



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.80
19 November 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 18 November 1985, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)
later: Mr. OYUÉ (Vice-President) (Gabon)

United Nations World Conference for the International Youth Year
(plenary meetings devoted to policies and programmes
relating to youth in accordance with resolution 39/22
of 23 November 1984)

- International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace: report of the Third Committee [89] (continued)
 - Policies and programmes relating to youth: report of the Third Committee [95] (continued)
 - Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session: [65]
 - (i) Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations: report of the First Committee (Part I)
- /...

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.

- Question of Namibia: [34]

- (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

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS WORLD CONFERENCE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR
(PLENARY MEETINGS DEVOTED TO POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES
RELATING TO YOUTH IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 39/22
OF 23 NOVEMBER 1984)

AGENDA ITEMS 89 AND 95 (continued)

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/40/855)

POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/40/856)

Mr. Kabore (Burkina Faso), Rapporteur of the Third Committee, presented the reports of that Committee (A/40/855 and A/40/856) and then spoke as follows:

Mr. KABORE (Burkina Faso), Rapporteur of the Third Committee

(interpretation from French): I have the honour of placing before the General Assembly the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 89 (A/40/855) and 95 (A/40/856). These deal with International Youth Year, of which the theme is "Participation, Development, Peace".

I would remind the General Assembly that at its 3rd plenary meeting, on 20 September, it decided, on the recommendation of the General Committee to allocate these items to the Third Committee and to confine itself at the fortieth session to considering the aspects which refer to youth policies and programmes in accordance with resolution 39/22, of 23 November 1984, on the celebration of 1985 as International Youth Year.

The Third Committee devoted several meetings between 18 October and 3 November to considering youth problems, particularly those concerning International Youth Year itself, appropriate efforts and measures to guarantee the implementation of human rights and to ensure that they are enjoyed by young people, in particular the right to education and to work, youth programmes and policies and, finally, opportunities afforded young people.

(Mr. Kabore, Rapporteur,
Third Committee)

In so doing, the Third Committee considered the reports of the Secretary-General (A/40/64 and A/40/701), the report of the Advisory Committee for International Youth Year (A/40/256) and several letters addressed to the Secretary-General by Permanent Representatives to the United Nations. The complete list of the documentation before the Committee is given in paragraph 3 of the report in document (A/40/85 , .

In the light of the foregoing, the Third Committee recommends that the General Assembly adopt the three draft resolutions in paragraph 12 of its report in document A/40/855 and the draft resolution in paragraph 7 of its report in document A/40/156.

I should like to draw attention to the fact that all those draft resolutions were adopted without a vote by the Committee. The General Assembly may care to do likewise.

The PRESIDENT: (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee.

I invite members to turn their attention to the two reports of the Third Committee.

We shall first consider the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 89, entitled "International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace" (A/40/855). The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on the three draft resolutions contained in paragraph 12 of that report.

The Committee approved draft resolution 1 entitled "International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace", without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 40/14).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee approved draft resolution II, "Efforts and measures for securing the implementation and the enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 40/15).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution III, entitled "Opportunities for youth", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 40/16).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 89.

We shall now take up the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 95, "Policies and programmes relating to youth " (A/40/856). The recommendation of the Third Committee is in paragraph 7 of its report.

The draft resolution, entitled "Channels of communication between the United Nations and youth and youth organizations", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 40/17).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from the Spanish): We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 95.

AGENDA ITEM 65

REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION:

- (i) BILATERAL NUCLEAR-ARMS NEGOTIATIONS: REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (PART I) (A/40/877)

Mr. Souliotis (Greece), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/40/877) (Part I) and then spoke as follows:

Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece), Rapporteur of the First Committee (interpretation from French): I have the honour to introduce Part I of the First Committee's report on agenda item 65, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session" (A/40/877). This part of the report contains one draft resolution, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations". It is presented to the Assembly separately so that a swift decision may be taken to make it possible for the steps spelt out in the last paragraph of the draft resolution to be implemented.

It is not necessary to go into the details of the draft resolution, which the Committee recommends for adoption in paragraph 8 of its report. All mankind hopes that the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will give a further impetus to the bilateral negotiations now under way. I am certain that I speak for everyone here when I express the hope that the result of the Summit Meeting will contribute to promoting the objectives we are all striving for, which, in the final analysis, would strengthen international security.

On behalf of the First Committee, I submit the draft resolution to the Assembly for adoption.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall consider that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind Members that, in paragraph 7 of its decision 34/401, the General Assembly decided that, when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee.

May I also remind members that, in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

I now invite members to turn their attention to Part I of the report of the First Committee on agenda item 65, "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session" (A/40/877).

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of the report of the First Committee (A/40/877). The draft resolution is entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 40/18)*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have thus concluded our consideration of agenda item 65 (i).

* Subsequently the following delegations advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

AGENDA ITEM 34

QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL FOR NAMIBIA (A/40/24)
- (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/40/23 (PART VI), A/AC.109/824, 825 AND 826)
- (c) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/687, AND ADD. 1)
- (d) REPORT OF THE FOURTH COMMITTEE (A/40/882)
- (e) DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/40/24 (PART IV): (CHAPS. I AND II))

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has before it, among other documents, the report of the Fourth Committee concerning the hearings of organizations (A/40/882).

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of that report?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to propose that the list of speakers on this item be closed tomorrow at 12 noon. May I take it that there is no objection to this proposal?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): May I request representatives wishing to participate in the debate to add their names to the list of speakers as soon as possible.

Mr. Arnouss (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur 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, presented the report of that Committee (A/40/23 (Part VI) and then spoke as follows:

Mr. ARNOUSS (Syrian Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24): As Rapporteur 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, I have the honour to introduce to the General Assembly the chapter of the report of the Special Committee (A/40/23 (Part VI)) covering its work during 1985 concerning the question of Namibia.

The report, which relates to agenda item 34, is submitted pursuant to operative paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 39/91, of 14 December 1984, on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the General Assembly requested the Special Committee

"to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in all Territories that have not yet attained independence and, in particular:

"(a) To formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism...". (resolution 39/91, para. 12)

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Committee of 24)

In continuing to perform these tasks in relation to the question of Namibia, the Special Committee took into consideration the various relevant resolutions of the General Assembly concerning this question, in particular resolution 39/50, as well as the related decisions of the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia.

As will be noted from the report, the Special Committee took up the question of Namibia during its extraordinary session held at Tunis in May in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The debate at Tunis, in which a number of representatives at the highest level took part, focused on the further-deteriorating situation in and around Namibia. Taking into account the statements made in the debate and on the basis of the Chairman's consultations with all concerned, including the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Special Committee adopted a consensus decision on this important question, which is reproduced in paragraph 12 of the report.

In this consensus the Committee reaffirmed that the question of Namibia was a burning issue of primary importance in the process of decolonization and noted with grave concern the critical situation in and around Namibia resulting from the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by the racist minority régime of South Africa. The Committee reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with the Charter and General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2145 (XXI) and subsequent resolutions relating to Namibia. It also reaffirmed the legitimacy of the freedom struggle of the Namibian people by all means at their disposal to achieve that right and reiterated its conviction that the apartheid régime of South Africa was

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Committee of 24)

responsible for creating a situation which seriously threatened international peace and security as a result of its persistent non-compliance with and violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions, in the form of denial to the people of Namibia of their most basic rights; its ruthless resort to repression of and violence against the Namibian people; its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States; its continued manoeuvres to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); and its sinister attempts to impose on the people of Namibia an internal settlement.

The Committee rejected and denounced all manoeuvres by South Africa to bring about a sham independence in Namibia through fraudulent constitutional and political schemes designed to perpetuate South Africa's colonial domination in Namibia and strongly condemned the latest attempt by South Africa to impose an internal settlement through the so-called multi-party conference and the establishment of an "interim government".

The Committee also reiterated that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). It reaffirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remained the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and reiterated the need to proceed to its immediate implementation without modification, qualification or pre-condition.

The Committee firmly rejected the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish a linkage between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous and irrelevant issues and called upon those who drew such a linkage to abandon the policy immediately.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Committee of 24)

In reaffirming that the national liberation movement of Namibia, SWAPO, was the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, the Committee strongly condemned the illegal South African Administration for its persistent and systematic attempts to undermine, discredit and destroy that organization and its members and supporters, through arbitrary arrests, torture, intimidation and terror.

In condemning South Africa for its ever-increasing and large-scale military build-up in Namibia, its introduction of compulsory military service for Namibians, its forced recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies and its use of mercenaries to reinforce its illegal occupation of the Territory, the Committee called upon all States to take effective measures to prevent the recruitment, training and transit of mercenaries for service in Namibia. It further condemned the continued military, nuclear and intelligence collaboration between South Africa and certain Western and other countries, which constituted a violation of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977.

The Committee thus urged the Security Council to adopt further measures to widen the scope of resolution 418 (1977) in order to make it more effective and comprehensive. The Committee deplored the continuing collaboration of certain Western and other countries with the racist régime of South Africa in the political, economic, military and nuclear fields and reiterated its conviction that such collaboration undermined international solidarity against the apartheid régime and helped to perpetuate that régime's illegal occupation of Namibia. The Committee condemned and rejected the policy of so-called constructive engagement, which had further emboldened the apartheid régime to intensify its repression of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, to escalate its aggression against independent African States and to continue its intransigence over the independence of Namibia, against the wishes and aspirations of the Namibian people.

