



General Assembly

PROVIS IONAL

A/43/PV.48  
17 November 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVIS IONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 14 November 1988, at 3 p.m.

<p><u>President:</u> later: later: later:</p>	<p>Mr. CAFUTO Mr. TREIKI (Vice-President) Mr. CAFUTO Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vice-President)</p>	<p>(Argentina) (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (Argentina) (Vanuatu)</p>
---	--	---

- Question of Namibia [29] (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

- Adoption of the agenda and organization of work: letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences [8] (continued)

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

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 29 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/43/24)
- (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/43/23 (Part V), A/AC.109/960)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/724)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/43/780)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/24 (Part II), chapter I)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision taken at this morning's plenary meeting, the list of speakers in the debate on this item will be closed tomorrow at noon. I would therefore stress that those representatives wishing to speak be so kind as to inscribe their names on the list as early as possible.

The first speaker this afternoon is the Acting Chairman 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, on whom I now call.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) Acting Chairman 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 (Special Committee of 24) (interpretation from Spanish): As the Assembly once again turns its attention to the question of Namibia, it is profoundly disquieting that, despite the Organization's concerted efforts over the past four decades, the accession to independence of Namibia continues to be obstructed owing to the defiant attitude of the minority régime of South Africa.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Ten years ago, when the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, accepted by both South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the world community believed that an independent Namibia was at last in sight.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

Yet the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa continues, in blatant violation of international law, while the Namibian people continue to be denied their inherent right to self-determination and independence. The United Nations plan is at a standstill, unimplemented, while the racist régime continues to mount acts of repression within Namibia and to perpetrate acts of aggression against neighbouring States, thus seriously threatening international peace and security.

As outlined by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee, my learned colleague and friend Mr. Ahmad Farouk Arnouss of the Syrian Arab Republic, the Special Committee of 24, within the context of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, has undertaken during this year a serious and vigorous review of the situation in Namibia and, in a consensus decision adopted in August, firmly reiterated that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. Indeed, as is firmly reiterated in the United Nations plan, immediate implementation of the plan is in order, without pre-condition or modification.

As the Special Committee has once again recommended, the imposition forthwith by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the South African régime represents an integral part of the strategy for a peaceful transition in southern Africa. Sustained pressure must therefore be brought to bear upon the South African Government until the people of Namibia have been given the opportunity freely to decide on their future status and until apartheid has been eradicated from Namibia and South Africa.

At this crucial stage of developments there is a pressing need for providing increased and effective support to the struggling people of Namibia and their sole

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

and authentic national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). While several agencies and organizations of the United Nations system have, albeit in varying degrees, continued to extend assistance to them, the level of assistance rendered to date is far from adequate. The international community has a particular responsibility to ensure that, through the Nationhood Programme and the Institute for Namibia, all possible steps are taken to offer maximum training opportunities for the people in preparing themselves for the establishment soon of an independent, sovereign Namibia.

I wish to express my sincere hope that the appeals addressed in this connection to all Member States, the specialized agencies and other organizations, both within and outside the United Nations, will be responded to positively and generously in order to meet the ever-increasing requirements of the Namibian people.

Recent developments relating to the region, if anything, suggest that due in large measure to the combined efforts of the liberation movements and the front-line States the beginning may at last be in sight of the ultimate collapse of the folly of the racist régime, succumbing to the irresistible and irreversible forces of liberation and of history.

It is hoped that the efforts being made in recent years in particular to secure an internationally acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia, as endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), will at long last lead to the ending of bloodshed in the region and the achievement by the Namibian people of their freedom and nationhood.

Although we are cognizant of the existing probability of a successful outcome of those efforts, our optimism is tempered by the dangers inherent in dealing with a régime that has for so long succeeded by deceit, cunning and ruthlessness in

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

maintaining its rule over Namibia. That doubts still remain as to the sincerity of the régime's present intentions is therefore to be expected. As concerned members of the international community we must of necessity remain alert to changing situations and be ready to take urgent action or to propose constructive initiatives. It is equally essential that all relevant organs of the United Nations be kept abreast of crucial developments affecting the ultimate fate of Namibia, so that they may enhance their collective endeavours towards the attainment of their common objective.

It is all the more crucial that at this critical stage of the liberation struggle the international community resolve, once and for all, to discharge the sacred trust it assumed on behalf of the people of Namibia by taking all appropriate measures to compel South Africa to comply with the decisions of the Security Council. We must continue to manifest our solidarity with the people of Namibia, not only through moral and political support but also by contributing generously to the various programmes of assistance which the United Nations has launched on their behalf.

For its part, the Special Committee stands ready to take whatever action is necessary to facilitate the speediest possible restoration to the people of Namibia of their inherent inalienable rights.

The people of Namibia have suffered for more than a century under colonial occupation. On behalf of the Special Committee of 24, I should like to assure them that they are not alone in their struggle, for their cause is the very same as the goals of this Organization: peace, justice and freedom for all.

In conclusion, I should like on behalf of the Special Committee to pay a particular tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the important work

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Acting Chairman,  
Special Committee of 24)

it has continued to carry out so effectively under the leadership of its distinguished President, Ambassador Zuze of Zambia. The role of the Council, as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until it achieves independence, cannot be overemphasized. At the present stage of the struggle of the Namibian people it is essential that the Council be given the maximum co-operation possible by all Member States so that it may continue to discharge its responsibilities with greater effectiveness.

I am confident that, under your leadership and guidance, Mr. President, and with your skill and diplomacy, the work of the Assembly at this session will make a further positive contribution towards ending the situation prevailing in Namibia.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the Observer for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152, of 20 December 1976.

Mr. ANGULA (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): Let me take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, upon your well-deserved election to preside over the forty-third session of the General Assembly. Your great country, Argentina, is very supportive of the Namibian cause and has in recent years taken important steps against apartheid South Africa, including the severance of diplomatic relations with that régime. The close geographic proximity of our two countries offers good potential for future co-operation.

Your predecessor, Mr. Peter Florin, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, presided over the work of the forty-second session of the General Assembly with admirable distinction. I take this opportunity to salute him for a job well done.

I also wish to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his courageous and untiring efforts in pursuit of freedom, justice and peace across our globe. His unshakeable commitment to the common good of mankind has earned him great admiration. I should be failing to mark a historic moment if I failed to refer to the great potentialities existing today for the resolution of conflicts and making our planet safer from a nuclear apocalypse.

Thanks to the Secretary-General's strong faith in the United Nations, hard work and sacrifice, we are at this historic moment witnessing a revitalization of our Organization. Even those who in the not-too-distant past wanted to wish it away now realize the central role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security.



(Mr. Angula, SWAFO)

Certainly the easing of tension between the Soviet Union and the United States of America and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty - eliminating a whole class of nuclear weapons are commendable steps in the right direction towards complete world disarmament.

Naturally, southern Africa, specifically the current efforts to resolve the conflict in South West Africa, was referred to during the general debate by various eminent persons. I will return to this subject in detail at a later stage.

Now I should like to put things into proper perspective. Once again the General Assembly is seized of the question of Namibia. To some, this may have become but a routine exercise. The uncaring ones who, even before looking at the content of the subject, lament the inopportuneness of the debate, the length of the documents, the expenditure, the so-called name-calling and other such diversionary manoeuvres would probably be happy if the question of Namibia were removed from the agenda of the United Nations without necessarily the resolution of the problem. We owe our warm appreciation to those who, as a matter of principle, have rejected this cynicism and continue to support our just struggle for self-determination and national independence.

To us, the Namibian people, appearing before this body over the past decades has been an experience of both pain and hope; pain because with the passing of every year, every month, every week and every day more and more Namibian men, women and children are murdered in cold blood, maimed, arrested, imprisoned, detained and tortured by the army, police and murder squads of the apartheid régime. More of their property is destroyed by those terrorist bands and more of their natural resources, be it diamonds, copper or uranium, are plundered by the unscrupulous and greedy Western transnational corporations operating in our country, which ignore

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

the plight of poor, hungry and homeless Namibians while repatriating the fabulous profits accrued.

This eminent world body is the right forum in which to expose such gross denial and violations of the fundamental rights of our people, for it was this body which, over two decades ago, in a historic decision, terminated racist South Africa's Mandate over our country. Similarly, the decisions by other international bodies, including the highest organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations Security Council, as well as the International Court of Justice, served to assure the Namibian people that they were in good hands. But today we look back with anger and frustration upon two wasted decades of continued manoeuvring, delaying tactics and outright arrogance on the part of the illegal occupation régime, while the United Nations seems to be powerless to put its own decisions into effect, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Nevertheless our people have come to appreciate the role and importance of the United Nations. There was a time in history when our hope was close to sheer naïveté, when we thought the United Nations would come marching to liberate us. Those days are now past, for we have come to appreciate that, unfortunately, the same Organization that holds promise for the oppressed and exploited is hamstrung by those who befriend the racist colonial rulers in Pretoria and are bent on supporting that régime for their own selfish and shortsighted ends. Understanding this internal contradiction does not in any way dissuade us from our faith in the United Nations. It is for this reason that we are convinced that, if the Governments of those so-called democracies refuse to see the light, the people must of necessity make their voices heard. Herein lies our hope, for the voices of reason are becoming more audible every day.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

There is no doubt that there are those represented here who wish the Namibian people well and who will call for patience at this time of delicate negotiations. I would just like to remind them that 10 years is a long time for which to demonstrate patience.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

We are heartened by the Secretary-General's untiring efforts in seeking the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in its final and definitive form. We congratulate him on his patience. SWAPO, for its part, has always maintained close co-operation and regular consultations with him and his staff in this regard.

Our own history and experiences elsewhere have taught us that we are indeed our own liberators and, in this context, whatever the international community does is complementary to our own struggle. In the tradition of those who came before us, our vanguard movement, SWAPO, has continued to build on the victories achieved on the political and military fronts against the racist régime. In other words SWAPO has continued to play the vanguard role in leading the Namibian people at home and abroad in the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation. We have succeeded in uniting the masses of our people - the workers, the peasants, the women, the youth and the students - around that common objective. In keeping with our policy of reaching out to all Namibian patriots, without regard to their creed or colour, SWAPO has in the past years and months witnessed an ever-growing number of white Namibians joining its ranks at a time when the political and military situation in Namibia has made it extremely difficult for any self-respecting person still to believe Pretoria's cheap propaganda and disinformation campaign. The intensification of the armed liberation struggle by the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, combined with the ever-increasing mass action by our people, particularly the workers, youth and students, has led to the current turning-point in the history of our struggle, which is irreversible. We are more than ever before confident that victory is in sight.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

Let me now turn to the ongoing quadripartite talks involving Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States. SWAPO has already expressed itself at length on the subject. It is our view that if there is goodwill, a real possibility exists of resolving the conflict in south-western Africa by bringing about the long-delayed independence of Namibia on the basis of United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and guaranteeing security for the People's Republic of Angola. In this context, we fully support the Angolan/Cuban constructive proposals that led to the agreement reached in Geneva in July.

Pursuant to that agreement, and in an effort to make a positive contribution to this welcome process, the President of SWAPO, Comrade Sam Nujoma, wrote a letter to the United Nations Secretary-General on 12 August in which our position was made clear. We undertook to observe the agreed cease-fire on the Angolan side and to suspend offensive military action inside Namibia provided we were not provoked by the Pretoria army of occupation. This position still stands. In addition, SWAPO restated its willingness to sign a cease-fire with South Africa in order to start the process of implementing United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Needless to say, racist South Africa has to date not responded to our offer.

However, it must be understood that cease-fire is not an end in itself. The Pretoria régime is notorious for its bad faith, arrogance and defiance. We have still to be convinced that Pretoria is serious this time. We are reminded of missed deadlines in the past, from the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia to the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence. We recall that on 4 October 1969 Pretoria was ordered by the Security Council to leave Namibia. We are equally reminded of the period immediately after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), particularly after racist South Africa supposedly accepted the resolution. Then came the Geneva pre-implementation conference in

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

January 1981. Need I remind the Assembly of the talks in New York in 1982 when we were promised that the only remaining outstanding issue before the implementation of the decolonization plan was the choice by Pretoria of the electoral system? Three years later, in May 1984, we went to Lusaka for yet another conference. On all these occasions, of which I have mentioned only the recent ones, the people of Namibia and the international community were treated with the characteristic racist Boer mentality of deceptiveness, arrogance, and blatant refusal to co-operate. The uncouth behaviour of the apartheid régime was best characterized by the eminent international figure and Indian leader, Jawaharlal Nehru - whose birth centenary commemoration coincides with the opening of this debate - when he stated:

"The capacity of the Government of the Union of South Africa to persist in error is really quite remarkable, but I take it that if a country, as an individual, persists long enough in error, retribution comes."

I have recalled these facts to show that the fixing of dates alone does not in itself constitute willingness to act on the part of racist South Africa. Racist South Africa cannot cynically use the world body to determine the deadline as to when and how it will exit from Namibia. Pretoria very conveniently provides changing deadlines to suit its diabolic intentions.

On this basis, we believe, so far as we are willing to be optimistic, that the Pretoria régime has still to show tangible signs of willingness to leave Namibia. As it is now, the situation on the ground in Namibia does not indicate in any way that the illegal occupation régime is ready to withdraw its colonial machinery. On the contrary, while Pretoria has been talking peace, it has simultaneously increased its repressive machinery in the country. In the recent months and weeks, apartheid South Africa's militarization of Namibia has reached dangerous

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

proportions. The régime has poured into Namibia more of its occupation troops and war matériel on an unprecedented scale. The troops which were already in Namibia have been reinforced by thousands of others from the apartheid Republic and those recently withdrawn from Angola. This unprecedented military build-up is particularly worse in the northern part of Namibia, where the régime now has 50,000 troops along the Namibian/Angolan borders. This fact has been confirmed by some Western journalists. During the same period racist South Africa conducted provocative military manoeuvres at the Namibian port of Walvis Bay. The régime has been expanding its military bases in the same area.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

Above all, the illegal occupation régime's army, murder squads and police have increased their brutal campaign of repression and terrorism against our people. The cold-blooded murder of innocent civilians, including old people and children, has become a daily reality in our country. People are shot at will; their property is destroyed or looted by Pretoria's troops and other armed agents. Many more of our people are imprisoned, detained without trial and tortured. The racist army is also currently conducting a campaign of intimidating members and supporters of our movement at gun point, with the aim of imposing the régime's rejected puppets on the Namibian people.

