



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/43/PV.52
22 November 1988

ENGLISH

Forty-third session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 16 November 1988, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. CAPUTO

later:

Mr. HUERTA MONTALVO (Vice-President)

(Argentina)

later:

Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vice-President)

(Ecuador)

(Vanuatu)

- Question of Namibia [29] (continued)

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

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 29 (continued)

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/43/24)
- (b) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (A/43/23 (Part V), A/AC.109/960)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/43/724)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/43/780)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/43/24 (Part II), chapter I)
- (f) REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

Mr. KARUKUBIRO-KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda): In the course of the general debate at the beginning of this session there was near-unanimous agreement that the spirit of understanding and co-operation prevailing between the two super-Powers would have a positive impact on international relations. Reports regarding the quadripartite talks between South Africa, Angola, Cuba and the United States suggested that progress was being made. Agreements reached to settle conflicts in other world trouble spots gave encouragement to the belief that the independence of Namibia was just around the corner. Indeed, so optimistic were these reports that 1 November was fixed as the date for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) in Namibia and hence the commencement of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That date, 1 November, has passed.

The apartheid régime continues to hold Namibia in colonial bondage. The implementation of the United Nations plan has once again been postponed, to 1 January 1989 or beyond. True to form, South Africa has yet again managed to prove that in the case of Namibia the appearance of brightening skies and

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

a silver lining on the horizon is overshadowed by the heavy clouds in the background.

As we deliberate on the question of Namibia's independence at this time of heightened expectation it is important to emphasize the fact that South Africa's strategy has always had and continues to have one objective: by hook or by crook to continue its hold on and control of Namibia. It is in this context that all actions of the apartheid régime with regard to Namibia should be viewed. The régime has pursued a policy of treachery and rebellion against the international community as a whole.

It will be recalled that when the then South West Africa was placed under the administration of South Africa by the League of Nations that régime, contrary to its obligations under the Mandate, embarked from the outset on a course aimed at annexation of the Territory. It was governed as an integral part of South Africa. In 1946 the régime rejected outright the recommendation of the General Assembly that Namibia be placed under the United Nations Trusteeship System.

The termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia by the General Assembly by resolution 2145 (XXI) and the unequivocal ruling by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971, declaring South Africa's occupation illegal and spelling out its obligation to withdraw from the Territory, stripped the régime of any legal justification for hanging on to that Territory. In spite of those injunctions, South Africa did not relinquish its hold on the Territory. It has since continued to challenge the community of the United Nations and the international community.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the only agreed framework for the independence of Namibia, was adopted by the Council 10 years ago, on 29 September 1978. The fact that South Africa initially accepted those arrangements, sponsored by the five members of the Western contact group, for the

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

peaceful transfer of power under the auspices of the United Nations gave us grounds for hope at the time that the Namibian tragedy was about to come to an end. The history of the efforts to implement that plan is well known. Various time frames have been set by the United Nations for its implementation, only for the deadlines to pass without any progress having been made.

As is well known, South Africa has used every possible trick to frustrate the efforts of the United Nations to bring about implementation of resolution 435 (1978). One pretext after another has been manufactured for the purpose of blocking the efforts of the international community. Perhaps the most persistent has been the notion of linking the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from the People's Republic of Angola. Uganda has always maintained that the independence of Namibia should never be held hostage to the settlement of issues which are alien to resolution 435 (1978).

As we have had occasion to state before, Uganda believes that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a bilateral arrangement legitimately entered into under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. We therefore view linkage as a transparent attempt to delay Namibia's independence. South Africa has used linkage as a convenient cover for manipulating the international situation in Namibia in favour of its internal puppets. At the same time it is given an opportunity to pose as a defender of Western interests and values in the southern African region. Indeed, the stance of South Africa in the negotiations on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) has always been aimed at ensuring either that Namibia does not get independence or, alternatively, that independence is handed only to its internal puppets, who would thereafter be manipulated from Pretoria. That would be in line with the régime's grand design of creating a constellation of States around its borders to make the region safe for apartheid.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

Uganda has closely followed the quadripartite talks between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States, which have the objective of establishing peace in the region as well as securing the independence of Namibia. We are indeed encouraged by reports of progress and agreement by the parties. We salute Angola, Cuba and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for the statesmanship and courage they have demonstrated to go an extra mile in compromising to achieve peace in the region.

While welcoming these developments my delegation would like to counsel caution. We have been on this slippery road before. We should remember that over the years South Africa has demonstrated a remarkable capacity for pulling out of its commitments at the critical final hour. As I have already indicated, 1 November was supposed to be the deadline for starting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). South Africa has already given signs of reneging on its promises by proposing 1 January 1989 as an alternative date. We shall not be surprised if in January we hear more excuses.

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

While sitting at the negotiating table, professing to work for peace in the region, South Africa is reinforcing and putting in place a massive military presence in Namibia. The whole of North Namibia has been turned into an armed camp with over 50,000 combat troops stationed along the northern border, including air force strike units at Rundu. The régime has been conducting troop manoeuvres and naval exercises at Walvis Bay. Commenting on those manoeuvres, the racist Deputy Defence Minister, Mr. Breytenbach, stated that Namibia's future would "in no way affect the future of Walvis Bay as a naval and military base". As my colleague, the Observer of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), informed the Assembly on Monday, the régime has also increased its brutal campaign of repression and terrorism against the civilian population. The logical inference from this conduct is that the régime may be engaged in a sinister diplomatic game that could scuttle the diplomatic process at any time.

It is important for the international community to understand the fact that Walvis Bay and the offshore Penguin Islands are an integral part of Namibia. The port and the offshore islands are a source of oil reserves and rich fishing. They were annexed by South Africa in 1977, which then sought to administer them independently of Namibia. The clear aim of the South African régime is to take advantage of those resources while keeping a stranglehold on Namibia. Walvis Bay is its only deep-water port, and its occupation by the racists would make Namibia virtually a land-locked country and a hostage of the racists. In any negotiations for the independence of Namibia this issue should not be compromised. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) applies to all parts of Namibia.

Namibia is one of the richest countries in the region, with plenty of mineral and marine wealth. The Namibian people are entitled to benefit from those resources. As has been excellently chronicled in the reports of the Council for

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

Namibia over the years, South Africa, in collusion with foreign economic interests, has been plundering and depleting those resources of Namibia. It is reprehensible that Members of this Organization have, contrary to Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia, been colluding with South Africa in this criminal enterprise. This injustice perpetrated against the Namibian people needs to be redressed.

While Uganda welcomes the progress registered at the Geneva talks, we should like to point out that in the question of Namibia there are three parties to the conflict, namely, the occupier, South Africa; SWAPO, as the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people; and the United Nations as the Administering Power. It follows, therefore, that any solution must be within the United Nations framework and must be in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The settlement must also be acceptable to SWAPO. The Secretary-General has a central role to play in the implementation of that resolution and we are gratified to note that he has in the meantime made contingent arrangements to put in place the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). UNTAG assumes a critical role in ensuring that the machinery to be left behind by South Africa does not rig the elections in favour of its puppets. It must also take control of Walvis Bay and the Penguin Islands.

Our primary objective, from which we should not be diverted, is to secure the independence of Namibia. The agreement reached in Geneva in this regard is thus welcome; but it should not lull us into complacency.

Uganda has always believed that South Africa only concedes when the cost of its adventures becomes prohibitive both in military and economic terms. The forced withdrawal of South African forces from Angola was a consequence of its disastrous defeat at Cuanavale, rather than being a concession by the racists, as some of its supporters would like us to believe. It is therefore imperative to strengthen

(Mr. Karukubiro-Kamunanwire, Uganda)

SWAPO's military capability. This will stand them in good stead to challenge South Africa in the event that Pretoria reneges on the agreement or attempts to compromise the sovereignty of Namibia after it achieves independence.

We also support the early convening of the Security Council, which should pass an enabling resolution for the emplacement of UNTAG. The Council should send unmistakable signals that should South Africa fail to comply, it will act under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

The failure of the Council to shoulder its responsibilities, and the protective veto power exercised by Western countries to protect South Africa from long-overdue sanctions, have in large measure contributed to South Africa's intransigence. The self-serving reasons advanced against imposition of mandatory sanctions have long ceased to be convincing. They are a smoke-screen to protect the aggressor and the continued plunder of Namibia's resources. We commend those Governments that have imposed sanctions.

I wish to express my appreciation to Ambassador Zuze, President of the Council for Namibia, and the other members of the Council for their efforts to prepare Namibia for nationhood. I am aware that at this time there are those who would like to curtail the programme activities of the Council, but more than ever before, the Council needs to be strengthened to contend with the challenges posed by South Africa.

I should like to conclude my statement by reiterating Uganda's support for SWAPO and the people of Namibia in their struggle for dignity, freedom and justice. I wish also to express our appreciation to the front-line States and Cuba for their support and the high cost paid in support of the cause of freedom in the region.

Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden): Change in Namibia is inevitable, and peaceful change in the near future may be possible. Recent developments have again raised hopes that, finally, a just and internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian question may be in sight.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

Several rounds of talks have been held between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the United States as mediator, with a view to seeking ways of ending the conflict in the area and securing independence for Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Sweden has welcomed these negotiations. We also welcome the efforts by the Secretary-General to ensure that the United Nations be prepared for the important task of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should the negotiations result in a new situation. Yesterday we received reports on the agreement reached in Geneva between Cuba, Angola and South Africa. If allowed to prevail, this agreement might create conditions to facilitate an early implementation of the resolution. My Government sincerely hopes that the talks will now come to a successful conclusion.

Sweden remains firmly committed to Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan. We have confirmed our undertaking to assist the United Nations in this process through participation in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG). Sweden is also prepared to enter into extensive development co-operation with a free and independent Namibia.

In spite of our misgivings about South Africa's intentions, we continue to insist that every avenue must be explored in order to find a peaceful alternative leading to a solution that takes into account the legitimate interests of the whole Namibian people. As members of the world Organization which has the sole legal responsibility for Namibia, we have an obligation to the people of that Territory. They have placed their hope in this Organization and in its ability to bring peace and independence to their nation.

Let us look back in time. More than 40 years ago, at its very first session, the Assembly rejected South Africa's claim to incorporate within its territory the then South West Africa. More than 20 years ago this Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Ten years ago

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978). Today that resolution remains unimplemented. It is not difficult to understand the bitterness and to share the frustration felt by the Namibian people, by African States and the world community over such a long lasting impasse over Namibia's future.

There are indications of progress in the negotiations on Namibia. Let us hope that they are more than indications. In the event that South Africa should fail to grasp this historic opportunity, the Security Council should without delay act decisively in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Action must then be taken in order to protect the basic principles on which this Organization was founded. Namibia is a supreme test of those principles.

The basic issue - South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia in contravention of United Nations resolutions and of international law - should not be forgotten. The main burden of Namibia's struggle for freedom and independence is carried by the people of Namibia. It is essential that the international community intensify its concrete support to the Namibian people. Sweden, for its part, has continuously increased its humanitarian assistance to the people of Namibia, and we shall continue that support.

In conclusion, let me stress once again the direct and unique responsibility the international community has to fulfil on this issue. It should at last live up to the expectations of the people of Namibia and make now a decisive, positive contribution to the solution of one of the most long-standing and serious problems on the agenda of the United Nations.

Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (interpretation from French): Once again our Assembly is called upon to take up a question which is among the major challenges the United Nations faces. In this case it is a challenge to the ability of the Organization to promote decolonization and respect for human dignity.

(Mr. Adjovi, Togo)

In the consideration of the question of Namibia, history would seem to be repeating itself. Neither the nobility of the objectives contained in the Charter nor their compelling force, neither the constant broadening of the international consensus nor the intensification of pressure in favour of the just cause of Namibia has been able to make the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for the decolonization of Namibia.

