



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.50  
18 November 1988

ENGLISH

## Forty-third session

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 15 November 1988, at 3 p.m.President:

|        |                                |                      |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| later: | Mr. CAFUTO                     | (Argentina)          |
| later: | Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Vice-President) | (Bahrain)            |
| later: | Mr. CAFUTO                     | (Argentina)          |
| later: | Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Vice-President) | (Bahrain)            |
|        | Mr. BRANCO (Vice-President)    | (Sao Tome, Principe) |

- The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives:
  - (a) Report of the Secretary-General
  - (b) Draft resolution
- Question of Namibia [29]
  - (a) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia
  - (b) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
  - (c) Report of the Secretary-General
  - (d) Report of the Fourth Committee
  - (e) Draft resolutions

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 22

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA: THREATS TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY AND PEACE INITIATIVES:

- (a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/729);
- (b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/43/L.26)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Guatemala to introduce the draft resolution in document A/43/L.26.

Mr. VILLAGRAN DE LEON (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour of introducing the draft resolution on the situation in Central America, on behalf of my colleagues from the Central American subregion as well as from the countries of the Contadora Group and of its Support Group, whose co-sponsorship we appreciate.

The draft resolution is the result of open and constructive discussions among representatives of the five Central American countries, discussions in which they realistically recognized the lack of progress in the process of implementing the Esquipulas II agreements, signed in Guatemala on 7 August 1987, and in which they maintained the view that those agreements contain the indispensable principles and elements for the achievement of firm and lasting peace in Central America. In those discussions there was also great awareness of and interest in the need to continue and promote the regional peace process. That is the sense and purpose of the draft resolution which the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela also have supported with their valuable co-sponsorship.

Those fraternal countries which make up the Contadora and Support Groups have maintained a constant interest in a peaceful solution of the Central American

(Mr. Villagran De Leon,  
Guatemala)

conflict and a constant readiness to help us in the search for that solution. We recognize once again, with gratitude, that the efforts made by the Contadora and Support Groups contributed to creating a political-diplomatic space that made possible and encouraged the negotiation and subsequent signing of the Esquipulas II agreements by the Central American Presidents. We are pleased that those efforts served also to identify new and more ambitious goals towards Latin American integration through consultation and political agreement.

The draft resolution that we have submitted reflects the concern expressed at the beginning of this session of the General Assembly by a large number of delegations about the difficulties confronting the peace process. In it, the Assembly would appeal to the five Central American Governments to continue to do all in their power to achieve, within the framework of the Esquipulas II agreements, harmonious and stable coexistence, ensuring peace, democracy, development, security and respect for human rights. It would also request the Secretary-General to continue affording the fullest possible support to the Governments of the region, both at the diplomatic level and in terms of co-operation. With a view to promoting full observance of the principles of self-determination and non-intervention, an appeal is made to the countries with links to the region and interests in it to facilitate the implementation of the Esquipulas II agreements. Lastly, under the draft resolution the Assembly would urge the international community to increase its technical, economic and financial co-operation with the region.

This draft resolution merely reflects a reality and points to conditions necessary to improve the situation, for the benefit of all Central Americans. The members of the Assembly can contribute to that noble goal by giving the draft resolution their unanimous support.

(Mr. Villagran De Leon,  
Guatemala)

I wish to take this opportunity to present Guatemala's position on the situation in Central America.

My Government also is concerned at the deadlock in the regional peace process and is always ready to contribute to the fulfilment of the urgent task of giving the process new impetus. It is precisely for that purpose that President Cerezo has insisted on the timeliness of holding another meeting of Central American Heads of State. President Cerezo believes in dialogue and negotiation as the most appropriate means to settle differences among States, and his policy of active neutrality is based on the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes as well as on respect for self-determination and non-intervention.

Aware of the difficulties that we would have to confront and overcome, after the historic signing of the "Procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America", President Cerezo said the following before the General Assembly last year:

"The Esquipulas II agreement is only a first step on a long road. We cannot proclaim to the world that the mere fact of having signed it has solved all the problems, that peace and stability have been achieved. Far from it: now comes the hard part of this task, because if it was difficult to achieve agreements that seemed quite improbable, it is even more difficult to put them into effect". (A/42/PV.6, pp. 12 and 13)

We accept our responsibility and we express again our resolve to make greater efforts to do what we should do to achieve the objective of peace, democracy and development. None the less, we must bear in mind that peace in our region will not be the result only of the political will of the Governments and peoples of Central America. That is why the appeal to countries outside the region but with links to



(Mr. Villagran De Leon,  
Guatemala)

and interests in it to shoulder their responsibility and facilitate the process of implementing the Esquipulas II agreements is relevant.

Now more than ever before it is necessary to strengthen that process, to encourage and promote it so that it will continue and be enriched by new contributions. We know that it is basically up to us Central Americans to demonstrate with deeds that we are inspired by the will to build democratic and united societies capable of promoting development in the region. We understand that it is necessary for certain positions to be made more flexible and that, through dialogue and negotiation, we must make a contribution not only by proposing and demanding but also, and above all, by knowing how to yield and make compromises.

By choosing active neutrality, Guatemala seeks to make a positive contribution in the region. In order to promote stability and security in Central America, we have carefully observed, for a number of years now, the principles contained in the important Contadora document of objectives, which are still valid and the necessary basis for achieving the stability and security of each of the countries of the region. In that connection, I wish to mention the following principles:

The Government of Guatemala, in the context of the Central American subregion, has refrained from participating in the arms race. The Government of Guatemala does not participate in international military manoeuvres, nor are there foreign military installations or foreign military advisers in the country. The Government of Guatemala does not allow the presence of irregular forces on its territory, nor does it support any group or movement that wishes to destabilize any Government in the region. The Government of Guatemala promotes national reconciliation through elections, political pluralism and the strengthening of democratic institutions.

(Mr. Villagran De Leon,  
Guatemala)

Guatemala considers that the commitments undertaken in the Esquipulas II agreements on the non-use of territory to attack other States and on the cessation of aid to irregular forces or insurrectionist movements must be implemented.

Guatemala has also proposed the creation of a Central American parliament. The Treaty establishing the parliament has already been signed and ratified by four countries. We are hoping for ratification by the other in the near future.

(Mr. Villagran De Leon, Guatemala)

The Central American parliament will be an important forum for political interaction between ideological parties and communities and will serve to promote the discussion of our economic, social and political problems, as well as to strengthen and complement those formulas of negotiation aimed at achieving peaceful coexistence in Central America.

In Central America there are other forms of interaction that confirm the close link between peace and development. In the economic field it is appropriate to mention the decision of the five Central American Governments to adopt measures to strengthen the secretariat of the Common Market, of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the Central American Monetary Council. In the commercial field the negotiation of a new customs agreement will help expedite the adherence of four countries to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The fifth country, Nicaragua has been a member of GATT for a number of years. This means that in Central America there prevails a clear awareness of the interdependence of our countries and the need to deepen the process of regional integration.

The definition of the machinery for the implementation of the special plan of economic co-operation in Central America prepared by the United Nations Development Programme, as well as the decision jointly to administer special support by the international community for that plan, are the result of that integrationist awareness which has survived in spite of the tensions and difficulties of recent years.

In the social sphere we are fully aware of the problems faced by refugees and we want to find solutions with the assistance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. For this purpose, we have proposed to the General Assembly that it convene an international conference on Central American refugees for next year.

(Mr. Villagran De Leon, Guatemala)

This integrationist awareness has been encouraged by dialogue with other regions of the international community, especially with our Latin American brothers and with the European Economic Community. This dialogue with the European Economic Community has not only been a source of inspiration but has also strengthened our faith in our vast potential to build a better future for our peoples.

Mr. SERRANO CALDERA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Item 22 of the agenda of this forty-third session is without doubt one of the most important items the General Assembly has discussed during this decade. The discussions and resolutions of the Assembly are supplemented by the debates and resolutions of the Security Council, which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

All this diplomatic activity has not been in vain. In addition to the tremendous work of the Contadora Group and its Support Group, and the continued willingness of the Secretary-General to lend his co-operation in the peace efforts, this diplomatic activity has prevented greater deterioration and helped create the basis for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the region. Without those efforts, we Central Americans would have been unable to go to Esquipulas last year and commit ourselves to a series of obligations constituting the synthesis of all the political and diplomatic efforts and, on the basis of total respect for the principles of the Charter and international law, the answer to the problems, concerns and aspirations of our peoples.

Unanimous recognition of such efforts found expression in the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session, namely resolution 42/1, in which the Assembly expressed its firm support for the agreement known as the "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America", signed by the five Central American Presidents on 7 August 1987 in Esquipulas, Guatemala.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera, Nicaragua)

A further summit meeting of the Central American States, held in Alajuela, Costa Rica, on 16 January this year, gave fresh impetus to the peace process in the area. The progress made has been set out in the excellent report presented to the Assembly by the Secretary-General in document A/43/729. Of course, all these efforts have not been insufficient, for peace and development remain a dream yet to be realized, a right our peoples must continue fighting for every day at the cost of their blood.

The Secretary-General recognized this when he stated, in paragraph 11 of his report:

"On the other hand, there has been an apparent lack of similar progress towards fulfilment of the commitments on non-use of territory to attack other States and on termination of aid for irregular forces and insurrectionist movements. The lack of progress towards compliance with those obligations not only has affected the simultaneous fulfilment of the commitments embodied in the agreement, but also has undermined the Esquipulas II strategy aimed at bringing about the cessation of hostilities on the basis of a broad amnesty and democratization, in conjunction with the termination of aid for irregular forces and insurrectionist movements, and non-use of territory to attack other States. It seems that since the Alajuela Declaration was issued, the principle of simultaneity has been replaced by the principle of unilateralism; but it is difficult to imagine how in practice the principle of reciprocity in the fulfilment of the commitments could cease to apply." (A/43/729)

It is with satisfaction and pride that I reiterate before the Assembly that the profound desire for peace which motivates my Government - a desire which has been further demonstrated by the strenuous efforts made unilaterally to ensure the implementation of the Esquipulas II commitments.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

It must be recognized, that the Esquipulas II efforts, have failed to achieve the desired results, because the policy of aggression and destabilization has not ceased, and because the present United States Administration is continuing to spend millions of dollars to preserve the war option and has boycotted efforts to bring about dialogue and reconciliation.

On 23 March this year my Government reached an agreement with the leadership of the so-called Nicaraguan resistance. This agreement of principle, the so-called Sapoa agreement, could not be developed at subsequent meetings, because of the orders given by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to the militarist sectors of the counter-revolutionary leadership to disrupt and boycott the negotiating process. The reason was obvious: those negotiations were at that time an obstacle to the efforts of the Reagan Administration to obtain greater military assistance for its poorly named freedom fighters.

The pressure put on and the manipulation of internal opposition groups by the Reagan Administration also came to light through the so-called Melton plan, orchestrated by the United States Ambassador in Managua, the objective of which was to create a situation of internal chaos.

Last week President Reagan's Administration, in a reaffirmation of its obsessive, blind policy, renewed the trade embargo against Nicaragua, which was declared illegal by the International Court of Justice in its Judgment of 27 June 1986 and the immediate lifting of which has been urged by this General Assembly since it was first imposed in 1985. All this provides a tangible, tragic example of how the war option has prevailed to this very moment.

The Secretary-General therefore recognizes in his report that it is not simply a renewed impetus on the part of the Central American Governments that is needed.

(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

These Governments are, I am sure, ready and willing to demonstrate such a spirit. They have already demonstrated it by working together on the special plan of economic co-operation for Central America, prepared by the Secretary-General with our enthusiastic collaboration, and approved by the Assembly in its resolution 42/231 on 12 May this year. They continue to demonstrate it by presenting today to this Assembly a draft resolution on the subject of peace and security in Central America, which enjoys the firm support of the five Governments and constitutes a substantive contribution to the process begun in Esquipulas a year ago. They have demonstrated this will also by agreeing to meet again at the end of this month at the presidential level in the city of San Salvador. This Central American agreement on the urgent need to put an end to war and respond to our peoples' needs for freedom and development should go hand in hand with the actions of countries outside the region, as the Secretary-General recognizes when he states:

"the countries outside the region with ties and interests in it must resolutely decide to facilitate that task and refrain from any action likely to undermine it." (A/43/729, para. 12)

What the five Central American countries are seeking is an opportunity for peace. We urge and demand that we be allowed to exercise our rights, and fulfil our responsibility to solve our problems through negotiation and dialogue, to work together, to rebuild our devastated economies and have the support of the international community so as to be able to face the economic and social problems of the region.

What have we achieved in all these years? What have been the fruits of the policy of destabilization and war that has inspired the Reagan Administration? Has the time not come to understand that war, destruction, economic and financial blockades, arrogant domination and threats are not the means of solving and will

(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

not solve the problems of Central America? Has the time not come to understand that the security interests of the United States, which it says are threatened, will be better served by a Central America at peace, united and committed to the task of achieving economic and social development for its peoples and improving its own democratic models? Has the time not come to end once and for all this horrific chapter of eight years of genocidal war and begin writing the chapter of peace? Have 50,000 victims and more than \$12 billion in material damage - the price Nicaragua has had to pay to defend its national dignity, sovereignty and independence - not been enough?

At this particular time in the history of the United States there is an exceptional opportunity to correct the mistaken course of the past. As always, Nicaragua has been ready and willing, and will continue to be so, to take the first step. The President of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega Saavedra, in his message of congratulation to Mr. George Bush, the President-elect of the United States, stated:

"On learning the results of the election of 8 November last, I should like to offer you my greetings and express the readiness of Nicaragua to work for the normalization of relations between our countries. I recall that when we shook hands in the Brazilian Congress in March 1985 the political leaders of Latin America and other world leaders gathered there broke into applause which clearly expressed the desire that peace should reign between our two nations. This is the desire of Nicaragua, and we understand that it is the desire also of the immense majority of the people of the United States. I invite you to work with us to make this noble aspiration to peace a reality."

We hope that those words of the President of Nicaragua will be heeded by the next President of the United States. We hope that the voice of the General Assembly, which this afternoon will certainly be adopting a new and dramatic



(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

appeal for peace in Central America, will not be disregarded. We trust that this document, which is supported unanimously by the Central American countries, by the countries of the Contadora Group and of the Support Group, will be understood as an unambiguous message of peace

A/43/PV.30  
Mr. MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly is meeting today to deal with the item entitled "The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and initiatives", a subject which is important to the international community and vital for those of us to whom the region is home. The fact that this session is being presided over by a man who has played a significant part in the Contadora Support Group and our own peace effort is not only a guarantee but a symbol of hope.

Every human being is a living monument of his culture and experience. By the same token, every nation is a living monument to its culture and history. Central America came into existence as one single political entity in the colonial era, born to independent life on 15 September 1821 as one entity, and the countries which make it up have travelled the path of history sharing successes and setbacks on roads which intertwine in such a way that they could almost be defined as one single path.

What is at stake in Central America is the definition and determination of a destiny which we all know that we all share. Therefore, we have always recognized that this requires a comprehensive regional solution. Faced with the disagreements which have arisen among the Central America leaders as to the best course towards this destiny and the impact of the deep social needs involved, internal conflict has broken out in some Central American countries. Hence, there is a need for us, through mutual concessions, to solve those problems in a high-level dialogue.

Even though the definition of Central America's destiny in every instance concerns the Central Americans themselves, brother countries meeting in the Contadora and Support Groups to air their fraternal commitment to their aspirations for peace, the interference of other international forces makes the problem more complex. Thus promising dialogue is at times complicated and impeded. In one of those instances there arose the initiative of the President of the Republic

(Mr. Martinez Ordoñez, Honduras)

of Costa Rica, Mr. Oscar Arias Sanchez, resulting in the Esquipulas II, which brought new hope, not only to the Central Americans but to the entire international community.

It is clear that Esquipulas II is a framework constituting an important contribution to the process which should lead to peace, democracy, justice and reconciliation in Central America, and hence development. All those objectives have been recognized in the Esquipulas agreements as basic to our peoples.

Honduras, which fully shares these aspirations, recognizes that Esquipulas II defines, to a great extent, an appropriate response to our regional crisis. It similarly recognizes that the process, heralded by Esquipulas II is now almost stagnant as a result of difficulties which have arisen at the negotiating table, the complexities of the problem and the need for us, the Central Americans, to recover trust in each other.

Honduras is well aware of the urgent need to give renewed vitality to the Central American dialogue without moving away from the process referred to in Esquipulas II, particularly its objectives, and a constructive proposal was presented at the general debate of the General Assembly by our Foreign Minister, Carlos Lopez Contreras, which, taking up the question of the security and tranquillity needed in the frontier zones, and proposing an appropriate solution to the problems there, afforded the international community an opportunity to make available an effective recourse for the purpose of curbing armed violence in the region.

I have to point out that the Honduran proposal is not rigid or absolute. It is open to modifications, which could improve or supplement it and points out international obstacles only with the idea that dialogue will overcome them. From another standpoint we trust that it motivates the Central American Governments to contribute innovative ideas to make the process of the Esquipulas II more viable.

(Mr. Martinez Ordoñez, Honduras)

I am very pleased to be able to inform the Assembly that the proposal of the Honduran Government to which I refer has been received in my country with the greatest possible enthusiasm. All the political parties have supported it, as well as professional federations, workers' unions, agricultural and farmers' organizations and the national press. Without exaggerating, I can say that the Foreign Minister, in submitting it, spoke in the name of the entire Honduran people. The international press and many Governments, foreign corporations and organizations have welcomed the Honduran proposal.

San Salvador, where the Foreign Ministers of our region are meeting in a session of the Organization of American States, presents a good opportunity for the Central American Foreign Ministers to meet, analyse our proposal, supplement it with their own ideas and implement it through joint action in order to establish the vital security of the frontier zones, which would contribute significantly to the achievement of the objectives of Esquipulas II to which Honduras commits its best efforts.

Central America has an urgent need to see the prolonged armed conflict cease in those of our countries in which it is raging. It has an urgent need to see security established in all our countries and a return of peace to our region. It has an urgent need for genuine internal reconciliation in each one of the States afflicted by armed conflict. It has an urgent need to see internal conditions in our countries improve to put an end to the tragic exodus of refugees looking for safety, so that the thousands of refugees who have left their homelands, sharing the aspirations of their brother peoples, can return. There is an urgent need to do away with the reasons for the irrational arms race we are witnessing. We have an urgent need to see our citizens regard each other as brothers again, living in democracy, opening up new prospects for economic, social and cultural development. All of this can be achieved through Esquipulas II which can make it a reality.