Given the deterioration of the security situation inside Namibia, as we witnessed in the mid-seventies, thousands of Namibians, mainly young children, are escaping the Gestapo-like repression at home and going into exile. SWAPO has been receiving daily hundreds of these young Namibians in its centres in Angola for care.

It is on the basis of that sad reality that we urge the international community to remain vigilant lest it be hoodwinked again by the racist Boers. To be sure, Pretoria is not negotiating because of a change of heart. On the contrary, the apartheid régime is compelled to talk because of the humiliating defeat it suffered at the hands of the Angolan-Cuban forces following its ill-fated large-scale invasion of Angola at the end of last year. Available information indicates staggering figures in military expenditures, estimated to be about 1 billion Rand a month - that is, approximately \$500 million. Combined with the intensification of the struggle in Namibia and South Africa and the measures taken by the international community to isolate Pretoria, this has made the régime pay a higher price for its policies of aggression. As we suspected, the apartheid



(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

régime has been looking for a breathing space. It is now busy with manoeuvres and delaying tactics. From both Pretoria and Washington we see attempts to have Pretoria thanked for being forced to accept the fact of having to agree to the safe withdrawal of its troops which were trapped in Angola. What is more, apparently they would also like Pretoria to be showered with praises for its years of violation of Angola's territorial integrity and sovereignty and its killing of so many Angolan people as well as its massive destruction of economic and social infrastructures in that country. Using their compliant media, both South Africa and the United States are accusing the victims of being intransigent; therefore, according to that logic, the victims should be held responsible for the missed target date.

We have not forgotten that it was the United States Administration that invented the linkage, to the joy of Pretoria, eight years ago. For that reason we still find it difficult to accept Washington's playing the role of an honest broker while its sole concern is the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola. Meanwhile the United States still provides military and other forms of support to the UNITA bandits in a campaign to destabilize Angola. It is therefore not surprising that we see more and more linkages being manufactured - the latest being the so-called internal reconciliation in Angola before independence for Namibia can even be considered.

The only way to counter-poise such manoeuvres is to remain true to the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978). We specifically call upon the United Nations to push for the unconditional implementation of that resolution. It has now been proved over and over again that the only language Pretoria understands is that of force. We urge the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

Of late we have been hearing an old song once again - the so-called United Nations bias in favour of SWAPO. To our best knowledge, and without giving the racist rulers in Pretoria undue credit, the Secretary-General was assured that the apartheid régime was satisfied on the question of so-called impartiality. But apparently this issue is being raised again and again. If this were merely coming from Pretoria, we would say we were not surprised, but since there is more to it we should like to state here, loud and clear, that the United Nations has shouldered direct responsibility for Namibia until genuine independence is achieved. That is the letter and spirit of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966. That historic decision has been reaffirmed in subsequent decisions of both the Assembly and the Security Council. Suggestions that, somehow, in order for the United Nations to show its impartiality it should relinquish its responsibility to the Namibian people before genuine independence are, to say the least, tantamount to the betrayal of the sacred trust and of our people's right to self-determination and national independence. Moreover, it is absurd to observe the illegal Pretoria régime demanding United Nations impartiality in administering the electoral process when it denies human rights to the vast majority of the population within its own territory.

In all seriousness, we strongly suggest that it is high time that Pretoria's years of destruction in Namibia and its capabilities of manipulating all the efforts to implement resolution 435 (1978) before, during and after that implementation are clearly understood. We are on record as having undertaken to accept the verdict of the elections, so long as they are free and fair. We are talking here about an illegal occupation régime that has had its own colonial machinery in operation in our country for so many years. The régime has spent billions of dollars in creating its repressive institutions. By this we mean that

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

apart from its standing army, the so-called South African Defence Force, which will pull out of Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), the régime has created so many armies, para-military forces and so-called police forces, such as the so-called South-West Africa Territorial Force, the notorious Koevoet, the so-called South-West Africa Police Force, and the other mercenary forces. All of these together comprise thousands of armed thugs under the command of and on the payroll of the illegal régime. What assurances do we have that even if they are disbanded they will not remain on the loose, to disrupt the process? In addition, Pretoria has created bogus political institutions, such as the so-called interim government, which is totally maintained by the apartheid régime in all respects. It should be kept in mind that all these bogus institutions were created in violation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) and other United Nations resolutions. Given that serious situation, we would expect the United Nations to address itself to these and other questions of great concern to us and the international community in general.

We should like to stress that those who think the so-called impartiality relates only to SWAPO need to rethink their position, because this pre-supposes either bad faith or lack of serious appreciation of the situation. It is common knowledge that SWAPO has given an undertaking to participate on an equal footing with any political groups in Namibia when free, democratic and fair elections are held in our country under the supervision and control of the United Nations on the basis of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

To raise the so-called partiality issue, even before the signing of the enabling resolution by the Security Council, is dishonest and treacherous and is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

We call upon the United Nations Council for Namibia to remain true to its mission as a fighting body until such time as it has fulfilled its mandate and the flag of independence is hoisted in the Namibian capital. At this critical juncture of the Namibian struggle we cannot afford to have self-doubts and uncertainty about the work of the Council. Its mandate must remain as stipulated in General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967 until Namibia achieves independence.

Under the dynamic leadership of its President, Ambassador Zuze - whose important statement earlier was indeed reassuring - we call upon the Council to continue to mobilize international public opinion in support of our just cause and to carry out its programmes of support for the Namibian people. We call upon the General Assembly and the international community fully to support the report of the Council, particularly its recommendations for action during the coming year.

Similarly, I should like to commend the work of the decolonization Committee described in its report now before the Assembly. The Special Committee will remain a vital body for as long as there are countries and peoples under colonial rule and foreign domination.

In our long and bitter struggle for national liberation we have always relied on the support of the international community. The role played by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which SWAPO is a full member, remains a key factor in keeping the question of Namibia to the forefront.

We have enjoyed all-round and long-standing support from the socialist countries. This has been indispensable to our cause, and SWAPO and the embattled people of Namibia will always remember it. SWAPO's steadfastness and perseverance

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

have earned sympathy and admiration from all peoples of good will. Our relations with the Nordic countries deserve a special mention. We are very grateful for the humanitarian assistance given by those countries to our displaced and exiled people.

As a fighting African people, we have naturally relied on the crucial support of our continental body, the Organization of African Unity, and its member States, whose charter calls for the total abolition of colonialism, racism and imperialism from the face of the African continent.

Turning to our region, southern Africa, as has often been stated apartheid is the root cause of instability in southern Africa. The front-line States, particularly Angola and Mozambique, have suffered from direct military aggression by racist South Africa or, indirectly, through its surrogate forces, UNITA and MNR. We thank the fraternal peoples of the front-line States for their steadfast support.

At this juncture I should like to single out the People's Republic of Angola, which has just commemorated the thirteenth anniversary of its independence. In his congratulatory message to the Angolan President, Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos, the SWAPO leader, Comrade Sam Nujoma, said:

"Since its independence Angola has become a bastion of anti-colonial struggle which has greatly encouraged the people of Namibia and South Africa in their fight against the apartheid régime. We have great admiration for the Angolan Government and people and their armed forces, FAPLA, which have heroically defended their independence and sovereignty from imperialist aggression, and which despite the enormous human and material losses suffered as a result have remained firm and resolute in supporting our cause. We salute them in their commitment to socialism, justice, peace and social progress."

On behalf of our vanguard movement, SWAPO, I should like to reaffirm our

(Mr. Angula, SWAPO)

fraternal and militant solidarity with those who are engaged in similar fights: the heroic people of South Africa, led by the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), in their struggle for a united, democratic and non-racial society in that sister country; the people of Palestine which, under the able leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), is courageously fighting the Israeli occupation and working towards the establishment of an independent Palestine; the fighting people of Western Sahara, led by the POLISARIO Front; the peoples of Puerto Rico and New Caledonia; and all other peoples fighting colonialism, racism, oppression, exploitation and all the other evil forces threatening mankind.

In conclusion, we should like to declare that we will march on to victory no matter what it entails. Should Pretoria at last show goodwill, SWAPO will not be found wanting in playing its part in achieving Namibia's independence through the ballot. However, in the event of that régime's continued intransigence, we shall call upon our people to rise to the occasion and to shoulder their national duty for the total liberation of every inch of Namibian soil, including Walvis Bay and all the offshore islands. The struggle continues; victory is certain.\*

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Today the world is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the great Indian leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, who through his steadfast policy left an imprint on contemporary history and joined the ranks of the noble leaders of his day. India is not the only country to be proud of him, for he has become a legitimate source of pride for all other developing countries. Nehru was a staunch friend of Egypt and its people; he took a sympathetic view of its problems and always supported its rights in the political arena. Egypt will always be grateful to him for his support for our liberation struggle.

---

\* Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Nehru, with his contemporaries Tito and Nasser, was one of the pioneers who laid the groundwork for the positive policy of neutrality and one of the founders of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which resulted from the convergence of the purposes and principles of the newly independent States of Africa and Asia. Because of his farsightedness, Nehru was a precursor of and responsible for the awakening of the world conscience to the tragedy of racial discrimination in South Africa, which is the very negation of the dignity of man and his inalienable rights. With his characteristic prescience, he awakened the conscience of the international community to the need to resist that loathsome phenomenon so as to prevent its taking on the dimensions of a catastrophe the effects of which the international community would be unable to escape.

The General Assembly today must come to grips with a problem that was born at the same time as the Organization itself and that has preoccupied it since its first session. For more than 40 years the General Assembly has adopted resolution after resolution on this subject, as has the Security Council. But, above all, since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), in 1966, terminating South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, it has had direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory until independence.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), accepted by all the parties concerned, was the culmination of the efforts of the international Organization to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem which would restore to their legitimate owners the rights of which they have been deprived and contribute to the establishment of peace and security in an important region of the African continent. The international community welcomed that resolution and has declared it to be the only internationally accepted means of enabling the Namibian people

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

to exercise self-determination, regain their independence and take control of their territory, its natural resources and its economy.

Although the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been impeded for a long time, we feel that the serious quadripartite talks now under way and the intensive diplomatic efforts, which have made significant progress in the last few months, give grounds for hoping that implementation will begin at an early date.

Egypt has supported these sincere efforts from the outset and has played a major role in encouraging the attainment of independence by Namibia and the establishment of peace and security in southern Africa. That is why we welcomed the willingness of the interlocutors to come to Cairo for the first round of the talks. That is not surprising because, from the moment that Cairo played host to that meeting and Cairo was chosen as the site of the first foreign office of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Egypt has always supported, materially and politically, independence and freedom for Namibia. Thus this is the culmination of a long effort.

We feel that Namibian independence would be a giant step forward, not only towards peace and security but also in bringing justice and equality to the region, and to other regions, including the region from which I come. Independence for Namibia would bring to an end an illegal occupation repeatedly denounced by the international community - a positive outcome that would restore to the Namibian people the right, of which they have been deprived, of national sovereignty over the resources and economy of Namibia, while putting an end to a vile chapter of history during which the natural resources of that country have been plundered.



(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Independence for Namibia would also mean the end of the acts of aggression launched against the neighbouring countries from Namibian territory, of pressure and of blackmail, and would make it possible for the Namibian people to devote all their efforts to reconstruction and national development, thus ridding themselves of the vicissitudes of the past. But, above all, Namibian independence would demonstrate the pre-eminence and triumph of legality, no matter how great the acts of aggression and the injustice.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in southern Africa for their sustained and sincere efforts and their firm determination to carry out the wishes of the international community. We wish them complete success in that historic task.

In conclusion, I wish especially to thank SWAPO, which has given proof of its political and military effectiveness, and the United Nations Council for Namibia, which will continue to carry out its task until Namibia accedes to independence.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community and to reaffirm our full support for the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

Over the years the policy of the Twelve has been clear, consistent and unequivocal. We remain firmly committed to Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and reaffirmed by subsequent resolutions. This plan embodies the only internationally agreed framework for ensuring Namibia's independence and its people's authentic expression of its will through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The Twelve, in rejecting the establishment of a so-called transitional government in Namibia, have repeatedly

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

called for the implementation of the settlement plan without further delay or pre-conditions. In this respect, we believe that the role of the Secretary-General will continue to be of great importance and we wish to reiterate our whole-hearted support for his resolute action with a view to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

The Twelve express their satisfaction with the ongoing negotiations among Angola, Cuba and South Africa, mediated by the United States. We strongly support the endeavours to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in the area and to secure Namibia's early independence in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We welcome the progress achieved so far. We regret that the date set by the parties involved for an eventual beginning of the implementation of the settlement plan, 1 November, was not met. Nevertheless, we reiterate our wish that the momentum of the negotiations not be lost and that the transition period under United Nations control leading to Namibia's total independence will at last start in the very near future.

As the Secretary-General has put it, Namibia's independence is long overdue. The question of Namibia has been before the United Nations virtually since its inception; a decade has passed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and still the people of Namibia have not exercised their right to self-determination. The Twelve share the frustration felt by the international community and its anxiety for the early and full independence of Namibia.

The process leading to that independence is the responsibility of the United Nations - and in particular of the Security Council and the Secretary-General. However, the question of Namibia constitutes a moral responsibility of the international community as well. For their part, the Twelve wish to recall their established position on Namibia's independence and their previous statements deploring specific policies and acts of the Government of South Africa in this regard.

The Twelve have substantially contributed to efforts to alleviate the suffering of the Namibian people caused by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. The European Community and its member States have provided the people of Namibia with assistance in various fields. On the one hand, educational

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

training and professional secondment aid has ensured an improvement of the standards of living of the population. On the other, humanitarian aid and self-help projects in favour of Namibian refugees and support for the victims of apartheid there have helped to ease to a certain extent the negative impact of the draconian policies exercised by South Africa, such as human rights violations, illegal detentions without trial and forced conscription of the people. We reiterate our readiness to continue and, if necessary, to expand our aid to the Namibian people with a view to securing a smooth transition to independence.