In speaking on agenda item 29, entitled "Question of Namibia", my delegation would like to reaffirm the vital importance the Government of Togo attaches to this matter in view of its unswerving commitment to the ideals of peace, freedom and justice and its scrupulous respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

The adoption by the General Assembly in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples constitutes a legal and political act of great historical importance since it created and guided the remarkable exercise of decolonization carried out by the United Nations. In adopting that Declaration the General Assembly assumed fully its responsibilities to promote the universality of our Organization by establishing the necessary conditions for the attainment of one of the purposes set forth in the Charter, namely:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

(Mr. Adjayi, Togo)

In terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, by its resolution 2145 (X) of 27 October 1966, the General Assembly clearly understood that the decolonization of that international Territory could not be undertaken in conjunction with a régime that had not the slightest desire to promote the progressive development of the Namibian people towards the ability to govern themselves or towards independence, or to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

Thus, in order to place Namibia under the direct responsibility of the international Organization, the General Assembly in its resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 established the United Nations Council for Namibia, entrusting it with a specific mandate: to administer the Territory and prepare it for independence, with the total participation of its people.

In that respect, I must pay a very warm tribute here to the Council for Namibia for the enormous amount of work it has done since it was established in protecting and defending Namibia's economic and social interests and in alerting international public opinion and mobilizing it in support of the heroic struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the dynamic leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and authentic representative, to gain its freedom and independence.

Through what expedient of history has a State based on racial discrimination been able to engage in this disturbing sleight of hand of defying the international community with impunity for more than two decades by continuing to refuse to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia? By means of what historical miracle has such an anachronistic colonialism been able to survive despite the tenacious efforts made by the United Nations and various other international organizations to promote Namibia's accession to independence?

(Mr. Adjovi, Togo)

The truth is that successive developments in the question of Namibia clearly indicate that, motivated as they are by clever geopolitical calculations and powerful economic and financial interests, the settlements advocated by South Africa and its allies have had no effect other than to encourage Pretoria to perfect its machinery for oppressing the Namibian people. Thus, from systematic scorn for the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions to a semblance of co-operation with the United Nations, and including the attempt to impose an internal settlement and to introduce elements extraneous to the question of Namibia, South Africa has spared no effort of the imagination to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia, to extend the policy of apartheid to this international Territory and to plunder its natural resources.

Such attitudes, made up of arrogance, cynicism and intransigence, have been made possible only because of the compliance - indeed the reprehensible complicity - of certain Powers that maintain fruitful political, economic, military and nuclear co-operation with Pretoria.

To be sure, our Organization has never been fooled about the real motives of South Africa's colonial policy in Namibia. Among other significant decisions, the attempt at an internal settlement of the question and the linkage established by South Africa between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola have been rejected, in particular by Security Council resolution 566 (1985) and General Assembly resolution 42/14 B.

Nevertheless, the stubborn opposition by certain Powers to the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa has been a major obstacle to breaking the impasse on the question of Namibia. Now, the imposition of such sanctions, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, has for some years now been the only peaceful way of putting an end to South Africa's illegal

(Mr. Adjayi, Togo)

occupation of Namibia and promoting that international Territory's accession to independence through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The situation in Namibia quite rightly continues to be of the greatest concern to the Government of Togo. Indeed, according to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, that international Territory is still occupied by a South African colonial army of more than 100,000 men, who have turned Namibia into a garrison. The state of emergency that was imposed in the north of the country in 1972 is still in effect, and more than half of the country has been living under martial law since 1979. Moreover, the bantustanization of Namibia by South Africa and the stepping up of the repression against the Namibian people are part of a policy designed to break their will to resist this colonialism.

Furthermore, in defiance of many pertinent United Nations resolutions, the advisory opinion handed down on 21 June 1971 by the International Court of Justice and Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, promulgated on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia, South African and foreign economic interests are continuing and even increasing their plundering of the abundant natural resources of the Territory.

The multinational corporations - estimated to number more than 1,100 - that are participating in the plunder of Namibia operate under licenses granted by the racist, colonialist régime of South Africa in important strategic spheres such as minerals and oil.

Thanks to the improvement in the international political climate, sustained efforts are being made throughout the world to extinguish the hotbeds of tension, with a view to strengthening international peace and security.*

*Mr. Huerta Montalvo (Ecuador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Aljoyi, Togo)

It is encouraging to note here that the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia is part of a series of quadripartite negotiations that have been taking place for some time between Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States.

In that respect it is encouraging to note that the desire for peace, the diplomatic flexibility and the spirit of constructive dialogue displayed by Angola during these negotiations have had the necessary echo from South Africa. This has enabled the parties to the negotiations to reach an agreement, a fact we should like to welcome from this rostrum. We hope that that agreement will be signed, as foreseen in Brazzaville, to commit the will of those involved to settle the question of Namibia.

It is hoped that the postponement of the date announced by South Africa for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) from 1 November 1988 to 1 January 1989 is not a delaying tactic aimed at paralysing negotiations and therefore aimed at blocking and delaying the process of the accession of Namibia to independence.

We have reason to believe that the present administration and the American people will remain resolutely and concretely committed in the negotiations to bring to completion the inevitable process of Namibia's independence as advocated in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The time has come for South Africa to understand that the question of Namibia is purely and simply one of decolonization which cannot be made hostage to extraneous considerations which are unwarranted and irrelevant.

The Pretoria régime has finally understood that the problem cannot be settled in a way that is to the detriment of the security aspirations and the sovereignty of Angola and other countries of southern Africa.

In the interest of peace and security in southern Africa and in the world, the conclusions of the negotiations must be accepted in all good faith, confirming the

(Mr. Adjayi, Togo)

urgent need to promote the unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

It is encouraging to note that the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa, the intensification of repression and the plundering of natural resources of the Territory, have in no way broken the resistance of the Namibian people or suppressed their desire for independence.

The heroic struggle for national liberation of the Namibian people is closely connected to that of the South African people, for both of them are aimed at the elimination of colonialism and apartheid in the southern part of Africa.

As in the past, the Government of Togo is determined to lend its unswerving support to the Namibian people and the people of South Africa and to support any initiative aimed at accelerating the process of accession to independence of Namibia.

The constant widening of the international consensus in support of the Namibian cause clearly indicates that Namibian accession to independence is an irreversible process.

South Africa has been able to make the right choice between the folly of continuing to obstruct the course of history and the political wisdom that recommends taking account of the concerns and demands of the international community and the aspirations of the Namibian people for freedom and justice. Only one course is available to South Africa, namely to accept without conditions the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): I think I have an excuse not to make a long speech - an excuse which I hope I shall never need to regret. The excuse is that we have been buffeted by the winds of excitement, hope and anticipation blowing out of Geneva. I do not think I need to say what the excitement, hope and anticipation are all about.

Ten years and 48 days have elapsed since Namibia was promised independence by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In the decade that this famous resolution has been in existence and lying comatose thousands of innocent Namibians and nationals of the front-line States of southern Africa have perished. The peace and stability of every nation in the region has been seriously disturbed. Economies have been wrecked by endless strife and violence. Our region has become a veritable cockpit of conflict and violence. The stubborn and incessant pestilence that is apartheid in South Africa and the unyielding persistence of the brutalities of colonialism in the international territory of Namibia are responsible for all that.

Some months ago the longings of the people of southern Africa for peace in south-western Africa were tantalized by what appeared to be a renewed effort to remove artificial impediments to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Now, many months later, the impediments still remain although we are told they are under intense, widespread negotiation. Our longing for peace in southern Africa remains unfulfilled as the international Territory of Namibia remains a victim of global politics. With the threat of new linkages and symmetries, we wonder whether we are indeed at the dawn of a new era in southern Africa, as we are made to believe.

It is not my delegation's intention to cast sinister aspersions on the efforts now being expended in the search for a way out of the stalemate that has frustrated the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) for the past 10 years.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

We have welcomed the quadripartite talks and the progress they have made towards somewhere. We wish them well. We have no other choice but to wish them well, because we love peace and freedom, not only for the people of Namibia but for everybody in the southern African region.

It has to be understood, however, that those of us who have been with the struggle for Namibian independence for so long cannot be overly excited by occasional spasms of activity purportedly aimed at the resumption of the struggle for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have been through it all. We have been deceived and cheated before. Chasing and wrestling with mirages on the question of Namibia is not new to us.

A week in Geneva in January 1981, where we had gathered ostensibly to proclaim the launching of Namibia on the road to freedom, turned out to have been an occasion contrived to prepare the stage for the introduction of the hated linkage. Another week or so - a year later, in August 1982 - here in New York at the Canadian Mission, turned out to have been clearly contrived to lull us into believing that all was going well in the clearing of the undergrowth that had collected under Security Council resolution 435 (1978) since 1978.

Since 1982 no trick has been left untried to get us involved in all manner of stratagems whose purpose and objective we have wisely judged to be antithetical to our own aspirations for Namibia's liberation and independence. As a matter of principle we have resolutely rejected and scorned the linking of Namibia's liberation and independence to irrelevant issues. So has this Assembly. So has the Security Council.

Unfortunately, as fate would have it, the linkage has persisted and it certainly shares fatherhood for the quadripartite talks. If the reports emanating from Geneva are correct, the linkage has finally brought us to the verge of what

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

we hope and pray will turn out to be a momentous achievement. That is, we hope and pray that what is reported from Geneva will turn out to be something we have been looking for over the past 10 years, that is, the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, as we hope, the pacification of south-western Africa. Yes, if it is true that the Geneva talks have resolved the question of the time-frame and the rhythm of Cuban repatriation, who are we not to cherish the hope that we are at long last approaching the end of the long, dark tunnel?

But are we? Are we sure the success of the linkage will not inspire the manufacturing of more linkages to squeeze more concessions from the Namibian tragedy? Were all the parties in Geneva motivated by good intentions in their deliberations? The world will certainly understand why we who come from southern Africa are so incapable of crediting our South African neighbours with any amount of good faith. We have learnt to be punctiliously circumspect in dealing with them, and we shall be convinced that we are not being taken for a ride only when the flag of freedom is finally hoisted in Windhoek.

The people of Namibia have been through too much in their tortured history. They have been the victims of international intrigue and trickery of all kinds for more than a century. They have been exploited, brutalized and humiliated without mercy for too long. So often in the not-too-distant past they have been led to the gate of freedom only to watch it bolted and barred in their faces. Yet they have always been ready to face their rendezvous with their own destiny. They have never tired of yearning and waiting and struggling for their freedom. They have fought and shed blood for it, and if Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been suffocated to death by linkages the struggle for freedom in Namibia would have continued with heightened impetus. This the colonial Power in Namibia must understand very well.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The people of southern Africa, Namibians in particular, will no doubt celebrate the promulgation of a definite date for the inception of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) if that is the culmination of the agreement just reached in Geneva. The agreement was reportedly greeted with a champagne toast, apparently a symbolic indication of the crucial importance its authors attach to it. We hope such powerful symbolism will not come to naught. To our knowledge, they have never before celebrated any success with champagne. So we hope the champagne means far more than an agreement in principle.

So far so good, then. The ending of violence in Namibia and Angola, crowned by the independence of the former, would go a long way towards the pacification of the southern African region as a whole. Any extension of the frontiers of freedom in our region is welcome.

I said it was not my intention to make a long statement, and I very much wish this to be the last I shall ever make on Namibia as a colonial Territory. I hope that next year when I speak here I shall be welcoming the Republic of Namibia.

Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again the General Assembly is discussing the question of Namibia, 42 years after its inclusion on the agenda and 22 years after the adoption in October 1966 by the General Assembly of resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating Pretoria's Mandate over Namibia. In June 1971 the International Court of Justice reaffirmed the responsibility of the United Nations with respect to Namibia and the illegal nature of South Africa's presence in Namibia, a presence considered to be null and void. In Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) the Security Council defined the measures necessary to ensure the independence of Namibia as a part of the question of decolonization that should be the subject of a General Assembly resolution.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

Given the consensus on the matter, we hoped to celebrate the independence of Namibia this year. However, the efforts of the international community to ensure the immediate independence of Namibia were unsuccessful because of the attitude of the racist Pretoria régime and the delaying tactics in which it excels. For decades the people of Namibia has been subjected to persecution, racial discrimination, apartheid and violations of human rights. Its wealth and natural resources have been systematically plundered, with the co-operation of major transnational corporations.