Mr. RIVERA BIANCHINI (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly is once again dealing with the concerns, situation and aspirations of Central America. On this occasion I wish to express the views of the Government of Costa Rica, doing so with an awareness not only of what an honour it is to address this plenary Assembly, but also of the constraints imposed by the Assembly's heavy agenda and the time allotted for the debate on this issue. I would have wished to make a more extensive statement, with much more detail, but I am limited by the measures taken and the obligation to confine myself to the time allotted so that the greatest number of delegations interested in the subject can make statements.

As was the case last year, the representatives of the five Central American countries have together prepared a draft resolution, with the co-sponsorship of the representatives of the Contadora and Support Groups, reflecting the generosity and spirit of co-operation that has characterized their endeavours in respect of our problems. Hence this is a proposal that results from an agreement among the States of the region involved in a problem; however, all of them want to live in peace.

That is why we are confident that all members of the international community will support this initiative, that it will be possible to obtain the consensus reached last year, as well as agreement on the draft resolutions concerning the special plan of assistance to Central America and to the problem of refugees.

The crisis in Central America is not of recent origin: it dates back to a history of unjust structures, with bitter political, social and economic violence and the constant presence of foreign interests in the region. It is a history of divergency that has become more acute in recent years.

In some countries of the region the possibility of achieving structural change is limited, owing to the concentration of power in certain groups. All countries have problems of political refugees or migration difficulties, be they for

(Mr. Rivera Bianchini, Costa Rica)

have problems of political refugees or migration difficulties, be they for economic reasons or because of violence. Extreme poverty or a lack of basic needs affects over 50 per cent of the population; agricultural lands are increasingly concentrated in the hands of the few; barely 30 per cent of the economically active population is covered by a health system; unemployment is on the increase; in two countries almost half the population can neither read nor write; the foreign debt is over \$20 billion and the flight of capital in three countries represents over 50 per cent of the foreign debt.

Given the worsening of the crisis, various proposals for negotiation were put forward; these proposals have been strengthened, thanks to the efforts of the Contadora Group, and have finally taken shape in the agreements reached by the Central American Presidents in August 1987.

These agreements, which reflected the confidence and faith of the Central American peoples, in a short time achieved things that seemed impossible. The inflexibility of traditional positions yielded to dialogue. Divergences seemed to turn into a sea of agreements. Intransigence in Central America seemed to disappear. The five nations on their own, through their own will, opened the way to a world of peace, freedom and democracy. The international community spoke out to welcome with hope what had been achieved and was emerging in Central America. How could a regional or global forum not express its pleasure at the efforts made by five small countries in the quest for peace, to strengthen democracy, to overcome the dark nights of dictatorships, injustice and poverty?

But just as in the case of other regional conflicts where this year the promise of a solution could be discerned, we must recognize that the spirit which emerged in August 1987 has not flourished as we would all have wished. We regret to say that our region is still experiencing a painful military reality, continued

(Mr. Rivera Bianchini, Costa Rica)

violation of human rights, constant abridgment of freedoms, continued distrust and lack of political will on the part of some of the protagonists in the Central American tragedy.

The Esquipulas agreements, as conceived by President Arias and subsequently accepted by the other four Presidents, are genuine commitments to peace and democracy. They represent immediate, concrete and effective actions, actions that aim to have rhetoric yield to tangible deeds so that we can all become true champions of democracy and peace.

The existing deadlock is a fact which our Minister for Foreign Affairs highlighted in his statement in the general debate at this session of the Assembly and which the Costa Rican Government believes should be brought to the attention of members.

As a country that cherishes democracy, Costa Rica deplores any setback in the implementation of the commitments entered into in the peace plan. It distresses us to see delay or to see the light of hope provided by the Presidents of Central America extinguished.

Nevertheless, we have not lost our optimism, determination and faith in our future.

Central America is called upon to provide examples of freedom, of democracy and peace. It is not just that we should bequeath to our children the problems of today's Central America. Why not aspire to having our peoples in future concerned only with their development and the improvement of their standards of living rather than with seeking formulas for peace?

Although the main structural elements and the difficulties in achieving stability still exist, the crisis has changed its course. Its focus has been moved from conflict to negotiation. It has been reaffirmed that a comprehensive solution

(Mr. Rivera Bianchini, Costa Rica)

to the Central American crisis is political and not military. We have stressed the increasingly close link that exists between peace, democracy, development and justice.

It is true that the negotiations held within the framework of the Esquipulas agreements have not been completely successful, neither in the individual countries nor at the regional level. Although differences still persist, this year we have had more dialogue and less violence. For the first time the insurgents from Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua have these past months entered into dialogue with their respective Governments. This year the United Nations approved the special plan of economic assistance to Central America, the implementation of which will mean that the social and economic needs that constituted the initial causes of the crisis will be met, and we trust that this will become a reality. This is the year when the European Economic Community is redoubling its efforts and giving special assistance for the development of Central America. This is the year when the machinery for Latin American agreement is obtaining assistance in the field of economic co-operation. This year the amnesty laws were enacted; there were pardons and many men and women were released from prison. This year of the peace plan is the year of committees of national reconciliation. This has been a year more of aspirations and of looking to the future than of disappointments and of looking to the past.

Undoubtedly, in spite of war this year has for Central America been better than others. None the less, if all the parties had had greater resolve we would have gone further still. Our Government hopes that what was not achieved in this first will be achieved in the coming months.



(Mr. Rivera Bianchini, Costa Rica)

The majority of the Central American peoples are in favour of a negotiated political solution, not a military solution, to the crisis in the region. The minorities and certain interests outside the region that have promoted war as a means of resolving conflicts in the isthmus are tending to disappear. That is why the Costa Rican Government reaffirms its position, which will remain unassailable, that the Esquipulas II agreements offer the frame of reference and the path for the attainment of peace in Central America.

Nothing that has been done or not done since August 1987 has indicated that the plan cannot be implemented or that the solutions agreed are not valid for the Central American situation. The time has come for a new examination of conscience, the time to make amends. It is an important time, at which to admit our failures and correct our mistakes. This is the time not to hesitate or change our course but rather to make greater efforts to be true to the word.

We must achieve peace through national reconciliation and by putting an end to external aid to the vying factions. We must make effective our protection of human rights and continue our protection of public freedoms. We must institutionalize free suffrage, honestly exercised by the people, as the sole formula for political power. We must restore the validity of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and the use of peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, wherever they may occur. We must eliminate the arms race, which only brings the peoples tragedy and suffering. We must implement the peace plan not only in areas where there are immediate advantages but also in those where there may be problems. Central America must once again demonstrate its firm resolve to live in peace and democracy.

The strengthening of the Central American democracies depends mainly on the internal efforts of each country. None the less, however heroic those efforts, they will never suffice if we do not achieve for the future of those democracies a

(Mr. Rivera Bianchini, Costa Rica)

political and economic space more conducive to growth. This is where we need the support of the international community, so that just as it helped us to establish the peace plan, so it will use its influence to make it possible to implement that plan.

The Costa Rican Government is aware that failure to comply with the Esquipulas agreements would prevent the Central American countries from getting the support promised by the international community. It is impossible to deny freedom and request aid of free nations. It is impossible to deny democracy and request democratic nations to contribute so that we can embark on the course of development. It is impossible to devote every effort to war and then claim guarantees of life in peace.

The Costa Rican Government intends to implement each and every one of the Esquipulas commitments. We also express our willingness to participate in all negotiations, take every step and make every effort to fulfil every obligation to make those commitments effective.

We invite members to join us in this effort to give a greater impetus to the peace-making process. We urge members to co-operate with all the means at their command to bring about a renewed resolve not only to reactivate but to complete, with glory and in a definitive fashion, that difficult but possible endeavour, the endeavour of peace.

Mr. MELENDEZ BARAHONA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to take this opportunity, Sir, to tell you, on behalf of the people and Government of El Salvador, how pleased we are at your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its forty-third session and by the very efficient, responsible way in which you are guiding our work and deliberations on the various complex subjects which are being considered during this session.

Consideration of the situation in Central America began in our Organization in

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

1983, precisely five years ago, for the purpose of analysing, among other things, the prevailing serious political situation, the intraregional crisis of confidence, the threats of intervention, the possibility of a generalized armed conflict and ways of avoiding it and finding a political solution to the regional problem so as to prevent a breakdown of international peace and security, basing ourselves on the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

As everyone knows, it has been recognized that the present crisis in our region is the result of economic and political structures whose historical development has not been in accordance with the needs of social dynamism and whose causes derive from both endogenous and exogenous factors. As a result our national societies are in a tragic state of poverty, social injustice, limited opportunity, closed and authoritarian political systems and so on, and this has given rise to internal situations of instability, polarization and confrontation between the various social groups, as well as the emergence of serious differences between the countries of the region.

The efforts of Central American Governments to overcome underdevelopment and improve the well-being of their peoples have been limited not only by the social and political situation resulting from a lack of democracy in the broader sense, but also because the foundation for development has consisted and still consists basically of economies that are in the main not exporting economies and are dependent on the unstable conditions of the international economy. Nevertheless, experience in some Central American countries shows that in the periods of peace and stability that have followed times of political agitation development programmes were established which, although limited in their results, made possible economic growth based on close co-operation among Central American countries, particularly in the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s. Unfortunately,

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

however, these did not solve the problem of social inequalities, and the gap between rich and poor continued to grow.

The Alliance for Progress, the Central American Common Market, the Generalized System of Preferences and the Caribbean Basin recovery mechanism, because of the limitations of underdevelopment in Central America and because the situation does not require it yet, have not been improved upon, gone into in greater depth or given the necessary support, so that their development and the benefits they have yielded have been very limited.

The deepening economic crisis, which has become more acute in recent years as a result of increasing foreign debt, natural disasters and, in some countries, the existence of internal armed conflicts, and the emergence of a state of ideological confrontation in the Central American region which could have given rise to regional conflicts, were the crucial characteristics of the early 1980s. These in turn gave rise to initiatives to achieve a negotiated political solution to the crisis and to establish a climate of trust, security and stability to avoid a wider conflict. Among the initiatives adopted to this end recognition must be given to the efforts and contribution of the Contadora Group and the Support Group in the search for a solution to the regional crisis; the peace proposal of President Arias of Costa Rica, which culminated in the signing by the Central American Presidents of the Esquipulas agreement of 7 August 1987, entitled "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America"; the joint initiatives of the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity; and the measures adopted by the Secretary-General in support of the Esquipulas agreements in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 42/1, of 7 October 1987, and 42/204, of 11 December 1987.

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

I will now refer briefly to the peace process in the region and to our perceptions of it. All the Central American countries have made efforts to comply, to a greater or lesser extent, with the commitments made in the peace agreement, in accordance with the particular conditions existing in each country. What is important is not individual quantitative results; what is important, indeed essential, is that our Governments have reaffirmed before this Assembly the validity of the principles of Esquipulas and the historic undertaking to continue using dialogue and negotiation as a means of achieving a stable and lasting peace in Central America in accordance with the desires and aspirations of the people of the region.

The Central American countries are now in a stage of transition to consolidation of democracy, peace and economic recovery. That is why it is necessary to consider the obligations and commitments made towards our peoples, our neighbouring countries and the international community in general in order to ensure that the crisis will end in harmonization of global and regional solutions. Such harmonization cannot be achieved unless a climate of trust, security and credibility is established among the Central American countries so that further progress may be made in the regional process. In this context the comments made by the Secretary-General in his report on the situation in Central America are very important. He says:

"On the other hand, there has been an apparent lack of similar progress towards fulfilment of the commitments on non-use of territory to attack other States and on termination of aid for irregular forces and insurrectionist movements." (A/43/729, p.3)

We feel that, in accordance with the principles of the Esquipulas agreement and the United Nations Charter, methods of force, violence and confrontation should not be

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

promoted or encouraged. Rather, they should be rejected as a means of achieving power because these methods and the accompanying struggles, although perhaps meant to contribute to a solution of the crisis, prolong it and make it worse, with their respective adverse consequences for the suffering Central American peoples.

In the same context we regret that the International Verification and Follow-up Commission, established in accordance with the Esquipulas agreement, has not been given the necessary strength and life to carry out its role of greatest importance in the peace process in Central America. In the light of the validity of the commitments that have been made, the proposals formulated by the Foreign Ministers of Honduras and El Salvador before this Assembly on mechanisms for control and supervision of the peace process can be considered seriously for the agenda of the next meeting of the Central American Presidents. The consolidation of the process of pacification and of the peace process is very important to the peoples of the region, and therefore we urge faithful compliance with and respect for the will of the Central American peoples, made manifest, through the provisions of the Esquipulas agreement, both for the countries of the region and for countries outside the region, in order that the Central Americans may be enabled to adopt their own decisions on the process.

The political phenomenon in Central America cannot be analysed in isolation; it has to be seen in its relationship with economic phenomena as a whole. From this perspective we have been able to see that, at a time characterized by confrontation and internal struggles, the efforts of Governments, despite great outlays that affect their respective economies, are facing great limitations of resources as they try to reinitiate the process of economic recovery, in some cases deviating into areas that do not relate to development and the well-being of peoples at all.

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

In this context we share the view that there is an interrelationship between peace and development but that in the present crisis what is necessary is that both concepts be developed simultaneously in such a way as to stimulate the consolidation of democracy. In the last five years Central America has been dependent upon transfers from abroad, and doubtless in the short term and the medium term it will continue to need external aid to promote development and overcome the unjust social and economic structures that are the cause of social problems and internal conflicts.

In this context the steps to implement the special plan of economic co-operation for Central America, approved in resolution 42/231 of 12 May this year, are important. This resolution received broad support from the international community, from which it requests an increase of technical, economic and financial assistance to the countries of the region. This assistance has been considered necessary and vital as a part of the efforts made in the peace process.

Taking into account the needs and limitations facing Central America, my delegation feels that the implementation of the plan has not moved forward in step with the urgent needs of the regional situation, in particular because of procedural questions and the revision and adoption of mechanisms for its implementation. Consequently we feel it appropriate to appeal to the donor community and the relevant bodies of the United Nations system to take the necessary measures to provide and make more viable the assistance and co-operation required for implementation of the special plan.

Also in the field of co-operation, we would like to say how pleased we are that an international conference on Central American refugees is to be held in Guatemala in 1989. We offer our gratitude to the United Nations bodies that made this possible, in particular, to the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

(Mr. Melendez Barahona,  
El Salvador)

We hope the conference will produce very positive conclusions and recommendations, making it possible to solve the problems of refugees and displaced persons in the region and the difficulties that result therefrom. We are certain that peace and stability are an important element in ensuring that Governments will devote greater efforts and resources to improving the well-being and the living conditions of our peoples through a process of sustained and permanent economic recovery. The achievement of both peace and development is the direct responsibility of the Central American countries, but we believe that without co-operation and international assistance it will not be possible to overcome the structural maladjustments.

Finally, I should like to refer to draft resolution A/43/L.26, sponsored by the Contadora Group, the Support Group and the Central American countries. My delegation feels it supports and articulates the aspirations and desires of the Central American countries. We repeat our appeal that the draft resolution be supported and implemented in order to create one more opportunity for the peace and development so desired by the Central American peoples. We hope it will receive general support from the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Mexico, who will speak on behalf of the Contadora Group.



Mr. MOYA PALENCIA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation, on behalf of the Contadora Group, wishes to express its broadest and most resolute support for draft resolution A/43/L.26, submitted by Guatemala and sponsored by the five Central American States and the eight Latin American States that form part of the Contadora Group and its Support Group, and requests the international community represented here to adopt it as a General Assembly resolution. We do so, convinced that the draft contains and develops the essential elements of a proper analysis of the situation in Central America, of the threats to international peace and security it involves, and of the peace initiatives needed to transform it.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

We do so because in its preambular paragraphs, as well as in its operative part, the draft resolution is in line with the efforts that the Central American countries themselves have made, especially since the Esquipulas II agreements of 7 August 1987, in order fully to meet the historic challenge of shaping a destiny of peace and development for that still troubled region. We do so also because the draft resolution coincides with the principles and tenets that the Contadora Group and its Support Group have always defended, respected and applied in their mediatory efforts to contribute to peace in Central America. Lastly, we do so because it contains the essential elements to urge the countries that have links with, and interests in, the region to facilitate the process of implementing the Esquipulas II agreements and to refrain from any action that could obstruct that; and also because it urges the international community not only to contribute to the realization of the peace process itself, but also to increase, directly and through international organizations, its technical, economic and financial co-operation with the Central American countries in order to achieve the goals and objectives of the special plan of economic co-operation for Central America, pursuant to resolution 42/231 adopted by the General Assembly on 12 May last year.

The Contadora Group therefore requests the entire international community to adopt this draft resolution. We are gratified that it emerged from the spirit of dialogue and negotiation which created a bond between the five Central American countries that are primarily and irreplaceably the protagonists in the regional tragedy.

However, beyond the progress which the joint preparation of this draft resolution undoubtedly reflects, the Contadora Group remains deeply concerned because, as was stated by the heads of State of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela, at the Second Presidential Meeting of the

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

Permanent Mechanism for Consultation and Concerted Political Action, held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, at the end of October,

"In discouraging contrast to the process of détente and the improvement in various situations of regional conflict, the conditions for a just and lasting peace in Central America have not been attained." (A/43/791, p. 5)

We remain deeply concerned, as the Presidents also stated, that while in the past progress towards peace and democratization in Central America was possible only through dialogue and negotiation, which culminated in the Esquipulas II agreements, the development of the crisis has shown that the threat and use of force foster belligerent conflict and instability, in violation of the principles and rules of law governing international coexistence.

We reaffirm with them the conviction

"that the principles motivating the Contadora Group and the Support Group in their efforts to achieve a Latin American solution to the crisis are more valid today than ever, and we are prepared to persevere in co-operative action to achieve their implementation. New avenues of negotiation must be sought, involving the political will of the Governments in conflict, and making use of the experience and the institutional framework of the United Nations and the Organization of American States" (A/43/791, p. 5).

Please allow me at this point, on behalf of the Contadora Group and of my own Government, to thank the Secretary-General for the report he has submitted to us in connection with agenda item 22, dated 19 October. In that report he provides an accurate, detailed and courageous analysis of the present characteristics of the situation in Central America. We are in agreement with that report and in particular with the conclusion in paragraph 12 to the effect that

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

"The Central American Governments must renew the momentum of their efforts to overcome the obstacles now before them, and the countries outside the region with ties and interests in it must resolutely decide to facilitate that task and refrain from any action likely to undermine it." (A/43/729, para. 12)

In the view of the Contadora Group it is that problem which determines the very possibility of resolving the crisis peacefully and of having the peace process immediately transformed into a process of economic and social development for Central America. However, for that process to materialize, as is also stated by the Secretary-General, political will must cut through the vicious cycles, the Gordian knots, that strangle Central America and that have regrettably held back the Esquipulas II negotiations, which were resumed in Alajuela, Cost Rica, and which we hope will be resumed very soon at the highest level, in a forthcoming meeting of the Central American Presidents that will give new and renewed impetus to the implementation of their commitments.