Furthermore, solid economic infrastructure is a prerequisite to full political independence, security and stable and lasting socio-economic development. Genuine Namibian independence can only be assured through continuing assistance, particularly in the early period of freedom. Once again the European Community and its member States reaffirm their intention to assist Namibia to that end as soon as it becomes independent. In the light of the above, we are looking forward to receiving from a sovereign Namibia an application for association with the Group of African, Caribbean and Pacific States and accession to the Lomé Convention.

On the question of Namibia, our attention should remain focused on the fact that it is a question of illegal occupation in defiance of repeated resolutions of the United Nations. No excuse can justify prolongation of this situation, which constitutes a breach of fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter. The international community must spare no effort to secure Namibia's independence. We urge the Government of South Africa to comply forthwith with its obligations and to help turn into reality the spirit of determination demonstrated over the last month and thus bring about a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. We are convinced that an early and just solution to this problem will have positive repercussions for peace, stability, further settlements and co-operation in the region.

Mr. KAHN (India): It is a particular honour for my delegation to participate in the debate on the question of Namibia on the day that the centennial commemoration of the birth of the first Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, begins. In his eyes, the United Nations was a vital institution. As he said in the very first of his regular letters to the Chief Ministers of India's states, with the clarity and candour that was so much a quality of his style, "we were dependent for many things on international good will." Newly free India was fortunate to receive this good will in abundant measure and it was in this spirit that we, among many others in this world body, were determined that good will should reach peoples everywhere. No matter what their political condition or the abridged state of their freedom, the United Nations and the world would be with them, with solidarity in their struggle and determination to diminish their despair.

We need no statistics to tell us how effective the translation of this international good will into tangible international commitments proved to a largely dependent world. Its proof, if proof is needed, is in this Hall itself. And so is the proof of where that translation seems to have been less than successful. Who dare question the goodness of our will towards Namibia? Who dare suggest that our commitment to the dignity of man is less hallowed than hollow? Whom shall we blame for not allowing a country with internationally acknowledged existence to take its place between the seats reserved for Mozambique and Nepal?

The past year has been full of those deliciously ephemeral moments of tantalizing torment and withered hopes we are so desperate to believe are still green. South Africa's proposals on Namibia have acquired a new stridency, a new assurance, to many a new legitimacy. Like Hamlets trapped on the stage set for "A Midsummer Night's Dream", we wait in the wings unsure what part we are expected to play. Those with memories a little longer than today's headlines may well feel

(Mr. Kahn, India)

they have been here before.

With a sense of political decision and statesmanship, Angola and Cuba have joined in negotiations whose success could allow the Namibian people to spend at least a fraction of the twentieth century in freedom and sovereignty. But the great practitioners of Rugby along the Cape of Good Hope should know, at least by now, that you cannot play a game if you keep changing or hiding the goal post. There is more truth than resignation to the reply to the question "Who is more insincere, Pik or P.W.?" The answer, "Both are."

(Mr. Kahn, India)

My delegation is glad, and proud, that we have not allowed the lure or temptation of tinsel promises to hold us hostage in the proposals submitted to this Assembly on the question of Namibia. South Africa must be judged not on our hopes but on our experience. Its culpability on counts without number is proved. Its impunity has proved to be directly in proportion to the benevolence of its well-wishers abroad. Sanctions against South Africa will be a sanction for peace. Sanctions against South Africa will be a sanction for human rights. Sanctions against South Africa will be a sanction for the capacity of the United Nations to approximate with action the wealth and wisdom of its words.

In this threshold hour, poised between the certain past and the uncertain future, our thoughts are with the Namibian people, whose representatives we are honoured to have with us in this Assembly: the South West Africa People's Organization. "Not law, nor duty bade them fight; not public men and cheering crowds". We salute them for having begun a struggle that was, as all great struggles are, at first lonely; which gathered, as all great struggles do, not only the tumultuous enthusiasm of its people but also the support and resolve of the world beyond.

In his broadcast to the people of India after the formation of the pre-independence interim Government, Jawaharlal Nehru said,

"The world, in spite of its rivalries and hatreds and inner conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer co-operation and the building up of a world commonwealth. It is for this one world that free India will work, a world in which there is the free co-operation of free peoples and no class or group exploits another."

At this forty-third session of the General Assembly, when so much once thought intractable has proved capable of traction, will the question of Namibia finally be excised from our agenda? The question is perhaps unfair, put to this Assembly, for

(Mr. Kahn, India)

the single party that can give us that assurance has deservedly been excluded from our deliberations. But its postures, its prevarications, its procrastinations and pre-emptions of action give us all the answer we need.

Considerable, indeed, have been the effort and the time spent on this question - 20 years; to some, like Eliot's phrase, 20 years largely wasted. Certainly, against the yardstick of freedom the years have been squandered, but within the limitation of our means we have proved ourselves. The United Nations and the United Nations Council for Namibia have not allowed the continued compulsion of their trusteeship to weaken or dilute their focus. Under the wise and able stewardship of Ambassador Peter Zuze, the United Nations Council for Namibia has continued its record of awareness enhancement, research and assistance in regard to Namibia. To the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Bernt Carlsson, and his staff are also due our appreciation for the diligence and dedication in which so awesome a political responsibility has been fulfilled in harmony with this Assembly's mandate.

In his recent novel "The Shadow Lines", the Indian author Amitav Ghosh wrote of "the indivisible sanity that binds people together independently of Governments". That perception's truth is compelling, palpably tangible, in South Africa where the ordinary civilized person can and does relate with compassion, affection and kindness to those who are his kin. That is the lesson Pretoria has yet to learn. That is the lesson it cannot afford to learn if it wishes to survive in its present primeval form. That is the lesson, once learned, that will prove that clinging to the body cannot assure control of the mind or possession of the heart.

We cannot teach lessons to those who will not learn. We can only leave them to the enforced solitude of their ways, bereft of the faintest contact with the world they need so much more desperately than the world needs them. But we cannot



(Mr. Kahn, India)

afford to wait much longer. The evening of our indecision is growing dark and chill. Our anger and our sorrow will no longer have the power to console.

Many years ago an Indian lyricist, Talat Mehmood, sang of "the night that had itself fallen asleep and the life that had lost itself in the face of sadness".

If we think about it, there is a moral there somewhere for us today.

Mr. SUTRESNA (Indonesia): The General Assembly has taken up the question of Namibia at a time when the situation inside the Territory and in the surrounding area is characterized by a sense of heightened expectation simultaneously tempered by uncertainty and doubt, for the bitter history of the region requires a degree of scepticism that South Africa has finally decided to let go its grip on Namibia.

In this regard it is instructive to recall the many lost opportunities and unmet deadlines in the past. The original date set by the United Nations for Namibia's independence was two decades ago, in June 1968. Significantly, this year is also the tenth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, the only internationally acceptable framework for the peaceful decolonization of Namibia. Since then the United Nations has repeatedly established time-frames for the implementation of the plan, but to no avail. Thus in 1981 the Pretoria régime scuttled the Geneva pre-implementation talks on Namibia. In 1983 it introduced preconditions that were, a priori, designed to prevent implementation of the United Nations plan. In 1984 it sabotaged the two meetings on Namibia held in Lusaka and Mindelo. In 1985 it sought to subvert the United Nations plan by attempting to impose a so-called internal settlement on Namibia.

I need hardly go on with the endless list of dilatory manoeuvres, duplicity and delay that have always been South Africa's tactics, as they are all too well

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

known to all of us. Suffice it to say that at every stage of the negotiations South Africa initially accepted arrangements for the orderly transfer of power to the Namibian people under United Nations auspices, only subsequently to raise objections and introduce elements that conformed neither to the spirit nor the letter of resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

In fact, South Africa has proved to be unmatched at negotiating away from seeming agreements by resort to prevarication and subterfuge.

This established pattern of hypocrisy and betrayal should also be viewed in the context of South Africa's unceasing efforts to entrench itself further in Namibia. In this connection I should like to emphasize particularly Indonesia's grave concern over the total militarization of the Territory, which has been transformed into a huge military base with one heavily armed South African soldier for every 12 Namibians, including women and children. Furthermore, Pretoria has continued to step up the ruthless exploitation of Namibia's human and natural resources, aided and abetted by the morally repugnant investments of South Africa's major trading partners, in total disregard of the Council for Namibia's Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Furthermore, there has been no cessation of attempts at internal social and political fragmentation through the creation of pseudo-political parties and a so-called interim government, in order to impose a fait accompli. The people of Namibia are also subjected to all of the demeaning and degrading policies and practices of apartheid. Thus there has been no let-up in the full array of repressive measures intended to bludgeon the Namibians into submission.

It is against these stark realities that Indonesia has followed the quadripartite talks to establish a basis for peace in the south western region of Africa and to ensure Namibia's independence. Regrettably, the indications are that South Africa has already begun posturing, pulling back from its commitments and sending deliberate and confusing signals. As representatives are undoubtedly aware, the deadline for commencing the implementation of the United Nations plan, 1 November 1988, has passed, with South Africa now allegedly proposing 1 January 1989 as a possible alternative date, and its insistence on linking

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

extraneous issues to Namibia's independence remains unchanged. Such a situation cannot but instil in us a sense of déjà vu, that indeed we have been here before. Indonesia is therefore constrained to express its foreboding that South Africa may again be engaged in a sinister diplomatic game to gain time for itself and ultimately to scuttle the whole process.

None the less we believe that the ongoing discussions in Geneva may in the end be successful, for they have already resulted in the withdrawal of South Africa's troops from southern Angola and have brought about the general cessation of armed hostilities in Namibia as well. These developments are in themselves significant, as they enhance the prospect of a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. It is to be emphasized that, inter alia, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the front-line States, the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement have welcomed these talks in the hope that peace, justice and independence can be established in the subregion. The fact of the matter is that, in contrast to South Africa's intransigence, SWAPO and the front-line States have always responded in a constructive manner to diplomatic initiatives and have co-operated fully with the United Nations in the search for ways and means to commence the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In this connection also, my delegation fully recognizes the right of the individual parties engaged in the negotiations to end the conflict between them, namely, the termination of the occupation by South African military forces of southern Angola, and it is precisely the four parties involved - Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States as the mediator - that are the principals in that conflict. Indonesia is also aware that the preservation and consolidation of the sovereignty, independence and security of the front-line States are part and parcel of the liberation struggle of Namibia. We are equally convinced that the

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

solidarity and effective support of those States constitute a decisive factor for success in that struggle. It is our hope that the new opportunities thus created will contribute to the search for a permanent solution to the grave situation prevailing in south-western Africa and be made to serve the immediate and unconditional decolonization of Namibia.

At the same time Indonesia would like to stress that when it comes to the question of Namibia there are only three parties involved: South Africa, the illegal occupier of the Territory; the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people; and the United Nations, the Administering Authority responsible for the Territory until independence. Hence any final solution must be acceptable to and implemented by the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In this regard we are heartened by the results of the working visit to southern Africa in September last by the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, during which further practical arrangements were made for the implementation of the United Nations plan. With the finalization of the draft agreement establishing the legal status of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and its personnel, as well as the dispatch of a United Nations technical team to the Territory in order to assess the administrative, logistic and budgetary requirements for UNTAG, there is further cause for guarded optimism.

However, given the fluidity, complexity and uncertainty surrounding the quadripartite talks, the international community must demonstrate the utmost vigilance and resolve. Indeed, there can be no justification for complacency, since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented and Namibia continues to be occupied.

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

If South Africa persists in its delaying tactics, demanding unacceptable linkages and diluting the terms of the United Nations plan, then the collective will of the United Nations must be brought to bear through concrete penalties rather than further concessions and inducements, which have only emboldened the Pretoria régime in the past. Indonesia therefore supports the call for the early convening of the Security Council in order that the Council may move expeditiously either to adopt an enabling resolution for the emplacement of UNTAG in Namibia, in accordance with the terms of the United Nations plan, or, in the event of South Africa's refusal to co-operate with the United Nations, to act under Chapter VII of the Charter and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime. In sum, whatever the further evolution of the situation it should not divert us from the primary objective of Namibian independence.

In conclusion I should like to reaffirm Indonesia's solidarity with and commitment to the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, in their legitimate quest for freedom, justice and independence. Indonesia will not cease in its principled assistance to them as well as to all international efforts towards the immediate independence of Namibia.

At this critical juncture there can be no excuse for inaction. The United Nations is duty-bound to bring the requisite pressure to bear in order to compel South Africa to live up to its international obligations. It should be our common resolve that, 10 years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), there will be no further delay in securing the faithful implementation of the plan for Namibian independence.

Mr. FITARKA (Albania): It is almost 10 years since the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia and more than two decades since the United Nations decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. None the less, this high international body is still deliberating on the question of Namibia. It continues to remain on the agenda of the General Assembly because the situation in Namibia has not changed and South Africa's racist régime continues to deprive the suffering Namibian people of their legitimate national right to self-determination, to live free in an independent and sovereign homeland. The policy of segregation that the Pretoria racist régime obstinately pursues, turning Namibia into a big prison for the entire Namibian people and a base for aggression and armed terrorist interventions against the independent front-line African States, has for years been the subject of the severe condemnation and tremendous indignation of the world public.

The Albanian people, too, have followed with attention and concern the inhuman conditions to which the Namibian people have been subjected, and the opposition and large-scale resistance they are putting up against the South African occupying régime and the unprecedented violence, massacres, genocide and political manoeuvres to which that racist régime resorts. The Albanian people have always been on the side of the Namibian people, and have supported and followed with sympathy the consolidation of the armed resistance of the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania holds that the continued occupation of Namibia is further supporting evidence of the fact that the imperialist Powers will stand by the most obscure racist and fascist forces when it comes to defending their imperialist and neo-colonialist interests. We recall the support and all-round assistance the United States and the other imperialist Powers have given to South Africa's bloody régime, supplying it with armaments and other means to

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

crush by fire and sword the armed resistance, the undying struggle, of the Namibian people. It is this very support and assistance, stemming from common interest in preserving domination over and oppression of the peoples and sustaining the neo-colonialist system that has prolonged the tragedy of the Namibian people, threatening and undermining the security of the neighbouring countries as well. This assistance has further encouraged the Pretoria racists to engage in hazardous ventures and acts of terror and aggression against sovereign countries such as Botswana, Zambia, Angola and so on, thus precipitating a tense situation in the region as a whole.