Despite the policy of terrorism and oppression practised by the Pretoria régime, the people of Namibia has continued its resistance to the illegal occupation and its just struggle to exercise its right to self-determination and national independence.

The Pretoria régime's occupation of Namibia, the institutionalization of its policy of racial segregation and its defiance of the international will could not have continued without the support in various fields that the South African Government receives from Western countries and Israel. This is clearly seen in the efforts to prevent the Security Council from imposing against that régime comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter to force it to respect the international will as reflected in resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

The South African racist régime counts above all on the Zionist entity in Palestine to thwart any serious efforts to boycott and impose a trade and military embargo on the Pretoria régime. This collaboration between the Zionists and racists is in line with the doctrine and ideology of the two régimes, which are based on occupation of the territory of others and negation of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

Sudan has followed consistently and with interest the development of the quadripartite talks on Namibia's accession to independence, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses a complete and agreed plan for the independence of Namibia. We hope that the talks, which ended yesterday, will contribute to the immediate independence of Namibia.

We wish to pay a tribute to the people of Namibia in its struggle and resistance under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has demonstrated great political flexibility and shown its readiness to co-operate with the parties concerned to bring about the implementation of the Security Council resolution. In this context, we should increase assistance to SWAPO until the people of Namibia have been able to achieve total victory. We must find the necessary guarantees of the independence of Namibia and its sovereignty over all its territory, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other offshore islands.

The representative of SWAPO, in his comprehensive statement the day before yesterday, stated that while SWAPO had given proof of flexibility and willingness to co-operate in the implementation of the Security Council resolution, the Pretoria régime had taken no measures towards the independence of Namibia. On the contrary, it had strengthened its military and administrative presence in the Territory. That is why we must remain vigilant and guard against the conspiracy that the racist régime might create to impede Namibia's accession to independence and sovereignty. We should categorically reject the idea of any linkage between the independence of Namibia and extraneous matters.

Sudan wishes to pay a tribute once again to the resistance of the African front-line States which support SWAPO and other African national liberation movements struggling for Namibia's independence and the eradication of racial discrimination. All the necessary assistance must be given to those States so that

(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

they can continue their resistance, and we must support the African national liberation movements so that reason and freedom may prevail.

The General Assembly must condemn South Africa for its continuing aggression against front-line States, for the purpose of destabilizing these southern African countries.

Since its independence, Sudan has always given its assistance to all fighters for freedom and independence and, in particular, the liberation movements carrying out a heroic struggle in Africa. Accordingly, we shall continue to give aid and support to SWAPO, which is leading the Namibian people in its struggle as its authentic, legitimate representative, until it achieves independence and its own independent State. Sudan will contribute, together with other countries, to the transition arrangements with respect to the cease-fire and the implementation of the agreement on the independence of Namibia.

In conclusion, my delegation commends the praiseworthy efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on decolonization. Through their combined efforts they have helped to expose the racist Pretoria régime, revealing its conspiracies and crimes and mobilizing the resources available to strive for the independence and freedom of heroic Namibia.

Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): The question of Namibia is as old as the United Nations itself. For more than 40 years the Assembly has debated the question, year in, year out. Everything that can possibly be said on the issue has been ably said. Excellent ideas that should have enabled us to arrive at a solution of the problem have been presented in a masterly way in each of our debates on the question. Yet no success whatsoever has been achieved, because of the recalcitrant attitude of the South African régime.

(Mr. Mounin, Comoros)

Every year for the past 40 years South Africa has been severely condemned for not abiding by General Assembly resolutions. In response to its defiance the General Assembly has severely punished recalcitrant South Africa by revoking its right to participate in the work of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Mumin, Comoros)

South Africa has for more than 20 years been an outcast in the international community for its illegal occupation of Namibia.

The time has come for South Africa to realize that the international community means business and that it intends to see to it that Namibia becomes independent in the immediate future. South Africa should avail itself of the opportunity offered in 1988, which will go into the annals of this Organization as a most propitious year for international peace and security, to rid itself of this problem of Namibia.

The delegation of the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros welcomes the new positive attitude of the South African Government and its desire to arrive at an agreement with the Governments of Angola and Cuba that will enable it to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without further delay.

We sincerely hope that this time the South African Government is genuinely looking for a peaceful solution to the Namibia problem and is not manoeuvring to buy time as it has done on many previous occasions. The people of Namibia and the international community have the right to be sceptical about South African intentions because this is not the first time that the South African régime has raised our hopes sky-high on the independence of Namibia and then cruelly, like a sadist, shattered them. The valiant people of Namibia and the international community are weary and tired of these unbecoming manoeuvres by the South African régime.

My delegation, however, welcomes the preliminary agreement reached in Geneva yesterday by the negotiators from South Africa, Angola, Cuba and the United States of America. Our ardent wish is that these negotiations will be crowned with success, thus eliminating all the pretexts that South Africa uses to block the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Moumin, Comoros)

My delegation is looking forward to welcoming the South West Africa People's Organization next year in this august body as the new representatives of independent Namibia.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Until the current debate on Namibia was launched a few days ago many questioned the wisdom of conducting a full-scale General Assembly consideration of the matter at this time; others less sympathetic to the cause of the Territory even derided yet another routine debate on a Territory that they were convinced would never be given up by South Africa. They were probably right in their assessment of the proposed debate, except that the conduct of the debate, the enthusiasm for it, and the comments of those who have already spoken show convincingly that the consensus is in favour of the United Nations carrying out the mandate entrusted to it by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966 and Security Council resolution 435 (1978), namely to bring the Territory of Namibia speedily to self-determination and national independence. The Ghana delegation concurs in this approach for, much as we respect and support ongoing efforts to achieve the same objective outside the United Nations, we cannot advocate an abdication of responsibility by the world body in favour of a handful of countries, particularly when the outcome is still anybody's guess.

This September marked the 10th anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), mandating a detailed plan for the implementation of political arrangements for the independence of Namibia. During this period many calls have been made on South Africa by the Security Council and the General Assembly to abide by resolution 435 (1978) and withdraw its troops and administration from the Territory. Instead, what we have seen is an arrogant disregard of the united voice of the international community, an arrogance which has not been limited to defiance of lawfully constituted authority but has also

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

materialized in the systematic and brutal acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated against neighbouring front-line States.

In this period also Pretoria has outdone itself in perfecting the instruments of repression and control within South Africa through draconian measures exemplified by a state of emergency ruthlessly and efficiently executed. South Africa has proceeded to ban organizations engaged in peaceful and non-violent opposition to apartheid. This fact has occasioned discomfort and, at times, embarrassment on the part of South Africa's friends, who have often pointed to so-called internal reforms as plausible grounds for optimism as to the good faith and pragmatic intentions of Mr. Botha.

In the Territory of Namibia the situation has been no less brutal and repressive. Tribal armies have been raised through forced conscription; forced labour has continued; indiscriminate and merciless violence in which hundreds have perished has been directed at the population in general, including women and children. All of these barbarous actions inflicted on the Namibian people by South Africa have appalled and continue to appal international public opinion and deserve condemnation.

Perhaps Mr. Botha deserves his notoriety also for creating conditions in Namibia which offer a free hand for foreign multinational corporations to exploit the mineral-rich mines of Tsumeb and others - companies that record huge profits from the recovery of copper, zinc, diamonds and uranium. These companies, oblivious of the illegal and violent auspices under which they operate, collaborate with the racist authorities in the latter's quest to impose on the Territory the harsh methods of social and political organization peculiar to apartheid - methods having the distinct colouring and flavour of fascism and completely bereft of any public morality.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

It is estimated that, together with South African companies, these multinationals are responsible for net outflows of capital, or operating profits, constituting a phenomenal 40 per cent of the gross domestic product of Namibia - a reality which, when viewed against the backdrop of the squalor of mining settlements and the poor living conditions of the population in general, provides ample illustration of the workings and exploitative methods adopted by companies operating in the Territory.

Economic laws determine that foreign private capital, in order to expand and thrive, must secure for itself conditions that do not fetter the attainment of profits - conditions of stability, expressed through laws and policy. The Ghana delegation has no philosophical objection to these manifest objectives of foreign private investment when pursued in conditions of legality and where the promise of social and economic advancement of host countries is real and not apparent.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In the case of Namibia this is decidedly not the case. South African laws licensing foreign investors in Namibia are void and of no effect to the extent that they derive from the illegal exercise of jurisdiction arising from the fact of occupation by force, acts that fly in the face of the fundamental norms of international law and recognized as such by competent authorities, including the Security Council.

Evidence also suggests that these companies are not merely passive beneficiaries of an illegality but participate in the pervasive infrastructure of violence instituted by the racist régime to assure the continued illegal appropriation of the Territory's wealth. Reports confirm the existence of company militias and armed groups established to intimidate workers into submitting to the most unjust terms and conditions of employment. Trade union activity is clamped down on and clear attempts are made to sponsor company or house unions that act as stooges. The hated system of apartheid finds expression in the sweltering mines of Namibia, where equal pay for equal work is jettisoned in favour of remuneration on the basis of colour and race. Such are the ways of foreign private investments in Namibia.

The principal vehicle for the expression of Pretoria's policies in southern Africa has been the continuous and premeditated use of force against its neighbours in violation of law and the Charter. Aggression and destabilization have been perpetrated directly through armed attacks, or indirectly through the use of mercenaries and irregular armed bands. Namibia has been used by the racist régime as a formidable rear base for frequent armed incursions undertaken by the South African Defence Force into the territories of Angola, Zambia and other States in the front line of Pretoria's campaign of State terror. Integral to the overall strategy of the racist minority régime has been its use of UNITA and RENAMO mercenary bands against the lawfully constituted Governments of Angola and

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Mozambique. In this enterprise, South Africa has enjoyed collaborative and invaluable assistance from its friends, both within and outside the continent of Africa.

Present to execute the policies of control in Namibia and State terror against its neighbours is a South African Defence Force contingent of 100,000 troops deployed in various formations across the Territory, with heavy concentrations, particularly on the border with Angola. Indeed the Territory has been turned into a giant military camp for suppressing internal dissent and committing aggression against neighbouring States, especially the Republic of Angola.

How is it then that, in face of the categorical requirements of resolution 435 (1978) and international law, illegality continues to flourish?

Perhaps the seeds of an answer lie partly in the mutually supportive and interdependent relationship between the apartheid State, on the one hand, and the economic interests so vividly represented by foreign multilateral corporations, on the other, which combine to reap profits from the unhappy conditions imposed on the Territory and its people, for indeed the denial of rights and economic opportunity on the basis of race has its inextricable complement of low wages and poor living conditions, which in Namibia "happily" results in the extraction of surplus for distribution as dividends to the shareholders of the West, dividends and corporate profits that contribute to the revenue base of the treasury departments of the States of origin as tax dollars.

Of course no State would readily forgo tax dollars generated from corporate profits, and yet there is something not quite right about a State's receiving benefits from tax dollars that are occasioned by manifest illegality, illegality committed in the context of brutal repression and which such States have themselves derided in the General Assembly and Security Council.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Part of the answer as to why illegality still flourishes lies also in the indirect assurance given the racist régime that the United Nations would not be permitted to act with resolve against the illegal occupation of the Territory or its merciless exploitation. In the circumstances, the current General Assembly debate takes on added significance because many delegations, including our own, continue to believe that our Organization, its principles and pertinent decisions offer the best options and hope to Namibia. This is indeed the forum to ventilate the international community's disgust at the racist régime's intransigence and its disapproval of the role being played by certain Western Member States in the matter.

The underlying unity of interests so described finds important political and ideological expression in policies ostensibly designed to involve South Africa in constructive and reasonable dialogue to change its ways, policies that bear the insignia of "containment" and are predicated on South Africa's pre-eminent role as the last best bastion against an imagined Red peril that may potentially sweep the southern tip of the African continent. An indispensable component of these initiatives has been to argue and act against concerted international pressure designed to compel a real transformation of South African society and the dismantling of apartheid. The evident accommodation of South Africa by its friends in this regard has thwarted decisive action by the Security Council to compel compliance with its decisions.