(Mr. Arnouss, Rapporteur,
Committee of 24)

In reaffirming that the natural resources of Namibia were the inviolable and uncontestable heritage of the Namibian people, the Committee strongly condemned South Africa's illegal exploitation of such resources, including its illegal extension of the territorial sea, the proclamation of a purported exclusive economic zone off the coast of Namibia and its illegal exploitation of the Territory's marine resources. It condemned the South African and other foreign economic interests which continued to exploit those resources in disregard of United Nations resolutions and decisions, in particular Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, and demanded that such exploitation cease forthwith.

Finally, the Committee recommended that the Security Council, which had been prevented from discharging effectively its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security in the region owing to the opposition of certain Western permanent members, respond positively to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that country under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.

On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend the report to the serious attention of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, who will introduce the Council's report.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana), Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: I should like at the outset to express our sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his untiring efforts on behalf of the people of Namibia, and in particular for endeavouring to secure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

Since the Assembly last considered the question of Namibia, no one can reasonably assert that the prospects for Namibia's independence are brighter now than they were at the time of last year's debate. As recently as 6 September last, in his report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that there had been no progress in his consultations with the South Africans with regard to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

South Africa's iron hand still rests heavily on the Territory of Namibia. It continues to regulate all aspects of the lives of the Namibian people. In such important areas as housing, education, health facilities and in the structure of wages, it continues to be clear that white Namibia is still white Namibia, and black Namibia is still black Namibia.

South Africa's acts of aggression against its neighbours have continued, and the purpose of these attacks is to raise the price these States have to pay for their support of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the African National Congress (ANC). Lesotho has been the victim of such acts, as have Botswana and Mozambique. Who can forget the invasion of Angola in June by about 1,500 South African troops on what was described as a "search and destroy mission"; or the so-called "Operation Iron Fist" invasion of northern Namibia near the Angolan border in the same month? That was described as the largest example of conventional warfare inside Namibia undertaken up to that date by the racist régime. Southern Angola has been turned into a veritable military camp for the

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

conduct of what South Africa terms the curbing of SWAPO military activity in northern Namibia.

The South West Africa People's Organization, the vanguard of the struggle of the Namibian people for their independence, has been waging a gallant struggle on their behalf against the racist, imperialist régime. In spite of the odds against them, the SWAPO forces have achieved significant successes against the enemy, for which we salute them.

The last year has also seen a continuation, even an intensification, of attempts by the Pretoria régime to install, in Namibia its own structures which would be responsive to its own designs for the future of the Territory. In this regard, we recall the proclamation of a so-called interim Government in Namibia. While this device has been categorically condemned by the Security Council, and indeed by the entire international community, as it ought to have been, its creation is undoubtedly a complicating factor, as the Secretary-General has stated.

As if the creation of the so-called interim Government were not enough in defiance of this Organization, in the course of the consideration of the question of Namibia by the Security Council last week the South Africans even requested formally, and without a blush, that the Council hear the views of the members of what they had created in Namibia.

The South Africans now have finally responded to the Secretary-General regarding their choice of the electoral system as called for in resolution 539 (1983) thereby removing what was the only outstanding issue where the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) is concerned. But they did not do so without raising another issue, one which all of us know was settled as long ago as 1982 - that of impartiality. There seems to be no end to South Africa's bad faith and intransigence. And, of course, the South Africans continue to insist on

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

linking Namibia's independence with withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. This was reiterated as recently as last Wednesday in the Security Council, even though the Council itself categorically had rejected such linkage.

But South Africa's continuing repression and intransigence are only one side of the picture. There is another side which it is essential that members of this Assembly keep in mind as we approach this year's consideration of the question of Namibia.

We are all aware, of course, how deeply South Africa's apartheid system has touched the hearts and lives of peoples all over the world. This year we have witnessed a veritable revolution in the process of informing the world about the realities of apartheid. How many of us in this Assembly, for example, have not retired at the close of many a day with our minds disturbed by visions of South African police kicking, whipping or shooting to death unarmed black people who dare to vent their anger at years of oppression and deprivation? The result of that increased consciousness is that more people and more governments in more countries than ever before are now locked in the struggle to bring an end to that hateful and criminal apartheid system. Consequently, the Pretoria régime now finds itself an object of unprecedented international pressure and isolation.

The Council for Namibia has been consistently calling for such international pressure upon and isolation of the régime which continues its illegal occupation of the territory of Namibia, and we express gratitude to all those States, institutions, and people who have taken a stand against the Pretoria régime.

What does not make as many headlines as the international effort in support of the struggling people of South Africa is that in support of the struggling people of Namibia and of SWAPO. The Council for Namibia has been active in all regions of the world during the past year on behalf of the people of Namibia, and we are most

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

gratified and encouraged by the rising levels of enthusiasm and support for the cause which we have found, particularly in Western Europe and North America. Of course we know full well the extent of the support which the cause of Namibia enjoys in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as in Eastern Europe. Western European States, in keeping with their greater historical and geographical closeness to Africa in general, are keenly interested in the development and future of the Namibian question. Our contacts with them this year have been substantive and meaningful, and these States, we have found, endeavour to match their political expression with practical demonstrations, whether in the form of contributions to the Fund for Namibia, the Nationhood Programme, or of direct support to SWAPO. I am here referring to Western European States in general. There are, unfortunately, a small minority of them whose attitudes clearly show less support for Namibia's evolution to independence.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

In general, however, while there are still important actions which we as a Council feel we must recommend for consideration by Western European States in respect of Namibia, and which we shall draw to the attention of the Governments concerned in the course of next year, in general, I say, our contacts with these States have been useful and encouraging.

At the level of non-governmental organizations, Parliamentarians, Namibia support groups, individual lawyers and researchers and friends of Namibia, however, we have found a commitment to Namibia's liberation which is most commendable - not only for the steadfastness which it is expressed, but also for the courage and sacrifice with which it is pursued. Non-governmental organizations and the other categories I have just mentioned have been making outstanding contributions in support of the struggle for Namibia's liberation, educating the people in their societies about the realities of the Namibian question, about the legal status of the Territory, about South Africa's illegal occupation and the manner in which co-operation between their respective Governments and South Africa helps to prolong that occupation, and also about the role of SWAPO. Thanks to their efforts, Namibia has become a human issue which increasing numbers of Europeans know about and care about. The non-governmental organizations have constituted a source of intelligent and well-co-ordinated pressure on their respective Governments and are responsible for stimulating the consciences of peoples in a region to which South Africa has traditionally looked for support.

The point I wish to make is that our contacts during the last year enable us to state to this Assembly that the media with which we in New York are in the most frequent contact do an injustice to the struggle of the Namibian people and to SWAPO. That struggle enjoys far greater support than the media here ever give one to understand. SWAPO is better known, better understood and has greater support than the media here report.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

In the light of all the foregoing, and notwithstanding the obstinacy and intransigence of Pretoria, the Council is not discouraged. We are certainly anguished at the continuation of suffering in Namibia. We are concerned that 40 years after the creation of the United Nations the benefits of the international Organization do not yet extend to the people of Namibia. We are concerned, too, that 25 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Namibia is still a nation-in-waiting. We are deeply disturbed that in November 1985 two permanent members of the Security Council have found it necessary to veto a resolution calling for, among other things, sanctions against South Africa. It pains us that beyond the rhetoric of some, the concern still seems to be essentially that of protecting profits, rather than justice and decency and law.

This double veto concerns us because of several considerations, not least of which is the kind of signal it inevitably sends to the Pretoria régime at a moment when that régime is under such intense international pressure and, what is more, just after South Africa had responded with regard to its choice of the electoral system. In other words, immediately after South Africa finally gave the response which brought an end to the last phase before implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), just when we thought there would be a decisive move for the prompt implementation of that resolution, South Africa received a signal that it could continue to rely on its traditional sources of support.

What makes us not discouraged however, is our sense of history: our sense of history and also our faith in peoples, in this case the people of South Africa and of Namibia in particular. That historic process by which peoples subject to alien domination free themselves has begun and is at work in South Africa and in Namibia. Its results have been consistent in the past. Namibia also will be free.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

What is more, the struggle for freedom from the oppressive Pretoria régime now has an international participation which is unprecedented in the history of colonial struggles. It is Pretoria against the rest of the world; or most of the rest of the world, at any rate. The forces on the side of Namibia's freedom are greater than those on the side of Namibia's continued domination.

Be that as it may, the outcome, though certain, will not be achieved without the much more sweat, tears and even blood. The readiness of the people of Namibia even so to continue their struggle was reaffirmed only last week in the Security Council by the Secretary-General of SWAPO. But this Assembly must continue to give the most unequivocal support to that struggle and to SWAPO, in order to enable it to prosecute that struggle and, in this regard, the Council has sought to give guidance, once again, with regard to the areas and the types of support that are particularly relevant, and here I recommend our draft resolutions to the consideration of Member States. The first recommendation includes appeals for specific courses of action by States, both individually and collectively, to help advance Namibia's freedom struggle and to intensify support for SWAPO.

The draft resolutions will be introduced to this Assembly individually at a later stage, but I merely wish to state now, in an attempt to enhance everyone's appreciation of the importance and urgency of finding a solution to the Namibian question, that 1986 will mark the twentieth anniversary at once of the termination of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory, of the assumption by the United Nations of direct responsibility for the Territory, and of the launching of the armed struggle by SWAPO. Our draft resolutions contemplate specific activities to mark these anniversaries and we hope that the passage of this twenty-year period will serve to stimulate action by all States to exert maximum and decisive pressure on South Arica to co-operate in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

Of course, implementation of that resolution is the subject of a separate draft resolution. Now that South Africa has at last indicated its choice of the electoral system, all the conditions are satisfied for its implementation, and we expect that the necessary pressure will be placed on South Africa for its co-operation in this exercise.