It is not hard to perceive, though, that South Africa's arrogance and aggressiveness and the present-day reality in Namibia are yet another reflection of the rivalry between the super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and the clashing of their imperialist and neo-colonialist interests in the rich African continent. The imperialists find it easy to plunder the uranium and diamond riches of Namibia and South Africa as long as Pretoria's racist régime rules in those countries. Namibia's geographic position, its vast natural riches and the United States need to defend its neo-colonialist interests are some of the reasons that make United States imperialism rely on the South African régime, which it has turned into its gendarme in the region. It has long since embarked upon so-called constructive engagement, reserving to itself the right to determine the destiny of peace. One of the goals that United States imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are at present striving to attain is to prove themselves able to solve every discord, problem or conflict - Africa's included - proceeding on the basis of countless manoeuvres and manipulations intended to retain and restore their neo-colonialist positions. These manoeuvres are an escalation of their attempts either to preserve or to establish their economic and political presence wherever possible by offering the African peoples "patterns" for the solution of



(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

their problems. This is why the granting of independence to Namibia has been made subject to other questions completely irrelevant in essence to the fundamental issue. In addition, numerous manoeuvres have been used, alternating with political pressure and various intrigues, designed to divide and split the people into racial and ethnic groupings. Overt violence, coupled with political and diplomatic schemes, is the preferred means of the Pretoria régime, which in no circumstances has ever lacked support from the United States.

In their statements the representatives of a number of Member States - and today the representative of SWAPO - have underlined the hardships, the savage oppression and violence of a fascist type, the inhuman treatment and the national destruction that the Namibian people are experiencing. However, the Namibian people have not for a single moment given up their heroic resistance, and are responding to the Pretoria racist régime by expanding and intensifying their struggle. They are resolutely opposing its political manoeuvres and fighting against the measures adopted by the occupying régime for the annexation of strategic regions of Namibian territory, such as Walvis Bay, the Caprivi Strip and the islands.

The decades of racist oppression and slavery have failed to subjugate the Namibian people, who hold their ultimate freedom and independence to be their dearest cause. From among the people have emerged the freedom fighters and their leading organization, SWAPO, which they incessantly defend and support. In May this year, Namibians took to the streets in their thousands in memory of the anniversary of the Cassinga massacre, one of the racists' extermination operations against the SWAPO fighters.

In the light of events in Namibia and in view of the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of its sole, legitimate and authentic

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

representative, SWAPO, it is already clear that South Africa's racist domination in Namibia will be short-lived. The history of the peoples' struggle against colonialism has time and again borne witness that the imperialist Powers have never retreated of their own accord, out of willingness to grant independence to colonial countries. At the foundation of every move towards freedom and independence lies the peoples' fight and resistance, their struggle, weapons in hand, against foreign aggression and occupation. Against this background, the present events in Namibia are, in the final analysis, the outcome of the self-denying struggle of the Namibian people and their unyielding resistance in all forms: massive manifestations and demonstrations and clashes with the racists amounting even to armed confrontations. This is part of the overall struggle of the African peoples against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism; it is proof of the boundless strength of the peoples and of their vitality, which originates in the ideals of freedom and independence and, in lawful aspirations to self-determination and social development and progress.

The Albanian people and Government have always voiced their unreserved support for the lawful national cause of the Namibian people. We have unflagging confidence that, through resolute fight and efforts, they will emerge victorious over the Pretoria racists at last enjoy the results of their long and difficult struggle and set the country on the road to free and independent development. By breaking the chains of racist occupation and domination the new sovereign Namibia will gain the position it deserves among the other Member States of our Organization.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): The encouraging atmosphere that has prevailed since the beginning of this session, over which Mr. Dante Caputo is presiding so skilfully and effectively, has been characterized by the beginning of the peaceful settlement of a number of regional conflicts, so that many delegations felt that the question of Namibia would be tackled in the same context and spirit.

The various stages of the quadripartite talks in London, Cairo, New York, Brazzaville, Geneva and elsewhere led us to believe that the basic principles would be translated into specific agreements on a comprehensive settlement by peaceful means of the situation in southern Africa. The long-term aim was to create a favourable climate for substantive progress in the areas of co-operation and the establishment of friendly relations of confidence, understanding and peace between all the States of the subregion of southern Africa. Those well-known basic principles reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI) and other General Assembly resolutions on Namibia, the legitimacy of the Namibian people's struggle to win its freedom being the logical consequence of these basic principles. In acceding to independence Namibia must preserve its territorial integrity by retaining Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands which are an integral part of Namibia.

The history of the world teaches us that all conflicts and disputes between States or concerning liberation and independence have been settled through dialogue and negotiation. For this reason the delegation of Zaire encourages the quadripartite talks now under way, since they include almost all the parties concerned and interested in the situation in southern Africa and thus hold out hope of expediting implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976),

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

435 (1978), 439 (1978), 532 (1983), 539 (1983) and 566 (1985) and the relevant General Assembly resolutions on the question of Namibia.

Namibia continues to be the direct responsibility of the United Nations until it achieves genuine self-determination and independence, in accordance with the resolutions I have mentioned. Accordingly, the United Nations should play a fundamental role in the quadripartite negotiations in order to help the parties concerned in their efforts to move towards a dynamic compromise. To that end my Delegation proposes that the Organization be represented in the negotiations either by a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia or by a member 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. As with the meetings in Geneva on Afghanistan, Western Sahara and the Iraq-Iran conflict, which led to peace plans, the United Nations Secretary-General and all bodies competent with regard to the Namibian question should spare no effort to thwart any negative manoeuvres by any party concerned in the conflict during these negotiations.

The presence during the negotiations of a representative of the United Nations would guarantee the implementation of agreements resulting from the talks because of the means available to the Organization for ensuring that all the interested parties respect the cease-fire and that international peace and security is maintained by the special United Nations forces, the competence and effectiveness of which have recently been recognized by the award of the Nobel Peace Prize.

The comprehensive, peaceful, political settlement of the situation in southern Africa must be based on the immediate, unconditional cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibian territory by South Africa, but also on the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces from the region and free, unimpeded exercise by the

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV).

Zaire believes that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) - the tenth anniversary of the latter of which we are celebrating - is the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and must be implemented without delay.

The delegation of Zaire reaffirms its solidarity with SWAPO and urges it to continue its liberation struggle despite the sacrifices and losses which it has to bear. Its willingness to co-operate and its farsightedness in the political and diplomatic arena have earned the international community's recognition of its qualities and merits as the genuine representative of the Namibian people.

It is in this context that my delegation very much hopes that the quadripartite negotiations now under way in Geneva will lead speedily to recognition of SWAPO so that it may be entrusted with the task of implementing the agreements which emerge from the meetings, in particular through the attainment of independence for its country and the people it represents.

In operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A, entitled, "The situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa", it is proposed that the General Assembly reaffirm its decision that the United Nations Council for Namibia, in pursuance of its mandate, should proceed to establish its administration in Namibia with a view to terminating racist South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. Present circumstances lead us to believe that the quadripartite negotiations will be able to accelerate the process of implementation of that decision because, although the United Nations Council for Namibia

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya,  
Zaire)

has not taken part in the talks, it is none the less the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it by resolution 2248 (S-V).

Furthermore, my delegation, while supporting draft resolution B, on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), feels that the draft resolution ought at least to have contained a reference to the negotiations at present taking place, one of the main objectives of which is the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Similarly, with regard to draft resolution C, on the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, it would have been as well for the draft resolution to redefine the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia in the context of all the negotiations, the main objective of which is independence for Namibia. We take this opportunity to reaffirm our support for, and congratulate the President of the Council on, all its efforts.

My delegation supports draft resolution D, on dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia, and resolution E, on the United Nations Fund for Namibia, and sincerely hopes that all the parties concerned and participating in the current negotiations will agree on Namibia's independence in the very near future so that it may become a Member of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Mr. ORMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Ten years after the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), calling for the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, as is its inalienable right, we are again debating the colonial occupation of that country.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

That resolution is still the sole acceptable basis for a just and lasting solution to this conflict, embodying as it does the will of the international community.\*

The Namibian patriots have traveled a long, hard road towards bringing their homeland into the concert of independent nations. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, has been waging a tenacious struggle to ensure the exercise of the inalienable right of every people: its independence. All the obstacles raised by South Africa as it has sought to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia have been swept aside by the will of a people determined to attain its cherished goal of independence. South Africa has used the territory of Namibia also to attack Angola, despatching its troops to the southern part of that country's territory, in open defiance of the rules of international conduct, decisions of the Security Council and demands of the General Assembly.

Because events proved its position to be mistaken, South Africa used its troops last year to attempt to seize a strategic objective in southern Angola: Cuito Cuanavale. There, the combined Angolan and Cuban forces resolutely repulsed and defeated the invading soldiers, thereby safeguarding Angola's territorial integrity. That operation marked a qualitative change in this long-drawn-out conflict and was a crucial factor in bringing about the new situation we see today in the region of South West Africa, in which conditions have been created that are propitious to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the independence of Namibia.

---

\* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

South Africa, a joint Angolan-Cuban delegation and the United States, as mediator, have throughout this past year been holding four-party talks. Those talks have already produced the withdrawal of South African troops from southern Angola. Today, terms are being discussed for the strict implementation of resolution 435 (1978), free from any distortions or modifications. By the same token, any just agreement that emerges from this negotiation process must unequivocally guarantee the security and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

Cuba has been participating in these talks, together with Angola, in a constructive and noble spirit and with the aim of contributing to a negotiated, worthy and honourable solution to the situation. We have no desire to humiliate any of the parties; rather, we are determined that Angola's territorial integrity will be respected and that Namibia will become independent, in conformity with the agreement reached 10 years ago by the Security Council.

We have sat down at the negotiating table with the firm intention of contributing to the establishment of peace in the southwestern part of Africa, where there has been perturbation for years now because of the apartheid régime.

For the internationalist Cuban forces that 13 years ago responded to a call for solidarity with Angola, it would be a special honour to be able to return home in the knowledge that what they had done had contributed also to putting an end to one of the last vestiges of colonialism on the African continent.

We deem it necessary to specify that our stance throughout these negotiations has been clear for all to see. We take this opportunity to reject categorically insinuations and rumours to the effect that Cuba and Angola have any responsibility for the delay in starting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) - which had been envisaged for 1 November last.



(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

We must say here that it is South Africa that is now hindering the translation into fact of the international community's determination that Namibia should accede rapidly to independence. It is taking certain steps in that Territory which contradict its own statements about its readiness to implement resolution 435 (1978); for it is reinforcing its troops in Namibia, holding military manoeuvres in Walvis Bay, stepping up repression against the Namibian people and appointing soldiers as teachers in institutions whose students support the call for independence.

We appeal to South Africa from this rostrum to heed the wishes of the international community and put an end to this kind of action, which is delaying a negotiating process that must conclude with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in all its parts.

The recent general debate in the General Assembly has shown once again the deep interest of the vast majority of States in bringing Namibia out of its colonial night. Of 154 speakers in that debate, 139 heads of State, foreign ministers or special envoys spoke out unequivocally for the earliest independence of Namibia and for support for SWAPO. South Africa and those that covertly help it must draw the proper conclusions from that near-unanimity voiced in the General Assembly by Governments throughout the world.

We deem it pertinent to repeat now the following statement made recently by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Isidoro Malmierca, from this rostrum:

"Cuba is not seeking a military victory. Cuba has no intention or desire to humiliate anyone. It is inspired simply by the desire to make its modest contribution to the preservation of Angola's independence, to the progress of the negotiations on Namibia's independence and to the attainment of peace and security in that part of Africa. Consequently, Cuba is prepared to continue these talks and looks forward to a successful conclusion, although it is aware

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

of the obstacles and difficulties that still have to be overcome and the time and effort that this will require". (A/43/PV.11, p. 7)

Cuba believes, and we wish to state this unequivocally here and now, that the outcome of the four-party talks - that is, the agreement that may emerge from them - must be endorsed by the Security Council, acting as a guarantor of the agreement, thus emphasizing the responsibility of the Council and the United Nations for the independence of Namibia. Hence, it is at United Nations Headquarters that those countries taking part in the four-party talks must formalize the agreement.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

My delegation wishes to express its profound concern at certain reports that there are no budgetary resources for implementation of the plan originally envisaged to give effect to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). There can be no excuse of any kind for modifying the original plan for the implementation of that resolution. It makes no sense to have waited a decade for implementation of this Security Council decision, during which so much blood of Namibian patriots has been spilled and so many Angolan combatants and internationalist Cuban soldiers have fallen on the soil of Angola. To accept now a caricature of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and its implementation plan distorted or modified on the pretext that there are no funds available, would be to make a mockery of the feelings of the international community and of the reputation and credibility of the United Nations.

We wish to warn against any manoeuvre designed to undermine the process already envisaged for the accession to independence of Namibia, and to emphasize the need for full international guarantees that the transition will be properly carried out. Only United Nations troops can guarantee the balance necessary to ensure that the elections in Namibia will be genuine and honest.

We must bear in mind that those greatly indebted to the United Nations have special responsibilities and the resources with which to meet the financial needs created by the accession to independence of a Territory which has for so long been subject to colonial exploitation.

As I say this, I recall the words of the father of Cuban independence, Jose Marti, who said:

"If I had kept silent about anything important it would have been weakness; I have said what needed to be said."

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia just two weeks after the tenth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the basis accepted by the international community for the peaceful settlement of the question. It is also the basis of all the efforts made to achieve that goal. The State of Kuwait reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence, on the basis of this resolution and under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole, authentic representative. That organization deserves the full support of the international community for its honest struggle on both the military and the diplomatic front to liberate Namibia from the yoke of racist oppression and illegal occupation.

The South African occupation régime continues to step up its oppressive acts in Namibia. The people of that occupied country are still subjected to all possible forms of intimidation, murder, torture and usurpation, as well as the destruction of property and detention of innocent citizens for many years without trial.

In this connection we should like to pay a special tribute to the stand taken by that heroic people against the brutal occupation forces. It is reported that popular resistance to South African oppression is gaining momentum. There are also reports of the persistent boycott throughout the country of all schools administered by the South African authorities and the continued increase in the activities of the trade union movement.