No doubt Pretoria's resilience and its ability freely to sustain illegal act after illegal act is explicable by a complexity of factors, not least of all the influence afforded by its historic alignments.

We do not recount the history of the apartheid régime's infamy, terror and brutality for an idle purpose. The past is always an important guide to the present and the future, and so it should be in the evaluation of the current situation pertaining to the future of Namibia.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

The Ghana delegation, informed by this history, is of course anxious for the condition of peace to prevail in Angola and southern Africa in general. Indeed, the present quadripartite negotiations sustain hope that peace may be the beneficial outcome of this difficult undertaking. Also, the possibility of Namibian independence in the year ahead invokes profound anticipation and guarded optimism. Member States will recall that we have travelled this road before and know well the infinite capacity for dissembling and duplicity of the apartheid régime. We know of agreements shot through by the guns of marauding South African defence forces even before the ink on the parchments was dry.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

In airing such sentiments and our hopes for success in the current efforts at negotiation, we cannot, however, be parlayed into blessing Mr. Botha as a transformed man to be accommodated and hailed as a man of peace. Nor, in the same vein, can we be prevailed upon to embrace his acolytes who have so treacherously sown destruction among their own people. Neither can we be unduly optimistic about a future which, the present reveals, will see the racist régime ever committed to retaining its minority preponderance over the black majority in South Africa at all costs.

The Ghana delegation continues to support the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Real and concrete steps in the implementation of the Namibian plan remain to us the litmus test of the good faith of Pretoria in matters specific to Namibia.

In those circumstances, the Ghana delegation can only encourage the Secretary-General to continue his deliberate and principled efforts to bring about an early implementation of the Namibian plan, and in that enterprise as in others he must enjoy the responsible co-operation of the Security Council.

Before I conclude, I wish to reaffirm Ghana's solidarity with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as it leads in the quest for freedom and independence for all Namibians without distinction. We will continue to offer our moral and material assistance to enable them to triumph over foreign domination for as long as that domination remains. The attitude and co-operative spirit of SWAPO in all past negotiations - whether or not they were under United Nations auspices - have been exemplary, and we urge them to continue in the same vein until victory is won.

We also salute the heroic people of Angola for the supreme sacrifice that they continue to make on behalf of Namibia. Ghana cannot concur in the linking of Namibian independence with the presence - indeed, the invited presence - of Cuban

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

internationalist forces in Angola. Still less are we likely to concur in other strange linkages that are being rumoured. We wish to say to all those involved in the genuine search for a solution that their efforts should touch upon the preoccupations of Namibians and all other interested parties and not favour one country or individual. It is the only way in which peace will endure in the area.

The Ghana delegation believes that at this juncture the United Nations, which has recently brought hope and promise to millions the world over, has a responsibility to exert the needed pressure to compel the racist régime to conform to international law. It has the capacity to do so and needs to bring it to bear on an intolerable situation that has lasted to this day. Let us all resolve to bring delay and prevarication to an end so as to enable Namibia to achieve full independence through the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Mr. SLAOUI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, our Organization has assumed direct responsibility over that Territory. The international community is therefore duty bound to do its utmost to hasten the independence of Namibia and thus to eliminate one of the last vestiges of colonial domination in Africa.

In speaking in this debate, the Kingdom of Morocco wishes first to reaffirm its unconditional support for the Namibian people in its legitimate struggle for the attainment of its independence with respect for the integrity of its national territory.

My country also wishes to express its deep concern over the manoeuvrings and excuses used to delay the exercise by the Namibian people of its fundamental and inalienable right to self-determination. The continuation of the illegal

(Mr. Slaoui, Morocco)

occupation of Namibia, in defiance of international law, as well as the practices and policies of the South Africa Government in this matter are unacceptable and cannot be interpreted as anything other than a challenge to the international community.

For more than two decades now the United Nations has been trying to find a peaceful solution to this question, within the context of respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter. Efforts made to reach an internationally acceptable solution led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorses the settlement plan based on South Africa's withdrawal and the transfer of power to the Namibian people by means of free elections organized under the supervision and control of our Organization. That plan is the sole universal framework for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence and the only process accepted by all parties concerned.

Since the adoption of that resolution, the United Nations has been working tirelessly for the implementation of the plan and for respect for international legality. We would like to take this opportunity to praise the efforts made by our Secretary-General and by the United Nations Council for Namibia to safeguard the inalienable rights of the Namibian people and, in the immediate future, to provide it with the necessary humanitarian assistance.

Unfortunately, the Pretoria régime to date has refused to involve itself in the settlement process elaborated by common agreement and has tried to gain support for its colonial policy and the hateful system of apartheid by means of a local puppet government under its control.

Furthermore, the plundering of the territory's wealth is continuing in violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and of the provisions of the United Nations Council for Namibia's Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.

(Mr. Slaoui, Morocco)

This indicates the extent to which firm language is more than ever necessary to guarantee respect and the collective will as well as the application of a peaceful solution based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Kingdom of Morocco would thus like to reiterate the need for the immediate implementation of the plan adopted in 1978, which offers the sole internationally accepted basis for a settlement of the Namibian question and the guarantee for the independence, the territorial integrity and the well-being of its population.

(Mr. Slaoui, Morocco)

The international community's commitment and firmness are beginning to bear fruit: we can perceive the first signs of a happy outcome to this matter. Recent encouraging and constructive events following the quadripartite talks held, inter alia, at Brazzaville have signalled the possibility of a speedy implementation of the United Nations plan. Steps in the right direction include: the document of principle aimed at guaranteeing a peaceful settlement in the region adopted at a meeting held in New York on 29 July 1988 by the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa; the cessation of hostilities announced the following 10 August; and the respect for the cease-fire.

While the date of 1 November 1988 established in the 5 August 1988 Geneva agreement as the beginning of implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) could not be respected, we remain confident that pressure exerted by the international community will lead in the very near future to independence for Namibia within the framework of the United Nations peace plan.

But the international community must not let down its guard. It must keep in reserve possible recourse to comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa should the current talks fail.

The Kingdom of Morocco remains convinced that in the near future the people of Namibia will enjoy freedom and dignity and that, in security and prosperity, it will occupy its rightful place in the comity of nations. In view of that inevitable historical fact, we are more determined than ever to strengthen and refine our active solidarity with the people of Namibia in its struggle to realize its legitimate fundamental rights.

We want also to reiterate our ongoing support to the front-line States, which are making immense sacrifices and which have been the victims of ceaseless South African aggression. Namibia is and will remain a sacred cause for all of us

(Mr. Slaoui, Morocco)

Africans. We shall always be prepared and mobilized to a degree commensurate with the noble cause of the oppressed people of Namibia.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): The Cameroon delegation would like first and foremost to place on record its gratitude for the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia so ably presented by its President and for the reports 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 and the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly.

We recognize the great value of the report of the Secretary-General and wish once again to express our deep appreciation to him for his continuing and unrelenting dedication to the cause of freedom and the resolution of regional conflicts in Africa. We can only echo President Paul Biya's assurances of our nation's total support for and commitment to the Secretary-General's efforts.

Africans have passionately cried out these past two decades, attempting to mobilize the nations of the world against the endemic evils and disasters in southern Africa, this to little avail. The lyrics of our persistent lament have become repetitious; they no longer seem to invoke the level of universal attention, action and engagement called for. The culprits responsible for our malaise find comfort and encouragement in the growing complacency, while increasingly the victims languish in gaols and face the anguish of defamation, death and destruction.

The approach to the critical question of Namibia has almost reduced the item before us to routine treatment concluding in repetitive resolutions which hardly address the life-and-death issues in that part of Africa. The General Assembly and a Security Council paralysed and veto-plagued have virtually become repertory theatres from which the suffering men, women and children of Africa's southern subregion receive little but political tranquilizers and cold comfort.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Five thousand miles across the globe, perceptions about the scope of necessary action appear - at least to the Namibians and the non-whites of South Africa - to vary. There is little understanding of the nature of the human dilemma and problems in the subregion. Issues are blurred by ideological definitions; they are undermined by idealistic, simplistic and sometimes purely naive analysis.

The debates here must appear to our peoples in southern Africa, and throughout Africa, to lack adequate understanding of the central issue: that is, the true nature of the challenge to this generation constituted by the question of southern Africa as a whole and Namibia in particular. The African sense of decency is systematically mocked by the barbaric theology of racism from Pretoria. The international community must share in the humiliation, because the values of the universal conscience reject apartheid, racism and foreign occupation.

Once again we assemble here to address the question of Namibia. The occasion attracts a long list of speakers, as we can all observe. But the empty seats often indicate that it does not necessarily captivate a commensurately large crowd of concerned listeners.

Yesterday's echoes from Geneva have led to speculation and have stimulated hopes for an imminent breakthrough in southern Africa.

Cameroonians have a shared history, geography and human chemistry with the Namibian people. We have watched the drama of events and have come to understand that international politics concerning southern Africa produces masquerades that conceal deceit and evil.

We share hopes and aspirations for the attainment of peace and security in southern Africa: hopes of a cherished freedom and aspirations to the exercise of self-determination by our deprived peoples. We would, in that frame of mind, warmly welcome any genuine effort to resolve the issues that provoke breaches of

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

the peace and to set the stage for a future of fruitful nation-building and progress in economic development and military disengagement.

It is the view of the Cameroonian delegation that, in welcoming the reported results of what appears to be a critical phase in the Geneva negotiations and in congratulating the parties on reaching agreement on the agenda they set for themselves, the General Assembly must carefully undertake a review of the meaning and relevance of recent events.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Southern Africa, in contemporary times, presents interactions which are not conducive to the maintenance of international peace and security. This fact must remain at all times central to our discourse.

In Angola racist Pretoria has openly violated the principles of international law that prohibit the threat or use of force and intervention in the internal affairs of States. It has insisted with arrogance that the sovereign State of Angola should cancel important defence arrangements with Cuba, which has no aggressive intent against South Africa or its territorial integrity and independence.

Namibia, juridically administered by the United Nations Council for Namibia, remains illegally occupied by South Africa. This aggression is justified on the pretext that an extraneous factor, the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, impedes withdrawal from Namibia. Worse still, the occupation persists in spite of the decision of the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), which reflects a universal consensus in which Pretoria itself appeared to have participated with enthusiasm.

We shall gladly share in what the South African negotiator described yesterday as an impending "champagne celebration" in Brazzaville if, and only if, the details of the Geneva agreement have a direct impact on the speedy resolution of two problems: those of Angola and Namibia. The Assembly must reserve its flags and bunting, its songs of praise and jubilation, until Angola finds peace through the withdrawal of South African military and other pressures, until Namibia raises the flag of national freedom following full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The fate of that resolution to date dictates more than mere prudence. It demands that we consciously avoid any deviation from the universal consensus on how Namibia's freedom is to be planned and attained.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

A concerned Africa will remain unimpressed by mere declarations of intent on the part of South Africa. The truth must continue to guide us. The South African racists have set themselves up as archdeacons of the doom of black Africans and will not readily change a religion of racial superiority and dominance.

In the past, the Pretoria régime has endeavoured to buy time by diversionary declarations geared to the appeasement of critics. Ten years ago it unequivocally declared approval of and satisfaction with the agreement reached by the Security Council. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) addressed the proposal of the Secretary-General for a settlement of the Namibian situation and stressed that

"its objective is the withdrawal of South Africa's illegal administration from Namibia and the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations in accordance with Security Council resolution 385 (1976)."

To date South Africa has neither withdrawn nor made any credible move to indicate a beginning of the dismantling of its administration. We have witnessed manoeuvres to exclude the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and install a puppet régime, contrary to paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The United Nations Transition Assistance Group has been rendered irrelevant by circumstances imposed by Pretoria.