In preparing our draft resolutions on this question, the Council has sought to emphasize principally the suffering of the Namibian people under the illegal occupying Pretoria régime, the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory of Namibia, the need for South Africa to co-operate with the United Nations in its efforts to give prompt effect to that responsibility, the need for States to exert maximum pressure on South Africa to co-operate with the United Nations, the need for States to refrain from actions which have the effect of giving comfort to South Africa in its continuing occupation of Namibia or which help to prolong that occupation, and the need to maximize political, moral and material support for SWAPO. That is what our draft resolutions are about, and it is in relation to those main considerations that we wish them to be judged.

Some States have been expressing great concern over what they have called the name-calling aspect of our previous draft resolutions. We are all aware, of course, that the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice and certain resolutions of the Security Council have been most emphatic against actions by States which amount to collaboration with the Pretoria régime in respect of Namibia. The Council, for its part, does have an overwhelming concern that there are some States whose actions with regard to the régime in respect of Namibia amount to precisely such collaboration, or have the effect of giving comfort and support to South Africa in its illegal occupation, even as the United Nations tries to bring that occupation to an end, or which otherwise facilitate that occupation,

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President,
Council for Namibia)

and we have sought to say so, as we think we have a duty to do as legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Yet as Members of this Assembly we had no wish to be insensitive to or to disregard the concerns expressed. We have consciously taken them into consideration, and to the extent that the interests of consensus or of faithfulness to our duty allowed, we have made some adjustments to satisfy those concerns.

(Mr. Sinclair, Acting President
Council for Namibia)

For the rest we expect Member States to examine what we have proposed in this regard and determine for themselves whether the contexts are accurate or whether what we attribute to this or that State is on the basis of their own information so attributable, and that they will proceed accordingly.

We sincerely hope that all States which collaborate with South Africa will desist from so doing and will instead exert all pressure on the Pretoria régime to co-operate in implementing promptly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). There would then be no need to call names, no need even for a debate on Namibia with draft resolutions to be considered. Meanwhile, we do hope that States will understand the depth of our concern for the people of Namibia and share our impatience for Namibia to be free without further delay.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Special Committee of 24): As we begin the debate on the question of Namibia today we find ourselves addressing a situation which, if not worse, is not at all dissimilar to that which confronted this Organization exactly one year ago: the continued illegal occupation of a Territory for the administration of which the United Nations has long declared itself directly responsible. That this deplorable reality continues to exist is not for lack of action or initiative on the part of the international community, for we are deeply conscious of the fact that the United Nations has throughout the year continued to exert its concerted efforts with a view to launching the process leading to a free and independent Namibia within the shortest possible time frame.

(Mr. Koroma, Special
Committee of 24)

Indeed, twice in the year the Security Council has devoted its collective attention to the question. Likewise, every aspect of the situation obtaining in and around Namibia has been carefully reviewed by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Special Committee of 24, too, has given extensive consideration to this question within the context of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The two bodies have also held special sessions, seminars and conferences devoted to specific aspects of the situation in the Territory.

Extensive hearings were also held by the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in relation to the adverse effects of the activities of international consortia in and around Namibia. Furthermore, the Economic and Social Council took up once again, at its second regular session, the question of how best to assist the people of Namibia and their national liberation movement through various activities and programmes of assistance of the United Nations system of organizations.

That the situation continues to deteriorate, as it does despite the manifest and determined will of the international community, is due solely to the intransigence, stubbornness and obduracy of the racist minority régime of South Africa, which is desperately attempting to cling to its last bastion of colonial and racial domination.

As reported in full by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee some time ago and as reiterated by a number of United Nations bodies concerned during the course of the year, the only political solution for Namibia is one based in the first instance on the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation and the withdrawal of its illegal forces and, secondly, on the free and unfettered exercise by all Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). To that end, it is

(Mr. Koroma, Special
Committee of 24)

imperative that elections be organized without further delay, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, in the whole of Namibia as one political entity, as called for in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

Any attempt to undermine the international consensus embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be strongly resisted, for that consensus represents an acceptable common denominator for a peaceful transition by Namibia to independence. In that context, attempts to establish a linkage between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous and irrelevant issues must necessarily be rejected, as such linkage not only impedes the decolonization of Namibia but also, more importantly, constitutes serious interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign African State, Angola.

In the light of the continuing defiance by South Africa of its Charter obligations and its persistent use of force to perpetuate its illegal domination of the Territory, as well as its repeated acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States, the effective application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter remains the key by which the United Nations could obtain South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Security Council.

Doubts have been cast by some on the wisdom of applying measures which might adversely affect the very people whose liberation we are endeavouring to bring about. To that, Bishop Tutu and a number of other South Africans and Namibians have unambiguously responded that the suffering they endure under colonial and racist repression could not in any way be worsened by such measures, as these indeed represent the only viable alternative to the continuation of the life constantly threatened by a wholesale massacre and attempts at annihilation.

No less crucial is the pressing need for providing increased and effective support to the struggling people of Namibia and their sole and authentic national liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). While

(Mr. Koroma, Special
Committee of 24)

several agencies and organizations of the United Nations system have, albeit in varying degrees, continued to extend assistance to them, the level of assistance rendered to date is far from adequate. We must be mindful that the international community has a particular responsibility to ensure that, through the Nationhood Programme and the Institute for Namibia, all possible steps are being taken to offer the maximum training opportunities for the people in preparing themselves for the establishment soon of an independent, sovereign Namibia.

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

(Mr. Koroma, Special
Committee of 24)

We cannot ignore the serious threat to international peace and security in the region, nor can we, except at our own peril, continue to remain inactive in the face of the grave injustice and human suffering inflicted upon the majority of the peoples in southern Africa. We must realize that our Organization is further weakened by the frustration, disillusionment and mistrust which the perpetuation of this state of affairs engenders. Our action is long overdue; we must act decisively and without any further equivocation, for we know full well that no veto can forestall the irreversible tide of liberation, nor can it stifle the true aspirations of the peoples concerned for freedom and independence.

I should like at this juncture to reiterate that the spirit of accommodation, patience and statesmanship continuously demonstrated by the leaders of SWAPO deserves our warmest tribute. For its part, the Special Committee will continue to extend to SWAPO and, through it, to the people of Namibia, its full support in their struggle to achieve the goal of a free, democratic, independent Namibia. In the same context, I wish to pay a special tribute to the leaders of the front-line States and others for the crucial role they have played and are continuing to play in support of the cause of the Namibian people.

I should like also, on behalf of the Special Committee, to pay a particular tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the important task it has continued to carry out so effectively under the leadership of its Acting President, Ambassador Noel Sinclair of Guyana. We also commend the efforts of the Commissioner for Namibia, and will encourage him to continue in those efforts. It goes without saying that the Council should continue to be given the full co-operation of all the Member States so that it can continue to discharge its responsibilities with even greater effectiveness.

(Mr. Koroma, Special
Committee of 24)

I am confident that, under your leadership and guidance, Sir, and with your skill and diplomacy, the work of this Assembly at this session will make a further positive contribution towards the total liberation of Namibia from illegal, colonial domination.

Before concluding, I should like to pay a warm tribute to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his continuing efforts in search for a satisfactory solution to the problem of Namibia.

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

Mr. TOIVO ja TOIVO (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): It is an honour and privilege for me once again to address this body, particularly at its historic fortieth session.

It is an honour and privilege, Sir, for me to congratulate you most sincerely on your unanimous election as President of the fortieth session of the General Assembly. Your vast experience in the United Nations, your diplomacy and your personal qualities of wisdom and dedication to justice and peace qualify you to steer the work of this session successfully.

I have the duty of presenting to the General Assembly of the United Nations the demands and aspirations of the embattled people of Namibia for self-determination and national independence. On their behalf, their vanguard national liberation movement, SWAPO, and the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), I bring to all members warm greetings and salutations.

The Namibian people have always had a in high regard for the United Nations, which they accept as their custodian and caretaker until genuine independence. It is precisely with this consciousness that they strongly feel it is long overdue for

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

this body to fulfil its responsibility in carrying out that trust by acting decisively and bringing to an end racist South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its brutal repression, aggression and State terrorism in our country.

Regrettably, as the international community marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Namibia is not yet free. While we hail the many successes of the United Nations in various fields, and particularly in the field of decolonization, Namibia's independence, for which the international community has assumed a solemn and unique responsibility, still remains unfinished business and indeed a sad commentary on the resolve of the international community to bring about Namibia's independence.

May I, therefore, remind the Member States of their responsibility, collectively and individually, to Namibia and its people in carrying out that sacred trust. The failure of the last 40 years and beyond, through commission or omission, should be brought to an end through concerted and firm action against the illegal and colonial régime of South Africa.

When I addressed the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, I had an opportunity to inform this body of the critical situation prevailing then in southern Africa. It should be common knowledge for every reasonable person in this Assembly that the situation has indeed become more dangerous, when the racist régime of South Africa poses an ever increasing threat to international peace and security.

The racist minority régime has unleashed a campaign of terror against the opponents of the evil apartheid system in South Africa. Daily innocent children, unarmed women and men are murdered, shot or maimed by the racist military and police

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

forces, who, under the wide powers provided for them by the dreadful state of emergency imposed by Pretoria recently, have a free hand to commit all kinds of crimes in the service of that neo-nazi junta.

Of late, the régime has decided to carry out such brutalities in darkness, through the clamp-down on the media, which in any case has never been able to say it all, even without the latest action of the racist régime.