We would also recall at this point that the Latin American Presidents who met in Punta del Este insisted that the revitalization of the peace process that we are involved in requires that the international community step up its contribution to the political, economic and social reconstruction of the countries of the region, which are now also affected by natural disasters, and to that end they urged the countries endowed with the most resources to participate actively in this task of solidarity.

Mexico is convinced that the willingness demonstrated from the very outset by the United Nations to contribute to resolving the crisis in Central America is still in existence and that it must be fully used. Statements made by the highest

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

leaders of the international community, with just a few regrettable exceptions, reflect their deep concern at the regional situation and their reaffirmation of the principles underlying the Charter of our Organization, especially those of non-intervention, the non-use or non-threat of use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes. We firmly believe that the United Nations can contribute to supporting the efforts of the Central American countries by monitoring their commitments and collaborating in the establishment of the proper mechanisms for verification, especially in the area of security, including the cessation of external aid to irregular and insurrectional forces and the non-use of the territory of any State for acts of aggression against another. My country considers that the principles of the San Francisco Charter, which have proved their effectiveness in giving new direction to the peace process in other regional conflicts - the reason for which the Organization, and specifically its peace-keeping forces, was given the Nobel Peace Prize this year - cannot be sidestepped in the case of the Central American crisis. It is not possible to believe in solutions imposed from outside, to the detriment of the aspirations to peace of the Central American nations, to the detriment of stability based on co-operation and respect for law. Specifically, we cannot fail to condemn foreign intervention, campaigns of destabilization, and support for irregular forces in the region, which have obstructed understanding among the Central Americans and the diplomatic efforts aimed at settling the conflict.

(Mr. Moya Palencia, Mexico)

We must avail ourselves of the new political conditions and changes that have occurred on our continent so that together we may give new momentum to the peace process in Central America by resuming dialogue and speeding up negotiations.

The Contadora Group is unfailing in its support for and observance of the principles of international law, whose unconditional re-establishment must be obtained as soon as possible in Central America, and also in its respect for the freely taken decision of the countries of the region to choose the way of life and political and social system that best suits their interests, without foreign interference or aggression. Central America's wound hurts us all, especially the Latin Americans. The persistence of the crisis is in fact not only a challenge but also a growing threat to international peace and security. To make every effort to resolve that conflict is not merely an act of political, legal and socio-economic coherence, but rather an international moral obligation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Uruguay, who will speak on behalf of the Support Group of the Contadora Group.

Mr. PAOLILLO (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I am speaking on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay, the countries which make up the Support Group of the Contadora Group.

Since 1985, the Support Group has participated actively in the work to restore peace in the Central American region, jointly with the Contadora Group promoting and giving impetus to the diplomatic negotiation process between the countries of the region.

This participation was motivated by our conviction that an end to the conflict could only be achieved by a Latin American solution, sought through political dialogue and diplomatic negotiation, and based on respect for the principle of the

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

free self-determination of peoples and strict compliance with the imperative of non-intervention, the strengthening of democratic institutions and respect for human rights.

The desire of the four countries of the Support Group to contribute to the peace process in the region is as alive today as it was when the Group was born. My President stated this a little more than two weeks ago in the Uruguay Declaration, adopted at the end of the second meeting of the Presidents of the Permanent Mechanism for Consultation and Concerted Political Action, whose text appears in document A/43/791. On that occasion, jointly with the Presidents of Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela, the Presidents of the four countries of the Support Group reiterated the validity of the principles which inspired the actions of the two groups and stated their readiness and willingness to persevere in their efforts to co-operate in their application.

On the same occasion, the seven Presidents also expressed their disappointment that, in contrast to the process of détente and the lessening of tensions in various regional conflicts, the conditions for a just and lasting peace in Central America had not been attained.

The frustration caused by the persistence of the violence there, and the insecurity and disregard for human rights in the Central American region, has been shared by the rest of the international community, as can be seen from the many statements made by countries of all regions of the world during the general debate in the Assembly.

Indeed, in recent months there has been no significant progress towards ending the insecurity and economic hardship that continues to hold sway in our region. Nevertheless, in the political context in which the conflict is developing, there are some favourable circumstances that should have promoted the achievement of a solution.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

First, there is the unequivocal desire of the parties involved in the conflict to restore peace in the region, which has not only been reflected in declarations made by high Central American authorities, but has also taken tangible form in important decisions such as the acceptance by the Central American Governments of the Esquipulas peace plan and the commitment by the Presidents in the joint declaration of Alajuela to comply with the obligations which flow from that peace plan.

The fact that draft resolution A/43/L.26, now before the General Assembly, was negotiated mainly by the five Central American countries that are among its sponsors is another eloquent proof of the desire for peace shared by the parties involved and of agreement on the bases on which peace should be built.

The second set of circumstances favouring a swift solution of the conflict is the categorical support given by the international community to the Esquipulas peace plan, which was reflected in last session's adoption by consensus of resolution 42/1 of the General Assembly. The countries of the Support Group trust that the international community will respond similarly to the draft resolution we are debating now.

Lastly, in order to carry forward their peace plan the Central American countries need the institutional framework and experience of the United Nations and the Organization of American States, which have given broad support to the implementation of the principles and procedures agreed upon.

These procedures began being implemented through mechanisms participated in by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Central America, the Contadora countries, the Support Group and the Secretaries-General of the United Nations and the Organization of American States. Unfortunately, not much progress was made



(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

because, according to the Secretary-General's report, conditions did not exist for the establishment of the verification mechanisms in some areas provided for in the peace plan because of what the report describes as "the lack of unanimity among the five Central American Governments". (A/43/729, para. 7)

This inability to implement agreements reached at the highest political level does not fail to surprise us somewhat. If the Central American Presidents agreed on the principles and procedures for achieving peace and undertook to comply immediately, unconditionally and unilaterally with the obligations undertaken to achieve that objective; if the international community supports them firmly; if international institutions are giving them assistance; and lastly, if peace is being restored in response to the cries of the people of Central America, exhausted and impoverished after so many years of violence and insecurity - then why has not more progress been made in carrying out those commitments? What factors are coming in the way of the realization of the aspirations and desires of the Governments and peoples of Central America?

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

We have to recognize that carrying forward the implementation of the Esquipulas II agreements is an enormous task. The procedure for the establishment of peace is unprecedentedly complex and requires compliance by the five countries of the region with commitments referring not only to the cessation of hostilities and security but also to the promotion of national conciliation, the strengthening of democracy, economic development, respect for human rights, assistance and protection of refugees, and verification mechanisms. This is a task of extraordinary magnitude, perhaps without precedent in history, but it should not for that reason be felt that it is too great a task for the Governments which have to carry it out. These Governments have already overcome the most difficult stage of launching and beginning the implementation of the peace process on bases and principles which were previously agreed upon.\*

The members of the Support Group hope that the countries of Central America will once again give the world proof of the desire for peace that motivates them and the political capacity which in the recent past has made it possible for them to overcome their differences and external obstacles. We also hope that the international political atmosphere will help to strengthen these efforts and not hinder them.

In order to realize this hope, which we are sure is cherished by the rest of the world, the five Central American Governments will have to persist in making genuine efforts to complete the work they have begun. What remains to be done - just like what has already been accomplished - continues to be their primary responsibility. They have taken it upon themselves to exercise their sovereignty without foreign interference, to assume, as the Esquipulas agreement says, the historic challenge of forging a peaceful destiny for Central America; hence they

---

\* Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Paolillo, Uruguay)

must intensify their efforts to this end by using the procedures agreed upon for this purpose and, if necessary, by finding new ways to carry out negotiations.

Co-operation outside the framework of these efforts can only be directed at promoting and facilitating dialogue, creating conditions for negotiation and, in general, encourage any procedure or action conducive to a peaceful, just and lasting solution. That is what has been the contribution of the peace process of the Contadora and Support Groups in the past, and that is the contribution we are prepared to make in the future.

Mr. ZEROS (Greece): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Community and its 12 member States and to reiterate our full support for a peaceful and lasting solution to the problems besetting the Central American region.

The ties of friendship, culture and history that bind the members of the Twelve to the Central American region are not only very close; they can be traced over the centuries as well. We maintain close ties and share common interests with the peoples of Central America, based upon the ideals of genuine democracy and political pluralism, respect for human rights and economic and social justice. Therefore, we view with a special sense of concern the economic and political difficulties that continue to threaten the area.

The Twelve welcomed with particular satisfaction the initiative taken in August 1987 by the Presidents of the five Central American countries. It was an act of courage and a demonstration of political will and determination. We adopted the same attitude towards the second summit meeting of the five Presidents in January and we shall support their future efforts to bring about lasting peace, co-operation and progress among their countries. In this regard, we look forward to a successful outcome of the forthcoming summit of the five Central American Presidents.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

The desire of the Twelve to see peace established in this area was manifested by reaffirming that we are prepared, if asked to do so by all Central American countries, to contribute as much as we can to the task entrusted to the Executive Commission for Verification and Follow-up of the Esquipulas II agreement. We maintain once again that the parties to the agreement should, without further delay and reservations, make every effort to meet fully their outstanding obligations. We are firmly convinced that real and lasting peace in Central America can only be attained through political means and the exclusion of all forms of violence or military pressure. It is for this reason that we have given our unremitting support to the peace process initiated in Esquipulas.

It goes without saying that authentic democracy is a prerequisite for lasting peace in the region. It can only be achieved through political pluralism, involving full respect for human rights and civil liberties, full freedom of the press, and promotion of social and economic justice. At the same time it is impossible to achieve a lasting solution in the area without respect for the principle of national sovereignty, territorial integrity and the recognition of the right of all peoples to choose, without external interference, their economic, political and social system. Firmly committed to these principles, we reiterate our appeal to all countries with interests in the region to contribute to efforts to promote peace, democracy and economic development in the region.

There have been disquieting signs over the last months of a stalemate in the Central America peace process. We are gravely concerned by the interruption of the national dialogue in several countries, by the adoption of measures which undermine democratic institutions and by continued violations of human rights. The negative climate has also been reflected by the impasse reached in the talks of the Executive Commission and the difficulties encountered in the establishment of a mechanism of verification, control and follow-up of the peace agreement.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

Nevertheless, one should not disregard the fact that some progress has been made towards fulfilment of the obligations set forth in the Esquipulas II agreement. Although each country has responded in varying degrees to these obligations, we truly hope that the political determination, which a year ago led the five Central American Presidents to search for solutions to the problems afflicting their region, will prevail again, giving new impetus to the peace process. There are recent encouraging signs, including the draft resolution now before the General Assembly, which demonstrate once again the political will of the Central American countries to resolve peacefully their problems.

Major contributory factors to the vicious circle of violence, intervention and suffering in the region are the long-standing economic imbalances and social injustice. The interrelation between decreasing economic strength and political turmoil in the region is evident and, the longer the economic and social decline is allowed to continue, the more difficult it will become to halt it at a later stage. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations put it in his recent report:

"Not only has economic development been adversely affected by the political turmoil in the region, but the economic crisis is perpetuating the unjust socio-economic structures and prolonging internal conflicts, thus frustrating efforts to arrive at a consensus concerning the socio-political model for the Central American societies." (A/43/729, para. 16)

The socio-economic situation is further aggravated by the tragic plight of the refugees.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

The Twelve have demonstrated in concrete terms their commitment to assisting the Central American countries to overcome their political and economic problems. In September 1984 the European Community and its twelve member States, on the one hand, and the States of Central America and the Contadora Group, on the other, initiated a historic dialogue in San Jose, Costa Rica, and they laid the basis for a new political and economic relationship between the European Community and Central America. This dialogue continues on a regular basis. The San Jose IV Conference, held at Hamburg on 29 February and 1 March this year, concluded successfully, and we are preparing for the next conference - San Jose V - to take place next year in Honduras.

The co-operation agreement between the European Community and the Central American countries and Panama contributes to economic development and social progress in the region. The Community has more than doubled its aid since 1981. In 1988 the European Community and its member States will contribute some 250 million ECUs - equivalent to \$290 million - to Central American countries. At present the Community's assistance is concentrated on aid to refugees and displaced persons, food aid and aid to integrated rural development projects. We welcome the Secretary-General's involvement in this field through the United Nations Special Plan of Economic Co-operation for Central America. We are also committed to promoting regional projects with the aim of encouraging co-operation between the Central American countries.

We wish to reaffirm our belief that the crisis in Central America can be resolved solely by a comprehensive negotiated dialogue based on the principles of the United Nations Charter and the objectives set forth in the Esquipulas II agreements. We attach equal importance to respect for the principles of national sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, non-intervention,

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

non-interference and non-recourse to intimidation or force, as well as to the need for genuine democracy and respect for human rights in the region. Responsibility rests with each country individually and with all of them collectively. The arrangements provided for in the Esquipulas II agreements represent an indivisible whole and should be implemented collectively, not selectively.

The establishment and functioning of the Central American parliament at the earliest possible moment can make a major contribution to the strengthening of peace, democracy and co-operation in the region. We attach importance to the development of democratic institutions. We are therefore prepared to provide, when required, assistance in an appropriate manner for the preparation of the elections to the Central American parliament.

We urge the Central American countries to spare no effort in giving new impetus to the peace process. For their part, the European Community and its member States wish to reaffirm that they remain committed to contributing to the best of their ability to the process set up in Esquipulas and to the economic and social development of the region.

Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden): A year ago the General Assembly unanimously adopted resolution 42/1 on Central America, expressing its "firmed support" for the peace agreement signed in August 1987 by the five Central American Presidents. That was a clear and important manifestation of support by the international community for an outstanding example of political will and determination in the cause of peace, security, democracy, co-operation and social and economic development. I hope it will be possible this year also to have such unanimous support for that agreement.

For several years, news from Central America had been mainly about war, violations of human rights, foreign intervention and social and economic misery.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

The Guatemala agreement came as a signal of hope. During the first months after its signature, significant progress was made towards fulfilment of the commitments set forth in the Guatemala peace plan. National reconciliation commissions were established, amnesty decrees were issued, states of emergency were lifted, measures were taken to expand or strengthen political pluralism. Regrettably, that positive development has come to a virtual standstill. There has been a lack of progress as regards commitments on not using foreign territory to attack other States. The same goes for termination of aid for irregular forces.

However, the Guatemala procedure continues without a doubt to be the best foundation for peace and progress in the region. The Central American Governments must therefore be allowed and encouraged to renew the momentum of their efforts to overcome the obstacles facing them. What is more, the countries outside the region with links to and interests in it must resolutely decide to facilitate that task and refrain from any actions likely to undermine it. With its great influence, the United States bears a special responsibility in this respect.

Peace requires law and order in international relations. Respect for international law must be absolute and universal. All borders are sacred; all peoples have the right to determine their own future. All violations of the principle of non-intervention are to be condemned.

One of the driving forces behind the Guatemala procedure was the general awareness of the necessity for comprehensive economic recovery in Central America. As has been pointed out time and again, the principal origin of the crises in Central America is the glaring economic and social injustices in the region. The roots of the problems are to be found in the social, economic and political conditions. Those underlying causes must be tackled. In fact, there are few conflicts where the interaction between peace and development is as evident as it



(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

is in the case of Central America. The Secretary-General's report demonstrates that economic development has been adversely affected by the political turmoil in the region. The economic crisis is perpetuating the unjust social and economic structures and is prolonging internal conflicts.

The responsibility for the promotion of social and economic development lies of course primarily with the Central American Governments themselves. But the industrialized countries have a duty and, I would say, an enlightened self-interest in peacefully and positively contributing to the development of the region.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

In this respect the United Nations plan for economic assistance to Central America could be an important framework for concerted international action. We have noted with appreciation that the plan was formulated on the basis of extensive dialogue with the countries of the region. It thus reflects the development priorities of the region as a whole. Only two weeks ago the Nordic countries reiterated that for their part they were ready to use the United Nations plan as a frame of reference for their assistance to the region. We encourage other donor countries to do the same.

The International Commission for Central American Recovery and Development is meeting this week in Washington. Based on Central American leadership, there is hope that this independent multilateral Commission will make valuable contributions to the development efforts in the region.

Sweden, for its part, has for many years already provided humanitarian assistance to all the countries in the region. We are now making special funds available for the promotion of regional co-operation. We are increasing our regional projects to a level of \$22 million over the next three years. Out of that \$5 million will be used to help eradicate malaria and for housing projects. Our bilateral co-operation with Costa Rica has expanded rapidly. Nicaragua remains a major recipient country of Swedish development assistance.

While welcoming what has so far been achieved, we remain fully aware that a great deal remains to be done. All the principles of the Guatemala agreement must be respected. Since the social and economic situation in the region is precarious, contributions to the development of Central America are not only a challenge to but also an obligation of the industrialized world. In Esquipulas the Central American Presidents appealed for respect and help. Those leaders stated:

"We have Central American roads to peace and development, but we need to make them come true. Peace and development are inseparable."

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

In closing, I should like to stress again the urgent need for a positive and practical response to the appeal of the Secretary-General to the Central American countries and other countries for a renewal of the commitment to peace and democracy in Central America.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): More than one year ago the world community witnessed the historic decision by the Presidents of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua to sign the Esquipulas agreement in order to bring about stable and lasting peace in Central America. Austria, having firmly supported the process of peace and reconciliation in Central America for many years, welcomed this peace plan with a feeling of satisfaction and relief. Today we feel obliged to express our concern. The peace process seems to have lost momentum. Although progress has been achieved in some fields and a number of measures implementing the agreement have been taken, we note to our deep regret an increasing lack of interest and political will fully to comply with the provisions of the Esquipulas agreement.

The main conditions for a stable and lasting peace in Central America are still lacking, because of political confrontation and political instability. Austria notes and deplores the increasing violations of human rights taking place in El Salvador and, to the same extent, the harsh repression of the opposition and mass media reinstated by the Government in Nicaragua after some initial concessions in the field of human rights and democratization.

Austria urges all Governments of the region to open, reopen or renew the dialogue with all domestic political groups in their respective countries. Efforts to establish a national dialogue and achieve national reconciliation must be continued in order to lessen the tensions that still exist, the human suffering, the profound social injustice and the economic misery in the region.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

The peoples of Central America must be given the chance to determine their own future. Only they can decide where their true interests lie. It is for them exclusively to solve their political problems in joining together and building a prosperous and better future. In this context the Government of Austria welcomes the promising idea of holding elections to a Central American Parliament.

Foreign intervention or external pressure from whichever side and under whatever pretext would only aggravate the situation. On the other hand, responsibility for peace and democracy rests not only with each country individually but with all of them collectively. Consequently, the Esquipulas agreement represents an indivisible whole and must be implemented as a whole.