We appeal to those involved in the negotiations to bear in mind that any understandings reached will be futile if the procedures outlined by the Security Council in 1978 are not followed. The international community awaits the moment of application of the prescriptions of those procedures. Pretoria must invite the Secretary-General, if it means to show any honesty, and also the Council for Namibia, to undertake immediate consultations on a speedy process which, under the auspices of the United Nations, would enable Namibia to attain its freedom. SWAPO

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

remains the only legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. The valiant brothers and sisters who organize resistance and struggle for freedom, must be permitted to return home as heroes, to plan anew the destiny of a nation rich in resources but ravaged by the misdeeds of decadent imperialism.

The truest option for the peoples of southern Africa today remains the peaceful coexistence of the various races and the conscious construction of viable multiracial societies. Justice deprived always results in justice restored by violence and unnecessary destabilization. Pretoria and the conservative illusionaries must learn those truths, else they will continue to preside over the disintegration of an otherwise rich and beautiful southern Africa.

In the mean time, it is imperative that we recognize that only persistent pressure can bring change in South Africa. Negotiations are a process that, in the South African context, must not be regarded as a viable substitute. To be useful, all forms of pressure applied now should be complemented by negotiations, but must not be relaxed until change comes.

The global economic crisis that we are experiencing today has enhanced awareness of interdependence and the rudiments of peace. The maintenance of war and crisis have become too costly even for the richest nations of our times. Dialogue, with change of attitudes, is becoming part of the mood of the times. That could also create a productive atmosphere for pressures to induce change in Pretoria. South Africa must not misread the writing on the wall. Investment in lasting peace is the greatest guarantee of stability as well as of economic and social recovery.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Our solidarity with SWAPO and other valiant fighters for freedom grows, as we hope that conditions will not have been so wrecked by current violence that the excitement of national reconstruction and well-earned independence will have been destroyed.

Mr. AGUILAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The people of Namibia have travelled a long road to reach the present point at which hopes of freedom and peace appear to be close to fulfilment. It will have secured its independence after bitter years of struggle and suffering in which the sense of frustration has been comparable only to its will to persevere.

The United Nations has been part of this process, particularly since the establishment in 1967 of the Council for Namibia - of which Venezuela is proud to be a member - by means of a wide-ranging programme that has provided an international tribunal for the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and contributed generously to the training of the people who will be governing the country after independence.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

With the adoption ten years ago of the historic Security Council resolution 435 (1978) the process of reaching consensus on the substance and the ways and means of carrying out United Nations responsibilities regarding independence for Namibia was concluded.

In recent months we have been following, from a distance, a series of negotiations among Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States, on conflicts besetting southern Africa, including, of course, the question of Namibia. In the light of the information at present available, at the last round of those negotiations, which recently concluded in Geneva, an agreement in principle, or a tentative agreement, was reached that would provide a solution to the question of Namibia in the short-term. We hail that news and welcome the agreement, which is still to be ratified by the parties on a date to be determined. Certainly this is important progress, but on previous occasions similar prospects were later not borne out by facts; hence it would be wise to be cautious. It is well known that the Pretoria régime has a long history of disavowing its own commitments.

The United Nations Council for Namibia, as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory, has an important role to play at this stage in accordance with the mandate the General Assembly entrusted to it by resolution 2145 (XXI) and subsequent resolutions on the same subject. On the understanding that its responsibilities will not be discharged until the achievement of independence in Namibia, the Council must be vigilant in monitoring the process and ensure that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is carried out in keeping with the legitimate rights of the Namibian people and that the territorial integrity of Namibia is scrupulously preserved.

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

We must be clear and firm here: the sole internationally accepted independence plan is the one contained in resolution 435 (1978), with no modifications or accommodating interpretations aimed at distorting its aims and scope. United Nations impartiality is guaranteed by the universal legal instruments governing it, on the basis of which the broad majority of the civilized nations of the world live in harmony.

On the other hand, we must pay the greatest attention to the integrity of Namibia in order to ensure that its people will receive independence with the territorial legacy that is its due intact, without any curtailment imposed by force which would compromise its future economic and political viability.

At the time the United Nations assumes responsibility for implementing the independence plan by means of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), it will be necessary for these matters to have been fully resolved. Walvis Bay, the only deep-water port of the country, is an inseparable part of the Territory of Namibia, just as its population is an inseparable part of the Namibian nation. Any other arrangement would imply a serious contradiction of the mandate of the Council for Namibia, for which it is responsible to the General Assembly.

Despite the concerns I mentioned earlier, Venezuela would like to be optimistic, and it trusts that a satisfactory solution to the question of Namibia will be reached speedily, with proper international solidarity and co-operation. In this connection my country has already expressed its wish to participate in UNTAG whenever it is called upon to do so. However, we are aware that solutions are yet to be found to many technical problems, including the very financing of UNTAG, and we know full well that the Secretary-General has a difficult task ahead of him. Hence we take this opportunity to reiterate to the Secretary-General our

(Mr. Aguilar, Venezuela)

gratitude for his productive work and to urge him to continue undeterred in discharging his lofty responsibilities.

Mrs. SAVADOGO (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): In 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The United Nations Council for Namibia, established in 1967 as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until its independence, has endeavoured during the past decade to mobilize the international community for the attainment of the immediate and unconditional independence of Namibia on the basis of the United Nations Plan of Action for the Independence of Namibia adopted in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The year 1988 marks the tenth anniversary of resolution 435 (1978), which my country has never failed to support throughout the years. In fact, Burkina Faso attaches the greatest importance to the question of the liberation of Namibian territory, one of the last vestiges of colonialism in Africa. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an act of colonial domination and aggression which violates the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Need I recall that the mandate system was established following the unremitting opposition of one of the great Powers, which stated that it would categorically reject any solution that did not take account of the interests of the population to be placed under mandate. In that respect President Wilson was far from suspecting that his efforts to establish a system which would safeguard the fundamental rights and freedoms of peoples would lead to a shameful situation.

(Mrs. Savadogo, Burkina Faso)

The racist Government of Pretoria is carrying on a policy of blind and inhuman repression in Namibia. It has constantly been increasing its military presence and intensifying its acts of repression and oppression against the people of Namibia. In Namibia, the Pretoria racists are behaving like conquerors. They are systematically plundering Namibia and robbing it of its natural wealth. The South African régime maintains Namibia under its colonial domination in total defiance of the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly on the immediate independence of Namibia and in total defiance of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

(Mrs. Savadogo, Burkina Faso)

In his recent statement made in the general debate at the current session, the Comrade Minister of External Relations of my country expressed his hope that when the next session of the General Assembly opened, Namibia would occupy in this Hall the place that has been its by right for so long. Burkina Faso has always cherished the hope that in the near future it would see the Namibian people able to exercise its right to self-determination.

Is it possible to talk about Namibia without mentioning the hideous system of apartheid? Apartheid is in fact at the heart of all the tragedies in southern Africa and only its total, swift and straightforward dismantlement can bring peace back to that shattered region. The international community has whole-heartedly condemned that system, which constitutes a negation of man.

Namibian independence, the restoration of all the rights of the South African people and the assurance that the security of the front-line countries will be protected, as also their stability and their territorial integrity, are part of our collective responsibility and we are in duty bound to guarantee them.

Burkina Faso is pleased at the recent agreement concluded in Geneva, which allows us to have hope that peace will be established in the southern region of our continent. However, my country remains convinced that the only effective means of making South Africa listen to reason is the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions.

For Burkina Faso, Namibian independence cannot be subordinated to any condition contrary to the profound aspirations of the people concerned to self-determination, as expressed by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people. It goes without saying that my country will continue to reject the principle of linkage between the independence of Namibia and the presence of Cuban forces in Angola. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) would

(Mrs. Savadogo, Burkina Faso)

crown the efforts of our Organization, which will have to maintain its role as a catalyst in organizing and monitoring free elections in Namibia.

In that context, the delegation of Burkina Faso once again calls on Pretoria's allies to acknowledge the imperative need for the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), on the accession of Namibia to independence.

Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly, where hope for the freedom of Namibia has so frequently been sparked only to be quenched by the arrogant intransigence of the oppressor, is today illuminated by the promise of dawn, as a result of agreements reached yesterday in the quadripartite negotiations in Geneva, at which the fatalistic inertia that at other times has frustrated progress in this historic process seems to have been overcome.

It is a historic process because for all the peoples of the world, whatever their colour, belief or ideology, Namibia is a symbol that has drawn us together through all these years to defend freedom, the dignity of man and the independence and sovereignty of peoples.

It is historic too because Namibia has set a standard in the struggle against the politics of power, against intervention, against foreign occupation, against disavowal of international law and against the exploitation of peoples and the plundering of their natural riches and resources.

Hence, the appearance of Namibian freedom on the horizon is a milestone in mankind's political progress, in the consolidation of its juridical order and the enhancement of this Organization as a universal forum.

It is particularly important that this is occurring at a time when in other parts of the world historic events are taking place that inevitably have

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

repercussions on the process of the self-determination of peoples and the emergence of States representing them before the international community.

Namibian independence will come about not merely because of the international process that has occurred within this building, or the political and diplomatic steps the world community has taken with unflagging energy; it will emerge principally from the courage of the Namibian people, the determined struggle of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the support of the front-line States.

The freedom of Namibia will emerge from the battlefields of Africa where the most recent struggles have been waged on the border between Angola and Namibia, through the quadripartite negotiations between Angola, Cuba, the United States and South Africa, the protagonists in this process.

The quadripartite negotiations from which we can now see signs of a free Namibia, a Member of our Organization, are not simply a diplomatic exercise. First and foremost they are the product of factors of political and military power which determine the outcome of the process, after years of bloody combat and after many African and Latin American combatants have made the supreme sacrifice for a universal cause: the sovereignty of peoples.

The same community of values has been expressed in the past, in the wars of emancipation in Latin America in which all the races making up our nationalities fought and worked together, identifying with the same ideal of liberty.

In many parts of Latin America, across time and geography, African blood has been shed on various battlefields in our struggles for independence and against colonial power. The racial and spiritual mixture characteristic of the people of

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

Latin America and the Caribbean has been a substantive factor in national unification at all stages of our emancipation.

Almost two centuries later, the blood of Latin Americans, many of them descendants of the Africans who laid down their lives for the freedom of Latin America, has been shed on African soil so that Namibia too may be free.

In this sense of historic parallelism, which has also occurred at other times, on other continents and with regard to other peoples, my delegation would like to look above and beyond régimes, ideologies and political circumstance to the symbolism that crosses time and space, nurtured by the spirit of universal fraternity and spiritual solidarity, which humanity has always used in its most magnificent enterprises.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

It is perhaps this identity which explains the welcome African peoples and peoples of other regions of the third world have given to Latin American troops in peace-keeping operations. This constant friendship and trust - which must be maintained at a time when the United Nations will be providing security in the process towards achieving independence in Namibia - in turn calls for our commitment as Latin Americans to continue serving the cause of peace with the same dedication and sense of sacrifice with which these peace-keeping forces have carried out their universal mission in the past.

At this promising point in history which heralds the arrival of freedom for oppressed peoples, Peru renews its solidarity with them and its support for the global struggle to achieve the emancipation of Namibia. We trust that our diplomatic relations with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which were established in the course of the official visit to Peru by its President, Sam Nujoma, will pave the way to our official relationship with the new Namibian State and that the Day of Peruvian-African Friendship, instituted on that occasion, will provide a constant reminder of the final triumph of the cause, which we share with all the peoples represented here, in a common aspiration for freedom, peace and justice.

Mr. ORTIZ GANDARILLAS (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The Bolivian delegation deeply regrets that Namibia is as yet not among us, taking its place in this Assembly as a free, sovereign and independent State. It also deeply regrets that the Government of Pretoria still maintains its illegal colonial occupation and administration of Namibia. It similarly regrets the failure fully to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Twenty-two years ago Namibia was to have emerged to independent life, as did many other countries represented here. Unfortunately, over the entire period since then, the Namibian people have had to bear the humiliation of an anachronistic

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

colonial régime. But what is most tragic about this situation is that we do not know for how much longer the exploitation and oppression of the people of Namibia will continue, for how much longer the racist régime of South Africa will continue to defy the clear will of the international community, which today is once again expressing its most vigorous protest and just indignation at the arrogance, oppression and intransigence of the Pretoria régime.