We are heartened by the fact that the oppressed majority in South Africa, with whom we share a common destiny, have equalled the challenge by intensifying their struggle by all means at their disposal and shaking the very foundation of apartheid under the dynamic leadership of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa. SWAPO hails their heroic struggle to liberate their motherland from racism, apartheid and exploitation, and to bring about a united non-racial, democratic society in that sister country.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

In our own country, Namibia, the illegal occupation régime of South Africa has escalated its violent repression of our people. The more than 100,000 racist troops stationed in Namibia have increased their brutality, where unarmed men, women and children are their special targets as Namibia has been turned into a shooting range by racist South Africa with its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) supplied heavy machinery.

The current spate of violence in South Africa, unleashed by the Pretoria régime and the repressive measures taken by that neo-Nazi ruling clique, remind us of the same actions in our country. More than two thirds of our country has been under curfew and martial law for the past 13 years, since 1972, under a state of emergency declared by the illegal occupation régime following the general strike of Namibian workers during late 1971, which shook the colonial régime and its imperialist allies. Since then, the Pretoria régime has given wide powers to its occupation troops, its murder squads and police forces to shoot Namibians on sight. Over the years many of our people have died in this way. Many of them maimed and many others disappeared, unaccounted for. Many Namibians have been detained under such repressive measures for long periods of time without trial and tortured, some of whom have died as a result. It is enough to be merely suspected of being a SWAPO member or supporter to risk death, arbitrary detention and torture at the hands of Pretoria's occupation forces.

To add insult to injury, racist South Africa, earlier this year, declared many parts of Namibia as so-called security risk zones, thus further increasing its repression of the Namibian people. The purpose of this action by the apartheid régime was to seal off these areas from the international community and thus to continue its crimes with impunity and to cover up the real military situation inside Namibia. On top of all this, it has always been Pretoria's tactic to commit

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

its crimes in Namibia in darkness. The racist régime has for many years imposed a complete ban on foreign media representatives in Namibia in order to achieve this objective. Nobody is allowed to report the military activities and brutalities by the racist forces in Namibia, except those chosen by the régime itself for the purpose of propagating lies in tune with Pretoria's colonial schemes in Namibia.

Racist South Africa uses its military repression to delay Namibia's independence and to allow itself and Western transnational corporations to continue their massive plunder of Namibian natural resources. It is under these conditions that the apartheid régime has repeatedly imposed bogus institutions on the Namibian people, one after another, in an attempt to create a basis for neo-colonialism. It is worth recalling the former so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance "government" and its so-called National Assembly and Council of Ministers established by Pretoria in 1980. Despite extensive financial and other means of support, all these puppet creations collapsed early in 1983 because they were rejected with the contempt they deserved by the Namibian people. During the same period, Pretoria created the bogus "South West Africa Territorial Force" and "South West Africa Police Force" which were aimed at entrenching structures that would complicate the process of genuine decolonization in Namibia. The last two entities were created for the sinister purpose of converting the anti-colonial struggle being waged by the Namibian people into a civil war forcing our people to fight among themselves through forced military conscription while our country continues to languish under Pretoria's illegal and colonial occupation.

The latest such scheme by Pretoria was the installation of the puppet "interim government" in Windhoek on 17 June this year, once again arrogantly defying and violating the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. This obstructionist action by racist South Africa was rightly condemned and rejected by the

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

international community, including the supreme organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, which in its resolution 566 (1985), declared it null and void. It is our appeal to the General Assembly similarly to condemn and reject this puppet entity.

In its intransigent posture, the racist régime of South Africa continues to rely on the support of its major Western allies in the military, nuclear, economic, political and diplomatic fields. In particular, the Reagan Administration and its now discredited constructive engagement policy, continues to encourage the Pretoria régime in its intransigence and arrogant defiance of world public opinion.

Namibia's independence is still held at ransom to Washington's selfish, imperialist ambitions in the region of southern Africa. By insisting that Cuban forces leave Angola before Namibia attains its independence, essentially the Reagan Administration is bluntly telling the international community that the independence of Namibia is not an urgent issue. All that counts are the geo-political considerations, namely, the economic, strategic and military interests of United States imperialism. The choice of Washington, therefore, has been the latter over the human suffering and denial of our basic human rights by the Pretoria régime.

This community of interests between racist South Africa and the Reagan Administration has not only prevented the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) but, above all, both have tried to remove the question of Namibia from the United Nations where it belongs. Needless to say, this notorious linkage theory has been widely condemned and rejected as unwarranted and irrelevant to the independence of Namibia. This body is therefore called upon to assume its full responsibility over Namibia, in accordance with its resolutions 1514 (XV) of 1960, 2145 (XXI) of 1966, and 2248 (S-V) of 1967 until Namibia is genuinely free.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

Beyond South Africa and Namibia, the Pretoria junta has been encouraged by the constructive engagement policy to escalate its military aggression, subversion and destabilization of front-line and other independent African States in the region. Suffice it to recall the aborted racist attack on Cabinda, the People's Republic of Angola, the barbaric attack on Gaborone, the capital of the Republic of Botswana, and the ever-increasing threats against Lesotho, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Zambia. The People's Republic of Angola has been singled out as a special target by both Pretoria and Washington.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

Following the régime's recent escalated acts of aggression against Angola, and racist South Africa's dirty role in Mozambique, statements by Botha and Malan, the racist Foreign Minister and Defence Minister, respectively, confirmed the obvious. They have not only openly and publicly admitted that the racist régime is supporting the UNITA bandits in Angola and the Mozambique National Resistance Movement (MNRM) in Mozambique, but that Pretoria was also doing its dirty work in the knowledge that it has the support of the United States. Both the United States and the Pretoria régime support the UNITA bandits in Angola, who are trained and armed by racist South Africa at its military bases in Namibia, and then infiltrated into Angola to do Pretoria's criminal work. With the repeal of the Clark Amendment by the United States Congress this year after the illegal gathering in southern Angola of reactionary forces, including UNITA bandits, the contras from Nicaragua and other reactionaries from Afghanistan, Laos and Kampuchea, which was hosted by Lew Lehrman, an arch-reactionary from the United States, it became clear that the United States was planning to get directly involved in the aggressive campaign against Angola. That gathering was blessed by the President of the United States, who had his letter of support read by the same Lehrman to that mercenary gang; in that letter Reagan declared, in part, to those international bandits that "your cause is our cause."

It did not come as a surprise that the next meeting of the so-called Democratic International created by Lehrman on the inspiration of Reagan and other rightists and militarists was held in Dallas, Texas. It was, therefore, logical that in its last large-scale invasion into Angola, aimed at rescuing the UNITA bandits who were experiencing a devastating offensive by the FAPLA-MPLA government forces, the Pretoria régime expected outright support and blessing from Washington. For a moment, Washington was embarrassed, but to day, it is a matter

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

of fact that the Reagan administration is contemplating direct support for UNITA bandits reportedly amounting to as much as \$US 300 million. This is a clear indication that over and above the support for the UNITA bandits for the purpose of destabilizing Angola, the United States administration is planning to bail out the apartheid régime from the serious economic and political crisis it is now facing inside South Africa itself and in Namibia. Any support given by the Reagan Administration to UNITA bandits as well as other mercenary elements in our region is support for apartheid, colonial oppression, aggression and destabilization in southern Africa. It is our duty to expose those evil schemes, since they are aimed at prolonging the suffering and agony of our people, while our country is being used as a staging ground for acts of aggression against independent States in the region, particularly the People's Republic of Angola.

We realize our people are called upon once again to meet the new challenge of dealing not only with aggression and illegal occupation, but a threat of a possible renewal of direct intervention by United States imperialism on the side of the apartheid régime. We draw this serious matter to the attention of the international community.

We believe it was no mere omission that, when the President of the United States addressed this Assembly at the fortieth anniversary celebration, he did not refer to South Africa or Namibia, and that indeed he referred to southern Africa only in the context of East-West conflict.

The Namibian people and their vanguard movement, SWAPO, will shoulder the responsibility of liberating themselves from colonial domination, illegal occupation and exploitation. To that end, we have committed ourselves fully in the tradition of our forebears who fought German colonialism with courage and determination. The past 25 years since the founding of SWAPO have served as

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

testimony to the unshakeable will and dedication of the Namibian patriots and their right to be counted as selfless fighters in the just struggle for self-determination and national independence. SWAPO has, through those years of a bitter struggle, mobilized and organized the oppressed masses. Today, the unity of our people serves as a powerful force capable of frustrating Pretoria's neo-colonial schemes in Namibia.

On the military front, the gallant combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) have continued to challenge the formidable occupation army of racist South Africa in Namibia for more than 19 years now. They are indeed battle tested, learning with each passing day how to fight the enemy effectively. They continue to score victories at the battle front, inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy forces and causing extensive destruction of its war material and colonial structures which facilitate Pretoria's illegal occupation. The régime has been forced to admit its inability to deal with this self-created quagmire given the heavy cost it represents for the racist occupiers in human lives, capital and material damage. We will intensify this struggle until we liberate our land, our people and our resources.

Only days ago, the United Nations Security Council was once again called upon to respond resolutely and decisively on Namibia, following the refusal by racist South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in the implementation of its resolution 566 of June 1985. Pretoria's intransigence and obstructionist attitude was clearly pointed out by the Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council contained in document S/17442, issued on 6 September 1985.

In a calculated manoeuvre aimed at legitimatizing its puppet so-called interim Government, while at the same time pretending to have finally made up its mind on the choice of an electoral system, the Pretoria régime, in the same breath, treated

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

with contempt the highest organ of the United Nations, not only by insisting on linkage, but once again by reopening issues already agreed upon.

