Article 51 of the United Nations Charter gives authority to a Member States to choose its friends for its defence. South Africa, on the other hand, has no moral or legal imperatives on its side to justify the maintenance of its troops on Angolan territory, infringing the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. The least we could expect South Africa to do is to remove forthwith its forces from Angola and take full advantage of the flexibility and accommodation the South West Africa People's Organization is offering in order to bring about a cease-fire in Namibia.

The recent discussions in the Security Council, which resulted in another resolution - 601 (1987) - shows that even those who were otherwise inclined a decade ago are now under growing international pressure to hold South Africa to the obligation it committed itself to when it acceded to resolution 435 (1978). The unanimity of opinion expressed during that debate is evidence that today South Africa is becoming ostracized and isolated.

The Secretary-General has stated that all outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved. There is a clear statement from the representative of SWAPO of its agreement to sign and observe a cease-fire with South Africa. Let us hope that the Secretary-General and his good offices will prevail in arranging a cease-fire between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization, as a first step in the measures that are needed for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group.



(Mr. Wijewardane, Sri Lanka)

South Africa would only be delaying the independence of Namibia if it chose not to recognize the signal that has been given not only by the Security Council but by the gathering of Commonwealth Heads of Government at Vancouver in October this year, by the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare in 1986 and by the fourteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Namibia. South Africa should be under no illusion that it can bury its head in the sand imagining that the issue is caught up in the East-West confrontation. South Africa must realize that confrontational policies of the past are now rapidly giving way to the era of a world free from confrontation. Public opinion, enriched by debate and opinion-making, has caught up with the deceits and deceptions practised by South Africa. It must stop now and take cognizance of the wave of enlightened thinking that is now enveloping the world. It is now only a matter of time before the inexorable process of time and history lead to the demolition of the bastions of apartheid in both South Africa and Namibia and with them will disappear the racist proponents of that vicious theory who cannot see that "one man, one vote" is the political philosophy that brought independence and freedom to colonial territories during the second half of the twentieth century.

Several speakers before me have alluded to the contribution they are making to the cause of the Namibian people and I thought that before I concluded my statement, I should refer to the continuing co-operation, particularly in the educational sphere, which my country, constrained as it is, is offering the people of Namibia to equip them for the role they are destined to play in a free and independent Namibia.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.