The question of Namibia is the responsibility of the international community as a whole and must be regarded as constituting a problem within the decolonization process, without any linkage to extraneous and irrelevant issues. We need not recall here that the United Nations has assumed direct international legal responsibility for the Territory of Namibia and, accordingly, is obliged to discharge the mandate of the international community with a view to achieving the self-determination and independence of Namibia in accordance with the Charter and resolution 1514 (XV) on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. But we must bear in mind that there is a political juridical instrument that should be immediately implemented - Security Council resolution 435 (1978) - which constitutes the internationally accepted basis for the peaceful solution of the question of Namibia. The tenth anniversary of the adoption of this resolution has just been commemorated, an anniversary which should not only serve to emphasize the value of this important decision but also to remind us that it has, unfortunately, not yet been implemented.

It is obvious that the fundamental aspect of this problem lies in the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist, usurping régime of Pretoria. Thus the sole political solution is the immediate, unconditional end of this illegal occupation by the forces of South Africa in order to ensure the free exercise of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

independence, respecting its total territorial integrity, in accordance with the United Nations plan.

Despite the efforts of the international community as a whole, and those of the United Nations in particular, to achieve a solution to the sensitive problem before us today with the least risk to, and sacrifice of, the Namibian people, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia has stated that, unfortunately, the situation in Namibia has deteriorated, with the Pretoria régime intensifying its repression of the Namibian people and exploitation of the economy of the Territory and perpetuating its acts of aggression and destabilization against the independent States of southern Africa. The stubbornness, use of force, oppression, illegal and colonialist occupation on the part of the Government of South Africa have become a source of growing tension threatening international peace and security, thereby making the Government of Pretoria liable to the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter.

It is high time for a speedy solution to the situation in Namibia, which is a brutal and lamentable aftermath of the phenomenon of colonialism and apartheid - historical anachronisms violating the most fundamental norms of international civilized coexistence among peoples and sharply in contrast with the new climate of international political détente the result of the decision of States to diminish the threat of nuclear war, the readiness to replace acts of force and violence with dialogue and negotiation and the strength and presence of our Organization.

In the context of this favourable climate of détente - which we heartily welcome - the tripartite negotiations between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States, appear to have reached a positive outcome which might form the basis for progress. In this connection we should like to express our ardent wish that these negotiations will be successful, as the international

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

community hopes, and will pave the way to immediate independence and freedom for Namibia. While these are encouraging signs giving rise to a degree of optimism with regard to a speedy solution to this thorny problem, because of the record of the Pretoria Government's conduct we must remain cautious about the commitments that may result from these negotiations and in particular about the full implementation of those commitments. We must not forget that for more than 30 years dialogue and negotiations have been conducted with the Government of South Africa on this question, with the unfortunate results that we all know.

(Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas, Bolivia)

The question of Namibia - a problem of fundamental importance to the United Nations - is going through a critical and delicate stage, which deserves the closest attention and vigilance on the part of the international community. We must never, at any time - and particularly now - reduce the international pressure on the Government of South Africa; we must continue to exert that pressure until we achieve complete implementation of resolution 435 (1978). To that end, the United Nations must use all the means at its disposal, in order to avoid further disappointment and further suffering by the courageous Namibian people, who, together with its liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), deserves the full support of the international community.

The Government of Bolivia, in keeping with its anti-colonialist policy and position, takes this opportunity to express once again its traditional solidarity with and firm support for the just cause of the Namibian people and its liberation movement, SWAPO, in their struggle for the freedom and independence of Namibia.

The delegation of Bolivia expresses its thanks to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its hard work to help the Namibian people. We thank also the many international institutions and individuals that are making arduous and praiseworthy efforts to promote the independence of Namibia. We express our sincere gratitude to the Secretary-General for his constant, tireless dedication to the quest for an early peaceful solution to this important question.

In conclusion, I wish once again to associate my delegation with the clear, strong message of solidarity and support that the international community is now sending to the courageous Namibian people. At the same time, I express the hope that very soon Namibia will take its place among us in this Hall as a free, sovereign and independent State.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and as recognized by the General Assembly in resolution 1514 (XV). It has reaffirmed also the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people for the attainment of its freedom and the liberation of its Territory by all the means at its disposal.

The continued occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime constitutes defiance of United Nations resolutions and a serious violation of the Charter as well as a threat to international peace and security. The Pretoria régime is flouting the international community's will. It is depriving the people of Namibia of their fundamental rights. It continues to practice the heinous system of apartheid, imposing the most brutal repressive measures - not to speak of its acts of aggression against and deliberate sabotage and destabilization of the neighbouring States.*

The manoeuvres engaged in by the Pretoria régime to impede the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), containing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, are designed to impose an internal settlement on the people of Namibia, in order to strengthen Pretoria's iron-fist policy in regard to Namibia.

All those attempts, however, have met with dismal failure because the Namibian people will not be deterred from continuing its just struggle against South Africa's occupation of its Territory. That courageous people has proved that any solution to the problem must be based first and foremost on the termination of

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

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab
Republic)

South Africa's occupation of its national territory. Linkage of the termination of the occupation with any other matter is rejected by the international community, because such linkage is designed only to perpetuate this odious occupation.

The racist Pretoria régime's imposition on the people of Namibia of brutal repressive measures, the state of emergency, martial law and curfews, and the increase in the cases of disappearances and detentions are described in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and were referred to by the representative of SWAPO in his statement to the Assembly yesterday. But these practices will not induce the Namibian people to discontinue their struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

There can be no doubt that the support which the racist Pretoria régime receives from certain States and transnational corporations, in plundering Namibia's abundant natural resources and strengthening its military, strategic, nuclear and economic collaboration with its counterpart, the Tel Aviv régime, only hardens Pretoria's iron-fist policy in regard to Namibia and perpetuates its occupation of that Territory. That makes it all the more necessary for the international community to take practical and effective steps against South Africa and to ensure conditions propitious to the effective and immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to the administration of the Territory by the United Nations until it accedes to complete independence.

To that end, in view of the Pretoria régime's continued defiance and the schemes and prevarications in which it is engaging, the international community must have recourse to mandatory sanctions against that régime in order to compel it to end its occupation of Namibia, to cease its acts of aggression against the

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab
Republic)

neighbouring African States and to dismantle the heinous system of apartheid once and for all.

In conformity with its immutable and principled position of standing by the peoples who are languishing under and struggling against foreign occupation and domination, the Syrian Arab Republic supports the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative, to gain its freedom and independence.

Mr. OKEYO (Kenya): At the outset I should like to remind the Assembly of the very precise terms of the Mandate given to South Africa to administer what was then known as South West Africa. It will be recalled that South Africa was required to promote progressive development towards self-government or independence of its Trust Territory and to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. South Africa was also required to ensure equal treatment for all in the social, economic and commercial fields.

A simple analysis of what has happened in Namibia reveals that throughout the period when South Africa was legally entrusted with the administration of South West Africa it consistently flouted, with both arrogance and intransigence, every responsibility bestowed upon it by that Mandate. Since the abrogation of the Mandate in 1966, the racist régime has shamelessly engaged in an illegal and colonial^o occupation of Namibia, flagrantly violating every United Nations resolution on the matter, and has continually prevented the United Nations Council for Namibia from directly exercising the responsibilities for the Namibian people conferred on it by the Organization.

The racist South African régime has, furthermore, exported its repugnant and abhorrent policy of apartheid to Namibia, denying the black majority all their basic human rights, including their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. In the application of this despicable policy, there has been a forcible displacement of Namibians from their homes, a crackdown on mass organizations such as student bodies and trade unions and a muzzling of the press in its activities in that country. The brutal violence and repression practised by the racist régime against the defenceless Namibian people reflects its policy of State terrorism against the black majority in South Africa itself.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

The racist régime has further misused Namibian territory as a base for committing acts of aggression and subversion against front-line and neighbouring States. These deliberate acts of destabilization, coupled with a large influx of refugees fleeing from the evils of apartheid, have had a devastating impact on the economic, social and political structures of those front-line and neighbouring States, and have resulted in an extremely volatile situation in the southern African region as a whole. The explosion or unleashing of tensions in the region would, in my delegation's view, have serious repercussions not only for the whole African continent but also for international peace and security in general.

The violence, terror and brutality characteristic of the Pretoria régime have rightly been universally condemned. The arrogant indifference of the racist régime to the United Nations legitimate responsibility over Namibia, crowned by the installation of an interim government in Namibia in direct violation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), is further proof of the essence of the evil of apartheid which has been termed a crime against humanity. Kenya strongly condemns the interim government in Namibia, fully supporting Security Council resolution 566 (1985), which declared that government to be null and void, and we call on all Member States to do the same. Kenya recognizes the legitimacy of the use of all means, including force, by the Namibian people to attain their independence. We further recognize the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the sole, authentic and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. As such, Kenya will continue to provide SWAPO with both moral and financial support on a bilateral, regional and international basis for the attainment of their goal of self-determination and independence. We urge all States similarly to provide assistance to SWAPO in all fields of activity.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

There is something drastically wrong in apartheid South Africa, because what we have heard from there seems to make little sense. For example, late last month the Secretary-General, while participating in a ceremony to mark a week of solidarity with Namibia, asserted that Namibia's independence was long overdue. He further stated that he had informed South Africa that the administrative machinery had been set in motion for a United Nations transition group to start implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on 1 November 1988. The Secretary-General's optimism was based on the ongoing quadripartite talks on Namibia between South Africa, Angola, Cuba, and the United States.

The whole international community has been anxiously awaiting the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). However, the latest South African behaviour shattered the hope and expectations nurtured by the international community. The so-called Administrator General of the illegally occupied Namibia is quoted in the New York Times of 1 November 1988 as having said: "As far as we are concerned, we would like to see 435 implemented." To add insult to injury, and in the process of looking for an excuse for further delaying independence for Namibia, he added: "Someone is dragging his feet and it is not us." In the same interview, the so-called Administrator General also asserted that Cuban troops must be withdrawn before Namibia is granted independence.

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

The apartheid régime in South Africa has engaged in double talk in the past, and therefore any promises by it must be viewed as mere deceit and consequently worthless. We categorically reject the introduction of the so-called constructive engagement policy into implementation of resolution 435 (1978), believing it to be totally irrelevant to Namibia's independence. We strongly urge the United Nations to proceed with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any further delay.

The immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is all the more necessary in the light of the recent attempt by the racist Pretoria régime once again to dupe the international community with false promises of independence for Namibia. The 1 November 1988 deadline for the beginning of the implementation of that Security Council resolution has passed with the racist régime finding yet another excuse for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia. We are not optimistic that the proposed January 1989 date will fare any better, being only too well aware of the expert duplicity practised by the racist régime and recognizing that its stated intentions are nothing more than an attempt to buy more time for the further entrenchment of its abhorrent system of apartheid in Namibia.

Consequently Kenya remains convinced that the only peaceful means at the disposal of the international community to force South Africa to grant Namibia its independence and dismantle its apartheid system is the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as demanded by so many States Members of the United Nations. Kenya strongly condemns all foreign economic concerns operating in Namibia. We appeal to all member States of the international community, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council opposed to the application of Chapter VII of the Charter, to agree to comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

Africa. We strongly believe that any vacillation on the issue will serve only to hasten the inevitable plunge into violence and bloodshed in the region.

Let me conclude by reiterating Kenya's total commitment to the independence of Namibia. Kenya will continue to provide support to SWAPO in its just and noble struggle to free the Namibian people from the dual evils of colonialism and apartheid. We shall continue to view Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only basis for Namibia's independence and urge the international community to ensure its swift implementation. We in Kenya naturally look forward to the independence of Namibia in the very near future. We also await its admission to the community of nations as one indivisible nation with all its offshore islands and Walvis Bay.

Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's deep appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples for their invaluable work on Namibia. Equally, our Secretary-General deserves our gratitude for all he has done in this regard. Namibia will definitely be free. The writing is on the wall, but South Africa is incapable of reading it.

Ms. LIMA (Angola) (interpretation from French): The head of the Angolan delegation had occasion during the general debate to congratulate Mr. Caputo of Argentina on his election to the presidency of the United Nations General Assembly at the present session. I should like to reaffirm that my delegation will give him full co-operation in the carrying out of his task.

The General Assembly once again has before it the problem of Namibia. Indeed, although the question of Namibia is certainly a typical colonial problem, it represents a special responsibility for the United Nations. By the adoption of

(Ms. Lima, Angola)

resolution 2145 (XXI), in 1966, and the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility for the fate of the Namibian people. Unfortunately, Namibia today is still under the yoke of illegal colonial domination and occupation. Ten years ago the United Nations, through the Security Council, approved the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. If that plan, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), had been implemented, the Namibian people would now be in our midst as an independent and sovereign people. Everybody knows what obstacles were erected to the attainment of independence by the Territory, and particularly the contempt for world public opinion so obstinately displayed by South Africa in its attempts to counter the legal authority represented by the United Nations.

The implementation of resolution 435 (1978) has become a long nightmare over the past 10 years because of South Africa's reckless attempts to link Namibia's accession to independence to questions totally extraneous to the United Nations resolution. The overwhelming majority of the international community has agreed that this attitude on the part of South Africa runs counter to that resolution. Moreover, South Africa has used Namibian territory as a springboard for its acts of aggression against Angolan territory.

The settlement of the Namibian question is close to our hearts, as the Government of my country has demonstrated on many occasions. First, the independence of Namibia would ensure the national security of Angola, and then it is a question of Angola's commitment to the Charter of the United Nations, the charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the principles of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is this line of thinking that has led the Government of Angola to support all the efforts in favour of peace in Namibia.

(Ms. Lima, Angola)

The Angolan Government is participating in the current talks on peace in South West Africa, which includes Namibia. The parties - namely, Angola and Cuba on the one hand and South Africa on the other, with the mediation of the United States of America - finished a new round of negotiations yesterday, 15 November. It is necessary to indicate some of the things that opened the way to these negotiations.

First, the international community's pressure on the South African Government has never been as great as it is at present. Even South Africa's closest allies have begun to understand that their support for South Africa seriously compromises their credibility in the eyes of other countries.

Furthermore, the internal situation in South Africa, where the South African patriots have stepped up their struggle, has become explosive. Trade, religious and student organizations have increased their actions against the apartheid régime, and this has plunged South Africa into a political and economic crisis. In Namibia, the valiant people of the Territory, under the leadership of its sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), is successfully waging its national liberation struggle.

Furthermore - and this was the turning-point - South African troops suffered an overwhelming defeat at Cuito Cuanavale.

My delegation has no intention of humiliating anyone, but South Africa would not have dreamt of sitting at a negotiating table if it had won the battle of Cuito Cuanavale in which it had invested all possible human and material resources. Cuito Cuanavale was a bitter pill for the South African authorities.

Today the situation has changed. These events and the present positive trend in the international arena have given a boost to settlement of the South West African conflict.

The talks held recently in Geneva have reinforced the feeling of optimism. The parties have reached an agreement of principle on the settlement of the

(Ms. Lima, Angola)

situation in South West Africa. This agreement will be submitted to the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa for final approval. My Government believes that these results open the way to a peaceful solution in Namibia. There is no doubt that only a negotiated solution will avert a blood-bath, with unforeseeable consequences, in the region.

The Government of my country is encouraged by the progress made and hopes that South Africa will fulfil the commitments made. It is clear from these commitments that only the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) can lead to the final settlement of the Namibian conflict. We appeal to the international community once again to support the tireless efforts of the Angolan Government to bring about a settlement of the Namibian problem.

For our part, we are engaging in this process with flexibility and are convinced that it will contribute to the ending of the illegal occupation of Namibia and to peace in Angola. We shall never allow ourselves to be diverted from the final objective - the independence of Namibia in conformity with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We take this opportunity to affirm the unswerving solidarity of the people and Government of Angola with the people of Namibia and SWAPO in their courageous struggle for freedom. SWAPO's struggle for national liberation has earned it the admiration of the whole world. We are certain that the Namibian people will triumph.

We wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts and dedication in the search for a solution to the Namibian problem. We express our appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President for their unceasing, arduous work in promoting the Namibian cause.

(Ms. Lima, Angola)

Finally, we express our gratitude to the Government and people of Cuba for their support for the cause of the peoples of southern Africa and their selfless assistance to the Angolan people in the defence of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola.

The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Chilean delegation has once again come to this rostrum, as it has done since the item we are now considering was first taken up, to reiterate our consistent, unrestricted and unswerving support for the Namibian cause, the immediate independence of the Territory and the inalienable right of the Namibian people to live in freedom and to exercise the other prerogatives that the law and the international community recognize to all human beings equally. The first of these prerogatives is the right to self-determination.

Year after year, with rare unanimity, the Members of the United Nations have spoken out against the most flagrant, tragic case of the persistence of a colonial régime with no justification. Year after year the leaders of the countries represented here have said that the persistence of the question of Namibia is an affront to all mankind. The question is still before us because the Power that is occupying Namibia illegally is defying the entire international community and, more especially, because it has introduced into Namibia the policy of apartheid, a policy which Chile decisively rejects. But this disgraceful, iniquitous situation affects not only Namibia and the Namibians but also other countries in the region, whose inhabitants are suffering similarly from the negative consequences of a conflict that darkens the horizon of southern Africa. The United Nations has rightly adopted resolutions urging the international community to increase economic assistance to the front-line and other neighbouring countries.

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

I must stress with special satisfaction the fact that this and other subjects were studied very carefully, and with complete agreement, in the course of the talks in Santiago in July, between representatives of the Government of Chile and a consultative mission from the United Nations Council for Namibia, led by the Permanent Representative of India, Ambassador Chinmaya Gharekhan.

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

Evidence of what I have just said appears in the joint communiqué that came from that meeting. In addition to urging vigorously that South Africa put an end to the unlawful occupation of Namibia, it reiterated the effectiveness of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and expressed the solidarity of the front-line countries and other independent countries of southern Africa. Both parties reaffirmed that the harmful activities of economic and financial interests in Namibia were a major obstacle to the political independence of the Territory. They agreed that the United Nations Council for Namibia should take appropriate action to ensure compliance with the decisions that the international community has adopted in order to ensure proper protection of the natural resources of the Territory, including marine resources, so that the Namibian people would continue to have a vital means of subsistence.

In addition, both parties strongly support the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination with full respect for the unity and integrity of the Territory.

It should also be stressed that the Government of Chile and the mission created for consultations took note of both the new climate of international co-operation and the spirit of constructive dialogue and collaboration, which, it was felt, might make a positive contribution to the solution of critical questions in the international arena, such as the question of Namibia.

It was also agreed that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should be called upon to intensify his efforts, as decided by the Security Council, which determined that there should be a cease-fire between the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and South Africa as an indispensable stage in the creation of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group in Namibia and the holding of free and fair elections in keeping with the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. In this spirit both parties have expressed their satisfaction with SWAPO,

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. There was satisfaction that SWAPO had once again expressed willingness to observe the cease-fire, showing once more its political maturity. That was viewed as an act of good will.

Last, but not least, the Government of Chile, in the joint communiqué, expressed its willingness to co-operate in providing assistance in the teaching and training of students, technicians and professionals from Namibia. This, it is believed, will help to give the new nation-State the human resources, both in qualitative and in quantitative terms, that it will need to get through the early stages of independent life. Accordingly, the Chilean authorities offered a scholarship programme for study in the Foreign Service Institute of Chile and for courses in the fisheries and forestry industries - two areas where we have enjoyed a great deal of success. Details of the programme of assistance have been given to the Commissioner for Namibia and to SWAPO's Permanent Observer at the United Nations.

I do not want to miss this opportunity to express the well-known opinion of my delegation that the marine resources of Namibia are particularly important to the future of the new nation-State and its people. Yet my delegation believes that we are witnessing a plundering of Namibia's marine wealth and that the time has come for the Council for Namibia, using its legal and administrative powers, to deal with this situation decisively. A possible first step would be to call on the Secretary-General to study the legal and economic aspects of creating an exclusive economic zone for Namibia.

As we said in the debate that took place a few days ago in the Fourth Committee, the delegation of Chile is taking part in this plenary Assembly debate on Namibia encouraged by the legitimate hope that the political successes of recent

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

months will somehow help to promote a negotiated peaceful settlement of this question - a solution that will make it possible, very soon and once and for all, to begin the ardently desired process of independence for Namibia. In keeping with this thought, my delegation would like to express its special satisfaction at the fact that the parties directly concerned in questions relating to the region of south-western Africa have decided, with the valuable mediation and assistance of the United States and in a climate of political realism, to sit down at the negotiating table and try peacefully to resolve the conflict between them. This does not mean that the Government of Chile disregards or minimizes the various agreements that this Organization has already reached on the question of Namibia. In particular, there is resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council, which contains all the elements needed to ensure the independence of the Territory and the Namibian people's exercise of their right to self-determination.

We are convinced that we would all have preferred to see that resolution implemented a long time ago. That would have meant that today there would be a free, independent Namibia, a Namibia joining in our efforts to pursue the fundamental goals of the United Nations, the maintenance and consolidation of peace throughout the world. But the best intentions and resolutions based on unchallengeable principles are at times obstructed by stubborn facts which, whether one likes it or not, have an adverse effect on certain situations. In the circumstances, experience shows that we must follow the dictates of political realism, and that is precisely what the participants in the quadripartite negotiations on the south-western Africa region have been doing.

The task of decolonization, in which the United Nations has been involved ever since it was created, and in which it has enjoyed such success, is unfinished and will remain unfinished until Namibia achieves independence. Decolonization is essentially a matter of ethics, a matter of justice, and when one considers the

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

work that has been done and what remains to be done one realizes that this is a matter of priority. Because of the special characteristics of the situation, the decolonization of Namibia is the primary task that lies ahead of us.

The delegation of Chile is confident that in the course of the current negotiations the participants will show pragmatism and will bear in mind the ethical and spiritual principles of justice that need to be respected if this matter is to be resolved speedily and satisfactorily. We are convinced that human beings are capable of rising above political expediency and narrow interests and can agree on solutions and compromises that are in the interests of law and peace.

News from the written press and from the other media on the results of the round of negotiations held recently in Geneva would seem to justify our conviction. We hope that the next time we have to deal with Namibia in the Assembly we shall be greeting it and expressing our joy as it joins this Organization of free and sovereign countries.

It is on that note of optimism that my delegation wishes to conclude.

Mrs. DARLING (Australia): The question of Namibia has been on the United Nations agenda since the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946. It has consumed an immense amount of time and resources, but despite the persistent efforts of so many, Namibia remains an issue of outstanding importance in the process of decolonization in the 1980s.

Australia has consistently supported the people of Namibia in their struggle for self-determination and independence, and we continue to do so. We continue, too, to believe that the implementation of proposals contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) offer the best possible process and path to independence for Namibia. On 29 September this year, the tenth anniversary of the adoption by the Security Council of that resolution at its 2087th meeting came and went. Namibia is still not independent.

But we have seen in the past year, and in particular in recent days, significant activity in the fight for Namibian independence which has renewed our hopes. We have seen the welcome participation of South Africa, Angola and Cuba in a process of ongoing negotiations mediated by Mr. Chester Crocker of the United States. We have seen an agreement on 20 July this year by those three Governments to a set of 14 very important principles for a comprehensive and peaceful settlement in south-western Africa. We have seen the setting in motion by the United Nations of the administrative machinery for the implementation of its peace plan as set out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have seen a visit by the Secretary-General to the region to discuss practical arrangements for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We have seen the dispatch of a United Nations technical mission to South Africa and Namibia for three weeks in October to update plans for the administrative and logistics requirements and important budgetary provisions for the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. We have seen increased contacts within the region

(Mrs. Darling, Australia)

directed towards encouraging an early and long-term settlement to the problem, and encouraging reports from Geneva yesterday of the negotiations between Angola, Cuba and South Africa.