Even some of Pretoria's trusted allies were able to see those shameless manoeuvres for what they were, namely, to divert the attention of the Security Council by preventing it from taking a decision matching the régime's intransigence. Thus, once again, racist South Africa was engaged in its usual contemptuous treatment of the highest organ of the United Nation, charged with the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

To us, the logical action was to impose mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, as clearly stated in Security Council resolution 566 (1985).

As the going got serious, however, Pretoria's friends started dragging their feet. They had a choice of supporting mandatory sanctions against racist South Africa or agreeing to the tabling and adoption of an enabling resolution by the Security Council at that very session, to pave the way for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They chose instead not to support either. Both the United States and the United Kingdom cast negative votes, thereby abusing their veto power and preventing the Security Council from taking decisive action against the Pretoria régime. By so doing, those States once again chose to side with the illegal occupation régime. The claims that the sponsors of the draft resolution were unreasonable were obviously unfounded.

Those vetoes by two North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries did not come as a surprise, as the policies and attitude of Britain and the United States regarding the question of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa are well-known. While issuing hypocritical statements saying that they, too, are opposed to apartheid, repression in South Africa and the brutal colonial repression in Namibia, they vehemently oppose and veto all meaningful, peaceful measures which the international community demands against Pretoria. Their futile arguments that sanctions will not work, that they will hurt the black population more, or that positive changes are already taking place in South Africa have already been refuted by the South African and the Namibian people themselves, by their recent patriotic activities inside South Africa and Namibia, as well as by the international community. But for those two imperialist NATO countries the mineral wealth and profits they derive from South Africa and Namibia through their corporations are

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

more important than the thousands of lives of blacks which are being lost in South Africa and in Namibia at the hands of blood-thirsty racist troops and police.

SWAPO believes that by vetoing such necessary measures against apartheid South Africa, Britain and the United States will indefinitely delay Namibia's independence and prolong the agony of the Namibian people under the colonial yoke of apartheid.

SWAPO condemns Britain and the United States in the strongest terms for their selfish and imperialist actions. We warn them that such shameful vetoes will never deter the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, from intensifying the ongoing armed liberation struggle in Namibia, which will, there is no doubt, bring about genuine national independence and democratic rule by and for the Namibian people.

The General Assembly, as it considers the question of Namibia, should be cognizant of this negative development and take the necessary action in the decolonization of Namibia. The Assembly bears responsibility for our country, and it must now shoulder that responsibility in hastening Namibia's independence.

We call upon our friends, particularly in the United States and the United Kingdom, to redouble their efforts in demanding the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the apartheid régime and to challenge the collaborationist policies pursued by those two countries with racist South Africa.

We have just heard an important statement by the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24, Ambassador Koroma of Sierra Leone, as well as the report of the Committee, presented by its Rapporteur.

The General Assembly has heard another equally important statement by the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Sinclair, of Guyana, in which, amongst other things, he introduced the annual report of the

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

Council, including its recommendations for adoption by this high organ of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to appeal to the Assembly, through you, to give its full and unqualified support to the recommendations just submitted and to ensure the adoption of all the resolutions on Namibia. That is the least that the United Nations is called upon to do in response to the serious situation in Namibia and the expectation of our people.

I particularly urge the General Assembly to pay special attention to the call for the holding of an international conference and a special session of the General Assembly devoted to Namibia during 1986, as next year marks 20 years since the termination by this body of the mandate over Namibia of South Africa, which still remains intransigent in its continued illegal occupation of our country.

SWAPO gives its full support to the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the wise and dedicated leadership of Ambassador Lusaka, who also showed clear vision, enormous ability and statesmanship in his guidance of the important work of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly as its President.

SWAPO has always regarded the Council for Namibia as a valuable partner in the common struggle for the decolonization of our country. We attach great importance to its programme of work, as the legal Administering Authority over Namibia until independence, and call upon all Member States for their full support to the Council in carrying out its noble task in the service of the Namibian people. The challenge ahead is greater than ever before.

During its last session the General Assembly was faced with attempts from certain quarters to subvert the resolutions on Namibia and apartheid in South Africa. We know that those same forces continue with their arm-twisting and blackmail. Those who plead for moderation and patience, who insist that a spade

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

should not be called a spade, and yet do not make secret their collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, are shamelessly hypocritical. How long can we be patient in the face of such blatant arrogance and tyranny, while our people are being killed by the racists in the service of imperialism? We believe that enough is enough.

We trust that the international community will remain firm in supporting our just struggle and continue to give us increased political, material and moral support. SWAPO commends the world-wide efforts by States and governmental and non-governmental organizations to isolate the apartheid régime through economic sanctions and other measures in order to bring to an end the apartheid system and the illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as Pretoria's aggression against independent States in the region.

SWAPO wholeheartedly welcomes into its midst the 22 comrades who were released by racist South Africa on 14 November 1985. Most of them were arrested and sentenced together with me in 1966 and were serving life imprisonment on the notorious Robben Island. Their release, we are certain, is the result of the intensified struggle inside Namibia and the international campaign for their release, for which we are very grateful.

(Mr. Toivo ja Toivo, SWAPO)

We appeal to the international community to intensify the demand for the immediate and unconditional release of all other Namibian political prisoners, as well as the granting of prisoner-of-war status, in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, to SWAPO freedom fighters captured in combat by racist South Africa. Equally, we demand the immediate and unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other South African political prisoners, who must participate directly in the search for a solution that will ensure a multiracial, democratic society in South Africa.

Let me now, in conclusion, express again SWAPO's unswerving solidarity with all peoples fighting for freedom, dignity and justice, particularly the heroic and struggling peoples of Western Sahara, led by the POLISARIO Front, and its Government, the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic; the people of Palestine, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, for the establishment of an independent Palestine; the people of Puerto Rico; the people of East Timor; and, indeed, the people of South Africa, under the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa, with whom we share a common destiny by reason of history, geography and a common struggle against racist South Africa.

I assure the Assembly from this rostrum that, whether Reagan, Thatcher and Botha like it or not, the logical outcome of our just struggle is certain to be victory by our people.

The struggle continues; victory is certain.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now begin the general debate on this item.

Mr. TEWARI (India): Thirty-nine years ago, at the first session of the General Assembly - held not far from here, at Lake Success - it was the delegation of India that moved against South Africa's attempt to incorporate South-West Africa into the Union of South Africa. Therein lay the genesis of United Nations efforts to uphold the right to self-determination and independence of the people of Namibia;

(Mr. Tewari, India)

and of the question of Namibia, which we are once again considering today. The question of Namibia, therefore, is as old as the United Nations itself; indeed, we are observing the fortieth anniversary of both this year. The completion of 40 years of existence by the Organization is, of course, a happy occasion; the other anniversary - that of four decades of infructuous effort to bring freedom to Namibia - is, by contrast, a sombre one.

That my own country should have taken the lead in raising the question of Namibia at the United Nations can come as no surprise. This was only in consonance with our historical involvement in the struggle for freedom and social emancipation in South Africa itself. It was in South Africa that Mahatma Gandhi, father of our nation, started the crusade that was later to take him to his motherland and propel him into the leadership of our own struggle for independence. Our affinity for the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia was also in consonance with the view propounded by the leaders of our freedom struggle that our own freedom would be incomplete until colonial peoples everywhere had secured their liberation. That affinity was special in the case of Africa. As Jawaharlal Nehru, our first Prime Minister, stated at the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in 1947:

"We of Asia have a special responsibility to the people of Africa. We must help them to their rightful place in the human family. The freedom that we envisage is not to be confined to this nation or that or to a particular people, but must spread out over the whole human race."

Namibia, like South Africa, like Palestine, therefore occupies a special place in the hearts of the Indian people.*

*Mr. Oyoue (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Tewari, India)

Unhappy anniversaries are not hard to come by when one thinks of Namibia. It was a century ago that imperialism first established a foothold at Luderitz Bay, even while the rest of Africa was being carved up at the infamous Conference of Berlin. The struggle against the colonial Power in Namibia is likewise 100 years old. It will soon be 20 years since this Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory. More than seven years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted its historic resolution 435 (1978) embodying - together with resolution 385 (1976) - the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. Yet Namibian independence still remains but a cherished dream, and each anniversary, each passing year only brings further anguish, frustration and indignation.

The United Nations has, in the 40 years of its existence, compiled an impressive record of achievements, of which it - and all of us - can legitimately be proud. At the same time, the continuing bondage of Namibia is a serious blemish on its record and has served to undermine the authority and credibility of the Organization. Namibia is a unique responsibility of the United Nations; there is no parallel to this unique and direct relationship. Yet the United Nations has not so far succeeded in bringing to an end the tragedy of Namibia.

In lamenting that fact, I would not wish to gainsay or gloss over what the United Nations has done to promote the Namibian cause. In this context, the admirable role played by the United Nations Council for Namibia - the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence - comes immediately to mind. We salute the Council, under the leadership of its President and its Acting President, for its tireless endeavours to mobilize international public opinion and support for the cause of Namibia's independence and to promote the interests of Namibia and Namibians, as well as for its role in preparing Namibians for the

(Mr. Tewari, India)

challenges and responsibilities of independence. As a founder member and one of the Vice-Presidents of the Council, India has contributed its mite to the work of that body. We should also like to acknowledge the contribution made by the Commissioner for Namibia, whom we are proud to claim as a compatriot.

While paying tribute where tribute is due, I would not wish to forget the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, whose indefatigable efforts and deep personal commitment to the Namibian cause are common knowledge. We should like to express to him again our profound appreciation and our continued support in the discharge of his important mandate.