The question of Namibia is basically one of illegitimate occupation and colonialization. Therefore international legality demands that the independence of Namibia is not linked to the solution of any extraneous or irrelevant issues. This explains the indignation of the world public at the continued attempts by South

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Africa to dominate the Territory and subjugate its people, and to impede the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 385 (1976) respectively.

The United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia - the first time that it has taken such action. Thus it has shouldered international responsibility for the restoration of the rights of the Namibian people and fulfilment of the desire of the international community to enable them to attain independence and exercise their sovereignty. On the basis of that important responsibility the Security Council and the General Assembly are called upon by the international community to take all necessary measures to ensure that the United Nations Council for Namibia fulfils its responsibility for the Territory in all circumstances and completely free of any pressure or political pre-conditions.

Therefore, my delegation urges the Security Council to consider once again the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, in view of its failure to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on 1 November, as expected by the international community and as agreed by its delegation at the quadripartite negotiations in Geneva last August.

My country joins the international community in welcoming the negotiations now under way on the solution of the question of Namibia. Those negotiations were resumed on 11 November, and we pray that they may be crowned with success so that a free and independent State may soon be established in Namibia.

However, the racist régime in Pretoria, which is based on force and suppression, persists in its procrastination and vacillation, backed by the protection and support given to it by a few in the Western world and the continued activities of foreign economic interests. The majority of the Members of this

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

international Organization are therefore convinced of the need to bring to bear stronger economic pressure on South Africa and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it, and for the few I have mentioned to withhold all forms of military collaboration and co-operation from the régime in Pretoria.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Because of the immeasurable suffering imposed by the Pretoria system on the peoples of both Namibia and South Africa, we categorically reject the argument that no sanctions can be imposed since they would lead to further suffering for those peoples. In this connection, we call for urgent measures to be taken to implement Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, including bringing pressure to bear on the Governments which have not yet recognized the legitimacy of that Decree to do so. This would be in addition to taking all the necessary measures against the companies violating the Decree.

My delegation finds it necessary also to condemn here the establishment of the so-called interim government of Namibia, South Africa's attempts to create puppet entities there and imposition of colonialist economic structures on the people of the occupied Territory against their will and without their consent in order to keep them continually in a state of subjugation, poverty and deprivation with the same force we condemn the continued use by Pretoria of the territory of Namibia as a base for terrorist activities, and repeated attacks against the front-line States and neighbouring countries which are in full solidarity with the Namibian people in their heroic resistance against racist Pretoria.

While we condemn occupation and support resistance to it and the rights of those under its yoke, we demand that Pretoria release forthwith the valiant political prisoners in Namibia and desist from compulsory drafting of Namibians into the racist army of occupation and the tribal armies, using mercenaries and suppressing the Namibian people. We also condemn the oppressive practices of Pretoria against persons, organizations, trade unions, student organizations, religious leaders and the press in Namibia.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

We would also take this opportunity to express support for the right of the Namibian people to self-determination within their undiminished territory, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all the offshore islands of Namibia, as an integral part of Namibia; and this should not be linked to any extraneous issues or pre-conditions in negotiations.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the twentieth anniversary of the declaration of the illegality of the presence of South Africa in Namibia. Despite the passage of all these years, the Pretoria régime still persists in denying a fundamental human right, namely, the right of the Namibians to their land. Therefore it is a major moral duty of every member of the international community to make every possible effort to end this plight and to restore rights to their rightful owners in Namibia. In order to achieve this noble objective, the international community should give all possible moral, political and material support to the Namibian people and their heroic struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO. We are fully confident that this just struggle will soon be crowned with success and that the Namibian people will attain national independence through their struggle and the constant support given them by all the peoples that cherish freedom and peace.

Mr. OULD MOHAMED LEMINE (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): The question of Namibia was on the agenda of the first session of this Assembly and it has come up again ever since, in our annual debates and at certain special sessions. During the same period the Security Council and other subsidiary bodies



(Mr. Ould Mohamed Lemine,  
Mauritania)

of the Organization have also had occasion to consider this question. All these bodies have adopted, at their respective levels, a series of resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia.

The General Assembly at its twenty-first session ended South Africa's Mandate over South-West Africa and decided to place the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. That resolution was to begin the process leading to self-determination and genuine independence for Namibia in accordance with the march of history, the United Nations Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. However, 20 years later, we have to acknowledge that South Africa, in defiance of international law, is simply consolidating its illegal occupation of the Territory.

Since this is an exceptional situation, where the Organization has assumed direct responsibility for Namibia's accession to self-determination, freedom and independence, the Assembly decided last year to examine at this session steps to be taken in accordance with the Charter if the Security Council should find itself unable to adopt specific measures to compel South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) by 29 September 1988.

The Namibian people has suffered far too much from domination and oppression. In addition to the usual trials and tribulations which accompany colonial rule, Namibia has been subjected to the odious policy of apartheid, a systematic brutal repression has been unleashed against the Namibian people and its territory has been used as a springboard for acts of aggression and destabilization directed against neighbouring States.

(Mr. Ould Mohamed Lemine,  
Mauritania)

The continuing ordeal of the Namibian people is a slap in the face for the international community and a flagrant violation of international law. The illegal occupation of Namibia also poses a serious threat to regional and international peace and security.

In this situation, it is more necessary than ever for the United Nations to assume its responsibility with respect to this international Territory. Determined efforts must be made without delay to enable the Namibian people to exercise rapidly its inalienable right to freedom and independence.

The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia set forth in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) provides the only internationally accepted basis for a settlement of the Namibian question. Its immediate, full and unconditional implementation is the special responsibility of our Organization and all States that cherish peace and justice. It must involve the increased isolation of South Africa, since the most effective pressure is still the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. In particular, what is needed is strict and rigorous implementation of the arms embargo imposed by the Security Council in resolution 418 (1978).

In these difficult circumstances, SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people is confronting the apartheid régime on all fronts. It is making enormous sacrifices but delivering stinging blows against the illegal occupation. The entire international community should give it its full material and moral support to this legitimate and heroic struggle.

Mauritania's solidarity with SWAPO is only natural, since it is based on the innumerable ties that unite our two peoples and takes various forms. The accession

(Mr. Ould Mohamed Lemine,  
Mauritania)

of Namibia to independence is one of our major concerns, and we cannot but welcome any action conducive to the speedy achievement of that independence.

In this spirit, we note with satisfaction the ongoing talks on southern Africa; but we are aware that the apartheid régime will yield only to the combined force of armed struggle and international pressure.

Hence it is up to our Organization to take specific measures to compel South Africa to end its colonial domination of Namibia and to implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. In so doing, we shall have contributed to removing the serious threat to international peace and security posed by the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the only legal Administering Authority of the Territory, is actively participating in this just and noble work of peace. We should like to take this opportunity to commend it on its tireless efforts.

Mr. HIAM NGAC (Viet Nam): After years of tension and confrontation, international relations are now moving towards dialogue and co-operation. The recent positive developments have brought rays of hope and the promise of peace and settlement to the many pressing issues of both regional and global dimensions. For the first time, there has been a breakthrough in genuine nuclear disarmament, with the signing and ratification of the Treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty. Peace talks geared to political settlements have emerged out of deadlock situations in various parts of the world from Afghanistan to southern Africa, from Cyprus and the Gulf to the Western Sahara. The results obtained, though they vary in degree, have opened up a real prospect for solving regional conflicts and disputes through political means and dialogue. These encouraging developments are but a beginning. There are still some who obstinately oppose that process of change. Those forces of confrontation and interference have been seeking to hinder or reverse the ongoing trend of dialogue and to limit or undermine the progress achieved so far, especially as the process is yet at an initial, fragile stage. Experience, whether from Central America, the Middle East, South-East Asia or southern Africa, shows that only with the elimination of the source of the problem, whether it be reactionary forces, apartheid, genocide or outside interference, can the search for a negotiated settlement be accelerated and bear fruits. Fully aware of the complexities involved, the international community must therefore strengthen its political will so as to make the progress achieved so far sustainable and to meet more effectively the challenges now confronting us.

The question of Namibia has long stood as the test of our political will and common efforts to do away with the legacy of a long-preserved colonialism. The challenge posed by the question is typical of its kind.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

For more than two decades now, Namibia has been the unique case where the United Nations has undertaken direct responsibility for transition to independence and self-determination, since it adopted the historic General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI). This undertaking received the support of the overwhelming majority of the international community. But Namibia is yet to be freed. Colonialism has persisted in its old form for over a century and exists up until today with all its attendant sinisterness and brutality; and worse yet, South Africa has extended apartheid - the most obnoxious form of colonialism that exists - to the Territory. Mass, unwarranted arrests, detention, repression, massacres, and unabated exploitation, continue to be the daily lot of that anguished people. Tears and blood continue to be shed by the Namibians at the barbarous hands of the racist régime. Words, however, cannot express the case adequately and cannot tell all. South Africa, on the other hand, has maintained its policy of State terrorism, unceasingly launching attacks against the front-line States, so that the region is constantly prone to danger and instability. All this has stemmed from a root cause, namely, apartheid, which, as universally concluded, cannot be reformed but must be eradicated.

For a long time the international community has committed itself to the Namibian people's struggle for independence and self-determination, and to the elimination of apartheid. This is a case where unanimity has reached an unprecedented level with regard to the initiation of collective efforts on a global scale. The world as a whole has demanded the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, along with the elimination of apartheid - upon which that occupation is based - and all its practical manifestations. A plan for Namibia's independence has been envisaged in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The plan, since its adoption in 1978, has been the sole, universally acceptable basis for Namibia's independence. Ten years have elapsed but that resolution has yet to

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

be implemented. South Africa, thanks to the help of some, has for years brazenly defied world public opinion. With that support, South Africa has sought by all means possible to obstruct the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has brought in groundless, extraneous issues, such as the policy of "linkage", which has been totally rejected by the international community.

With the favourable conditions that are emerging in the world, diplomatic endeavours have recently been enhanced in south-western Africa with a view to speeding up the search for a political settlement of the region's problems.

With the authorization given to him in Security Council resolution 601 (1987), the Secretary-General has proceeded with practical arrangements for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), dispatching a technical team to the region and holding consultations with the various parties concerned.

The quadripartite negotiations now under way have aroused hopes that a political solution to the conflict in the region will eventually be found. We support the correct position and constructive attitude taken by Angola and Cuba in this ongoing diplomatic endeavour towards a solution that would guarantee Angola's sovereignty, security and territorial integrity, as well as Namibia's genuine independence. The South African authorities must strictly abide by the agreements reached and must refrain from setting up any new artificial obstacles.

The heroic struggle of the Namibian people has always enjoyed our whole-hearted sympathy and support. We further reiterate at this forum the consistent position of our people and Government towards the Namibian people and its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We also support the attitude of good will adopted by SWAPO in facilitating the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

In the present circumstances, the international community must in no way lessen its vigilance, given South Africa's record of bad faith and intransigence.

JSM/jpm

A/43/PV. 48  
79-80

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

International pressures must more than ever be increased, especially through the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that racist régime.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

Those who have misused the veto to date by blocking the Security Council from taking action in that regard must adopt a new line and join the rest of the world, because sanctions represent the most effective peaceful means available to compel South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of apartheid.

The Namibian question, like many other burning issues of our time, requires great efforts and firm action now more than ever. With the current broadening of international co-operation, our enhanced joint efforts and determination should finally bring about independence for Namibia and peace and stability to the whole region.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): We meet once again to deal with a problem that should have been resolved long ago. This year, instead of celebrating the independence of Namibia, we have marked yet another anniversary of our powerlessness - this time the tenth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Unfortunately, the United Nations has so far been unable to contribute decisively towards the liberation of Namibia, although the entire international community - even South Africa, in its own devious way - recognizes the right of the people of the Territory to form an independent State.

For years, we have been firmly and consistently demanding freedom for Namibia and providing assistance to the struggle of the Namibian people, while South Africa has reacted defiantly, appearing at best to yield to international pressure while in fact making only cosmetic changes.\*

Unfortunately, Pretoria has repeatedly succeeded in keeping a settlement on Namibia just out of reach, while working frantically to circumvent the will of the international community as expressed in numerous resolutions and decisions of the

---

\* Mr. Van Lierop (Vanuatu), Vice-President, took the Chair.



(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

United Nations, including the Security Council. It endeavoured to establish a puppet government in Namibia, to destroy the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and all internal opposition. It undertook military action or political destabilization against neighbouring States, trying to end their support for the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

Due to the efforts of the international community and of the United Nations in particular, we have this year witnessed progress in the process of settling a number of regional conflicts. In recent months, new prospects for a peaceful settlement in South West Africa have emerged. The constructive position and flexibility of Angola and Cuba at the quadripartite negotiations with South Africa, mediated by the United States, have provided a real possibility for resolving specific issues relating to the self-determination of the Namibian people. We express our sincere hope for a successful conclusion to the talks and for early agreements. A free and independent Namibia is in the interests of peace and security of the region and the entire world. Therefore, the realization of that objective constitutes an urgent task. Poland once again wishes to reaffirm its readiness to take active part in the process of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

On the other hand, the many years of Pretoria's defiant rule in Namibia leave ample grounds for scepticism about its good faith and readiness to carry out the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

The occupation forces in northern Namibia have grown even more numerous. An estimated 5,000 youths have fled the country due to harassment by the security police; South Africa has drafted new legislation against the trade-union movement, and a deliberately planned arson attack against The Namibian, the only independent newspaper in the Territory, occurred on 11 October 1988 against the background of peace negotiations.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Disturbing, too, are recent reports of armed soldiers of the South African Defence Force canvassing Namibian villages, taking down names, identification numbers and addresses and asking inhabitants to indicate their political affiliation. Should such action not be considered as pre-empting free elections under international supervision? Should the United Nations not remain vigilant?

In the present situation, it would seem important and useful, in order to ensure the continuity of the settlement process, to involve the United Nations and the Secretary-General in the elaboration of a definitive formula in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In that connection, we would like to commend SWAPO for its continued commitment to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and its preparedness to co-operate fully in the implementation of that plan.