Respect for the law must prevail in this region over military and ideological considerations, so that reason and the long-term interests of all the peoples of the continent prevail over immediate tactical and military considerations.

No authentic democratic process can exist without political pluralism, involving respect for human rights and individual freedoms, which never and in no circumstances can be denied. Pluralistic democratic societies in Central America will strengthen the political dialogue and national reconciliation. Speedy and persistent implementation of the provisions of the Esquipulas agreement by all countries concerned will offer the best guarantees of lasting peace and security as well as of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States in Central America.

The Esquipulas process remains the best chance for peace in Central America, providing as it does an authentic regional approach and recognizing all the facts of unity and diversity that exist in Central America.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

Let me take this opportunity of expressing my country's strong feelings of solidarity and support for all parties in the region which undertake effective and commendable efforts in the process of seeking a firm and lasting peace in the region.

In our view, the situation in Central America calls for the utmost restraint from all sides. Only with the resolute will of all five Central American countries signatories to the agreement on the procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America will it be possible to put an end to a conflict that is being needlessly prolonged.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

In this regard, the Austrian Government profoundly hopes that the convening of a summit meeting of Central American Presidents, which it was envisaged would take place in San Salvador this month but which had to be delayed, will soon give an opportunity for a new impulse to the peace process in order to bring about national reconciliation, mutual understanding and a peaceful living together in freedom and democracy.

Mr. KAGAMI (Japan): On behalf of my delegation, I should like first of all to express my sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for his ongoing efforts towards the peaceful settlement of the situation in Central America. We have read his report with great interest and believe it will be of great use in our deliberations.

At about this time last year the General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 42/1, in which it expressed firm support for the Esquipulas II agreement, entitled "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America", or the so-called Guatemala procedure. In that agreement the Central American countries confirmed their intention to resolve their problems through dialogue and negotiation.

Today, as we turn our attention once again to the item "The situation in Central America", I must say that I have very mixed feelings of hope and concern. I feel hopeful because some progress has been made towards putting into practice certain elements of the Esquipulas II agreement, such as those concerning democratization, the conclusion of a cease-fire and national reconciliation. I am also encouraged by the decision taken by the Central American Presidents at a meeting last January in Alajuela, Costa Rica, to implement immediately the provisions of the agreement which had not been fully complied with within the agreed time-frame.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

At the same time, however, I cannot but voice my concern; for, although there have been some positive developments, it seems that not only is the complete implementation of the agreement a very long way off but also the peace process has recently been stagnating. As the Secretary-General stated in his report:

"there can be no doubt that in the months immediately following its signature, significant progress was made towards fulfilment of the commitments set forth in the Guatemala Procedure." (A/43/729, para. 10)

However, as he also pointed out, there has been an apparent lack of similar progress towards the fulfilment of other commitments, and recently the process has suffered setbacks; thus the Secretary-General urged the Central American Governments to renew the momentum of their efforts to overcome the obstacles to implementation. I share the Secretary-General's assessment and sincerely hope that the countries concerned will redouble their efforts to restore stability to the region.

I make these observations in full awareness of the complexities of the issues involved. As this year's very mixed record of progress, stagnation and setbacks demonstrates, there is no simple solution to the problem. But it would be a grave error to allow these difficulties to overwhelm us and to succumb to a spirit of defeatism. To do so would jeopardize the peace and security of the countries not only throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region but ultimately of the entire world.

Indeed, I believe it was the realization of the crucial nature of the issues involved that motivated the Presidents of the Central American countries to conclude the Esquipulas II agreement and to endeavour to comply with its provisions. Japan strongly hopes that those countries will renew their political will and generate a new momentum in the peace process so that their peoples can

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

devote their energies to social and economic development in accordance with just and democratic principles and free from outside intervention.

As is the case in any complex situation, there are diverse views as to the root cause of the difficulties in Central America and how best to resolve them. There is no doubt, however, that underlying the Central American crisis are economic and social difficulties which have traditionally characterized the region. These difficulties are exacerbated by the current economic recession. While there is no need to analyse the historical background of the issues involved, history clearly proves that it is not possible to attain political, economic and social stability and development if there is no economic and social freedom and justice; and economic and social freedom and justice can be ensured only when democratic principles are strictly observed. Simply put, peace, development and democracy are inseparable. Indeed, the Secretary-General has remarked that there are few international conflicts in which the interaction of peace and development is as evident as it is in the Central American conflict.

My Government is convinced that a firm and lasting settlement can be achieved only if the countries concerned agree to work together in a spirit of co-operation and mutual trust. For this reason, Japan continues to support the peace initiative of the Central American Governments which resulted in the Esquipulas II agreement. We shall follow with keen interest the forthcoming summit meeting of the Presidents of Central American countries in the hope that they will achieve a breakthrough on the problem.

At the same time, Japan has expressed on a number of occasions its readiness to co-operate with the countries of Central America to the best of its ability to contribute to the achievement of peace and development in the region. It is also ready to co-operate in the rehabilitation of the region once true peace, based on



(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

democratic principles and supported by the will of all the peoples of Central America, is achieved. The former Foreign Minister of Japan, Mr. Kuranari, elaborated this position in his speech in Guatemala when he visited the region in September of last year, immediately after the signing of the Esquipulas II agreement. I also explained Japan's position in some detail at the resumed forty-second session of the General Assembly, which was convened last May to consider a special plan of economic co-operation for Central America.

Today, therefore, I should like simply to note that Japan's efforts in this regard include human resource development assistance, under which Japan sends experts to Central America and receives trainees in various fields from countries in the region, and also co-operation with regard to refugees and displaced persons. Moreover, Central American countries are included in a programme which Japan has established to recycle financial resources of \$20 billion to developing countries over the three-year period from 1987 through 1989.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

As other delegations have noted, recent developments have created an atmosphere that is conducive to the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts in various parts of the world. I am referring, of course, to the agreements on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the cease-fire between Iran and Iraq, and the ongoing efforts to find solutions to the questions of Namibian independence and the Western Sahara. The role of the United Nations in solving these problems cannot be overestimated. My delegation sincerely hopes that this positive trend will extend to efforts to resolve the question of Central America as well, and that the situation will be settled as soon as possible.

Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Speaking on behalf of the non-aligned countries, let me at the outset commend the Secretary-General for the comprehensive report before the Assembly in document A/43/729. We believe that the report contains some very valuable suggestions for the enhancement of peace, progress and justice in Central America.

On 7 August 1987 the Presidents of Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and El Salvador, meeting in Esquipulas, signed an agreement, entitled "Procedure for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America". That agreement was a major landmark on the road to peace in that troubled part of the world. It represented the fruition of many years of effort by the Contadora and Support Groups to achieve peace and stability in the area. Esquipulas II was an eloquent statement of commitment on the part of the Central American countries to put an end to years of external aggression, interference and intervention in their internal affairs and to work together for justice, socio-economic development and peace in the region. To the extent that foreign intervention has so far been prevented, this process, in spite of its shortcomings, has been a success. It was therefore only logical and proper that the forty-second session of the General

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

Assembly, meeting in the aftermath of the signing of the peace accords, gave the firmest support to the agreement and called on the Central American countries to continue their efforts.

Just over a year has passed since the coming into effect of the Guatemala peace accords. We in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries are gratified to note that modest but encouraging steps have already been taken by the Central American countries in fulfilment of their commitments under the accord. We note that the process of dialogue which began last year in the signatory States continues, albeit intermittently. Some important instruments envisaged under the Esquipulas II agreements are already in place. As the Secretary-General notes in his report:

"... National Reconciliation Commissions were established in each country, albeit with varying degrees of representativeness and varying functions, amnesty decrees were issued ... relatively firm measures were taken to expand and strengthen political pluralism; and specific action was taken to arrange a cessation of hostilities in countries where hostilities were taking place."

(A/43/729, para. 10)

We know that much still remains to be done. Support for irregulars continues and bases are still being made available for use by these forces. These are disturbing and serious setbacks, and there are others which we could mention, but we would be mistaken if we were to lose faith in this process which had powerful forces ranged against it. That it has survived to this stage is in itself cause for no small satisfaction.

Only recently the five Central American States took yet another historic step on the road to peace and co-operation by signing the treaty establishing the Central American parliament. Already four of the five legislative bodies in the subregion have ratified the treaty. This is a positive development that augurs

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

well for the future of Central America. The treaty represents a clear manifestation of the resolve of the people of Central America to avoid the divisions of the past, that oftentimes invited external interference, and to unite and co-operate in the promotion of democracy, socio-economic development and peace.

These efforts by the Governments of Central America, which are no doubt a reflection of their will to comply with the Guatemala accord, are commendable and should be encouraged. We in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries urge the leaders of Central America to continue to build on the broad consensus for peace currently prevailing in the subregion. We happily note that the setting up of an Executive Commission by the five Central American Presidents in January this year to verify, monitor and follow up all the commitments set forth in the Guatemala Procedure, has already gone some way towards creating the necessary confidence and trust among the countries of the subregion. It is our sincere hope that it will not be too long before the countries of the subregion complement this effort by putting in place the verification mechanisms, in co-operation with regional and extraregional States or bodies of recognized impartiality and technical competence. We are gratified to note that the Secretary-General and some States Members of the Organization have already indicated their readiness to assist in whatever manner possible in this process.

Peace in Central America will remain threatened unless valiant efforts are made to resolve the fundamental causes of the crisis in the subregion. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has always maintained that the root cause of the conflicts in that part of the world lies in the prevailing unjust economic and social structures. The problems of external indebtedness currently affecting the developing world in general and the subregion in particular have exacerbated the situation, putting the current peace initiatives in jeopardy. As if this was not

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

burden enough for these economically fragile States, a devastating hurricane recently struck the area causing extensive destruction to property and loss of lives. The urgency of the need for the international community to come to the assistance of Central American countries in these circumstances cannot be overemphasized.

In supporting the Esquipulas II agreements last year, the General Assembly, in recognition of the special relationship between development and peace in Central America, called on the international community to increase economic assistance to the subregion. By its resolution 42/231, the General Assembly endorsed a special plan of co-operation for Central America prepared by the Secretary-General. We commend the Secretary-General for the valiant efforts he has made thus far in fulfilment of the provisions of the plan and we appeal to the international community and international organizations to increase their technical and economic assistance to that subregion.\*

---

\* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Mudenge, Zimbabwe)

The people of Central America have chosen to give peace a chance in their subregion. It behoves the international community to give the broadest possible support to the Governments of Central America in their noble cause. We commend the Contadora and Support Groups, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States for the pivotal roles they have played and are playing in the search for a negotiated solution to the Central American crisis. They must continue their efforts and can always count on the support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

In conclusion I would like, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to lend our full support to the draft resolution before the Assembly. This is a draft resolution in favour of peace, justice and progress. It is a blow against intervention, interference, inequity and injustice. We appeal to all people of goodwill to support it.

Mr. VILLAR (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): During the past year the international community has gone a long way towards resolving some of the most difficult regional conflicts. The political will of the protagonists, the more relaxed atmosphere of international relations and the renewed momentum of our Organization to a great extent explain this heartening trend. None the less this positive evolution has not occurred everywhere. The crisis in Central America, which we are now discussing, is one of the most striking exceptions.

My delegation completely supports the statement made a few minutes ago on this subject by the Permanent Representative of Greece on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, but we wish to add a few comments on Spain's behalf.

The dynamics of the peace process outlined in the Esquipulas II agreement are unfortunately in a state of stagnation. In spite of efforts made in different fields by the countries of the region to develop the commitments undertaken in that

(Mr. Villar, Spain)

agreement, peace today seems no closer. In spite of the magnitude of the suffering generated by the violence and the depth of the economic crisis fostered by the conflict, peace has not yet come. We must therefore ask ourselves why this state of affairs continues.

An objective analysis of the situation reveals the complexity of the problem and the depth of its causes. As the Secretary-General points out in his report on the situation in Central America,

"the root of the Central American crisis is to be found in the unjust economic and social structures which have traditionally characterized the region, exacerbated by the current economic recession." (A/43/729, para. 15)

Democracy, justice and development are the great challenges confronting the region. None of these major goals alone will ensure stable peace in Central America, which is dependent upon comprehensive, structural solutions to problems of this nature.

These solutions must necessarily come from the countries of the region themselves and they must be able to count on countries which are outside the region but have links with it to contribute to the attainment of peace and respect for their commitments. No agreement imposed from outside can replace or prevail over the will and action of the peoples of Central America. This is why today more firmly than ever Spain reiterates its conviction that the path undertaken through the signing of the Guatemala Procedure by the five Central American Presidents is the right one.

The fulfilment of the commitments undertaken at that time is, none the less, encountering obstacles. While in some cases the reason for non-compliance may be the lack of real political will, we sometimes detect a certain powerlessness, caused by the complexity of the different situations, to fulfil those commitments. But in our view the main obstacle to Esquipulas II is the persistent climate of

(Mr. Villar, Spain)

distrust prevailing in the region. Esquipulas II is an ambitious project that contemplates the establishment of conditions of security acceptable to the five countries of the region and at the same time the adoption of a series of measures of a political nature that establish and extend democracy, pluralism and freedom to all of them. It is a fact, as pointed out in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/43/729) that the fulfilment of the commitments in different areas has been uneven and especially discouraging as regards security, in particular the non-use of territory to attack other States and the termination of aid for irregular forces or insurrectionist movements. Furthermore, although a number of steps have been taken by various parties as regards the process of national reconciliation and democratization, the inadequacies, and sometimes even the setbacks, are clear. This picture, for which the lack of trust in each other's intentions is to a great extent responsible, only helps further to erode the necessary climate of trust.

In few areas is this clearer than in the area of verification. The work of the International Verification and Follow-up Commission established by the Guatemala Procedure did not culminate in machinery acceptable to all. Last January the Central American Presidents decided at their Alajuela meeting to transfer the verification functions regarding all the Esquipulas commitments to the Executive Commission. The latter agreed at its meeting of 7 April in Guatemala that it would request, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the co-operation of an auxiliary technical group to establish machinery for verification, control and follow-up. The Central American Ministers proposed at that time that the group be composed of staff from Canada, Spain and the Federal Republic of Germany.

My country, which has on many occasions expressed its wish to co-operate in the peace process in Central America, welcomed this agreement and reiterated to the five Central American countries its willingness to co-operate, as long as this was



(Mr. Villar, Spain)

requested by all of them. None the less, the agreement of the five Ministers has not been formalized. The persistence of important differences among the countries in conflict has almost halted the process since then. The Executive Commission has not met again since its meeting at Tegucigalpa in June; nor has the planned summit meeting of Heads of State yet taken place.

Although these differences are not minor, we are convinced that there is an important point of agreement among the five Central American States: awareness that the breach created by inaction in the peace process is in itself dangerous for everyone and that therefore it is urgent to give a fresh impetus to the political dialogue that will make it possible to continue on the course charted by Esquipulas.

It is to that awareness that we attribute the various initiatives recently put forward in this forum. Spain is following them all attentively and with respect, to the extent that they are the reflection of a genuine desire to find a solution to serious problems that affect those countries.

Our desire to contribute constructively to the establishment of effective verification machinery falls within a well-defined framework: it must be based on a realistic approach to what can be done and on the collective will of the five Governments of the region. Just as we expressed our positive reaction to the establishment of an auxiliary technical group as proposed in Guatemala - as I have already said - so we will continue to show our openness to any initiative that has the agreement of the Group of Five and that can effectively serve the cause of peace in Central America.

(Mr. Villar, Spain)

In that same spirit we support the desire for integration that is reflected in the plan to create a Central American parliament, which we hope can be established very soon, and we encourage the efforts that are being made to convene a summit of Presidents that will invigorate the process. We believe that the process must no longer bide its time, as it has in recent months, and that it is urgent to end this pause in the implementation of the commitments contained in the Guatemala Procedure.

There is no really insurmountable obstacle if, as we firmly believe, all the countries of the region desire peace. We are not unaware of the difficulties and uncertainties, which are many and varied, in each case: the presence of irregular forces; an active, armed insurgency; a disturbing growth in the number of refugees; a difficult internal political dialogue; destabilizing actions from outside; the fragility and sometimes deterioration of respect for human rights; obstacles to the broadening and deepening of political pluralism and of democratic institutions; resistance to the strengthening of civil authority; and an economic crisis which in some cases is of an extremely serious magnitude.

We believe, however, that it is possible to achieve agreements with the irregular forces through dialogue and negotiation in countries where this problem exists. It is possible to help to make unilateral truces final through reasonable agreements. It is possible to promote national dialogue with the various internal forces of opposition and, in that context, to revive the work of the various National Reconciliation Commissions so that they can effectively contribute to internal dialogue.

In its efforts to overcome these difficulties and to resume serious dialogue both at the domestic level and with regard to the conflicts that separate some States from others, Central America knows that today it can rely on the

(Mr. Villar, Spain)

solidarity of the international community and the practical support of those most directly concerned. In this respect the Contadora and Support Groups have played and will continue to play a fundamental role in pressing the peace process forward. We must also stress the political and economic dialogue with the Economic Community and its 12 member States. Spain trusts that the Community-Central American meeting to be held in February next year in San Pedro Sula, Honduras, which will continue the series of meetings begun five years ago in San José, will deepen the very positive dialogue of the last meeting in Hamburg last February.

I indicated at the beginning of my statement that the three great challenges to Central America are democracy, justice and development. The economic crisis now experienced by Central America, of particularly tragic proportions in some of the States of the region, has deepened as a result of the regional conflict which it, in turn, exacerbates. The political agreements that must be reached without delay by the Central American countries must serve to begin an economic reconstruction that will give stability to the socio-political development of its peoples. When I spoke at the resumed forty-second session of the General Assembly, which dealt with the problems of economic assistance to Central America, I said:

"The crisis being experienced in Central America today is to a considerable extent a reflection of the failure of a model of growth without authentic development, a model of growth practically devoid of social progress, incapable of adequately underpinning open, pluralistic and stable political institutions and a social fabric that could fully guarantee justice for all on a continuing path towards the drastic reduction of enormous inequalities."

(A/42/PV.112, p. 31)

Peace in Central America must lead to economic recovery which will make possible social progress and justice in a democratic and pluralistic society in which all citizens participate in the common cause of national betterment.

(Mr. Villar, Spain)

The special plan of co-operation for Central America proposed by the Secretary-General has, in the context I have just described, the firm support of Spain. It is our intention to continue to increase our technical and economic co-operation with Central America, at the bilateral and regional levels, at the same time as we channel our assistance through the European Economic Community. We shall also continue to strengthen our financial assistance through concessional grants. In this respect we trust that the agreement signed recently between the Spanish Government and the Inter-American Development Bank for Spain's granting of a loan of \$500 million will also have a positive effect in Central America.

