



**President: Mr. Paul J. F. LUSAKA  
(Zambia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 29**

**Question of Namibia (*continued*):**

- (a) **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;**
- (b) **Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;**
- (c) **Reports of the Secretary-General**

1. Mr. TAHINDRO (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The question of Namibia has been a matter of grave concern to the United Nations since its establishment. Despite its continuous efforts to include Namibia in the world of the second part of the twentieth century, in accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of peoples and their right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the people of Namibia remain the victims of a colonial régime which stubbornly refuses to abide by the injunctions of the international community. Although there is a world consensus on condemnation of the illegal occupation of the Territory, South Africa has attempted to consolidate its grip by massive militarization of Namibia, pillaging its resources and treating its people brutally. Moreover, this shameful régime has continuously sought to impose puppet institutions on the local population, in violation of Security Council resolution 439 (1978) which declared any unilateral measures taken by the *apartheid* régime in relation to the electoral process and any institutions established as a result of such elections to be null and void.

2. South Africa, in collaboration with certain foreign interests, is shamelessly pillaging the natural resources of Namibia. In this context, it is not surprising that the Namibian economy has remained a colonial-type economy. A report of the United Nations Council for Namibia prepared for the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, demonstrates that that economy is divided into two sectors. The main sector includes the two most highly productive branches of activity, mining and commercial agriculture, and is located in the area reserved for the whites. That area takes up more than two thirds of the Territory. As for

the African majority, it is parked in homelands in the north of the country, whose meagre agricultural resources are not sufficient to feed the population, and it is not authorized to leave those areas, under the *apartheid* system, except to act as cheap contract labour for white farmers.

3. If we study a breakdown of the gross domestic product in the Territory in per capita terms we note that this is one of the most inequitable systems of income distribution in the world. According to available figures, the per capita income of whites in 1980 was 3,000 rand approximately, whereas for the blacks as a whole the corresponding figure was 125 rand. This represents a 24 to 1 ratio.

4. Moreover, an analysis by sector demonstrates the unbalanced and precarious structure of the Namibian economy. The mining industry contributes approximately half of the gross domestic product, but uses only 10 per cent of the labour. Commercial agriculture provides a lucrative revenue to approximately 5,000 white exploiters, who own more than 95 per cent of commercialized agricultural production. Subsistence agriculture is almost the only economic activity reserved for the indigenous population and constitutes only 2.5 per cent of all the agricultural production placed on the market. Altogether, the agricultural sector contributes approximately 14 per cent of the gross domestic product and 20 per cent of exports. It can be noted in passing that there is over-exploitation of fish resources and that this has contributed to impoverishment of the marine resources of the Territory. On the other hand, the mining sector represents approximately half of the gross domestic product and approximately 90 per cent of exports. Since South African and foreign interests operating in Namibia are focusing on mining in order to make quick profits, other sectors of the economy have been left to one side, leaving this potentially rich Territory dependent on imports to meet their most elementary needs.

*Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus). Vice-President, took the Chair.*

5. According to available information, it is generally estimated that South African forces in Namibia number approximately 100,000 men—in other words, approximately one soldier per 12 Namibians. To that figure must be added the territorial forces of South-West Africa/Namibia, the paramilitary and the police, including the “anti-riot forces”, called the “permanent force”, the “citizens’ force”, the “national service men”. All these occupation forces are stationed in approximately 85 to 90 bases in Namibia.

6. Moreover, it has been established that South Africa, in violation of international treaties prohibiting the production and utilization of chemical and bacteriological weapons, is manufacturing such

weapons for use against the national liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia. In this context, a white South African conscientious objector stated to a United Nations *ad hoc* group of experts on 26 May 1983 that the *apartheid* régime was trying to develop biological weapons, called ethnic weapons, using carefully chosen viruses that would contaminate the black population only.

7. In view of the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria, it is important to emphasize that the Namibian people, far from bowing their heads, have pursued their armed struggle under the guidance of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], their sole authentic representative. The freedom fighters of the people's liberation army of Namibia have stepped up their armed struggle and inflicted important human and material losses on the occupation forces.

8. We are convinced that continuing armed struggle, with the unswerving support of the international community, is the only way for the Namibian people to regain their freedom.