Today, a great and friendly Asian nation, India, begins a 12-month commemoration of the birth on November 14, 1889 of Jawaharlal Nehru, its founding father and first Prime Minister from independence in 1947 until his death in 1964. Let me pay tribute to that outstanding politician by recalling some of his wise and inspiring words:

"The racial policy of the South African Union is, I think, more basically wrong and dangerous for the future of the world than anything else. It surprises me that countries, particularly those that stand for the democratic tradition and those that voted for the United Nations Charter and for the Human Rights Convention, express themselves so moderately or do not express themselves at all about the racial policy of the South African Union. It is not a question of policy only. I say it is the greatest international immorality for a nation to carry on in that way."

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Namibia is clearly a victim of immorality and inhumanity. Those who aid Pretoria share moral responsibility for the plight of the Namibian people.

In conclusion, we once again express our full support for and solidarity with the people of Namibia, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, in their just and heroic struggle for liberation and equal rights. We remain convinced that the days of the illegal occupation of their country are numbered and that Namibia will soon attain its rightful place in the community of nations.

Ms. ATTAH (Nigeria): The Chairman of our delegation at the current session of the General Assembly and Minister for External Affairs of Nigeria has already conveyed to Mr. Caputo the congratulations and warm felicitations of the Government and people of Nigeria for his election when he addressed this body on 29 September 1988. I shall therefore simply reiterate his sentiments and assure the President of our continued co-operation with him and the other members of the Bureau in the discharge of the onerous tasks assigned to them. We are totally satisfied with his stewardship to date and we are certain that his wide experience and immense diplomatic skills will see us through to a successful conclusion of the session.

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

The Nigerian delegation attaches great importance to the agenda item under consideration. This importance springs not only from the historical fact that Nigeria is a product of the inevitable process of decolonization which occurred in the middle decades of this century in Africa, but also from our belief that the case of Namibia is sui generis. Among the remaining colonial and dependent Territories, which number about 19, Namibia is the unique case where the United Nations terminated the mandate that was given to the administering racist Government and thereafter assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. Namibia is also unique in the sense of having an agreed framework in the form of the United Nations plan approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) designed to guide the Territory to independence.

It is sad that 22 years after racist South Africa's mandate over Namibia was terminated by the United Nations, and 10 years after the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), Namibia is still a dependent colony. And yet apartheid South Africa's arrogance and contempt for the United Nations and the entire international community are the direct consequences of the support, solace and succour it continues to receive from certain countries, some of which were the chief architects of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is regrettable that implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) approving the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been consistently frustrated and stymied for over a decade in total defiance of the United Nations and the international community. It is even more regrettable that apartheid South Africa's disregard for the injunctions of the United Nations has been encouraged and supported by some of the nations whose painstaking endeavours culminated in the adoption of resolution 435 (1978). It is hypocritical, in our view, for countries

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

which played very key roles in formulating and negotiating the framework for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem to be involved in attempts at derailing the implementation of the same plan by insisting on extraneous issues.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan approved therein are quintessential democratic means of bringing about a peaceful resolution of the Namibian question. The resolution neither seeks to impose a solution devoid of the preferences of Namibians nor to foist on them a Government, liberation movement or political party which the Namibians themselves have not chosen. Among other things, the resolution envisages a cessation of hostilities, the peaceful return of Namibian refugees and exiles, the organization of free and fair elections for both a constituent assembly and an eventual democratic Government of Namibia, all under the close and impartial supervision of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group. All these are democratic principles and processes which certain countries proclaim and recommend to others. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the liberation movement of the Namibian people, has consistently and repeatedly declared readiness to initiate and submit itself to the democratic verdict of the Namibian people. It has never wavered in its commitment to the full and unfettered implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO therefore deserves the commendation and support of the international community for its resolute commitment to peaceful and democratic solution of the problem.

The Secretary-General has indicated in his numerous reports that all conditions necessary for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been met. Nevertheless racist South Africa and its allies continue to stall and prevaricate on the commencement of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by insisting on red herrings to delay, if not totally

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

prevent, the long overdue independence and freedom for Namibia. South Africa has done everything, including impose the hand-picked and unrepresentative interim government on the Namibian people.

Nigeria is dismayed that the self-appointed guardians of Western civilization have failed to date to appreciate the ploy of racist South Africa. We are disturbed by the overt and covert support to maintain apartheid's stranglehold over Namibia and its people. It is ironic that some of the countries which are propping up racist South Africa are the same whose history inaugurated man's fight for freedom, equality and dignity in the last three centuries. It is however noteworthy that the people of those countries have through mass demonstrations, the media, churches and other non-governmental organizations, distanced themselves from the myopic policies of their Governments regarding apartheid South Africa. We call on the Governments concerned to heed the expressed wishes of their citizens and stop sustaining apartheid and colonialism in southern Africa.

We cannot but observe that 1 November 1988 has come and gone rather uneventfully apart from the intensification of the repression and oppression of the people of Namibia. While Nigeria expressed its support and encouragement for the efforts to achieve a peaceful solution, which was the proclaimed goal of the ongoing Quadrupartite Talks, we cannot but sound a note of caution and warning to the international community not to be lulled into complacency and a betrayal of the Namibian people. The racist occupation forces in southern Angola were made to realize that Cuito Cuanaveles was the limit of tolerance and aggression had its price. The demoralized racist troops were forced to withdraw. South Africa may be buying time for yet another chapter in prevarication and frustration of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. The foregoing assessment leads to one inevitable conclusion. We believe that it is now opportune for the international

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

community to take immediate steps to consolidate and universalize all the disparate measures that are in place against the racist régime. We believe that the abhorrence of apartheid by all civilized people must be underscored and re-emphasized in order to force the Pretoria régime to abandon its policies of racial discrimination, oppression and brutal repression. Further, we reiterate our conviction and the Jemand of the majority of Member States of the United Nations for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist South Africa régime under Chapter VII of the Charter. We believe that action under Chapter VII is the only viable option for peaceful settlement of the problem. It has become urgent and imperative for the international community to terminate the anachronisms of apartheid and colonialism in Namibia. The intransigence of apartheid South Africa should be stopped without further delay.

The freedom of the entire people of Africa is neither negotiable nor reversible. The gale of freedom and independence which started to sweep across the vast continent of Africa in the 1950s and 1960s cannot stop on the banks of the Zambesi and the Limpopo. It is headed for and will blow across the Namib and Kalahari deserts, through the Orange River and the velds of South Africa into the rough waters of the Cape of Good Hope. History is on the side of the people of Namibia. No force and no amount of overt or covert support for the oppressors will stop them from enjoying their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

(Ms. Attah, Nigeria)

In the final analysis, there is never a time-frame for a liberation struggle; it will continue until victory is achieved. The people of Namibia are engaged in such a titanic struggle, and all the freedom-loving peoples of the world are with them. They will not fail.

Mr. GDSHU (Ethiopia): The General Assembly is once again engaged in its periodic deliberations on Namibia. Despite the concerted efforts deployed by the international community and the world Organization, the unique colonial Territory of Namibia remains under the cruel occupation of the racist régime of South Africa. In spite of our fervent hope that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence would be duly recognized by South Africa and its collaborators, the Territory has been systematically converted into a regimented mineral-resources outpost serving the rather focused interests of the multinationals.

Regardless of our resolve to accelerate the process of decolonization in that Territory and move closer to the day when Namibia assumes membership in our family of free and independent nations, the occupation troops of the racist régime remain entrenched in every part of that unhappy land. The illegal and brutal colonial occupation of Namibia continues unabated, exacerbated by the racist régime's arrogant conversion of its territory into a springboard for carrying out acts of State terrorism, aggression and destabilization against the front-line States and other neighbouring States.

Ten long years have elapsed since the adoption of the now well known Security Council resolution 435 (1978) providing for a universally accepted independence plan for Namibia. Although we had harboured the hope that its implementation might at long last lead to the independence of Namibia, the attitude displayed by the Pretoria régime ever since the adoption of that resolution, on 29 September 1978,



(Mr. Goshu, Ethiopia)

has left much to be desired. Pretoria has demonstrated its mastery of the craft of deceit and treachery by systematic introduction of extraneous issues into the negotiating agenda, which has not only stalled the negotiations carried out within the parameters of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) but further complicated the issue of Namibia's accession to independence.

Without any of the prevarication or obfuscation often employed by those in certain interested quarters, we affirm that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the sole universally acclaimed framework for the peaceful resolution of the Namibian question. For as long as the racist régime resorts to futile manoeuvres to deny the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination there will be no end in sight to the stalemate and procrastination that have so far characterized developments surrounding the Namibian question.

Essentially, Namibia remains the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The United Nations Council for Namibia is the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia until the Territory accedes to independence. In that regard, however, it is important to highlight the fact that we are at an important crossroads as regards the settlement of the Namibian question. In this connection, while we commend the efforts of the United Nations and its tireless Secretary-General, we should like all the same to emphasize that no time and no opportunity should be lost in commencing implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In this regard, a word or two on the unfolding situation regarding negotiations on the peaceful resolution of the Namibian question may be in order. It is significant that the recent Geneva agreement on Namibia is the culmination of a sustained international campaign for the independence of the Territory. As such it marks the triumph of multifaceted world-wide efforts mobilized over the past

(Mr. Goshu, Ethiopia)

several years to secure freedom for the people of Namibia; hence it constitutes a serious setback for the racist clique and could be the harbinger of the systematic dismantlement of the system of apartheid in South Africa itself.

In view of South Africa's history of arrogance, obduracy and recourse to dilatory tactics to delay Namibia's independence, however, it is most appropriate to remain vigilant and watch for signs that the racist régime is not employing another gimmick.

In spite of our misgivings about South Africa's intentions, we shall support all negotiations leading to the ultimate independence of Namibia. We believe that every effort made to enhance the probability of the attainment of peace in southern Africa is on the credit side for the people of Namibia. If such tributary efforts can contribute to the mighty river of peace, they will continue to enjoy our support. However, it must be said that when Namibia accedes to independence its territory must of juridical necessity be in one piece. Such processes therefore should take into account the maintenance of the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all other offshore islands.

When the history of the struggle for freedom and independence in southern Africa is written it is certain that a significant part will be devoted to the role of the valiant sons and daughters of Namibia who, under the vanguard leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, legitimate representative of the people of the now illegally held Territory, have successfully brought the racist occupiers to their knees. It is most pertinent to note that the South African régime, which is renowned as an arch-enemy of peace, would not suddenly have opted for negotiations and peaceful dialogue over Namibia had it not been for the crushing blows it suffered in southern Angola and Namibia. My

(Mr. Goshu, Ethiopia)

delegation therefore salutes the SWAPO combatants and the heroes of Cuito Cuanavale, and pays a tribute to the front-line States and other neighbouring States which have borne the brunt of South Africa's campaign of destabilization and State terrorism and, having endured all types of hardship and tribulations, have given unswerving support to the struggle of Namibian and South African patriots.

At this eleventh hour of Namibia's long march towards independence it is essential that the international community demonstrate its commitment to the Namibian cause by augmenting its support for the struggling people of Namibia and its sole, authentic national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization. All assistance rendered will facilitate the speedy accession of Namibia to independence. Conversely, any delay in the provision of vital assistance is bound to be an added advantage to the occupation forces of South Africa. Thus, the worth of our support so far will be determined by how expeditiously we act today. We have come a long way, and we can only follow the worthy path we have trodden thus far.

As a Member State which had the honour of bringing the question of Namibia to the attention of the International Court of Justice, Ethiopia has followed this crucial question with the degree of seriousness it warrants. Within the limits of its capabilities, Ethiopia has never failed to provide the patriots of Namibia with political, diplomatic and material backing.

Let me therefore avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate Ethiopia's unswerving support for the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence, justice and peace.

Mr. H. R. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh): That at this time and age the malignant cancer of racist occupation should be allowed to spread and decimate an entire population is a sad commentary on our generation. Nowhere has tyranny expressed itself so starkly as in Namibia. Nowhere has colonialism manifested itself so virulently as in that unfortunate land. The soul of Africa today cries out in anguish, while the inflicter of pain, Pretoria, carries on its odious conduct with impunity. If the sorrows of Namibia are a great tragedy, our toleration of South Africa is a mortal sin.

The sufferings of the Namibians have been excruciating. Their limbs have been bound, their voices silenced and their resources stolen. Pretoria has also tried to numb their minds by foisting on them a vile hypothesis that the lighter the skin, the more superior the culture.

For decades the global community has tried to reason with South Africa. To date, its efforts have been in vain. We cannot, however, afford to throw up our hands in despair. The need now is for sober reflection, cool assessment and concerted action. Also, although there is a glimmer of light perceptible at the end of the tunnel, we cannot afford to rest in complacency. We must plan and execute our programme - which is in what we hope are its final stages - to blot out for ever the stains of suppression left imprinted upon the fabric of Africa by a pariah régime.

The problem, however, is not as intractable as it might appear. There is indeed a solution. It lies in the United Nations plan for Namibia. Of particular urgency is the need to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) of 1978. A decade has elapsed since its adoption. The main obstruction to its implementation has been the intransigence of South Africa. Time and again the General Assembly, this parliament of nations, has adopted resolutions on the issue, which Pretoria has persistently defied. We condemn that attitude unequivocally.

(Mr. H. R. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

The Botha régime does not appear to be amenable to reason or logic. We see no option, therefore, but to try to force its hand. If there ever was a case for the imposition of the comprehensive, mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, it is here and now. To assist South Africa to buttress its military capabilities would be unwise and destabilizing.

South Africa must also be isolated economically. Those of us who still remember the long struggle for freedom against the Raj in British India will recall what an effective non-violent weapon the boycott of goods was. If the world shuns the use of things South African the message to Pretoria will be unambiguous, the signal will be clear.

We are all aware of South Africa's attempts to hoodwink the world by installing a puppet régime in Windhoek in June 1985. But it failed to pull the wool over our eyes. Its attempts to muffle the media have revealed more than they have concealed. We must not allow the Botha Government to succeed in linking the independence of Namibia to extraneous or irrelevant issues, nor must we allow it to continue its shameful plunder of Namibian resources in defiance of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia.

True, Namibia inspires rage; but then, it also evokes the positive emotions of courage and determination. Bangladesh salutes the courage of the valiant people of Namibia and supports them in their relentless struggle against oppression. We admire the glorious leadership provided by the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and we support it in its determination to free its people.