I should like to conclude my statement on a note of hope. My delegation is convinced that the spirit of Esquipulas remains alive, that there is no better alternative on the path towards peace and that with resolve and with the encouragement of the international community the five Central American countries will be able, together, to give new impetus to the process. For that purpose they can be assured of Spain's support.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/43/L.26. Before doing so, I should like to inform the Assembly that, should the General Assembly adopt this draft resolution, the Secretary-General does not, at this point, anticipate any programme budget implications. Should unforeseen requirements arise in connection with the implementation of the resolution during 1989, the Secretary-General would have recourse to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 42/227 on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1988-1989 relating to the maintenance of peace and security and would report thereon to the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly in the usual manner.

(The President)

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution A/43/L.26?

Draft resolution A/43/L.26 was adopted (resolution 43/24).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of the United States of America for an explanation of position after the adoption of the resolution.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): In the long and valiant efforts of Central Americans to overcome a legacy of poverty and repression, one light shines clearly - the burning desire of the overwhelming majority to forge democratic governments with guarantees for their rights intact - democratic governments that will ensure that the rights of freedom of speech, assembly, and unrepressed participation in the political, economic and social lives of their countries will be available to all their citizens. For most of the people of Central America this long-held desire for democratic government has become a reality. For some, however, the quest for democracy continues. The United States shares the commitment to this quest.

Although the United States joined with other members of this body in adopting the resolution by consensus, we find some troubling developments in Central America that are not adequately reflected in it. We all recall the hope that existed in this body one year ago when we saw in Esquipulas II a mechanism to move towards the pluralistic democracy Central Americans sought. Now, despite the language of the resolution, we all know that the promise of Esquipulas II is not yet fully realized and that one Central American country has not lived up to its commitments made under Esquipulas II.

(Miss Byrne, United States)

In Esquipulas II Nicaragua promised a free press, freedom of assembly and free elections. It has delivered on none of these promises. Indeed, Nicaragua has just announced that long-overdue elections proposed for March 1989 will not occur. The Nicaraguan free press is in danger of extinction, and political opposition leaders languish in gaol.

Another troubling element of this resolution is the call for international economic co-operation despite the absence of any progress by Nicaragua to grant the freedoms that are basic to building a healthy economy. It is the responsibility of the international community to encourage respect for human rights and democracy by all countries of the region. Increased economic co-operation should duly benefit only those nations of Central America which are working towards these goals, towards reconciliation and greater freedom for their people, and towards peace with their neighbours.

In summary, the United States urges the international community to adopt a realistic and honest appraisal of the disastrous effects of Nicaraguan mismanagement and repression upon the search for peace and democracy in Central America.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Nicaragua, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. SERRANO CALDERA (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): In the debate this afternoon on the item on Central America, which has taken up this afternoon, some fundamental positions have been made clear which embody the spirit

(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

of the international community and the spirit that prevails in this Assembly, which has just adopted the draft resolution on Central America. The general lines, stated briefly but not, therefore, less clearly, are that intervention and interference from outside are negative for peace, that the Central American region needs from those who have repeatedly taken this attitude in our area respect for our desire for peace and our efforts to achieve it. There has also been recognition of the efforts of the Central American countries to arrive at consensus and to submit jointly a draft resolution based on our joint positions. This reflects the fact that despite our differences and difficulties what unites us is stronger than what separates us and that in spite of everything there are points of agreement between us that should be emphasized in our quest for peace.

Emphasis has also been put on the supremely important role of the regional mechanisms and other machinery set up in the area in the search for peace, and in this respect there has been recognition and appreciation of the efforts made by the Contadora and support groups and of the Esquipulas Agreements, emphasizing in particular the will of the Central American Presidents themselves to build instruments and find the path that will bring us to peace.

The need for economic assistance for the countries of the area has been emphasized also by recognizing that the outstanding causes of the conflicts in Central America are structural, economic and social factors, that the roots of the conflict were determined by unjust structures that are, as it were, the origin, the generator of the Central American crisis.

Given this situation, what has been the preponderant attitude in the General Assembly? The conciliatory spirit of our own group, the Central American, and of the Contadora and support groups contrasts violently with the attitude of the delegation of the United States of America, which actually represents a rupture

(Mr. Serrano Caldera,  
Nicaragua)

with the spirit of this debate in the political and economic fields. We deplore the fact that problems as tragic as those of Central America are dealt with repeatedly in this obsessive way. For our part, we reaffirm our constructive spirit, our openness to dialogue and our quest for civilized mechanisms to solve our conflicts.

We request - and we said this in our statement - that the United States, which has a major responsibility for this crisis, leave us in peace and allow us to find our own alternatives to solve the conflict. It has been proved that when we talk to each other there are concrete possibilities for an understanding. In this respect we reiterate our positive attitude, reaffirm our constructive will and recall the message that we conveyed in our statement in this forum addressed to the new United States Administration, which we hope will understand the prevailing spirit among Central Americans who are seeking peace on the basis of respect, dignity, sovereignty and self-determination for our peoples.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have now concluded our consideration of agenda item 22.

#### AGENDA ITEM 29

##### 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)



Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Today the international community is witnessing a momentous event: the proclamation of the Palestinian State. This significant development is the culmination of a long struggle and unstinting sacrifice. It gives effect to the principles of international legality embodied in the provisions of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions, which reject foreign occupation and uphold the rights of peoples to self-determination. Those are the same lofty goals for which the people of Namibia is struggling.

Since the United Nations proclaimed the termination of the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and the direct responsibility of the United Nations for that Territory in accordance with its resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted at its twenty-first session in 1966, the national liberation movement, namely the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), has waged an unrelenting struggle to achieve independence. The Council for Namibia also has made constant efforts in defence of the legitimate rights and interests of the Territory. After more than 20 years of valiant struggle, the Namibian people has proved its resolute will to gain independence despite the repressive measures imposed by South Africa. The Territory is on the threshold of the final phase of that unrelenting struggle.

Throughout that long period, the international community has directly stood by the Namibian people. It has supported its struggle and strengthened its efforts to achieve its ultimate goal. In 1976, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976), in which it requested South Africa to withdraw its illegal administration from the Territory, transfer power to the people of Namibia, and hold free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations throughout Namibia as a single political entity.

That was followed by a number of historic developments, foremost of which was the adoption of a draft plan for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia,

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

which both SWAPO and South Africa accepted in principle. It provided for free elections to be held under the supervision of the United Nations. In that connection, we wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who has made constant efforts to achieve independence for the Territory.\*

Regrettably, however, the South African régime has constantly endeavoured to prevent the implementation of the United Nations plan by linking it to extraneous issues. The Security Council rejected such linkage, considering that the independence of Namibia should not be a hostage to matters unrelated to the United Nations plan for the independence of the Territory. It seems that the South African régime failed to grasp the significance of all those developments. It tried to oppose them by all means, including the establishment of a provisional Government in violation of the provisions of the settlement plan formulated by the United Nations. The international community rejected that attempt, and the Security Council considered it a blatant insult and a glaring violation of its previous resolutions. It therefore declared the measure null and void and requested South Africa to rescind it.

Meanwhile the Pretoria régime continued its hostility to the resistance movements, perpetrating acts of ruthless violence and political oppression, racism and apartheid, flouting the Charter of the United Nations, human rights and the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Although recent developments suggest light at the end of the tunnel and the possibility of agreement between the negotiating parties on the withdrawal of South African forces

---

\*Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

from Namibia, the Pretoria régime is still insisting on impossible terms to prevent the conclusion of the desired agreement.

South Africa's arbitrary and colonialist practices in Namibia have led to the deprivation of its people of their political rights, their fundamental human rights and their right to contribute to economic activity. The deprivation of all those rights has impoverished the people and weakened their ability to tackle the problems they are confronting and those they will be confronting after independence.

In 1974 the Council for Namibia adopted Decree No. 1, pursuant to its responsibility for protecting the natural resources of the Namibian people. The Decree dealt with the protection of the natural resources of Namibia in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1720 (XVI) which proclaims the right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their riches and natural resources, after it became clear that the Government of South Africa had usurped those rights.

The State of Qatar pays tribute to the people of Namibia in its struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, which has spared no effort to achieve freedom and independence. We look forward to the day when the Namibian people will achieve self-determination and independence.

Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary): In the wake of improvements in the international situation we have witnessed promising progress and favourable developments in the quest for settlement of several acute regional hotbeds of crisis. It may be stated that during the past year the prospects for Namibia's accession to independence have improved and the Namibian people has moved closer to the possibility of actually exercising its genuine right to self-determination.

Since the termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the world Organization has been unable to enforce its will and give effect to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. During the past years the Member States have become clearly aware of the causes of that incapacity

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

for action as well as the interests at work that have allowed the dilatory tactics of the South African régime to meet with success. It is obvious that those interests have not ceased to exist over the past period, but have been put into a new perspective by the world set-up and, first and foremost, by the development of the situation in that region, prompting the parties directly involved to seek a compromise.

The region is giving added proof that its inherent antagonisms are bound to surface sooner or later; that they cannot be removed or suppressed by the use of force. Those antagonisms and the tension in the southern part of Africa are multifaceted and interrelated, all of them rooted in the essence of the apartheid system. In his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General of the United Nations refers to a three-dimensional conflict: the question of Namibia, the acts of destabilization against neighbouring States of South Africa and the system of apartheid in South Africa itself.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

My delegation fully shares the view expressed in the report that:

"Developments in, or relating to, the continuance of a situation of racial discrimination, which is so repugnant to the spirit of our age, lend further force to the repeated - and hitherto unheeded - urgings of the international community that apartheid be dismantled." (A/43/1, p. 5)

Recent negotiations on the southern African region and the agreement achieved today, according to the latest news reports, give reason for cautious hope of resolving the conflict in Angola and achieving the independence of Namibia. The fact remains, however, that the root cause of the conflict in southern Africa is the maintenance of apartheid, and as long as this system is in effect, regional peace will be threatened constantly. While there are promising signs of an improvement in the political climate in and around the region, the international community is witnessing the fact that apartheid - racial discrimination - which has been the root cause of the regional conflict, remains virtually intact.

Therefore we are of the view that as long as the régime defies the world's demands, postpones introducing fundamental changes and tries to evade the inevitable, total eradication of apartheid, it is of vital importance that the community of nations should exert pressure on the régime.

The sanctions already imposed have significantly contributed to the common efforts of the international community and have had a catalytic effect on the régime's awareness that there is an increasing need to introduce fundamental change.

It is a welcome fact that, in the absence of the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, a growing number of countries have adopted measures, national as well as collective, although we continue to believe that international pressure can be effective and successful only if it is comprehensive and mandatory.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

The régime finds it of vital importance to maintain its influence and dominant role in the region. For that purpose it resorts to armed aggression against the front-line States, besides exercising economic pressure on them, thereby destabilizing the situation in the entire region and prejudicing the chances of those States to develop and to establish mutually beneficial relations on the basis of equality.

Although my colleagues have already spoken of the different aspects of this complex question in the course of the debate, let me share some of our further thoughts on the situation in Namibia. The Territory has been occupied and kept in colonial bondage. It has been denied the right to dispose of its rich natural resources and its aspirations for national liberation have been suppressed by force. This has been done without consulting, and against the will of, the vast majority of the Namibian people. The South African régime, however, has been unable to suppress the liberation struggle led by the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, which enjoys international recognition.

A settlement plan exists: it is internationally recognized, and the world community has to act to ensure its implementation. The developments of the past ten years, the present international situation, and the changes in the region have narrowed the apartheid system's scope for manoeuvring, and this has created a more realistic possibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1987) of the Security Council. For its part, the United Nations has made the necessary preparations for the implementation of the plan, which my Government notes with high appreciation. We hope that the new efforts and possibilities will open fresh perspectives for the common political endeavour and will serve as an encouraging example to follow in eliminating other regional hotbeds of the world.

Mrs. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The date of 29 September 1988 was the tenth anniversary of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), an anniversary which the international community had hoped not to have to celebrate any longer.

Alas, Namibia is not yet released from its chains. The positive side of this celebration, however, will have been that it was a reminder to States Members of the United Nations of their collective responsibility towards Namibia. It is in this spirit that, from this rostrum, Madagascar reaffirms its unreserved support for the just struggle for national liberation waged by the Namibian people, under the guidance of its authentic and legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

During these 18 months, my delegation has followed with interest the efforts of multilateral diplomacy to arrive at a cease-fire in southern Africa and the application of the plan provided for under resolution 435 (1978). We have shared the hopes of the Namibian people to accede at last to independence. We have also shared their doubts regarding the sincerity of South Africa. The change in the date from 1 November to - probably - 1 January in the timetable for the implementation of the resolution seems, regrettably, to confirm those doubts, the more so since the ambiguous attitude of Pretoria leads us to be cautious in our optimism. Indeed, even while the talks were continuing and while it was claimed that the dialogue had not been interrupted, while SWAPO declared unilaterally that it had halted military operations, Pieter Botha's government was tightening its hold over Namibia. There are reports of increased military activity, of the aerial transport of weapons, it would appear, from Windhoek to the north of the country. There is talk also of 50,000 men which South Africa has massed at the Angola frontier. But it is the situation within Namibia itself that denies the sudden apparent good will of Pretoria. No opposition is tolerated in the Territory.

(Mrs. Rakotondramba, Madagascar)

Through cruel and repressive laws promulgated in defiance of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions the racist South African minority continues to impose martial law, maintains security zones, prohibits boycotts and demonstrations and muzzles the press. Those laws, which the General Assembly in paragraph 25 of its resolution 42/14 A declared to be null and void, are being used by the South African occupation forces, flanked by their troops and death squads, as justification for mass arrests, cold-blooded murders, deportations, torture, detention without trial, and the disappearance of civilians. Students and trade unions are persecuted, the media are muzzled, men between 17 and 55 years of age are being forcibly conscripted to confront their brothers in order to undermine the credibility of SWAPO, or are trained for tribal conflict. South Africa's mercenaries are increasing. This is despotism in all its horror. Thousands of Namibians have no choice but to seek refuge in neighbouring States, thus giving Pretoria a cynical pretext for pursuit, transforming Namibia into a springboard for ambushing, committing aggression and terrorizing the populations of neighbouring States.



(Mrs. Rakotonirainy,  
Madagascar)

South Africa maintains its illegal occupation of Namibia in violation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), of 27 October 1966. Greed is at the root of this illegal occupation. Because of the vast mining, agricultural and marine resources of the Territory, South Africa, in order to preserve its advantages and those of other foreign economic interests which, by their co-operation, give it support and comfort, impedes Namibia's accession to independence. South Africa's grip on the natural resources of Namibia enables it, in association with foreign companies, to make large profits. It is indeed plunder to which South Africa and certain Western and other economic interests resort, in violation of relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.

We have often heard certain delegations, prompted by concern for objectivity or by bad faith - it is not always easy to differentiate - affirm that transnational companies also benefit colonial peoples. That is not true of Namibia. The transnational companies are delighted to find there an enormous reservoir of raw materials and cheap labour, while the black majority, deprived by South Africa of their most fertile lands and their mining areas, live in exile in arid homelands where they can barely survive or are forced to work for the white minority in mines or agricultural projects in conditions approaching slavery. For South Africa and the transnational corporations, however, these are ideal conditions in which to garner enormous profits which they transfer to their respective countries without investing in the Territory or trying to help the indigenous population by integrating sectors of the Namibian economy. It is a colonialist and

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa,  
Madagascar)

neo-colonialist economic policy which drains the human and natural resources of Namibia at the expense of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to genuine national independence in a united Namibia.

It is clear that this situation will persist for as long as foreign and other economic interests, which are the main beneficiaries of this plunder, continue to put their short-term national interests above the interest of mankind as a whole.

This is why, given the intransigence of Pretoria, we call upon the international community to be firm. Negotiations are now at a crucial stage. The Namibian people need, more than ever, the full support of all members of the Assembly. My delegation hopes that the various ideologies will not distract us from our purpose, because the question of Namibia is a question of decolonization and as such is part of the Assembly's belief in the fundamental rights of man and the dignity and value of the human person.

In keeping with its support for the conclusions set out in the final document of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries, which met at Nicosia in regular session from 5 to 10 September 1988, my delegation reaffirms its conviction that comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions must be imposed immediately against the racist South African régime to force it to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

We express the firm hope that the decisions of this Assembly will contribute to ending that occupation and that, sooner or later, the natural resources of the Territory will be used for the benefit of the majority of the Namibian people, whose dignity will be restored and who will be compensated for the damage inflicted upon them. We hope, too, that the front-line countries will be able to develop in peace and security. Accordingly, Madagascar will show its support by voting in

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa,  
Madagascar)

favour of the draft resolutions now before us, in particular those on the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of the immediate independence of Namibia.

We urge all Member States strictly to apply economic sanctions, the effectiveness of which is beginning to be proved by events. Madagascar appeals to the two permanent members of the Security Council which have so far supported racist South Africa in its intransigence by their veto to transform that veto into a positive vote.

We support multilateral diplomacy and encourage all those who continue to work tirelessly for a lasting peace and the complete independence of a united Namibia. We are particularly pleased by the activities of the Council for Namibia, which, having undertaken responsibility for the interests and rights of the Namibian people, continues to defend them to the best of its ability.

We encourage the Secretary-General of our Organization and assure him of our total support in his efforts and his continuing commitment to ensure implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

On 9 November the world remembered with horror and profound sorrow Kristallnacht, the symbol of fascist genocide. We remind the Governments and peoples who witnessed or were victims of that holocaust that for the black majority of Namibia every day is Kristallnacht.

Mrs. CHAN (Singapore): The year 1988 should have been Namibia's year and November should have been Namibia's month. After seven decades of repressive colonial occupation by South Africa, 17 years of it illegal in terms of international law, the international community looked on as an agreement was initialled in New York in July 1988 for a peaceful settlement in southern Africa. The implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was promised; the date was settled for 1 November, ushering in the long-awaited process of independence for Namibia. But it was not to be. The target date has now been moved to 1 January 1989. Shall Namibia yet be free?

(Mrs. Chan, Singapore)

My delegation greeted the negotiations on southern Africa this year with two cheers - two, not three, because one of the parties to the negotiations is South Africa. When one is dealing with a blatantly racist régime with the iron will to survive, it is necessary to be cynical and sceptical. Alfred T. Moleah, a black African academic, born and raised in and around Johannesburg and now teaching in the United States - a person who is active in the struggle against racism, apartheid and colonialism - has warned that "In Namibia, as in South Africa, the more things change, the more they remain the same".