9. We would like to express our appreciation to the United Nations and in particular the United Nations Council for Namibia for their tireless efforts to ensure that this Territory speedily achieves independence. We consider the Council to be the only Administrative Authority for Namibia and reject any solution that would envisage the prior elimination of SWAPO, which, because of its valiant struggle, has indeed become the sole representative of the Namibian people.

10. We are convinced that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem. It is high time for South Africa to understand that the international community will accept no internal settlement which imposes a neo-colonialist solution. Similarly, it must understand that the international community will continue to reject any "link" or "parallel" between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola as obviously incompatible with the spirit and letter of resolution 435 (1978). South Africa must understand sooner or later that it is not by a blind rush forward, politically, by turning the conflict into a Namibian conflict, or by perpetrating armed acts of aggression against Angola and other front-line States that it will be able to solve the problem of the decolonization of Namibia.

11. We are convinced that only the speedy exercise of self-determination by the Namibian people under the supervision of the United Nations, the dismantling of the *apartheid* system, the unconditional withdrawal of South African occupation forces from Namibian territory, the cessation of acts of aggression and destabilization, and the granting of material assistance to SWAPO and front-line States will make it possible to reduce tension in this area of Africa. We call upon all peoples that cherish peace and justice to support the victims of the barbaric régime of Pretoria, as called for in the Bangkok Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B] of May 1984.

12. For our part, we reaffirm once again our solidarity with the just cause of the Namibian people who are fighting for recognition of their fundamental inalienable rights and for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. Also, we solemnly reiterate our support for

SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of this heroic and martyred people. We are convinced that Namibia will soon take its proper place within the international community. In this context, we should like to read out an extract from the message of the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, which was transmitted to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, on the occasion of the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and Their Liberation Movement, SWAPO, as follows:

"The Democratic Republic of Madagascar will always stand side by side with peoples struggling for their liberation, and it is with deep feeling that the Supreme Council of the Revolution, the Government and I offer the fraternal people of Namibia and SWAPO our sincere support and militant solidarity."

13. Finally, we should like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to reiterate our support for the United Nations Council for Namibia—over which you have the honour to preside, Mr. President—as the only legal Administering Authority of the Territory until its total independence.

14. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): For as long as the question of Namibia continues unresolved, it becomes increasingly instructive. It holds valuable lessons in explaining why States behave the way they do; what motivates them; the extent to which they believe in and are committed to principle and to the rule of law; and how far they are prepared to go in defence of the values they profess to uphold, particularly when they believe a national interest, whether real or otherwise, is at stake.

15. One aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia is that the framework for a settlement of this question already exists, unanimously adopted by the Security Council. I refer to the settlement plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This plan has even had the support of a potentially effective institution for its implementation, and here I refer to the Western contact group.

16. Six years have elapsed since the adoption of that resolution and the people of Namibia are no nearer the achievement of their goal. They have seen their right to freedom made a hostage of East-West Power politics, with their future linked to extraneous considerations relating to issues falling squarely within the purview of the sovereignty of an independent African State.

17. I am aware that this situation of stagnation has been causing a great deal of anguish to the Secretary-General. In addition to the aspect of human suffering and threat to peace and security, there is also that of the implications for the United Nations, which, since 1966, has had such a special relationship with the Territory of Namibia.

18. I should like here to pay a public tribute to the Secretary-General for his continuing personal devotion to the cause of Namibia's freedom in the face of South Africa's intransigence on the one hand and the collaboration and permissiveness of some Western States on the other.

19. Reflecting on the question of Namibia—as this debate provides an opportunity for so doing and indeed requires us to do—I am certain that members will agree that the pervasive feeling in the Assembly is one of having been let down. The international community had reposed faith in the ability, and

certainly the preparedness, of the contact group, acting on behalf and in support of the Security Council, to curb South Africa's intransigence and defiance and to ensure Namibia's freedom. Yet, looking back over the last six years, is it not South Africa that has been "calling the shots" over Namibia? And who knows what other devices may still be concealed in its repertoire in order to produce even more delay in Namibia's accession to freedom?