But, as the Secretary-General said a couple of weeks ago in a statement to the United Nations Council for Namibia, there must be no let up, particularly at this time, in the commitment of the international community to a free and independent Namibia enjoying all the fruits of its own nationhood. And I would like to pay tribute at this point to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, his Special Representative for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, and their staffs for all their very great efforts in support of Namibia's independence. But until that long-awaited independence is assured and Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is implemented, we and other members of the international community have a responsibility to maintain pressure to ensure that the people of Namibia do achieve their Charter rights to self-determination, freedom and national independence.

Speaking in the Australian Parliament just two weeks ago, the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Bob Hawke, welcomed the current initiatives being undertaken to bring about a just, lasting and peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and expressed the hope that a final agreement would soon be reached. He welcomed, and welcomed strongly, the very constructive approach that had been taken so far and called on all parties involved to continue the negotiations to a successful conclusion. We hope that this will happen in the very near future. No one, least of all the Namibian people, can afford to have these negotiations fail.

My delegation recognizes that there may still remain some issues to be settled between the parties, but we are encouraged by these recent developments. While Australia does not accept any linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) for Namibia's independence and other extraneous issues such as Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola, we would see agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban

(Mrs. Darling, Australia)

troops as an important step forward. It would remove an excuse for South Africa's failure to implement the plan contained in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). At the same time we look to the South African Government to cease its support for guerilla movements opposed to the Government in Angola.

An integral part of the plan approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the deployment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to monitor the implementation of the peace plan. Nearly 10 years ago, in 1979, Australia offered to provide an engineering logistics contingent totalling some 300 people to UNTAG. When United Nations officials approached Australia recently as part of the renewed process of setting in motion the administrative machinery for the emplacement of UNTAG, the Australian Government very quickly reaffirmed this long-standing commitment and advised the United Nations accordingly. Also, Australia has recently provided the United Nations Secretariat with an Australian officer, on secondment, to assist with the logistical planning for UNTAG.

Australia has been a committed member of the United Nations Council for Namibia for many years. My delegation has been an active participant in Council and Committee activities during that time, and we will continue to be so. We also shall continue our voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

In the first week of September this year Australia had the pleasure of welcoming a mission of consultation from the Council led by its President, Ambassador Peter Zuze, the first such mission to Australia since 1984. That mission briefed the Government on the situation in Namibia, met with the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs, Trade and Defence, and held talks with senior officials of a number of major Government departments. I would like to take this opportunity to express the Australian delegation's particular gratitude to Ambassador Zuze for the energy and sense of purpose he has shown in leading the Council, and we will continue to look to his leadership in the coming months.

(Mrs. Darling, Australia)

It is our heartfelt hope that this will be the last year in which it will be necessary when we meet in this Hall to reiterate calls for Namibia's overdue independence and that our next task will be to welcome Namibia as a new and independent Member of the United Nations.

Mr. NIYUNGEKO (Burundi) (interpretation from French): The head of my delegation to the forty-third session of the General Assembly, had the opportunity during the general debate to offer Mr. Dante Caputo our congratulations on his election to preside over our work. Today I should like to add my congratulations to his and to assure Mr. Caputo that the manner in which he is conducting our debates will ensure successful results.

My country, which accords special importance to the Namibian question and which therefore generally takes part in its consideration, wishes once again to be associated with those that openly and whole-heartedly defend the just cause of the Namibian people.

The right of States to determine their own future is an inalienable and absolute right and my delegation greatly appreciates the enormous, persistent and fruitful work carried out by the United Nations since its establishment to ensure world-wide respect for that inalienable principle. It is by virtue of that right that a great many countries are represented here today. It is that same right that we claim for our brothers and sisters in Namibia.

We commend the tenacity and courage of the valiant Namibian fighters organized under the banner of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole and authentic representative, who have succeeded in controlling destiny and forcing South Africa to recognize that right.

Experience shows that the heroic resistance of subjugated, exploited and dispossessed peoples has always ended by shaking the prestige of dominant, colonial Powers to its very foundations. That lesson of history will once again be demonstrated in the case of South Africa, whose last moments of colonialist hegemony in Namibia are quite clearly at hand. We are certain that it cannot escape its fate. Arrogant and threatening yesterday, the racist, criminal régime of South Africa, today harassed by its trials in the field both in Namibia and

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

within South Africa itself is pretending to listen to the voice of human intelligence. That is ray of hope that my delegation sees in the recent development in the tripartite negotiations now under way between the People's Republic of Angola, the Republic of Cuba and South Africa, with the mediation of the United States of America, on implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia.

This optimism must be qualified, however. My delegation is convinced that no one should be deceived by the so-called repentance of a country which has more than once betrayed its negotiating partners, particularly when it assumed the right to administer Namibia as it saw fit in violation of the Mandate entrusted to it by the League of Nations in 1920.

That treachery was once again confirmed when South Africa, a signatory to the United Nations Charter, refused to place Namibia under the Trusteeship System as laid down in the Charter.

It was the same South Africa that caused the failure of the initiative of what is known as the contact group by the introduction of extraneous elements, just as negotiations on Namibian independence were about to be completed.

Those now involved in the negotiations on Namibia's independence, which began on 3 May 1988 in London and were continued in Brazzaville, Cairo, New York and Geneva, certainly saw with a certain frustration and bitterness the date of 1 November 1988, the date proposed by South Africa for the beginning of the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia, come and go.

Despite such duplicity in South Africa's policy concerning Namibia's accession to independence, my delegation welcomes the constant efforts of the United Nations and the international community to secure increasingly effective isolation of South Africa in order to force it to listen to the voice of reason.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

Year after year the forces supporting the just cause of the Namibian people have become more numerous, imposing and active, thereby exerting effective pressure on the heinous apartheid régime. It is that situation that has compelled South Africa finally to take part in negotiations to remove the obstacles to Namibia's independence.

The trials of strength with the military forces of Angola supported by Cuban internationalist troops having proved very costly, South Africa has been forced to consider implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and withdrawing its troops from Angola before they are defeated on the battlefield and the myth of South Africa's invincibility and military superiority is destroyed.

That is why my delegation continues to urge the international community as a whole to redouble its efforts, to be vigilant and to adopt enforcement measures against South Africa until a free and independent Namibia has been established.

In this connection, it has been unanimously emphasized here many times that foreign economic interests in Namibia and in South Africa constitute the greatest obstacle to Namibia's accession to freedom and sovereignty. Furthermore, we continue to associate ourselves with those that insist that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions as desired by the majority of the international public is the only peaceful way to make the Pretoria régime heed the voice of reason. My delegation remains convinced that those which, for reasons that have never carried conviction, refuse to apply comprehensive sanctions against Pretoria to a great extent hold the key to the solution of the Namibian problem.

It is the duty of the United Nations to shoulder its direct responsibility for Namibia in accordance with the mandate of resolution 2145 (XXI), and Burundi believes that this task will have been carried out only when the Territory of Namibia has recovered all its sovereign attributes.

(Mr. Niyungeko, Burundi)

In this context, we hope that the campaign for the mobilization of public opinion will continue. That is why we recommend that the forty-third session of the General Assembly unanimously endorse resolution 1988/56, adopted by the Economic and Social Council on 7 July. In paragraph 9 of that resolution, the Council

"Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to establish by 1989 a panel of eminent persons to conduct public hearings in Europe on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia, with a view to further mobilizing public opinion to induce home Governments and transnational corporations to cease any kind of collaboration with the South African régime." (E/1988/INF/8, p. 21)

In the case of the United Nations Programme of Action for Namibia, my delegation wishes to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is sparing no effort to fulfil its mandate. We support without reservation the programme proposed by the Council for Namibia for 1989.

We believe that the day is drawing near when Pretoria will have to make its act of contrition and resign itself bitterly to seeing Namibia, under the aegis of SWAPO, proud, free and independent, mount amid acclamation this rostrum from which its erstwhile masters have tried to exclude it for all time.

This is the simplest lesson of the history of colonialism, the most obvious conclusion from recent developments, particularly in the subregion of southern Africa. In the final analysis it is undeniable that for the valiant people of Namibia the roots of colonization, oppression and exploitation have already begun to wither and give way to those of freedom and dignity.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that the draft resolutions submitted under this item may have programme budget implications. The voting on these draft resolutions will therefore take place tomorrow afternoon after consideration of item 34, "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)".

(The President)

I shall now call on representatives wishing 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 intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. MATNAI (Israel): In what has become something of a tradition, yesterday the representative of Saudi Arabia once again felt the need to attack my country. That is regrettable, for every time he launches these attacks he reveals his disdain for this forum. He displays paramount hypocrisy; and, in this case, by interjecting extraneous and unwarranted remarks into a debate on the question of Namibia, the Saudi representative once again is trivializing the serious issue of apartheid.

It is always puzzling when the representative of Saudi Arabia, of all countries, lectures others on human rights, humanitarianism and racism. Can we take his remarks seriously? He comes from a country where slavery was officially banned only a few years ago, where women do not even enjoy the most fundamental human rights, where censorship is the rule rather than the exception, where the rule of law is an alien concept, where suspected criminals are decapitated in public squares, and where people are arbitrarily detained and deported.

Saudi hypocrisy is particularly evident in the case of South Africa. The Saudi representative falsely accuses my Government of "collaboration" with South Africa. At this very moment, I am sure, a huge oil tanker is sitting in one of the Saudi ports full of Saudi oil, preparing to set sail for South Africa. Saudi Arabia's oil trade with South Africa is a fact confirmed by this Organization and independent groups around the world.

(Mr. Matnai, Israel)

Let me advise the Saudi representative to turn his attention towards his home before falsely attacking others in this forum. Such disruptions only divert the work we are trying to accomplish. My delegation hopes these disruptions will be discontinued.

Mr. ALLAGHANY (Saudi Arabia): For the representative of Israel to speak of slavery in Saudi Arabia at a time when the whole world is witness to what is going on in the occupied areas is an insult to every single representative from an African country sitting in this Hall. Most African countries are represented in Saudi Arabia; they have been there for many, many years. If they knew about slavery, they would not have waited for the representative of Israel to bring the subject up. We have heard this several times before; I only mention it to show people how Israel tries to divert the attention of the world community from what is going on by way of real slavery, occupation and the killing of innocent women and children - even three-year-old children - about which we read about in the newspapers daily. And they talk to us about slavery!

As for women, I wish women in the occupied areas were treated as women are in Saudi Arabia. I ask the representative of Israel: How are women treated in Saudi Arabia? Give me some details. Do we shoot them in the streets? Do we knock them down on the ground and let blood pour from their faces, as we see daily on television - or at least on what the Israelis allow on television? Does the representative of Israel wish to speak about censorship? Everybody knows the military censorship that is going on right now in his country and in the occupied areas.

As to oil, my country is open to an investigative team from the United Nations. It may travel to Saudi Arabia at the expense of Saudi Arabia to check this so-called boat now "docked" in Saudi Arabia, or any other vessel. I make this

(Mr. Allaghany, Saudi Arabia)

suggestion formally, to be taken up by anybody. We have co-operated with the United Nations committee on shipping, and we have given it full information.

There are people who fish in troubled waters, who have accused not only Saudi Arabia but also African countries. All we can say is that we are willing to take part in any international effort that is serious about getting to the bottom of this.

At a time when the United Nations has come out with a report on the relationship between South Africa and Israel, the representative of Israel is trying to draw our attention to the so-called selling of oil to South Africa. That is all part of the diversionary tactics used to keep people from even thinking about what is going on in the occupied areas.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.