Our minds and hearts are always with the front-line States in Africa, engaged in a bitter and noble resistance to the evil machinations of Pretoria. We commend the untiring efforts of Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar,

(Mr. H. R. Choudhury, Bangladesh)

Under-Secretary-General Marrack Goulding, Commissioner Bernt Carlsson and others to bring peace to that troubled part of the world.

The cause of Namibia has always been dear to the people of Bangladesh. As members of the Council for Namibia we have tried to make our modest contribution to bring independence to Namibia. We offered to support the transition by participating in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). Should Namibia, when it is free, seek to share our experience to tide it over the initial phases, Bangladesh will be prepared and happy to make it available. It is our hope that the ongoing discussions on southern Africa will lead to a settlement that will be acceptable to the heroic struggling people of Namibia. With those ends in mind the Bangladesh delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions before the Assembly.

Surely there is a dawn at the end of the darkness of suffering that envelops South Africa today. As poet John Keats said, there is always a budding morrow at midnight. We hold our breath and await the first streaks of light on the Namibian horizon. The wait may still be a trifle longer, but the striving towards our goal is so ennobling that every moment will be worth the while.

Mr. LANGSLET (Norway): More than 40 years ago the General Assembly rejected a proposal to incorporate South West Africa, now Namibia, into the Union of South Africa and recommended that the Territory be placed under the United Nations trusteeship system. Twenty years later, in 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed responsibility for administering the Territory until independence. In 1978 the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) and thereby approved the proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation. Regrettably, subsequent efforts to implement that resolution failed owing to attempts by the South African Government to obstruct progress by introducing extraneous issues.

(Mr. Langslet, Norway)

South Africa's obstruction of the diplomatic process, its illegal occupation and its use of Namibian territory for launching unprovoked acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, particularly Angola, have for many years been a cause of deep concern to the international community. For all these years the Namibian people have been fighting over basic issues affecting the very nature of their existence: self-determination, independence, human rights and dignity.

New hope was injected into the situation in May this year by the initiation of talks between Cuba, Angola and South Africa, with the United States as mediator. Meetings in New York from 8 to 10 July led to an agreement between Angola, Cuba and South Africa on a set of essential principles to establish the basis for peace in the south-western region of Africa. The first tangible signs of progress came as South African troops withdrew from southern Angola and a de facto cease-fire between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa took effect in August.

Norway supports the ongoing negotiations aimed at a peaceful settlement of the situation on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We commend the mediation efforts and the flexibility and restraint exercised by the parties throughout the process, which we hope have reached the point of no return. We appeal to the parties to continue their endeavours towards a speedy and comprehensive settlement of the situation.

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

(Mr. Langslet, Norway)

Norway has consistently held that comprehensive mandatory sanctions would constitute the most effective instrument through which to exert pressure on South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This remains our position until a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue has been reached. Until such time, Norway for its part will continue its policy of total boycott against South Africa, as evidenced by the law on economic boycott which took effect on 20 July last year. We urge Member States, pending a decision on comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, to take appropriate national action.

Recent events have highlighted the need for preparedness on the part of both the United Nations and the international community as a whole. We are confident that the Secretary-General is prepared to undertake the administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) when he is called on to do so.

Norway stands ready to play its part in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and in assisting the people of Namibia. We have offered to contribute to UNTAG and, in co-operation with our Nordic neighbours, have developed a plan for concerted action on development co-operation once Namibia is a free and independent country.

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



(Mr. Langslet, Norway)

I should like to repeat the offer made by the Government of Norway during last year's session of the General Assembly of practical assistance in this regard. We also stand ready to draw on our diversified experience in such related fields as legislation to protect the marine resources off the coast, as well as the exploration and exploitation thereof, for the benefit of a free and independent Namibia.

Norway remains deeply committed to alleviating the plight of the Namibian people. I should like to reiterate my Government's unequivocal support for efforts made and measures taken by the United Nations to correct the grave injustice done to the Namibian people. Norway has had the privilege of contributing to various United Nations activities benefiting the Namibian people, such as those carried out through United Nations Institute for Namibia, in Lusaka, and the Namibia Nationhood Programme. We also accord humanitarian support to Namibian refugees through SWAPO and shall continue to do so for as long as such assistance is required. Norway appeals to all Member States of the United Nations to contribute generously to these funds and activities.

Last year in the course of the debate on the question of Namibia the delegation of Norway made a few comments on the activities of the most important United Nations body in this respect, the United Nations Council for Namibia. Although commending the main thrust of the Council's activities, my delegation expressed its concern at certain aspects of the recommendations presented by the Council to the General Assembly. This year I am pleased to note that some of our concerns have been addressed.

May I also, on a more general note, reiterate that in the current difficult financial situation all United Nations activities, including those of the Council for Namibia, should be carefully scrutinized to secure effective and appropriate utilization of resources. My delegation has on previous occasions expressed

(Mr. Langslet, Norway)

concern about the level of the Council's expenditure on seminars and conferences. We have suggested that the Council should concentrate its efforts on direct and practical assistance to the Namibian people. I take this opportunity to restate our position on these questions.

My delegation looks forward to the day when Namibia will take its rightful place in the family of nations. We call upon the international community to contribute effectively to the building of a free, united and independent Namibian nation State.

Mr. AL-ZAABI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): The Chairman of the Arab Group for this month will be speaking on behalf of the members of the Group to express our views in full. I shall therefore simply shed a little more light on the issue under consideration.

In the years since the establishment of the United Nations, the General Assembly has confronted a sequence of events inconsistent with the objectives of the Mandate, including South Africa's assertion that it is not responsible to the United Nations, the implementation of its policy of apartheid, its seizure of Namibian territory, its disregard for the ruling of the International Court of Justice and its defiance of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Government of South Africa continues to commit inhuman crimes, causing suffering which amounts to a blatant affront to human dignity and values. In doing so it is posing a threat to peace and security in Africa and hence in the world as a whole.

The question of Namibia is primarily one of decolonization. Accordingly, it has to be settled in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The fact that the South African racist régime is linking its illegal occupation of Namibia with co-operation between Angola and certain other countries is but a diversion aimed at justifying its occupation and turning the question of Namibia into an international conflict. While pursuing such policies, the apartheid régime is endeavouring to break the unity of the Namibian people by militarizing the Territory and establishing a white population there. That has led to tragic disruption in Namibian society.

In order to attain its goals, the racist régime has also created local tribal armies and puppet groups, and made extensive use of mercenaries in its desperate effort to crush the liberation struggle of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Al-Zaabi, United  
Arab Emirates)

Foreign economic interests, by co-operating with the occupation forces in the framework of South Africa's overall military strategy, are contributing directly to the continuation of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa.

Considering the situation, with South Africa's acquisition of nuclear weapons in co-operation with Israel, and its aggression against neighbouring African States to destabilize them, we are deeply concerned at the dangerous situation in Namibia. We urge the international community to step up its efforts to enable the heroic Namibian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. This should be done without jeopardizing the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the islands off its coast, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, which stipulate that those territories are an integral part of Namibia and that any manoeuvre by South Africa to separate Walvis Bay and the islands from the Territory would be illegal, null and void.

Although we are deeply grateful to the Secretary-General and the United Nations Commissioner for their efforts to put an early end to the colonization of Namibia, that can be done only if two conditions are met. First, there must be international unanimity, including the major Powers, so that in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations disciplinary measures may be taken against countries that defy the will of the international community. Secondly, we have to mobilize world public opinion and expose the political, military and economic activities of the Pretoria régime, and measures must be taken to protect the territorial integrity of Namibia and its natural resources in accordance with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session in 1974. We also have to safeguard Namibia's interests in the international organizations and to prepare its nationals to assume responsibility for setting up their own State. An

(Mr. Al-Zaabi, United  
Arab Emirates)

administration must therefore be established in the Territory in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its last session. Of course, we welcome the talks that have been - and are being - held, indicating that an internationally acceptable settlement providing for the peaceful transfer of power to the Namibian people in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) may be in sight. However, we would condemn any attempt to impose on the Namibian people a groundless electoral system likely to lead to the establishment of a neo-colonialist system which would deny the Namibian people the victories they have won under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole legitimate representative.

We do indeed appreciate the enormous sacrifices that have been made by the front-line States in support of the liberation struggle of the Namibian people. We condemn the repeated acts of aggression committed by the racist South African régime, including invasion and occupation, because such acts are incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and constitute breaches of international peace and security. In particular, we welcome the way in which SWAPO is leading the Namibian people; its constructive, flexible and consistent attitude; its co-operation with the United Nations in its efforts swiftly to implement Security Council resolutions; its endorsement of the agreement of 10 August 1988 on a cease-fire in Angola; and its compliance with that agreement pending the official signing of the cease-fire with South Africa. This attitude again demonstrates both SWAPO's co-operative approach and its resolve to continue the struggle for its freedom and independence, despite the obstacles created by the South African régime.

(Mr. Al-Zaabi, United Arab Emirates)

Independence means freedom from the constraints that restrict scope for action and the ability to take decisions by oneself, for oneself. That is what we want for the people of Namibia in the near future to enable them to establish their own independent and sovereign State, so that they can take their place among the nations of the world, especially since confidence in the Organization, as a framework for the settlement of regional and international disputes, has begun to pick up strength.

Mr. JARRETT (Liberia): Once again the General Assembly, as it has done for the last two decades, is debating the question of Namibia. This unfortunate situation is the result of racist Pretoria's persistent unwillingness to terminate its illegal occupation and colonial domination of Namibia and of its contemptuous treatment of the many resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. More than 21 years ago the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. By resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 it established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority until independence.

When we started the business of this forty-third session of the General Assembly over a month ago an overwhelming majority, if not all, of those who participated in the general debate mentioned with some degree of satisfaction the successes that this Organization has achieved recently in the resolution of conflicts, and commended the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts in achieving those results. References were made to the Afghan accords which made possible the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan; to the acceptance by

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

Iran and Iraq of a cease-fire in their eight-year war; to the acceptance by Morocco and the POLISARIO Front of a United Nations plan for holding a referendum to settle the Western Sahara problem; and to Viet Nam's announcement of the withdrawal of 50,000 of its troops from Kampuchea by the end of this year.

Unfortunately South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia could not be included in the list. The racist Pretoria régime continues to deploy its forces in Namibia and seemingly has no intention of withdrawing those forces and of commencing implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only internationally accepted basis for the settlement of the Namibian question. As we know, the settlement plan embodied in that resolution provides, among other things, for the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

The various negotiations that have taken place between South Africa and other interested parties during the last few months on the question of Namibia's independence appear not to have convinced the racist Pretoria régime of the imperative need to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia as well as to desist from using its territory for the launching of acts of aggression against front-line and other neighbouring States. South Africa's announcement of its intention to commence the withdrawal of its forces from Namibia on 1 November this year, good as it sounded, because such action is long overdue, was nevertheless received with scepticism by my Government. The Foreign Minister of Liberia, addressing this issue in his statement early in October during the general debate, stated:

"While we take note of the ... quadripartite discussions on the Namibian question, there is nothing in the negotiating records of the racist régime to justify any reliance on its commitments." (A/43/PV.22, p. 58)

History has proved that correct. We now understand that the withdrawal process will commence on 1 January 1989. Whether this is another ploy remains to be seen. However, The New York Times, reporting on this subject in its 6 November 1988 issue, had this to say:

"Namibians - including whites who make up only 7 per cent of the population - expect independence to come, perhaps not in two months, but inexorably, months or years later."

The racist Pretoria régime has consistently thwarted every action designed to free the Namibian people from oppressive apartheid policies and colonial domination. South Africa's deception should be easily discernible by now. But unfortunately there are those that still believe in the concept of constructive engagement and those that continue to have faith in that moribund régime of desperadoes. However, my Government wishes to reiterate that it is still convinced that nothing but concerted action will terminate South Africa's stranglehold on



(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

Namibia, a Territory that it continues to occupy illegally in defiance of resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. The General Assembly should therefore send an unequivocal signal to the Pretoria régime of its resolve to settle the Namibian question and that it will tolerate no further dilatory tactics.

The Government of Liberia perceives South Africa's insistence on linking its illegal occupation of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola as just another sinister strategy to delude the international community. The pity of it all is that there are certain permanent members of the Security Council which, perhaps because of their economic interests in Namibia, seem to have been hijacked by the Pretoria régime, judging from their vigorous support of the linkage theory. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola can never be an acceptable reason for South Africa's continuing occupation of Namibia. The racist Pretoria régime started its defiance of, and obstinate attitude towards, the United Nations long before Cuban forces entered Angola at the invitation of that sovereign State. Linkage, as members know, is totally unacceptable. It has been consistently and firmly rejected by the international community, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Angola and, indeed, the front-line States. It is nothing but a pretext by the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegality. We must continue to reject the spurious argument of linkage and insist on South Africa's total and complete withdrawal from Namibia.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted 10 years ago, but its implementation has been delayed for so long because of South Africa's dilatory manoeuvres. During this 10-year period the people of Namibia - men, women and children - have been systematically subjected to the most cruel and inhumane treatment. The racist régime has deployed a massive military force in the Territory, not only to suppress the Namibian people's struggle for their

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

inalienable right to freedom, justice and independence but also to launch acts of aggression and destabilization against front-line and other neighbouring States. Those attacks, which result in indiscriminate destruction of life and property, must cease if there is to be peace and security in the region.

At the same time, foreign economic interests, which include some of the world's largest corporations and financial institutions from South Africa, Western Europe and North America, are involved in the exploitation of Namibia's mineral resources by means of licences issued by the illegal and colonial South African régime. There are others which plunder the Territory's marine resources. These activities are in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, promulgated in 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for that Territory until independence, and in disregard of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

In view of South Africa's subjection of the people of Namibia to degrading and oppressive treatment through its abhorrent apartheid policy and its repeated defiance of the demands of the international community that it end its illegal occupation of Namibia, my Government once again urges the Security Council seriously to consider the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations against that racist and remorseless régime. We appeal to those friends of the white minority régime of Pretoria which are also permanent members of the Security Council and which repeatedly cast a negative vote on proposals for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa to reconsider their action, taking into account the sufferings and harsh treatment that the people of Namibia have had to endure for so long under apartheid.