Recent history teaches us to be cautious. South Africa is well known for its breaches of promise. It has come close to signing or has accepted agreements that raised great hopes for a settlement in southern Africa, only to have them dashed to the ground. One of those agreements, and a classic example, was Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which spelled out a process of withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia in seven months and the implementation of United Nations-supervised elections in one year. It was adopted on 29 September 1978. But South Africa, after accepting it in principle, has successfully avoided its implementation. Then again, in 1984, South Africa signed the Lusaka agreement to withdraw its troops from Angola but did not meet that objective. In 1984 talks were held also in Lusaka and in the Cape Verde Islands between South Africa and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, but failed to reach a conclusion because of South African obduracy.

It should be remembered that, when faced with the prospect of United Nations-supervised elections in the 1970s, South Africa attempted to annex Walvis Bay in 1977 in order to exclude it from negotiations over Namibia's transition to independence. The attempt to annex Walvis Bay was universally condemned by Governments, the United Nations and SWAPO. Today an estimated 3,500 South African

(Mrs. Chan, Singapore)

troops are permanently based in Walvis Bay, which has become one of the most militarized areas in southern Africa.

Even now as the quadripartite talks are progressing - and we heard this morning that an agreement has been reached in Geneva - the question for us is simply this: does South Africa have a hidden agenda for Namibia?

The indications that South Africa may be unprepared to relinquish control over Namibia are numerous. South Africa has been introducing apartheid structures into Namibia since 1964. In 1980 it introduced a decree dividing Namibian society into 11 mutually exclusive groups on the basis of racial, ethnic and tribal origins. That was a clear move to prevent the African majority from acting and organizing in unison against white and colonial domination. On 8 April 1988 President Botha visited Windhoek to check moves to reform apartheid. He strengthened the powers of the South African Administrator-General. He would be able to call racially based elections and veto any attempts to abolish existing authorities or to diminish the power of two second-tier authorities. The Administrator-General was also authorized to take "appropriate" steps to muzzle local media that promoted "subversion" and "terrorism". President Botha further advocated "fitting and effective" action against SWAPO and its supporters in their struggle for national liberation.

And as recently as 26 October 1988 we had clear indications from the South African local elections that the political climate within South Africa is hardening against the dismantling of apartheid. It is difficult in these circumstances to conceive of South Africa easing up on Namibia.

For its own selfish interests, South Africa uses Namibia as a critical buffer. It is oblivious of the injustice and suffering borne by the people of Namibia. South Africans do not want to lose Namibia for fear of the impact of that loss upon the white population in South Africa, but more importantly because of its

(Mrs. Chan, Singapore)

impact upon the black majority. Namibia would deliver the final psychological blow to the whites after the liberation of all the other African States. It would greatly magnify the writing on the wall. In fact, in a series of interviews conducted in South Africa in 1982 by the Christian Science Monitor, black leaders put the independence of Namibia at the top of their list of changes they hoped to see. Bishop Desmond Tutu said, "Namibia is a very high priority. I would say it is a pre-condition to our liberation".

Furthermore, South Africa sees Namibia as fertile plunder ground. Namibia is richly endowed with mineral resources. It is the fourth largest African and the fourteenth largest world producer of mineral products. The country is also said to possess rich oil, gold and coal reserves. South Africa will not relinquish this prize unless it is forced to.

The international community must continue to exert pressure on South Africa so that it realizes that there is no other acceptable recourse for it but to withdraw from Namibia. If there is any intention to renege on the agreement even now before us, the international community should make South Africa feel the high cost of its intransigence.

While Singapore is dedicated to a peaceful solution to conflict and a negotiated political settlement to conflict, we reject any attempt by South Africa or any other State to impart to the question of Namibia a dimension that is different from the one it has: an act of colonial domination which violates the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. We agree with the report of the Special Committee that Namibia has always been and remains a decolonization issue. We agree with the report that any attempt to portray Namibia as part of an East-West confrontation rather than as an issue of decolonization is flagrant defiance of the will of the international community and could only have the effect of further delaying the independence of Namibia. We reject linkage, as

(Mrs. Chan, Singapore)

an extraneous and irrelevant issue, and believe it will be used as a ploy by the South African régime to delay independence for Namibia.

We are gravely concerned that South Africa may seek to intervene in the shaping of the future independent Namibian constitution. Namibia's constitution should be decided by Namibians. The United Nations plan provides for a constituent assembly to be elected on the basis of one Namibian/one vote under United Nations-supervised elections. Therefore, the announcement by South Africa's Administrator-General after a cease-fire was announced in August this year that he would push ahead with domestic segregated elections should be regarded with suspicion. He has also publicly stated his desire to tie up "loose ends". One of these "loose ends" is the drafting of an independence constitution. That demonstrates the utter contempt South Africa has for the will of the Namibian people and its legitimate rights, even as it is a party to the current negotiations and says it is prepared to withdraw from Namibia.

We know that in Namibia today momentum is building up against the illegal occupying Power. SWAPO has provided leadership and mobilized the broad masses of the people for a sustained multifaceted struggle for national liberation. Throughout 1987 and 1988 there was a continuous wave of student protests and classroom boycotts. Military bases were established in and alongside school grounds on the pretext of discouraging guerilla attacks. In reality, it was to keep a tight control over the students. In May this year over 40,000 black Namibian secondary school children chose to boycott school to protest against the presence of the South African military in their school properties. They were joined by 60,000 workers, about 70 per cent of the black worker population. Namibia was brought to a virtual standstill. It was the biggest strike in the Territory's history.



(Mrs. Chan, Singapore)

The last nail may be hammered into South Africa's coffin. It has had trouble recruiting manpower for the South African Defence Force (SADF); forcible military conscription is running into trouble; too many white South African youths are dying on the battlefield; large-scale indiscipline has been reported in the ranks of the SADF and the South West Africa Territorial Force (SWATF). In fact, there are reports of a marked increase in mutiny, rebellion, indiscipline and desertion in the ranks of the SADF and SWATF.

Many long years have passed, and the Namibian people have waited patiently. They have grown confident waiting. But so long as they are ruthlessly exploited, brutally repressed and unfree they will intensify their resistance. They have a sense of inevitability about their liberation. As the Africans put it so vividly, "Nobody can stop the rain".

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): The issue of Namibia has featured annually as an important item on the agenda of the United Nations. The General Assembly and the Security Council have over the years adopted dozens of resolutions demanding South African withdrawal from Namibia and the return of the Territory to the United Nations. To Austria it is a matter of profound concern that the people of Namibia are still unable to exercise their fundamental right to self-determination. We have always considered the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in defiance of international law, to be a particular challenge to the international community. We have categorically rejected any unilateral moves by South Africa to transfer power in Namibia and have regarded the establishment of the so-called interim government in Namibia as null and void.

The international community has made great efforts to enable the people of Namibia freely to exercise their right to self-determination. Efforts to arrive at an internationally acceptable solution resulted in the adoption of Security Council

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed a settlement plan for the transfer of power to the people of Namibia through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

The year 1988 marks the tenth anniversary of that important resolution, which constitutes the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence for Namibia. Despite its endorsement by the international community and its acceptance by SWAPO it has taken nearly 10 years before we have seen movement towards implementation of the plan.

In various rounds of negotiations between South Africa, Angola and Cuba, mediated by the United States of America, agreement on a set of measures with a view to starting implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was achieved.

Although Austria has never approved of the concept of linkage, we welcome the agreement-in-principle on an end to the war in Angola and on Namibian independence reached by the parties concerned in July 1988 in New York. That agreement offers a realistic chance, the first for a decade, that the Namibian people will finally gain their independence.

Austria, which has consistently deplored that South Africa used the territory of Namibia as a springboard for military attacks against neighbouring States, also welcomed the cease-fire agreed upon by Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with which SWAPO agreed to comply.

The date that was widely believed to be that which would bring about the start of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), 1 November, has passed. We know that some issues still have to be resolved. However, in the light of the most recent events we are hopeful that the solution is now emerging. Austria looks forward to an early date for the beginning of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

Ten years ago Austria declared its readiness to participate in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) with a police contingent. Today Austria is again prepared to put such a contingent at UNTAG's disposal, and would consider making additional personnel available for other tasks related to the transition of Namibia to independence.

The cost of UNTAG has been estimated to amount to between \$700 million and \$1 billion. UNTAG will need a sound financial basis. As the United Nations peacekeeping operations now enjoy the highest esteem, we believe that all Member States will be able to agree on the appropriate mandatory financing for UNTAG. In view of the importance of the issue of leading Namibia to independence, for which the United Nations has a special responsibility, financial considerations should not stand in the way of finally bringing independence to the people of Namibia. The issue of financing, however, remains one of the highest priority and will have to be solved if the operation is to be as successful as we should like.

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

Under these circumstances the Namibian people clearly need the assistance of the international community. My Government welcomes and supports the efforts of the United Nations to help the victims of South Africa's policy in Namibia.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

For many years Austria has therefore contributed to the funds and programmes of the United Nations for Namibia.

It is the common responsibility of the international community to reach an early settlement of the Namibian question. I should like to pay a special tribute to the constructive policies of the front-line States, which under adverse circumstances have never flagged in their commitment to Namibia's independence.

We would deeply resent any attempt to delay Namibia's independence any longer. We look forward to the next session of the General Assembly, when there should no longer be a need to quote Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My delegation expresses the hope that Namibia will soon join the other 159 States Members of the United Nations and calls on the parties concerned to take immediate action to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The independence of Namibia is one of the major issues that command the attention of the international community. Recently there have been some significant developments with regard to the situation in Namibia. Since early May this year seven rounds of formal negotiations have been held among Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States of America on the issues of peace in Angola and the independence of Namibia. There are plenty of indications that these negotiations have made considerable headway, breaking the long-standing stalemate and bringing fresh hopes for Namibian independence. However, as these talks have failed to this day to produce a final agreement, and the target date agreed upon by the parties concerned to start implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has been postponed time and again, we cannot but feel worried. It is at this critical juncture that the General Assembly is deliberating on the Namibian question. Hence its special importance. Now I wish to make a few observations on this item.

First, an early realization of Namibian independence through peaceful negotiations is an inevitable trend of our times and represents the popular will of the people throughout the world.

At present, the international situation is moving towards relaxation. The fierce rivalry between the super-Powers has somewhat eased, and the tendency to seek peaceful solutions to regional conflicts is picking up momentum. Against the backdrop of these developments, a new situation has thus emerged, with the four parties sitting down for negotiations to settle the questions of peace in Angola and Namibian independence.

For decades, the South African authorities have refused to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia and continued their illegal occupation of that Territory. Moreover, they have used it as a base to launch armed invasions into Angola and other neighbouring countries, undermining peace and

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

stability in the region. The perverse acts of South Africa have not only met with dauntless resistance from the Namibian people and the people of Angola and other front-line African States but also aroused strong condemnation on the part of the international community. Losing its edge on the battlefield in recent years, South Africa is not only beset with mounting economic difficulties and a surging anti-war movement at home but has found itself in a worsening predicament caused by growing international isolation.

Longing for peace, the Governments of the front-line States and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have over the years made unremitting efforts to reduce regional tension and bring about Namibian independence. The Government of Angola has come to the four-party negotiations with flexible and realistic policies. SWAPO has time and again expressed its willingness to sign, and honour, a cease-fire agreement with South Africa. This testifies to the good faith of the front-line States and SWAPO for a negotiated settlement on the question of peace in South-West Africa. It has thus become an ardent desire shared by the Namibian people, the people of the front-line States and the people of the whole world to see a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question and the re-establishment of peace in South-West Africa.

Secondly, the key to the settlement of the Namibian question lies in South Africa's implementation of relevant United Nations resolutions.

Since its inception, the United Nations has adopted scores of resolutions on the question of Namibia. If the South African authorities had implemented them, the Namibia question would have long ceased to exist, and Namibia would have become an equal partner in the community of sovereign nations a long time ago. As is known to all, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), approving the Secretary-General's plan to realize Namibian independence through elections under United Nations supervision and control. Successive sessions of the General

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

Assembly have also repeatedly adopted resolutions reaffirming that resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the only acceptable basis for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and calling for its immediate implementation without any pre-conditions and qualifications. Although the South African authorities have been compelled to agree to this resolution under international pressure, they have kept obstructing its implementation by creating one side issue after another and deliberately complicating the matter, thus reducing the resolution to nothing more than a piece of paper ten years after its adoption. It is crystal clear that the key to the settlement of the Namibian question lies in a prompt change in the obstinate position of South Africa and the cessation of its external aggression and expansion.

Thirdly, South Africa's move to reinforce its colonialist and racist rule in Namibia does not accord with the spirit of the four-party negotiation now under way.

The actions taken by the South African authorities since the beginning of this year have made it clear that they are still reinforcing their oppressive rule over Namibia. During his visit to Namibia President Botha granted greater power to South Africa's Administrator General in the Territory, including the power to call racially segregated local elections and the power to impose more rigorous censorship on the mass media. The "interim government" propped up by South Africa is also stepping up its activities to formulate a so-called constitution in a bid to work out an "internal solution" outside the framework of the United Nations resolution.

In the meantime, the South African suppression of the Namibian people has gone on unabated. A large occupation force 100,000 strong remains in Namibia. South African troops and police keep harassing Namibian schools, churches and trade unions, and many innocent Namibians have been wilfully arrested and killed.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

These actions of the South African authorities are diametrically opposed to the spirit of the four-party negotiations aimed at bringing about Namibian independence. They must stop forthwith taking any action that is detrimental to a negotiated settlement, give up their delaying tactics and demonstrate their good faith with concrete actions. Only in this way can the negotiations make progress.

Fourthly, the international community should maintain its pressure on South Africa and continue to provide assistance to the Namibian people, thus helping to advance the independence process of Namibia.



(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

Although South Africa is already a party to the four-party negotiations and has also made some promises, in view of its record in Namibia and its past failure to keep its word with respect to implementing United Nations resolutions, the international community must heighten its vigilance. In the view of the Chinese delegation, the present session of the General Assembly should adopt resolutions condemning the South African authorities for their policy of apartheid and illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as their invasion of and acts of sabotage against the front-line States and other countries in southern Africa. They should continue to rally support from all countries, especially those Western countries that have influence over South Africa, for the imposition of effective sanctions against South Africa. And they should also call upon the international community to render more moral and material assistance to the Namibian people and the front-line States. It is also our view that, as the United Nations plan has not been implemented and the Namibian people remain unable to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, the United Nations Council for Namibia should continue to carry out its mandate given by the General Assembly and make unremitting efforts to bring about Namibian independence.

The Chinese Government and people will, as always, stand firmly on the side of African countries and peoples and support the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for national independence, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and the just struggle of the front-line States in safeguarding their sovereignty and security. We appreciate and support the efforts made by Angola and other front-line States to ease regional tension and bring about Namibian independence, and their reasonable proposals and suggestions to this end. It is our hope that the parties concerned will continue their endeavour so that an agreement aimed at implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) will be reached promptly and Namibia, the largest remaining colony on Earth, will become

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

independent at an early date. The South African authorities should go along with the trend of history and make a fresh start. Let us hope that when we meet again next year for the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, we shall find a free and independent Namibia taking up its legitimate seat here as a formal Member of the world body.

Mr. GAYE (Gambia): It is perhaps fortuitous that the General Assembly should be debating the question of Namibia at this time. In many parts of the world men and women of conscience with a sense of justice have over the past few days been engaged in acts of solemn remembrance of an earlier Fascist régime that plunged the world into armed conflict over a repressive, inhuman ideology. The scars of that debacle are a grim reminder of the past which the international community should never allow to happen again.

Yet, on the question of Namibia, the current South African régime with its apartheid policy apes the evils contained in the master-race ideology of past horrors. South Africa, through force of conventional arms and threats of nuclear capability, continues illegally to occupy Namibia, murder its legitimate citizens and imprison others. Thousands of Namibian citizens have been displaced and some even forcibly conscripted into military service in furtherance of South Africa's policies. Namibia's potential for economic development is being destroyed as its natural resources are being steadily pillaged by South Africa, in defiance of the Council for Namibia Decree No. 1, which calls for the protection of the natural resources of Namibia.

As in the past, abhorrence of such régimes has taken the form of studied indifference among some members of the international community, despite the long-standing plight of Namibia. In its Final Communiqué, the International

(Mr. Gaye, Gambia)

Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia cited several Governments that acted in obstruction of Namibia's struggle for independence and self-determination.\*

My delegation will admit that the implementation of some of the recommendations contained in the Communiqué has brought some incremental change of attitude among some members of the international community towards Namibia's quest for independence, as mandated by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). But States that heretofore, for their own economic interests, had abstained or cast vetoes in votes on decisions affecting Namibia's freedom are now reversing their previous stance on the issue. In fact, my delegation has followed with very keen interest the quadripartite talks to establish a basis for peace in the south-western part of Africa and the independence of Namibia. We are indeed pleased about prospects for Namibia's independence, and we offer all possible encouragement to the sponsors of the ongoing negotiations outside the framework of the United Nations. However, because of the duplicitous history of the racist régime in South Africa, our optimism is somewhat curbed by the fact that this year we mark the tenth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which spelled out the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the only internationally acceptable framework for the peaceful decolonization of Namibia. The Pretoria régime has in the past stifled several plans introduced by the United Nations that would have led to Namibia's independence; among these, to name a few, the Geneva pre-implementation talks on Namibia, the pre-conditions that prevented the implementation of the United Nations plan, as well as the meetings on Namibia held in Lusaka and Mindelo.

My delegation is proud to take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to Angola and Cuba for their statesmanlike decision to take part in the ongoing

---

\*Mr. Branco (Sao Tome and Principe), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Gaye, Gambia)

negotiations under the auspices of the United States, and we wish all concerned complete success. The genuine mediation efforts of the United States also deserve full acknowledgement and support by all parties.

Because of the past record of the Pretoria régime, my delegation is of the view that the international community, and the United Nations in particular, must continue to exert maximum pressure on South Africa. It is indeed unbelievable that, despite the fact that all outstanding issues relevant to the United Nations independence plan for Namibia have been resolved, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented because of the continued insistence by South Africa on linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

As has been observed by more than one speaker before me, the racist régime of South Africa is not prepared to change its policies, in spite of the assiduous efforts of the international community, to which the succession of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions bear eloquent testimony. The apartheid régime has proceeded, with apparent impunity, from one atrocity to another. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the case of occupied Namibia. Disregarding the formal revocation of the League of Nations Mandate in 1966, the apartheid régime has by unilateral decision continued to extend its jurisdiction and administration over the occupied Territory, whose vast mineral resources it continues to exploit for its own use. At the same time, it has transformed Namibia into a forward base for armed acts of aggression against independent African States in the region.

(Mr. Gaye, Gambia)

This situation is indeed unfortunate and it is for this reason that my delegation is of the view that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, should be imposed by the entire international community without further delay. To those who are still unwilling to embrace this important and effective measure, we ask them to reconsider their unreserved opposition to comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against a racist régime that violates daily all norms of civilized behaviour and also takes pride in defying the international community, thrives on racial segregation, injustice, violence and total disregard for the principles of democracy and human rights.