(Mr. Tewari, India)

The report of the Council for Namibia contains a comprehensive picture of the situation in and relating to Namibia as well as of the activities undertaken by the international community - here at the United Nations as well as in other forums - to promote the Namibian cause. The last report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council has, moreover, provided us all with a clear picture of the current situation, in particular the continuing impasse in the efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution, universally accepted as the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, remains only in the realm of good intentions, its implementation so far thwarted by the pretexts and red herrings strewn in the path by Pretoria, the latest of them being its continuing insistence on invoking the entirely irrelevant and extraneous question of the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

Those who followed the proceedings in the Security Council last week need no enlightenment on the nature of the obstacles confronting us. On the eve of the Security Council meeting - with its timing no mere coincidence - the racist régime communicated to the Secretary-General, with its blessings, the decision of the illegal "interim Government" in Windhoek to accept proportional representation as the electoral system. At the same time and in the same breath it reiterated its insistence on "linkage", rendering transparent its design to sow confusion and making clear the fact that there is no change in Pretoria's position.

The non-aligned countries members of the Security Council - India among them - submitted a draft resolution to the Council asking for mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We asked for selective sanctions, not comprehensive ones, in the hope that the Security Council could at least move forward from the position adopted by it in resolution 566 (1985) and that all of its members would respond to the rising crescendo of international opinion demanding firm action against Pretoria. It is a matter of profound disappointment

(Mr. Tewari, India)

and regret that this did not happen - or, rather, it was prevented from happening. Once again, the demands of the vast majority of nations were repudiated on account of the inflexible positions of a few.

We in India and in the Non-Aligned Movement have long believed that only comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter can compel it to comply with United Nations resolutions and decisions. No amount of persuasion will succeed in making Pretoria see reason.

In recent weeks and months we have witnessed an impressive upsurge of popular outrage in many Western countries against the racist South African régime and all that it represents. This concerted campaign has drawn into its embrace people from all walks of life. We have also noted with appreciation the voluntary measures taken by Governments, including many in the Western world, against South Africa. We appreciate in particular the position taken by Australia and Denmark in the Security Council last week, as well as that of several other Western States that have accepted the logic and need for mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The recent Commonwealth Accord on Namibia adopted at Nassau delineated a package of specific measures binding on Commonwealth countries and also agreed on arrangements for the implementation of monitoring. These are all, no doubt, welcome developments. However, these steps need to be built upon and intensified so that Pretoria may be effectively isolated and pressed into compliance.

India and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have taken clear, consistent position of principle of support for the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence. This was reaffirmed most recently at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Luanda, Angola, from 4 to 8 September 1985. We believe that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be implemented immediately and unconditionally. At the same time we support the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of

(Mr. Tewari, India)

the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) - their sole and authentic representative. Also at Luanda the Non-Aligned Countries called for an international conference on Namibia and a special session of the General Assembly in 1986 to mark the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's mandate. We note that these are among the recommendations presented to the Assembly by the Council for Namibia, all of which enjoy our support.

In this twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations Declaration on decolonization, we may look back with pride and satisfaction to the tremendous advances made in the realm of decolonization in recent decades. The winds of change have blown strongly across the continents, sweeping away the colonial phenomenon around the globe. However, Namibia remains the most glaring vestige of colonialism, where a renegade and racist régime fights to stave off the inevitable, to stem the inexorable tide of history. That régime, and the obnoxious system of apartheid, now find themselves in a corner even within South Africa itself, besieged by the forces of freedom and human dignity and threatened with annihilation.

The unanimous resolve of Member States finally to cry a halt to the genocidal terror in and continued subjugation of Namibia by the racist South African régime has once again been frustrated by its powerful allies in the Security Council. The world community and the struggling masses of Namibia have once again been cheated of the opportunity to herald freedom for the victims of the racist outlaw which will now find a much-needed boost in the veto exercised by its collaborators in the Security Council. A new wave of sadistic terror against the freedom fighters of Namibia and South Africa may well be the result.

It is shocking indeed that those who never tire of delivering elaborate lectures on the virtues of freedom should have unabashedly aligned themselves with the most detested villain of history and tried to condone its fiendish assaults on the freedom and dignity of man in Namibia and South Africa.

(Mr. Tewari, India)

World peace and security are in grave peril due to the growing abominations of the racist Pretoria régime and the inability of the United Nations to discharge its legitimate responsibility to free Namibia. Indeed, this opens up a new scenario, of the gaping vulnerability of the world body to the calculated machinations of racist colonialism and imperialism.

Slogans such as "constructive engagement" and "regional security in southern Africa" will not hoodwink international public opinion. We are convinced that the entire exercise is a deception. It is a pathetic euphemism for active collaboration with and patronage of the barbarous and illegal Pretoria régime, through which its patrons are trying to reinforce their global role of overlordship.

The apologia for not accepting mandatory sanctions against the racist régime lest they adversely affect the economic interests of the blacks in the region, is all too familiar and is clearly aimed at bolstering up beleaguered Pretoria to protect the economic and geo-strategic interests of its patrons in the West. "Constructive engagement" and other such theories have their ancestry in the infamous slogan of "white man's burden" of the colonial heyday, which provided the philosophy for colonial plunder and racial barbarities.

(Mr. Tewari, India)

But the authors of the new slogans and strategies appear to be oblivious of the fact that the sun finally set on the "empire" a long time ago and that the last vestiges of vile colonialism in Namibia and South Africa will also be overrun by the galloping hooves of history.

The struggle of the Namibians to throw off the yoke of occupation and to wrest their sacred land from the fiendish clutches of the racist aggressor is in conformity with the glorious traditions of liberation movements and is an epitome of heroism, bravery and indomitable courage in the annals of modern history.

The feverish diplomatic manoeuvres of the patrons of Pretoria will not succeed in halting the march of events. The nation of Namibia will rise like the proverbial phoenix from the ashes. History cannot remain hostage in the hands of those who want to raise crime, cheating and persecution to the level of statecraft and international relations.

I envision Pretoria and its collaborators being led to the bar of history in not too distant a future, where the inevitable nemesis is in store for them. Those who are trying to subvert and reverse the course of history will be submerged by it. Ultimately, the indomitable human spirit will triumph. History will stand vindicated. Namibia will be free.

Mr. TIRADO MEJIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The international community is obviously deeply disturbed by the possibility of nuclear war. The final holocaust is something terrifying. However, we tolerate indefinitely something which is in fact in conflict with justice and the postulates and tenets which have inspired the United Nations since its foundation, namely, the fact that a nation remains indefinitely deprived of freedom, the freedom to which it naturally aspires, and it is deprived of its right to self-determination and equality.

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

It has been rightly said that this Organization is going through a crisis of prestige. The case of Namibia continues to challenge the effectiveness of the United Nations and is making a powerful contribution to the evolution of that view of things.

The people of Namibia has been fighting against foreign occupation and oppression for more than a century.

More than 40 years have gone by since the question of Namibia first came up in the United Nations and it is 19 years since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to the Mandate conferred upon South Africa by the League of Nations and which brought the Territory of Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

Fourteen years ago, the International Court of Justice, in an historic advisory opinion, found that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal. The General Assembly put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia many years ago, and it is clear that any action or measure by that country upon that Territory is without foundation.

One of the most outstanding pages in the history of the United Nations has been the process of decolonization. Ours is an Organization which is practically universal now. We are living in a world of sovereign and independent States. Nevertheless, this is not the situation in Namibia.

This situation of illegal domination and unending subjugation of the Namibian people produces a deep feeling of anguish in all countries which are devoted to peace and justice.

The question of Namibia has been debated fully by all forums of the United Nations. The Security Council in 1978 adopted resolution 435 (1978) which provides the sole legally-recognized basis for bringing about the decolonization of Namibia.

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

Our delegation has repeatedly opposed any measure which would alter or affect the content of United Nations decisions with respect to the Namibian Territory and we have insisted on implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Colombian delegation deeply regrets the fact that the Security Council's meeting last week was yet another failed attempt in the struggle to obtain adequate measures to speed up the independence of Namibia. Today it is more vital than ever for the collective wishes of society to prevail. Not a single country dissents from the final objective which is being pursued. It is the duty of each and every one of us to transform our words and intentions into deeds.

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at its ministerial meeting in Luanda early in September 1985, once again reiterated its traditional position with respect to Namibia, on the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, national independence and the safeguarding of territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Island and other adjacent islands.

No régime has ever challenged the will of the international community for so long. In this our fortieth anniversary, we wonder about the authority of the United Nations, to whose Charter we have sworn fidelity and to which we have renewed our commitment to carry out its purposes in order that the collective aspirations of mankind for a life of dignity and freedom for all can one day become a reality.

The Constitution governing democratic life in our country contains a fine article which reflects our egalitarian view of things. It states: "There shall be no slaves in Colombia". Although the Constitution was drawn up in 1886, thirty years after the abolition of that shameful institution, slavery, in our country, nevertheless it was decided to preserve this as an article in our Constitution and this has been done to this day, as a standing warning against any form of discrimination.

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

Colombia has a zealous commitment to democracy and firm adherence to the cause of freedom and human dignity. That is why we have acted in solidarity with the rights of the Namibian people in their struggle for independence and we condemn the shameful apartheid régime which, as long as it exists, is a discredit to mankind.

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

Colombia has been a member of the Council for Namibia since its establishment; consequently we have been in the front line in the difficult process of attempting to guarantee the self-determination of the Namibian people and we will wage whatever diplomatic battles are necessary to bring about freedom and justice in that much-valued African territory. Namibia may continue to count upon our support in its struggle for independence. My country commends the role played by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) as the authentic representative of the people of Namibia and its efforts to bring about the independence of its country.