(Mr. Jarrett, Liberia)

The Government and people of Liberia wish to reaffirm once again their solidarity with, and unwavering support for, the heroic people of Namibia, who, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization, their sole and authentic representative, have gallantly resisted the onslaught of apartheid. The Namibians continue to fight courageously for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the other offshore islands. It is our fervent hope that when the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly is convened next year a free and independent Namibia will take its rightful place as a full Member of the United Nations.

Before I end this statement I wish on behalf of my delegation to commend our Secretary-General, a man of peace, for his personal commitment to Namibia's independence and for his tireless efforts to bring about the implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). While encouraging him to continue those efforts, I wish also to reassure him of the fullest co-operation and support of the Government of Liberia.

Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In the complexity of the world today there are grounds for noting the accumulation of positive trends as well as others. There is growing awareness of the indivisibility of the world, of the commonality of the fate of all peoples. The ideas of new political thinking are beginning to penetrate the very fabric of practical politics and specific actions, including disarmament affairs. There has been movement towards the political settlement of regional conflicts and, in particular, a political mechanism has begun to work in southern Africa.

We support in principle the quadripartite talks on a political settlement of the situation in southern Africa, but believe that on this item we must proceed from the actual situation in that part of Africa. For two centuries Namibia has been fettered, in chains. Twenty-two years have passed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia and made the Territory the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The General Assembly and other bodies have adopted over 100 resolutions on this very matter, calling for an end to the illegal occupation of the country by the South African racists. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has been waiting 10 years for implementation.

Recently, the situation in Namibia has not merely been improving but has been worsening. The document prepared by the United Nations Council from Namibia (A/AC.131/284) emphasizes in particular that over the past year South Africa has continued to use all possible methods to subjugate the Namibian people. It has extended the policy of apartheid to all aspects of life for the population of the Territory and stepped up the militarization of Namibia and acts of ruthlessness and oppression against the Namibian people. There have been more frequent cases of disappearance and detention of members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and its supporters. The emergency situation, martial law, the

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

curfew - all have been introduced by the Pretoria régime in the so-called security zones that cover more than two thirds of the Territory.

Namibia is still subjected to occupation by South African troops. In a country with a population of approximately 1.6 million there are about 100,000 South African soldiers, present illegally and supported by 10,000 police. That large military presence is used by South Africa as the basic means of maintaining control over the Territory and carrying out acts of aggression against the front-line States, primarily Angola.

There is no doubt that one of the basic reasons for South Africa's refusal to grant independence to Namibia is the Territory's wealth of natural resources. Despite many United Nations resolutions, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, South Africa, Western and other foreign economic elements continue to plunder the natural resources of the Territory. The virtually unlimited activities of foreign economic elements in Namibia has led to the exploitation of the wealth of Namibia in a manner that is detrimental to the interests of the people and has resulted in the further strengthening of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa.

The scope of this activity can be seen, for example, in the data cited in a document (A/AC.131/286) of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It indicates, inter alia, that the apartheid régime provides conditions in which transnational corporations of certain Western countries can make enormous profits as a result of their plundering of the economic resources of Namibia and exploitation of Namibian workers, whose pay, according to estimates, is 16 times lower than the pay for white workers in Namibia.

The General Assembly, in its resolution 42/14 A, and in earlier decisions also, declared that all activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia were

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

illegal and called for the immediate withdrawal from the Territory of Namibia of transnational corporations and the ending of their co-operation with the illegal South African administration.

It is perfectly obvious that the apartheid régime could not have conducted itself in such an insolent manner had it not enjoyed the direct and indirect support of certain Western countries. The interest of those States in strengthening the Pretoria régime and ensuring its continued occupation of Namibia is prompted by political, economic, military and strategic considerations and interests. It is those States, primarily, that are blocking the Security Council's adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

The road that would lead to a political settlement in Namibia is well known. It is described clearly and in detail in United Nations decisions, particularly Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), as well as in subsequent decisions on Namibia which have been accepted throughout the world.

The most important thing now is to exert pressure on the Pretoria régime and make it implement those decisions without linking the problem of the granting of independence to the people of Namibia with totally extraneous matters.

The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic supports the recent appeal by the non-aligned countries to the Security Council, as contained in document A/43/708, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime in the event that South Africa once again resorts to its dilatory and destructionist tactics and prevents the commencement of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which has always advocated a policy based on the principle of the full and complete elimination of colonialism,

EH/fr

A/43/PV. 48

119-120

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

racism and apartheid in all their forms and manifestations, firmly and consistently calls for the immediate exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence in a united and territorially intact Namibia. It also advocates the immediate and complete withdrawal from the Territory of all South African troops and administrators.

(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

We support SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We believe in stepping up the collective efforts to break the deadlock in this conflict in southern Africa and we believe there should be a constructive effort to find ways and means of swiftly implementing decisions taken by the United Nations on Namibia. We believe in working out a just political settlement in the region, fully in accordance with the principles accepted by the United Nations and the OAU. Such a settlement would entail the complete cessation of acts of aggression by the apartheid régime against neighbouring African States and the prohibition of such acts in the future, the immediate granting of independence to Namibia and the swift elimination of the inhuman system of apartheid in South Africa.

The United Nations has a direct responsibility for the granting of independence to Namibia as soon as possible. Accordingly, it is extremely important to accentuate the role of this Organization, primarily the Security Council, in achieving the implementation of United Nations decisions on Namibia. The Byelorussian delegation supports the Secretary-General's efforts to settle the Namibian problem and we commend the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

Guided by our position of principle, the Byelorussian SSR will continue to support the struggle of the gallant people of Namibia, headed by SWAPO, for their liberation.

In concluding my statement, I should like to express the hope that the United Nations General Assembly will adopt decisions on this item on the agenda that will serve further to mobilize the efforts of the international community on behalf of the liberation of Namibia and the final elimination of colonialism and racism from southern Africa. We firmly believe that the Namibian people, with the support of



(Mr. Mardovich, Byelorussian SSR)

the forces of peace, progress and justice, will achieve true freedom and independence.

Mr. IOHIA (Papua New Guinea): Much discussion in recent years has centred round attempts to find a negotiated settlement to Namibia's genuine struggle for independence.

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

Papua New Guinea will continue to maintain that we must all make a concerted effort, in keeping with the spirit of the statements we make in this Assembly, to make possible the early and immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and all related resolutions and initiatives of the United Nations and the Council for Namibia.

The ugly face of colonialism is disfigured with economic greed, a cultural superiority complex, political arrogance and strategic interests. Colonialism continues to exist in Namibia and elsewhere because of that greed, that superiority complex, that arrogance and those strategic interests.

The abundant natural resources found in Namibia and South Africa tempt countries to maintain policies which they know deep down are wrong and inexcusable.

There are those who prefer to have Namibia continue to be a colonial territory under racist South Africa as long as the rich resources of Namibia flow their way. If Namibia were not as rich as it is in natural resources and if it had a less strategic position, there would be little opposition to its freedom and independence. Papua New Guinea is hopeful that all the people of the world and the various interest groups in Namibia will remain united, for if they do not, the

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

racist régime will continue to take the opportunity to gain more ground and cause further instability among the good people of Namibia and southern Africa. Papua New Guinea welcomes the prospects for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia. We commend the Secretary-General of the United Nations and others for their tireless efforts in giving us this hope.

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

We, the Members of this Organization, regard ourselves as the champions of liberation struggles. Many more have fought vigorously to set themselves free from colonial bondage and are therefore totally committed to the principles of decolonization, both in word and in deed. Though colonialism as a system has been relegated to human history, its remnants, to our great indignation, have not disappeared completely. Indeed, Namibia is an unfortunate remnant of the colonial era of the past in the great African continent, just as New Caledonia is in the aquatic continent of the Pacific. Certainly, decolonization is one issue on which unanimity must prevail. How can we, who fought vigorously to free ourselves from colonialism, ignore those who are fighting against the same enemy today?

The persistent defiance by the racist South Africa of the universal calls for an end to apartheid and for the withdrawal of its troops from Namibia can be countered only by a strong demonstration of a firm political will and moral

(Mr. Lohia, Papua New Guinea)

responsibility by those who are well placed to bring about effective pressure, including mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa.

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

Mr. McLEAN (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The principles of peace, freedom and self-determination have forged the consciousness of peoples throughout history. For most of those peoples this has involved an arduous and unrelenting quest for their own identity and for their own inalienable right to live in freedom. Colombia is a product of this historical process and, as an independent Republic, it has not only incorporated these principles in its laws and Constitution but has also committed itself to the cause of all peoples, including those which are still struggling to achieve those ideals today.

The creation of the United Nations has given a universal character to this commitment, and this in turn led to one of the most important and successful stages of human history, with the process of self-determination and decolonization which began in 1947 with the independence of India, under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, whom we particularly remember today, 14 November, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth.

However, for thousands of human beings who still live under the yoke of colonialism, this process has not been completed. This is certainly true of Namibia, where a people is not only seeking to exercise its inalienable right to independence but also fighting a régime which is determined at all costs to maintain its rule over the Territory. The many initiatives taken by our Organization, particularly over the last 20 years, and pressure by the international community have had no effect, for Namibia remains under the physical, economic and administrative control of a foreign régime.

To what can one ascribe this stagnation of the process, a process which should be irreversible and enjoys universal support? First and foremost we must consider the continued intransigence of the South African régime in the face of this situation. Indeed, the Pretoria Government has clearly shown its contempt for

(Mr. McLean, Colombia)

fundamental rights such as the rights to peace, justice and freedom, not just externally when it persists in maintaining dominion over the Territory of Namibia but also domestically when, disregarding those principles and the repeated appeals of the international community, it has preserved the political system of apartheid which guarantees the power of a minority over large majorities. In order to uphold its position the South African Government has not only disregarded the appeals of the international community and the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations but also pursued a blatant policy of destabilization in the region, crossing its own national boundaries in its determination to strengthen its influence and power.

While it is essential to acknowledge the intransigence and arrogance of the Pretoria Government as the principal obstacles to legitimate independence for Namibia, it is also prudent to analyse the strategy of the United Nations over those years and ascertain possible changes in our course of action that would help us redefine our future strategy more forcefully. I do not intend to give a detailed historical account of the process but rather to highlight some of its aspects in order to strengthen the role of the United Nations in its efforts to achieve independence for Namibia. First we must refer to our lack of determination to implement mandatory sanctions as a logical step to secure compliance with the Organization's resolutions and decisions. In the case of Namibia such a situation has been obvious on more than one occasion. By way of example, I refer to resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and compelled it to withdraw immediately from the Territory, and to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted unanimously more than 10 years ago but which has not yet been implemented.

(Mr. McLean, Colombia)

Lack of will on the part of certain Member States has been one of the prime factors impeding the implementation of the mechanism leading to stricter compliance by States with United Nations resolutions and decisions, a fact which has clearly inhibited and impeded the work of the Organization. This difficulty of giving more binding effect to United Nations resolutions has given rise to a second difficulty, the difficulty involved in adopting resolutions which are apparently contradictory or inconsistent. General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V) gave the Organization a mandate, first directly and subsequently through the establishment of the Council for Namibia, in order to bring about the transition of Namibia from a colonial State to the status of a free nation and, additionally, made this process contingent on the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would transfer that mandate to an independent special representative, thereby removing South Africa's withdrawal as a condition for the holding of elections. Of course, all processes have to evolve and hence there is the need to adjust continually to changing conditions; but it is also clear that the process should show signs of progress towards a solution of the problem and should not be coupled, as it would now seem to be, with the intransigence of one of the parties involved. The case of Namibia would seem to fit the second of those definitions.

As a result of these factors, the ability of the United Nations to bring pressure to bear has been reduced and consequently a process of independent talks designed to provide a definitive solution to the Namibian problem has been started. Colombia is prepared to support that initiative, which we hope will lead to the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). None the less, we feel that it would have been preferable for this process to have been carried out under the direct auspices of the United Nations and - here I touch

(Mr. McLean, Colombia)

on a point which is perhaps more important - with the participation of representatives of the people of Namibia, which have suddenly ceased to be a party to the negotiations and have instead become the object of the negotiations.

Our prime objective continues to be the immediate independence of the Namibian people and the holding of elections to allow them to decide on their future. That is why we shall support any peace initiative within these parameters that is in keeping with the true interests of the Namibian people. On the other hand, we are aware that the problem of Namibia still remains and that the mandate given to our Organization is as valid now as it ever was. Consequently its work should not just continue but should be intensified. In this respect we must accordingly be prepared to place stronger emphasis on concepts which for the time being have passed into a secondary role but which, without doubt, have been fundamental pillars of the United Nations strategy. These concepts are flexibility, independence and unification and co-ordination of work.

(Mr. McLean, Colombia)

The United Nations and its various organs must be able to adapt to situations that are constantly changing. They must take an approach that will make possible continual and smooth work, independently of any process that may be set in motion. More important still, the United Nations efforts must be based on a strategy that is co-ordinated throughout the Organization and its various bodies.

Over and above those concepts, however, what is most important is the will of each Member State to make sure that the fundamental rights of freedom, peace and independence are fully implemented - for these rights belong to all the peoples of the world. Colombia will continue to work towards that end, not only through the General Assembly but also as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Security Council.

Commitment to the cause of a free Namibia is a universal commitment and must remain one of the principal items on our agenda until that long-overdue independence is achieved. In the meantime, the United Nations must not relax its efforts. On the contrary, it must do its utmost to ensure that all the efforts made to achieve this objective are in keeping with the real needs and rights of the Namibian people.

AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK: LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES (A/43/600/Add.1)**

The PRESIDENT: Document A/43/600/Add.1 contains a letter dated 11 November 1988 addressed to the President of the General Assembly by the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences. As members are aware, the Assembly, in paragraph 7 of section I of its resolution 40/243, decided that no subsidiary organ of the General Assembly should be permitted to meet at United Nations Headquarters during a regular session of the Assembly unless explicitly authorized by the Assembly.



(The President)

As indicated in the letter to which I have just referred, the Committee on Conferences has recommended that the Selection Panel for Human Rights Prizes should be authorized to meet during the current session of the General Assembly.

May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.