In conclusion my delegation would like to place on record our deep appreciation of the efforts being made by the Secretary-General, especially the arrangements being put in place for the implementation of the United Nations plan. Our steadfast aim is the attainment of independence for Namibia. To this end we must continue to support the quadripartite talks and the efforts of the Secretary-General with a view to ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, so that our brothers and sisters, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their true and authentic representative, can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. As far as my delegation is concerned, so long as an inch of Namibian territory remains under illegal occupation and domination by the racist régime the independence of Africa will be incomplete and insecure.

Mr. STRESOV (Bulgaria): This year's report of the United Nations Council for Namibia reflects the activities of different bodies of the Organization aiming at eliminating all obstacles in the way of the immediate accession of the Territory to independence on the basis of the United Nations plan for Namibia, namely, resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

In our opinion two events deserve special attention:

The first is the Security Council debate on Namibia of October 1987 and the adoption of Security Council resolution 601 (1987). For the first time the Security Council determined that all issues relating to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved and a truce between the People's Liberation Army of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa's occupying forces was needed in order to create the conditions for taking the administrative and other practical steps for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia. It is to be regretted that this has not yet been achieved.

The second event is the meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia at the ministerial level, held on 1 October 1987. Its final communiqué represents an adequate programme for the acceleration of the accession of Namibia to independence under the terms and conditions of the accepted United Nations plan. It should be mentioned here that this meeting determined that the criminal policies of racist South Africa represent a threat to international peace and security.

It is also necessary to highlight the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia in sensitizing world public opinion by convening seminars in different countries and organizing a campaign for world-wide dissemination of information, as well as having consultations with different Governments in order to mobilize their support.

A new element in the question of Namibia has appeared this year. What we have in mind are the talks between Angola, Cuba and the Republic of South Africa, mediated by the United States, for the finding of a political solution to the problems in the southern part of Africa. We should like to reiterate, however, that this should not unduly delay the accession of Namibia to independence. We are very encouraged by the flexibility shown by the Governments of Angola and Cuba,

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

which have expressed their readiness to accommodate specific demands of South Africa within the framework of relations among the three countries. We are, however, again witnessing procrastination on the part of South Africa. This fact compels us to re-emphasize succinctly our position on the different elements of the question of Namibia.

Despite the numerous United Nations resolutions, the racist régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its natural and human resources. It also conducts a policy of repression against the Namibian people. We share the view that the illegal occupation of that Territory constitutes an act of aggression against its people. Namibia is also being used as a springboard for aggression against the neighbouring front-line States and for their continued destabilization. We cannot but affirm once again that Namibia's territorial integrity must be preserved intact, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands. In accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, any attempt by South Africa to annex them is therefore illegal, null and void. No territorial matter should be left for negotiation between an independent Namibia and South Africa. We would like to highlight the role, competence and specific responsibility of the Security Council in this field. We denounce all fraudulent constitutional schemes by which Pretoria attempts to perpetuate its colonial domination of Namibia and we oppose any international recognition of any régime established in violation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We therefore join the call of the international community for the dissolution of the puppet institutions in Windhoek.

My delegation would like once again to express its solidarity with and support for the South West Africa People's Organization, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. We value the statesmanship, co-operation

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

and far-sightedness it has constantly displayed in the political and diplomatic arena despite the provocations of the Pretoria régime.

The efforts of the international community and the persistent activity of the United Nations in 1988 have brought about significant progress in the process of settling a number of regional conflicts. We would like to believe that this process will find an expression in southern Africa, including Namibia. We would like especially to commend the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his tireless efforts to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as early as possible. We shall lend support to all his political and practical efforts in this field.

We also support the statement made on 29 September 1988 by the President of the Security Council on behalf of its members containing an appeal to South Africa to respect the resolutions and decisions of the Council without delay and to co-operate with the Secretary-General in their immediate and strict implementation.

Finally, let me express the sincere hope of the people and Government of Bulgaria that this will be the last General Assembly to deliberate on the question of the independence of Namibia.



Mr. ZAROTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): It is now 10 years since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), a key document in the list of decisions adopted by the Organization aimed at bringing about the independence of Namibia. Moreover, it is 22 years since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating the Republic of South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia and proclaiming South Africa's continued presence in that Territory to be unlawful. In spite of the persistent efforts of the Organization and the whole of the international community, to date it has not been possible to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The people of Namibia have still not obtained their freedom and before us still looms the discussion on why this situation is as it is.

For many years the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa, which is being supported by certain Western Powers, has succeeded in disregarding the decisions of the Organization and ignoring the ever louder voice of the world community, which has demanded recognition once and for all of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

Times are changing. The upkeep of the army of occupation in Namibia and the aggression against the People's Republic of Angola have become too much of a financial and material burden for Pretoria. As has been pointed out by the representative of the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), Sam Nujoma, the racist Republic of South Africa is compelled to spend \$US 3 million every day for that purpose. There is an unprecedented increase in the Republic of South Africa's combat casualties. The cases of desertion in the ranks of its army are on the increase as well. In trying to stage an attack at Cuito Cuanavale the South African aggressor suffered a moral defeat which confirmed once and for all the pointlessness of a military solution.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

The Government of the Republic of South Africa is finding itself increasingly more isolated internationally. Moreover, Pretoria is compelled to resist the increasing repudiation of its policies of aggression and destabilization not only by the international community but also among the ranks of those representatives of the white community who think realistically in the Republic of South Africa itself. All this taken together has compelled the South African racists to sit at the negotiating table.

It is our conviction that time is on the side of the achievement of progress in the solution of the Namibian question and the cessation of the unlawful occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime. We follow with hope the progress of negotiations among the People's Republic of Angola, Cuba and the Republic of South Africa with the mediation of the United States on the question of the peaceful settlement of South West Africa. We would like to hope that the results of the negotiations will be a further positive step in this direction. We express total support for the constructive actions of the Governments of the People's Republic of Angola and Cuba at the current negotiations and their efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement that would ensure security for Angola and independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and peace throughout the whole of the region of South West Africa.

The realization of the principles for a peaceful settlement in South West Africa which were agreed in Geneva will not be an easy task. For the achievement of mutually acceptable compromises a flexible and constructive approach is also needed by the other side, namely, South Africa. The fate of the Lusaka Agreements concluded in February 1984, as well as the Nkomati Agreement lead us to be more circumspect. We are disappointed that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) which was to have taken place on 1 November this year, has

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

again been postponed. The Government of the Republic of South Africa should remember that its approach and the political will it shows in the search for solutions to the Namibian question will be gauged by the international community in terms of its practical actions in the specific issues which are the subject of negotiations.

Despite the current negotiations the racist régime of Pretoria is not only continuing its policy of flagrant repression of the Namibian people but, as was pointed out in the statement made by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia on 10 November this year, it is even continuing to intensify those repressions. The new Pretoria régime is building up its military presence in Namibia, especially in the northern part, and to date there are 50,000 South African troops concentrated there. In Windhoek and in other cities peaceful demonstrations by the Namibian population in the face of delays to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) were forcibly repressed by racist South Africa.

There is cause to fear that even if the Republic of South Africa is compelled to cease its unlawful occupation of Namibia it will try to retain that country within its sphere of influence and will continue its neo-colonialist exploitation. This flows from the fact that Namibia remains for the Republic of South Africa an important supplier of valuable minerals including uranium and rare strategic metals.

For the establishment of peace and stability throughout the whole of the region of southern Africa it is necessary to stop the further use of Namibian territory as part of the military strategy of the Republic of South Africa. In the present situation any lessening of pressure on the Republic of South Africa would be a great mistake. On the contrary, it should be intensified with the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, together with the consistent implementation of the measures already adopted against that régime, if the Organization is to carry

(Mr. Zapotorky, Czechoslovakia)

out all its obligations in regard to the oppressed peoples of Namibia. Only through the total isolation of the Republic of South Africa's régime is it possible to ensure that Pretoria will be compelled to refrain from its policy of apartheid and the oppression of the Namibian people.

The population of Namibia is suffering from two of the greatest evils of our time. It is both the victim of colonialism and the victim of apartheid, which is the most acute form of the manifestation of racism. The granting of independence to Namibia is a decolonization issue with a clear-cut humanitarian content that is of major significance for the elimination of the hotbed of tension in southern Africa and thereby also for international peace and security.

Czechoslovakia once again confirms its solidarity with the selfless struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative and will in future continue to provide it with all support.

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

We wish to commend once again the activities of the United Nations and its Council for Namibia and to express our confidence that, at the present decisive stage in its struggle for independence, Namibia will fulfil its destiny with honour as it takes any further steps that could contribute to the achievement of the ultimate objective - namely the restoration of the right of its people to self-determination and independence. The United Nations can rely on our total support.

Mr. KAGAMI (Japan): The Namibian issue continues to be the most urgent decolonization problem remaining on the United Nations agenda. Japan is deeply concerned that, although two decades have passed since the General Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the people of that Territory are still denied recognition of their right to self-determination.

Japan joins the overwhelming majority of Member States in insisting that Namibia's independence must be achieved in accordance with the wishes of its inhabitants as expressed through a free election to be held under the supervision of the United Nations. My Government firmly supports Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the only universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence.

The parties concerned have been engaged during this past year in intensive negotiations towards a peaceful solution of the conflict in the region and the achievement of Namibian independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). Just this morning we received a very encouraging report that the negotiations in Geneva have indeed resulted in an agreement. We sincerely hope that the agreement will gain the approval of the Governments concerned and that it can be signed definitively in the very near future.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

In the meantime Japan will continue to pursue policies aimed at inducing South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and abandon its racist policy of apartheid. The Government of Japan thus maintains no diplomatic relations with South Africa, limiting relations to the consular level. It strictly limits sports, cultural and educational exchanges with South Africa. Japan does not issue tourist visas to South African nationals, and it discourages Japanese citizens from visiting South Africa. It has suspended air links with South Africa and prohibits the use of South African Airways international flights by Japanese Government officials.

In demonstrating its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Japan refrains from any action that would in effect acknowledge the present status of Namibia. For example, the Government of Japan does not extend co-operation such as grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind to South Africans in Namibia. The Government of Japan further prohibits direct investment in South Africa and Namibia by Japanese nationals or corporations under its jurisdiction. It instituted this policy more than 20 years ago - long before disinvestment became a major issue in this Organization or in other major industrialized countries.

In accordance with Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which was enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, no Japanese national or corporation maintains mining concessions in Namibia. Moreover, Japan prohibits trade in arms and all co-operation in the nuclear and military fields with South Africa. South African agencies that enforce apartheid, such as the armed forces and police, are not permitted to purchase computers from Japan. The Japanese people are discouraged from importing Krugerrands and other

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

South African gold coins and are not permitted to import iron and steel from South Africa.

Those who are most seriously affected by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory are, of course, the Namibian people themselves; those who are suffering directly under the yoke of their oppressors, as well as those who have been forced out of their native land as refugees. The neighbouring countries that are accepting these refugees are also experiencing serious difficulties.

My Government has long been extending assistance to the Namibian people through its contributions to the humanitarian funds and programmes administered by the United Nations, including the United Nations Institute for Namibia. Looking ahead to the day when they will assume positions of leadership in their respective countries, Japan is extending educational and training assistance to young black citizens of South Africa and Namibia. For instance, it is contributing \$300,000 in 1988 to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. Moreover, it enhanced its assistance in this fiscal year by providing \$450,000 for medical, educational and housing projects for South Africa's victims of apartheid. Japan is determined to extend such assistance for as long as the need continues.

In addition to these efforts, the Government of Japan is prepared to extend all possible assistance to the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). Japan is ready to participate in the Group and intends to contribute financially to its operations in monitoring a cease-fire and fair and free elections. It will also consider providing the Group with material and equipment, if necessary. Once the independence of Namibia is achieved Japan looks forward to extending economic and technical co-operation for its nation-building efforts.

(Mr. Kagami, Japan)

At the same time Japan believes that the plight of the States neighbouring South Africa, which are constantly threatened by military incursions and economic blackmail from Pretoria, must not be forgotten. Recognizing that these States are suffering economic hardship, Japan continues to extend economic and technical co-operation, especially to the front-line States, with a view to strengthening their economic viability and resilience.

This morning we were given reason to hope that the Namibian people may soon be able to taste the joys of freedom and human dignity and that a sovereign Namibia will take its rightful place in the community of nations in the near future. Until then Japan wishes to assure the Namibian people that their peaceful efforts to achieve independence have our profound admiration and steadfast support.



Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Once again the General Assembly has before it the question of Namibia. Since the declaration of the end of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia in 1966 and the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory, the international community has regularly reaffirmed its support for the Namibian people's struggle for independence. This constant support is reflected in the many United Nations resolutions on the subject, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in respect of which there was universal consensus.

Ten years have gone by since the adoption of that resolution which defined a plan for the independence of Namibia, a plan which, at the time, seemed to have gained the support even of the Pretoria régime. However, years have passed and the Namibian people are still subject to an illegal system of occupation, repression and plunder by South Africa and continue to suffer both personally and as regards their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

In its pursuit of its sinister plan to crush the heroic struggle for freedom of the Namibian people, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), South Africa has not stopped at any excess and has used every means of oppression, torture, destruction and exploitation. It has even methodically recruited and trained mercenaries and redoubled the troops of militia and bands of assassins.

Extending the scope of its demands, of its violation of human rights and its defiance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law, the colonialist and racist régime of South Africa continues its aggression within the territories of the neighbouring front-line States, causing massacres and destruction there and violating their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

Confronted with the barbaric régime, the people of Namibia have waged a determined struggle to recover their independence and complete the liberation of that last pocket of colonialism on African soil. An armed struggle was imposed on Namibia; Namibia did not choose it and has always considered it to be a last resort. SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, has constantly affirmed its support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and has declared itself ready to implement a cease-fire if South Africa would agree to its implementation. In this quest for a peaceful solution on the basis of resolution 435 (1978), as well as in the conduct of the struggle of its people, SWAPO enjoys the support and concern of all justice-loving peoples.

The international community has followed with interest the quadripartite talks between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States of America, which are intended to put an end to the aggression of the Pretoria régime against Angola and promote the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has welcomed with hope the signs of détente and progress which these negotiations have seemed to indicate.

We should like to believe that it will not be long before we see the end of the delaying manoeuvres, subterfuges and evasions in which South Africa has always engaged. Every year that passes prolongs by that much the sufferings of the Namibian people. It is the duty of the international community, which has assumed a grave responsibility for the fate of the Namibian people, to spare no effort to put an end to the colonial occupation by South Africa without further delay.

Any just and lasting solution of the Namibian question must be based on the immediate and unconditional cessation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the apartheid régime and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with Security

(Mr. Ghezal, Tunisia)

Council resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of this colonial problem.

Today, faithful to the memory of its own struggle for independence and its unswerving commitment to all peoples striving against colonial occupation, and maintaining its respect for human rights and the right of peoples to dignity, freedom and justice, Tunisia would like to salute the people of Namibia and their sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, and reaffirm its solidarity with them in their just struggle.

We should also like to pay a tribute to the enormous efforts made by the Secretary-General and to the devotion and determination with which Ambassador Zuze of Zambia has taken on the responsibilities of the presidency of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the Mandate conferred on it by the General Assembly by resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967, must remain the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory until Namibia attains independence.

Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana): The situation in south-western Africa is evolving so rapidly that it is now difficult both to grasp the full significance of events and to predict their outcome. One can only look on from afar and hope that the situation will culminate in the establishment of a new era of peace for the region.

For much too long the peoples of South Africa and Namibia have been subjected to the cruel violence of apartheid rule. It is time for this oppression to be brought to an end. The new correlation of forces in the region would seem to suggest that, at least in the case of Namibia, the day of liberation may not be too far off. The quadripartite talks involving the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States as mediator, are now reported to have resulted in agreement on a set of principles which could serve as a basis for peace. It is as yet a fragile agreement, however, which, if not sustained by good faith, could

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

quickly unravel and disintegrate. Should it be allowed to take form, it could conceivably create the material conditions necessary to facilitate the early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We therefore hope that the current talks will have a successful outcome.

However, such is South Africa's record of shameless duplicity that full reliance cannot be placed on its protestations of good intention. We should therefore remain vigilant against its notorious subterfuges so that we are not lulled by false hopes into dangerous complacency or permissiveness. The Pretoria régime must be reminded that the freedom of the Namibian people is not a matter for negotiation and that it is under an obligation imposed by the international community to bring them quickly to independence. Continued failure to do so should attract the heaviest penalties the international community can impose. In the event of further procrastination by the régime, the United Nations will have no alternative but to employ sterner measures in order to secure the speedy removal of that régime. The Security Council, which has thus far failed to bring concerted pressure to bear on South Africa, must redouble its efforts to compel that outlaw State to withdraw.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

It can no longer afford to tolerate dilatory manoeuvres which transparently undermine its authority and perpetuate apartheid rule in Namibia. It should therefore move to expedite the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the only accepted blueprint for Namibia's independence. On the advice of the Secretary-General it should now closely monitor all developments to ensure that the necessary machinery is put in place to allow for an orderly transfer of power.

As the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence the Council for Namibia must continue to assert its responsibility for safeguarding the interests of the Namibian people. The imminence of independence compels its attention to the urgent requirements of Namibia's transition to freedom. This supreme responsibility cannot be abdicated and must be discharged with scrupulous respect. The Council must therefore ensure that it fulfils the purposes for which it was originally conceived. It must accordingly examine the role assigned to it by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of May 1967 and give serious thought to what it must do at this critical stage.

The priority task must be to protect the heritage of the Namibian people from further erosion. The rich natural resources with which the country was endowed continue to be viciously plundered by foreign exploiters. Precious little is left by way of a legacy to the rightful owners of the land, and even this will be subject to expropriation if steps are not taken to defend Namibia's interests.

Decree No. 1, promulgated by the Council for Namibia in 1974, was intended to deter the continued sequestration of the country's wealth. However, that instrument will be effective only if all nations respect its provisions and refrain from encroachment on Namibia's resources. As the legal guardian for Namibia, the Council must therefore insist on the enforcement of that Decree.

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Equally important is the preservation of Namibia's territorial integrity. The Pretoria régime has not abandoned its spurious claim to Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands or other offshore islands. These areas, however, are an integral part of the Namibian territory and cannot therefore be arbitrarily abrogated by colonialist greed. There can be no concession on this issue since to leave the question of sovereignty in doubt at Namibia's independence would place any new Government in the invidious position of having to assert and defend the nation's territorial rights. Namibia should not be allowed, therefore, to accede to independence encumbered by a political albatross around its neck.