Our delegation considers that those in Namibia who are fighting for the independence of their country deserve the respect of the international community, and we associate ourselves with the demand that the oppressive South African régime release those who have been imprisoned because of their struggle for their cause. Colombia reiterates the desirability of emphasizing that the international community's policy of discouraging investments in South Africa because of South Africa's inhuman discriminatory policy must be explicitly extended to the territory of Namibia, in view of the fact that these are two legally distinct entities from the international point of view.

The report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to the General Assembly at its fortieth session contains a draft resolution which it commends to the General Assembly for adoption and in which it:

"Strongly condemns the persistent collaboration between the International Monetary Fund and South Africa in disregard of repeated resolutions to the contrary by the General Assembly, and calls upon the International Monetary Fund to put an end to such collaboration and not to grant any new loans to the racist régime in South Africa;" (A/40/23 (Part V), p. 15)

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

Our delegation considers it appropriate to note that, whereas the International Monetary Fund follows rigid policy guidelines in respect of Latin American countries which are paying off their external debts at the cost of their development, it follows a flexible policy in the case of its relations with the racist régime of South Africa.

We reiterate the vital importance we attach to the defence of Namibia's natural resources in all areas, including in particular its enormous marine resources. The immediate implementation of Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia is essential. Although the protection of natural resources within the Territory has been a constant and continuing concern of the Council, the time has come to pay due attention to the protection of Namibia's enormous present and potential marine resources.

Colombia and other countries of Latin America have been in the forefront of the movement to adopt measures designed to protect the enormous heritage they enjoy thanks to the sea. The developing countries turn to international legal norms accepted by almost all States in order to defend their resources.

Based on the mandate of the General Assembly, and in consultation with SWAPO, pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations, the United Nations Council for Namibia must take appropriate legislative and other measures leading to the protection of the resources which will make possible the stable development of Namibian independence.

The Colombian delegation once again expresses its admiration and respect for the valiant position adopted by the front-line States, some of which are in difficult circumstances that make them particularly vulnerable; nevertheless they show no hesitation in their steadfast support for the cause of Namibia. They are entitled to understanding and co-operation from other countries, which must help them to resolve their problems.

(Mr. Tirado Mejia, Colombia)

The countries which have taken in large numbers of refugees who have been forced to flee their country as a result of the intensification of the oppressive measures taken by the illegal South African régime also deserve our praise and assistance. Colombia categorically rejects South Africa's attempts to establish within Namibia a so-called interim administration, something which is patently illegal and in contravention of United Nations resolutions, with which all its Members have undertaken to comply.

We pay tribute to the Council for Namibia, the legal administering authority of the Territory until it achieves independence, to its titular President, Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia and to its Acting President, Ambassador Noel Sinclair of Guyana, as well as to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra, for their outstanding performance of their difficult tasks. My delegation also reiterates its appreciation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for the diligence and wisdom with which he has dealt with this matter, and also to the Secretariat staff for their continuing support and co-operation in connection with the Council's work.

Mr. SUCRE FIGARELLA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): When the United Nations Council for Namibia met in Vienna in June this year I recall saying, as a member of the Council and commenting on events taking place at that time in the suffering territory of Namibia, that the time for impatience had arrived. The widespread deep discontent against South Africa's colonial domination was spreading and everything indicated that we had reached the limits of forbearance. Speaking to those who were calling for calm in the face of such justified rebellion, I recalled the cautionary words of our liberator, Simon Bolívar, for in a similar

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

situation in 1810, when our country was under colonial domination, he addressed a prophetic question to those who advocated calm in response to calls for immediate independence: "Are 300 years of calm not enough?"

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

It does not require an unduly profound analysis of the present plight of the Namibian people to realize that a similar situation prevails today and that if greater violence is to be avoided, it is necessary to find the solutions which historical justice make inevitable. Consequently, we must move from the time of impatience to the time of effective decisions; otherwise there would be no point to our present debate.

We have before us a situation which has come to maturity, a people calling deliberately with deep conviction and steadfast determination for the full exercise of their legitimate rights to independence and freedom, a position which both our Assembly and the Security Council have endorsed so many times in their resolutions.

Logically one is entitled to ask what has happened, how can it be that when there is such a clear consensus within the international community with respect to Namibia's independence, that independence has still not been achieved. My delegation does not think that when raising this matter one is calling into question the role played by the United Nations. As has been repeatedly said, what the United Nations does or does not do depends upon the active or passive wishes of its Member States. As was recently said by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in this same forum during the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the United Nations is a mirror in which we see reflected the faces of each of its Member States.

There is no doubt that in this mirror the face of South Africa casts its darkest shadow and its most sinister actions, since we all know that the problem of Namibia is indissolubly linked to the policy of the racist Government in Pretoria. This has been made absolutely clear in countless United Nations documents. Recently, on 3 September, the United Nations Council for Namibia issued its report

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

on social conditions within Namibia, document A/AC.131/187. All that we see in that document is a direct reflection of the policy imposed by South Africa over the occupied Territory. I am referring to the question of apartheid, racial fragmentation, education, health, living conditions, the status of women, repression and human rights violations, repressive legislation, arbitrary arrests and maltreatment of political prisoners, terrorization of the general population, terrorization of the Church, exploitation of labour and the refugee situation.

Does this mean that as long as the racist régime exists in South Africa there is little prospect of Namibia achieving its independence? The negotiating process which has been under way for some time now under the auspices of the United Nations and in which it is only right to recognize that the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, has played a constructive and important role, does not justify any such conclusion. On the contrary, the authorities in Pretoria have indicated apparent interest in complying with United Nations decisions, provided that certain conditions are met.

However, it is useful to recall, as my delegation has always done, that the setting of such conditions is a pretext rather than a reflection of any reasonable position. The report on the development of political events concerning Namibia issued by the Council for Namibia on 30 May 1985, on pages 11 and 16, describe the efforts made by the South African Government to impose its own solution on Namibia under the pretext that it is carrying out the provisions of Security Council resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978). What is really involved is an attempt to set up a régime with seeming independence but which is really totally subject to the colonial wishes of Pretoria. These efforts began in 1978 and took its most malignant form in April 1985, with the attempt to establish

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

an interim administration in direct contravention of the relevant resolution of the Security Council. As we all know, that would entail the formation of a provisional government, including a national assembly, an executive cabinet and a constitutional council, which would draft a constitution.

Fortunately, both the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council issued statements condemning such a procedure as being in open violation of the provisions laid down by the Organization, namely, conditions for the holding of free elections to give effect to the self-determination and independence of Namibia.

Thus the problem of Namibia continues in all its gravity. Thus it is understandable if the patience of the sorely tried population of Namibia is becoming exhausted. SWAPO has acted in a responsible manner. It has been encouraged by protest action which has been supported by the international community, and is confident that in the end the United Nations, interpreting the wishes of its Member States, can finally bring about the independence of the occupied Territory of Namibia.

My delegation considers that we are going through the most decisive period in the history of Namibia. The racist Pretoria régime itself is going through an extremely difficult time, with the visible spreading of a general international boycott, while the population within South Africa is in a state of constant rebellion.

The General Assembly has just held a debate on apartheid. My delegation considers that the express world-wide condemnation of the racist régime in Pretoria reflects something more than a simple rhetorical affirmation. We believe we are beginning to see a real international determination to see action taken to compel the racists to follow a different policy. Undoubtedly, their first reaction to the widespread national and international protest has been to take harsher measures, by

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

decreeing a state of seige. But this makes all the more clear the intimidating situation which is frightening them and is making them realize the danger in which they find themselves. We have seen on the streets of New York and other United States cities thousands and thousands of citizens protesting publicly against the South African régime. A few years ago, even a few months ago, this would have been inconceivable, and this strikes our delegation as being highly significant.

We are thus convinced that a favourable change in the relations prevailing in southern Africa cannot be far off - with the independence of Namibia, and change in the conditions of apartheid.

Venezuela, for its part, is continually reaffirming its opposition to what South African régime means. We have worked with absolute dedication as members of the Council for Namibia and we have given direct financial co-operation, within the limits of our capacity to help shape now what will be the free country of tomorrow. In this connection, we are honoured to be a co-sponsor of the draft resolution on agenda item 112, entitled "United Nations educational and training programme for southern Africa".

(Mr. Sucre Figarella, Venezuela)

Those forces fighting for human dignity in southern Africa have no ally more faithful than Venezuela. Consequently, pursuant to Security Council decisions, we have ended all links with the South African régime, whether economic, social, cultural or sporting. The African cause has our entire sympathy as the struggle against colonialism, demagoguery and the crime of racism. Gradually, our foreign policy has resulted in strengthened links with all African countries, not merely on economic grounds but because of growing awareness of international solidarity. Our delegation had the opportunity to state this during the debate on the critical economic situation in Africa.

There can be no doubt that what is happening in southern Africa is not going to change by itself. Privileged rulers do not abandon their advantages spontaneously. It is necessary to bring greater pressure to bear and to move from the time of impatience to the time for decisions which are going to be implemented. The time of the peoples has come and, as the Chilean poet, Pablo Neruda, said in his famous poem dedicated to Simon Bolivar, "I awake once every 100 years, when the people awakes".

Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): The international community has repeatedly expressed its profound concern about the future of the Namibian people and the deteriorating situation in Namibia. The latest expression of this concern was reflected in the deliberations of the Security Council concluded last Friday. My delegation, among others, hoped that the Council would demonstrate a clear-cut resolve to give meaning to that concern. Unfortunately, two of its members saw fit to dampen that prospect by the use of their veto power. It is indeed unfortunate that their actions do not measure up to the concern professed for the Namibian people. The fact that the Council failed at that juncture to take action should not deter this Assembly from pursuing even more keenly the resolution of the question of Namibia.