It will be necessary at the same time rapidly to equip the Namibian people with all relevant skills so that they might take full control of their own destiny. In this context training assumes a vital importance and should now be accelerated and expanded. The United Nations has received, through the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, an indicative list of the areas where expertise will be sorely needed. We urge that Member States respond sympathetically to this approach since appropriate and timely assistance now would assist the Namibian people to cope with the myriad responsibilities which independence will bring. A vacuum in government can pose grave risks to a fledgling nation.

The human dimension of Namibia's problems cannot be underestimated. It should not be forgotten that many of its people were driven by Pretoria's terrorism to seek refuge in neighbouring front-line States. At the International Conference on the Plight of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in Southern Africa, which was held in Oslo last August and at which we had the honour of representing the Council for Namibia, it was recognized that these enforced exiles would have to be repatriated on the attainment of independence. With the generous assistance of the host countries, the United Nations Fund for Namibia, the Office of the United

(Mr. Insanally, Guyana)

Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other international organizations SWAPO has been able to establish a comprehensive programme which will help to rehabilitate the refugees and prepare them for their return to Namibia. Much more remains to be done, however, and without a large measure of support from the international community it is unlikely that the task of rehabilitation will be satisfactorily completed.

Now that a de facto cease-fire exists between SWAPO and South Africa it should be possible to accelerate the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Assistance to Namibia. We would expect that the strategic emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) would help to build infrastructure needed to sustain an independent Namibia. The occupying forces will leave behind them only chaos and confusion. The international community must therefore come to Namibia's rescue and reinforce its capability to fend for itself as a free nation.

Time is not on the side of Namibia. For decades it has been relegated to the backwaters of colonialism and left to stagnate. While other peoples have long ago emerged into independence, Namibians are today still clamouring for their fundamental rights. It is now, as many have observed, 10 years since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted by the United Nations. At the time of its adoption the world was led to believe that Namibia would be set free by 31 December 1978. We are told today, after 22 years of repeated deferrals, that we must now look to 1 January 1989. Admittedly we are about to enter the season of peace and good will, but experience has taught us that South Africa is not known for these virtues. We must therefore not temporize any longer, for if we do we will have lost a great momentum in the struggle for Namibia's freedom.

Mr. LAPITSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The work of the present session of the General Assembly is being conducted under signs of positive changes in international relations. The new political thinking is gaining strength and life, as are the unacceptability of using military force to conduct international affairs and the need to find a political solution to problems on the basis of a balance of interests, the priority of common human values and respect for the right of peoples to freedom and socio-political choice. These new signs are evident in the approach to the solution of a number of age-old conflicts which threaten international peace and security. A trend towards their political settlement is emerging.

Against the background of these positive changes, however, the maintenance of the remnants of colonialism, racism and apartheid in various parts of the world is particularly intolerable. The focus of these anachronisms is southern Africa.

Nearly 22 years ago the General Assembly, expressing the will of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, terminated Pretoria's mandate over South West Africa. In the intervening years the international community and the United Nations have made considerable efforts to solve the Namibian problem. The Council for Namibia, established by the United Nations, is acting on behalf of the Organization and defending the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. It is mobilizing international action to resolve the Namibian problem on the basis of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 385 (1976), which provide for a speedy withdrawal of all occupation forces and the administration of the Republic of South Africa from Namibia and the holding there of general elections under United Nations control, with the participation of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. Clear evidence of the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia is its report which has been submitted to the present session of the General Assembly in document A/43/24.



(Mr. Lapitsky, Ukrainian SSR)

But in spite of the efforts under way and the existence of a universally recognized basis for the settlement of the Namibian question - as set out in the aforementioned Security Council resolutions and other United Nations decisions - the Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. It imposes its rule and prevents the Territory from acceding to independence. The policy of racism, colonialism and aggression of the Republic of South Africa gives rise to tension in the region, thus posing a threat to international peace and security.

At the same time, thanks to efforts by the international community and the activities of the United Nations, the current global trend towards the political settlement of international disputes and conflicts is beginning to be discernible in southern Africa as well. The quadripartite negotiations on a peaceful settlement in south-west Africa, among Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States of America, could, if successful, open the way to assuring Angola's security, strengthening peace throughout the region, putting an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, and achieving the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of the Namibian people in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We support the efforts of Angola and Cuba to attain those objectives, and wish the negotiations success.

At the same time, we want to emphasize the steps recently taken by the United Nations. In our view, added impetus must be given to United Nations efforts towards peace and the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

Yet, serious obstacles lie on the path of achieving a political settlement in south-west Africa, put in place by the policies and practices of the racist régime of the Republic of South Africa. The international community is gravely concerned at, and has condemned, the continued attempts by the South African authorities to repress the national liberation movement in Namibia. The world was recently alarmed by news of a new wave of repression against the people of Namibia. The

(Mr. Lapitsky, Ukrainian SSR)

occupation troops of the Republic of South Africa use weapons against the Namibians, arrest them and torture them. To intensify their repression of the struggling Namibian people and to maintain their illegal occupation of Namibia, the South African authorities have placed an enormous military and police apparatus on the Territory and in recent years have enacted many repressive laws. These and other aspects of South Africa's military activities in Namibia are discussed in Council for Namibia document A/AC.131/283.

The Pretoria régime's direct accomplices in its oppression of the Namibian people include South African and foreign monopolies and transnational corporations whose activities hamper the cause of the independence of Namibia. The scale of those activities - which are carried out in violation of the Council for Namibia's Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, endorsed by the General Assembly in 1974 - and the methods used by the Republic of South Africa to create the most favourable conditions for those activities are convincingly illustrated in documents available to delegations, specifically the report of the Council for Namibia contained in document A/AC.131/286 and the relevant portions of the 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.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is in favour of the speedy implementation of United Nations decisions on putting an end to military and other activities of the Republic of South Africa and other foreign circles in Namibia which hinder the Territory's accession to independence. We reaffirm our solidarity with the courageous struggle being waged by the South West Africa People's Organization for the independence of Namibia. We are deeply convinced that no acts of terror or oppression can break the will of the people of Namibia in its legitimate struggle to gain its rights and freedom.

(Mr. Lapitsky, Ukrainian SSR)

We stress that a political settlement in Namibia must be based on the immediate, unconditional end to South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of South Africa's armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence, with the country's full unity and territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

The Namibian problem should be settled on the basis of well-known Security Council resolutions and other relevant United Nations decisions. Any attempt to resolve the problem by short-circuiting the United Nations - in particular by establishing a puppet government in Namibia - will lead nowhere. That view was endorsed in the statement agreed upon by the Security Council on 29 September 1988.

The present critical stage in the struggle for the independence of Namibia demands that the international community increase its vigilance and the effectiveness of its efforts. Now as never before we need collective action by States to make the Pretoria régime implement United Nations decisions on Namibia. In that connection, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR affirms its support for the proposal by African and other countries that the Security Council have recourse to binding sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

We support and highly value the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the personal contribution made by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Bernt Carlsson.

What we need today is decisive concerted action by the international community to eliminate one of the major hotbeds of colonialism and racism. The freedom and independence of Namibia must be secured immediately.

Mr. SAIF (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the pleasure of speaking on behalf of the delegations of the two parts of Yemen.

For decades the Namibian question has continued to be one of the most important world causes. It has attracted the attention of the international community and figured prominently in the debates in the United Nations General Assembly and various committees. This world interest stems from the steadfastness of the just struggle of the Namibian people, who are demanding recognition of their right to self-determination, to establish their independent State so that they may take their natural place among independent peoples and States of the world, exercise sovereignty over their own soil and utilize its wealth and natural resources.

The United Nations has shouldered the responsibility of supporting the liberation struggle of the Namibian people and has taken various political and economic measures aimed at forcing the racist, colonialist Pretoria régime to respond to the international will and speed up the process of the granting of independence to the Namibian people. In so doing, the United Nations is acting in full awareness of the grave threat posed to international peace and security by the continued occupation of that region by the South African racist régime. It was in this context that the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), by which it called for independence for the people of Namibia.

However, the realities of the situation demonstrate beyond any shadow of a doubt the barbaric colonialist nature of the racist Pretoria régime. The facts speak for themselves: Pretoria persists in flouting the political will of the international community by continuing to enact new laws and impose military, economic and political measures aimed at tightening its iron grip on Namibia. This goes hand in hand with brutal acts of barbarism, terrorism and oppression aimed at crushing the Namibian people.

(Mr. Saif, Democratic Yemen)

In the Fourth Committee we have listened anew to statements made by individuals and representatives of certain organizations and institutions. Those statements have depicted very truthfully the prevalent situation in southern Africa. This is a situation created by the persistence of the occupying South African régime in tightening its hold through an increasingly intensive campaign of repression and terrorism against the brave Namibian people. Torture, murder, beatings, rape, destruction, demolition and usurpation of people's homes and property are the order of the day. Side by side with this, the Pretoria régime continues to strengthen its military hold on the region and to build new military bases on Namibian soil. All this indicates that without any doubt whatsoever that régime has no serious intention of withdrawing or granting the Namibian people the independence for which they have struggled for so long.

This is in stark contradiction with the high hopes raised by the initiation of negotiations between Cuba, Angola and the racist Pretoria régime, with the mediation of the United States, regarding the situation in southern Africa. At the time, optimism was generated by the fact that the racist South African régime was forced to withdraw its troops from Angola in an attempt to save face. It withdrew from Angola only after a series of setbacks and enormous losses at the hands of the Angolan forces. That was why it had to declare its acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In any case, we should not be over-optimistic. The racist Pretoria régime has familiarized us with its special brand of intransigence and its ability to renege on each and every international agreement or commitment it has ever accepted. Experience must have made it clear by now that Pretoria's entering into such agreements and commitments is no more than a ploy to gain time, give itself breathing space, allay international anger, and prepare for yet another round of oppression and repression of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Saif, Democratic Yemen)

I do not think that anyone would disagree with me when I state that the racist Pretoria régime could never have persisted in its defiance of the international community had it not been for the support and encouragement that it continues to receive from certain Western countries, and the military and nuclear co-operation extended to it by Israel.

At the forty-eighth ordinary session of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was held in Addis Ababa last May, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Peter Zuze, affirmed in his statement before the Council the collusion of some Western countries with the racist Pretoria régime when he said:

"The positions taken by some Western countries regarding the question of Namibia have been extremely disappointing. It would appear that those countries have sacrificed the principles of equality, freedom, justice and self-determination on the altar of immediate economic gain."

The two parts of Yemen salute the determination of the African front-line States and pay a tribute to the Namibian people in their struggle. The two parts of Yemen reaffirm their full support for the Namibian people and their sole, legitimate leadership, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). We ask that the Namibian people be enabled as soon as possible to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and call for the immediate withdrawal of South Africa's troops from Namibia and the complete transfer of power to SWAPO.

We reject any linkage of the question of the independence of Namibia to any extraneous issues and consider that any attempt at such linkage is a manoeuvre aimed at procrastination and a delaying tactic that has no purpose but to impede the accession to independence of Namibia and circumvent the United Nations, which

(Mr. Saif, Democratic Yemen)

remains responsible for the Territory, and by so doing to damage the credibility of the world Organization.

The two parts of Yemen fully support regional and international condemnation of the apartheid régime, and declare their solidarity with the Namibian people in their struggle to regain their legitimate rights and our support for the efforts of the United Nations, the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement in this regard.

We remain convinced of the inevitability of the ultimate victory of the Namibian people.

Mr. CHAGULA (United Republic of Tanzania): At the very outset, I should like, through you, Mr. President, to thank the General Assembly for its decision to proceed with its debate on Namibia as scheduled despite the pressure from certain quarters to defer the debate to a later date in view of the quadripartite talks now being held in Geneva on southern Africa, including the independence of Namibia. It is the firm view of my delegation that the Assembly's debate on such an important subject as Namibia cannot and should not be allowed to be held hostage to the quadripartite talks, which, though very important, are unfortunately being held outside the framework of the United Nations. In addition, it would be ridiculous if the United Nations, at this crucial time, were to be seen to be deferring its debate on Namibia because of the ongoing talks on southern Africa, in which South Africa, which has illegally occupied Namibia for the past 22 years, is a full negotiator and in which not even the Council for Namibia is a participant.

It is also the considered opinion of my delegation that the General Assembly should set forth at this session a programme of action and a mandate for the Council for Namibia commensurate with the importance our Organization attaches to the early independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

Next, my delegation would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report on the question of Namibia (A/43/24). My delegation has also noted with satisfaction the comprehensive report of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/43/24, Part I), as well as the 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, the Special Committee on Decolonization. All of those reports provide a rich source of information on the misery, suffering, exploitation and dehumanization to which the people of Namibia are still being subjected by the racist régime of South Africa, which continues to occupy that country illegally.

The question of Namibia is still on the agenda of the Assembly simply because of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of and refusal to withdraw from Namibia, a Territory that is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXII) of 1966, which formally terminated the Mandate of South Africa over the Territory and placed it under the authority of the United Nations. The United Nations Council for Namibia was subsequently established under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 1967 and was entrusted with the authority to administer Namibia until it attained its independence. We all know that to date that objective has not been realized because of South Africa's intransigence and non-compliance with the decisions of the international community. Thus, it is the blatant arrogance, intransigence and defiance of the racist régime of South Africa that have so far prevented the people of Namibia from exercising their right to self-determination and independence, as envisaged in the historic General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.



(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

Although South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated over 20 years ago, the people of Namibia are still suffering under the worst colonial rule. The Pretoria régime, supported by its external allies, has deployed every tactic to maintain its occupation. The enforcement of Draconian laws on the people of Namibia, including martial law, a state of emergency, dusk-to-dawn curfews, wanton killings and mass arrests of innocent civilians and young children are clear manifestations of the racist régime's evil designs to entrench its apartheid policies in Namibia. Indeed, recent developments in Namibia clearly indicate that the South African racist régime has embarked on what amounts to genocide against Namibians, and the Western collaborators of that régime should be fully aware of those tragic recent developments in Namibia. Surely it cannot be the intention of the international community to gloss over or to condone such negative developments in Namibia, particularly since Namibia is still legally the responsibility of the United Nations.

On 29 September 1988 the United Nations Security Council commemorated the tenth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On that occasion the Security Council expressed its grave concern at the non-implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) on Namibian independence. As far as Tanzania is concerned, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was the result of a series of long and sometimes very difficult negotiations among all the parties concerned, is still the only acceptable international peace plan for the independence of Namibia.

We all remember the high expectations then raised on the prospects of Namibia's independence. However, ever since 1978 South Africa has effectively blocked all attempts at implementing the United Nations plan by raising new excuses every time the independence of Namibia was about to be realized. The racist

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

régime's bad faith in honouring international agreements was again demonstrated during the pre-implementation talks at Geneva in 1981. Not only did the Pretoria régime wreck the talks; it shocked the whole international community with its false charge of the United Nations so-called lack of impartiality in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence. The régime's intransigence and total defiance of the will of the United Nations and the world community thus became the order of the day in the 1980s, and especially after the introduction of the now infamous "constructive-engagement" policy pursued by the Government of the United States of America, which thus far has definitely emboldened the apartheid régime to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and to increase its destabilization activities and military aggression against its neighbours, as well as its brutal exploitation of the Namibian people.

For a long time the Pretoria régime has used Namibia as a springboard for launching attacks against the front-line States and other neighbouring independent States, especially Angola. It was only in August of this year that the racist régime was forced to withdraw its troops from southern Angola by forces beyond its control, after having been there for a period of 7 years.

As we join other nations in following with keen interest the current ongoing quadripartite negotiations on the future of Namibia and the security of Angola, I should like to make a few points my delegation considers to be of paramount importance. From the beginning we have remained cautious about any quick acceptance of South Africa's credibility in sincerely negotiating issues involving self-determination and respect for the inviolability of the territorial integrity of sovereign States. South Africa's record is full of broken commitments to international agreements. Military invasions, commando raids, acts of sabotage

(Mr. Chagula, United Republic  
of Tanzania)

and threats are very well-known tools of the racist régime's foreign policy in the region.

While we have been encouraged by those quadripartite talks, reports that a beginning on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has now been deferred to 1 January 1989 raises renewed doubts about South Africa's true intentions. Secondly, as my Minister for Foreign Affairs had occasion to emphasize in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, on 6 October, the ongoing quadripartite negotiations on southern Africa, including the independence of Namibia, will prove to be an exercise in futility if we address ourselves only to the symptoms of the diseases and gloss over the diseases themselves. That is particularly important in view of the remarks emanating from certain quarters on the actual intent and progress of the negotiations. Those remarks are, to a large extent, the re-echoing of the doomed theory of linking the independence of Namibia to extraneous and irrelevant issues.

For in our view it is of vital importance that we not lose sight of the true objectives of the negotiating process and continue to put pressure upon the Pretoria régime to allow the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and genuine independence free of any conditions.

(Mr. Chagula, United  
Republic of Tanzania)

Tanzania therefore still rejects the linking of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola or Angola's accommodation of UNITA; for both are within the prerogative of the two sovereign States. We firmly hold the view that Namibia's independence should be granted without any pre-conditions.

Allow me at this juncture to express my delegation's deep appreciation to the President of the Council for Namibia and to all the members of the Council for their achievements since the establishment of the Council in 1967, especially in the difficult task of mobilizing international support for Namibia's independence, and the training of future cadres for an independent Namibia and in the protection of Namibia's natural resources. However, it is very unfortunate that ever since the present quadripartite talks on the independence of Namibia began in May this year, as I have already observed, the role of the Council for Namibia and that of the Commissioner for Namibia have been marginalized. This in our view is inconsistent with our original aims and urgently demands a reassessment of their future roles in the implementation of the plan for Namibia's independence. As things are now, the two, either by design or by accident, have become mere spectators on an important issue that directly concerns them. We demand that the agreed ingredients of the process leading to the independence of Namibia be scrupulously observed, in accordance with the relevant provisions contained in the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence. We firmly believe that the mistakes which have so far been made, wittingly or unwittingly, can still be corrected.

In addition, I should like to reaffirm my delegation's support for and solidarity with the people of Namibia and the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative, for the sacrifices they have so far made and are still making in the struggle for the

(Mr. Chagula, United  
Republic of Tanzania)

attainment of freedom, human dignity, social justice and independence in Namibia. We call on the international community to continue to give the necessary political, economic and moral support to the people of Namibia until they achieve their true independence.

In conclusion, as has been correctly observed by other delegations, we should not be too optimistic regarding the prospects of a Namibian settlement in the near future. South Africa's record of duplicity in the past calls for our continued vigilance to ensure that international pressure in the form of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is applied as a matter of urgency to force South Africa to allow the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. The world is demanding independence for Namibia right now and the people of Namibia should not be allowed to continue suffering any longer under the colonial yoke of the South African racist régime.

The meeting rose at 8.45 p.m.