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

While the Security Council has the primary responsibility for ensuring implementation of the resolutions it has already adopted on Namibia, the United Nations as a whole, as an Organization, has legal responsibility for Namibia until it attains freedom and independence. The international community has called over the years for the withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia and for the transfer of power to the Namibian people. These objectives are embodied in the settlement plan under Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the implementation of which remains a primary objective of the international community. While emphasizing its commitment to the peaceful settlement of the question, the international community has been trying to surmount one obstacle after another raised by South Africa. At various times these obstacles, as identified by the ⁱ apartheid régime, revolved around the impartiality of the United Nations, the composition of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) or the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

The problem of resolving these non-issues is one thing, but the attempt to resolve a situation that is a threat to international peace and security is another. The features of this situation are military occupation and increased militarization of the Territory, political hegemony over Namibia proper and neighbouring countries, and the economic exploitation and depletion of Namibia's natural resources.

The situation has not remained static since our debate last year. Developments in the southern African region have taken a turn for the worse. These are marked by the brutality of the apartheid régime against not only the African majority within South Africa but also the people of Namibia. The designation by South Africa last March of the entire northern border region of Namibia as a security zone has let loose the machinery of intimidation and repression in an

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

area inhabited by over half of the population. The establishment by South Africa of an interim government last June is but a flagrant manifestation of its colonialist policy of imposing overlords on the Namibian people. South Africa's use of Namibia as a base from which it continues to attack, subvert and destabilize neighbouring African States poses a grave danger to the whole region. Its aggression against Angola and Botswana and its acts of sabotage against front-line States during the year are further testimony to its policies and objectives.

Needless to say, the international community has repeatedly deplored and condemned the policies of the apartheid régime and the support rendered to it by its allies. These policies should be rejected rather than tolerated. The apartheid régime should be isolated rather than embraced. It has therefore been heartening to witness this year an intensified public campaign in the West against the policies of the apartheid régime. This campaign has clearly had its impact on the position of certain Western Governments and is therefore a boost to the demands for change. More recently, the Commonwealth Accord on Southern Africa was a hopeful sign that some measures will be adopted against South Africa. Although these measures fall short of the demands of the international community they nevertheless are important in that they involve a commitment by a permanent member of the Security Council. My delegation believes that, given serious pursuit of effective measures and co-operation among States, the international community could achieve the desired change in Namibia.

The application of effective measures, in particular those under Chapter VII of the Charter, is one aspect of assistance to the Namibian people in their struggle for freedom and independence. Another aspect lies in extending financial and technical assistance to their cause. The valiant struggle of their sole, authentic representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO),

(Miss Al-Mulla, Kuwait)

should continue to be supported. The role of the Council for Namibia towards this end has been indispensable. Kuwait, for its part, will continue to support all these efforts through the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement.

Let me conclude by quoting an excerpt from the message of His Highness, Sheikh Jaber Al-Ahmad Al-Sabah, on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement SWAPO. He said:

"We sincerely hope that this problem will not be left unsolved. Positive steps and immediate action should be taken in order to enable this people to determine its destiny, achieve its independence and fulfil its national aspirations to freedom."

Mr. PAZ AGUIRRE (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation feels it necessary to make some brief observations in the Assembly on the question of Namibia.

My country has always unswervingly maintained the principle of the self-determination of peoples and has championed respect for the norms of international law as a foundation for peaceful relations between States. This is the position which the democratic Government of Uruguay, under its President, Dr. Julio Maria Sanguinetti, maintains within the international community and it is in the light of this that we wish once again to express our country's thoughts with respect to this conflict which unfortunately has gone on for so long without an appropriate resolution.

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

On 23 August 1985, the Minister for External Relations of Uruguay, Mr. Enrique Iglesias addressed a communication to the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Ambassador Noel Sinclair, in which he stated:

"I wish to stress emphatically Uruguay's support for Namibia's right to self-determination and independence through the holding of free elections, without any exclusions, under the supervision and control of the United Nations pursuant to the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). At the same time I wish to reiterate my Government's support for the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council which declare that Walvis Bay is an integral part of Namibia to which it is closely linked by geographic, historical, economic, cultural and ethnic ties."

Later, the Foreign Minister of Uruguay stated:

"I also wish to express my country's deep appreciation of the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole, legitimate Administering Authority of the Namibian Territory recognized by the international community, and of the Secretary-General in his endeavours to bring about a peaceful transition to a free, independent and united Namibia."

I think this is sufficient to make clear what my country's views are on this matter. However, we feel obliged to make some further observations, prompted by our desire to make our contribution to the world-wide demand for a speedy, peaceful and satisfactory solution to this grave dispute.

The question of Namibia became a significant bilateral problem between the United Nations and South Africa nearly 20 years ago. South Africa's continuing procrastination in the search for a stable solution pursuant to international

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

law and its illegal occupation of Namibia resulting from its failure to implement successive United Nations resolutions, constitute not merely a refusal to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people but a direct challenge to the repeatedly expressed will of the international community.

My country feels that this question must be dealt with on the basis of recognition of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination, which implies their right to an independent State. This affirmation is based on the following principles.

The present Territory of Namibia was under a Mandate of the League of Nations, whose supervisory faculties were inherited by the United Nations as successor to the foregoing pursuant to Article 77 (1) of the Charter. This was confirmed by the International Court of Justice. Consequently, the United Nations has legal responsibility for Namibia, in particular with regard to the administration of the Territory and the process leading to independence. Full support must therefore be given to the United Nations Council for Namibia.

The General Assembly, on 27 October 1967, in resolution 2145 (XXI), decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate. It declared the provisions of resolution 1514 (XV) applicable to Namibia and the people of the Territory and a logical corollary recognized the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. South Africa's presence is consequently without legal basis and is unlawful. This has been declared by the Security Council on various occasions, by Security Council resolution 385 (1976), inter alia.

As Security Council resolution 435 (1978) states, the objective is

"the transfer of power to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations ..."

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

Accordingly, South Africa must meet its obligations under Article 76 of the Charter, which are to preserve the identity of the people in the region and to promote progress towards freedom.

On 13 May 1985 the Uruguayan Government sent a letter to the Secretary-General, for distribution as a document of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, with respect to South Africa's decision to establish a provisional Government in Namibia. That letter stated inter alia:

"The Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay wishes to express its firmest opposition to the decision taken by the Government of South Africa on 18 April 1985 to establish an interim government in Namibia, and to state at the same time that it considers that decision to be null and void.

This step taken by the Government of South Africa is in violation of resolutions of the main organs of the United Nations, in particular Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice." (A/40/312, p. 2)

In its resolution 39/50 A, of 12 December 1984, the General Assembly declared that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression against the Namibian people and reaffirmed its support for the struggle of the people in the region, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to control the aggression by South Africa and to bring about independence based on self-determination. However, the racist régime in South Africa has persisted in its refusal to comply with the decision of the United Nations, opposing the rights of the Namibian people and simultaneously using force to prevent any challenge to its illegal occupation. It imposed harsh political repression within Namibia, as well as the practice of apartheid which is an expression of the most acute and abhorrent violation of fundamental human rights, going as far as to set up so-called white brigades, which in their first public

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

declaration affirmed their determination to expel any foreigner or crush any United Nations troops arriving in Namibia.

In the light of these considerations, my country's Government, and consequently my delegation, reaffirms in this General Assembly our position, based on, first, our categoric emphatic support for self-determination for the Namibian people and the exercise of their right to create a free and independent State, and, secondly, our decision to co-operate as fully as possible with other delegations in order to achieve these objectives by peaceful means in accordance with national law.

It is clear that the case of Namibia continues to be one of the most important matters dealt with in the United Nations in its studies and decisions. It is however, not merely a subject for consideration, it is a cause of international confrontation, since this international Organization has adopted unequivocal decisions in this respect, but the Government involved is refusing to implement them.

The United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of African Unity and other international and regional bodies have called for immediate and total implementation of Security Council 435 (1978). The South African Government has refused to comply with those repeated international decisions.

The Security Council, on 30 April 1981, therefore considered the possibility of applying broad mandatory sanctions against the South African Government. However, these could not be adopted because of the imposition of the veto by several countries in the Security Council. At its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly condemned the South African racist régime for sabotaging the talks on Namibian independence held in 1984 in Lusaka and Maseru. The General Assembly reiterated that within the conflict there were only two sides, on the one hand the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, and on the other, South Africa's illegal occupation régime.

(Mr. Paz Aguirre, Uruguay)

The Uruguayan delegation again reiterates its condemnation of those who follow political and social concepts that are rooted in the past, who are incapable of realizing that they are living in the present with all its just claims, still less of realizing that they will have no place in the world of the very near future.

Finally, my country is convinced that there can be no true peace when there is no respect for peoples, when they are oppressed or arbitrarily segregated and, basically, while there is no respect for the principle of equality before the law, that law being the expression of the authentic will, freely expressed, of the peoples that are ruled by it.

My country considers that respect for international law is the basis for the peaceful and constructive coexistence of the States that make up the international community, and that the many efforts and resolutions of the United Nations, the supreme world body, with respect to Namibia cannot continue to be ignored as they are repeatedly by the South African Government.

Therefore, Uruguay stands by, and will continue to give emphatic support to, all the resolutions of this Organization aimed at bringing about justice and law for the genuine good of the people of Namibia, on behalf of the international community and in the supreme interest of peace among peoples.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.