20. It pains us to confess it but in the struggle for liberation in southern Africa or elsewhere, clear, proper assessments are essential. Effectively, the Pretoria régime has been able so far to halt the march of decolonization in Africa at the northern border of Namibia; and the judgement of history will certainly be that it was allowed to do so by States which had the power to restrain it but chose not to do so.

21. To be sure, there was much contact group activity over the last six years. But what is clear, what has been clear throughout the period in question, is that Namibia's liberation has never fired the enthusiasm of these States. It has never truly stimulated a commitment on the part of these Governments to doing something decisive to bring about that freedom.

22. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I wish to be careful not to imply a lack of appreciation for the part which the Governments of these countries have otherwise been playing in support of Namibia's liberation. Their contributions, financial and otherwise, to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, and in other areas, have been generous and have made possible significant accomplishments in the areas of concern of these various activities. This is a matter of record. However, while it is noble to raise the comfort level and to contribute to the well-being and the edification of Namibians outside of Namibia, ten times more noble is it to help them to get the occupiers out of their home.

23. The Guyanese delegation has stated on many occasions that South Africa's occupation of Namibia has benefited from and been sustained by Western investments, Western permissiveness, Western passivity and Western vetoes, whether real or threatened. The basis of the partnership between the racist Pretoria régime and some Western States and their monopolies is well known.

24. The converging and interlocking political and economic interests are no less so: the Tsumeb Corporation, Consolidated Diamond Mines of South West Africa, Ltd., Rössing Uranium Ltd., among others, are the embodiments of imperialist plunder and exploitation in the Territory of Namibia. Such collaboration with the Pretoria régime represents an alliance with *apartheid*, an alliance which hurts the people of Namibia and prolongs their suffering. It is these interests—is it not?—which stand between certain Western Governments and a genuine commitment to bringing an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

25. My concern now is not only out of humanitarian considerations. It springs also from considerations of legality, to which I know Western States are fond of expressing such profound adherence. And when I invoke legality I do not have in mind simply this or that resolution of the General Assembly or the Security Council. My concern is even more fundamental. It is that under contemporary international

law colonial occupation is illegal; and people subjected to alien domination and exploitation have a right to self-determination. This right to self-determination even pre-dates the very creation of the Organization. It is here that we find the roots of what is the legal consensus on Namibia.

26. Permit me to quote the following few lines from a work of a dear and close friend of the Namibian cause, Professor Julio Faundez, Lecturer in Law at the University of Warwick:

"The rejection of colonialism and the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle for national independence stem from a generalized awareness that colonialism constitutes a denial of basic human rights, of essential political freedoms and of economic independence. This political awareness is today part of international law and is embodied in rules which provide that the fate of a territory should be determined by the people who live in it, that the protection of natural resources is an essential prerequisite in exercising political sovereignty and that the adoption of policies to perpetuate alien political domination constitutes a particularly serious violation of international law. It is these general principles and rules of international law that create binding obligations on all States to bring South Africa's occupation to an end, to take steps towards contributing to the self-determination process and to take effective measures to protect Namibia's natural resources".

27. My delegation calls on the Governments concerned to make a firm commitment to Namibia's freedom; to take a stand, once and for all, on the side of legality, on the side of the people of Namibia and the struggle for their liberation. With such a commitment by them, Namibia's freedom could not be far away.

28. Of course, by withholding their full support for the struggle of the people of Namibia these Governments are only delaying Namibia's freedom; they do not, they cannot, deny it. And this brings me to other lessons to be learned from the question of Namibia: the indestructible nature of the desire for freedom, the resilience of the human spirit and the extent of sacrifice which peoples are willing to endure for their freedom. Policies of terror, detention, torture and intimidation have done nothing to the people of Namibia, if not to make that flame of freedom burn even brighter within their hearts. The Pretoria régime has left them with practically no options; that is why the struggle will continue, and it will be victorious.

29. The General Assembly has a duty in the course of the current debate to identify practical ways of intensifying moral and material support for the efforts of the Namibian people. That struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, is the true expression of the striving of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. Support by the international community for SWAPO is part of the effort for the application of principles on which the United Nations is based. The Assembly should, on this occasion also, invite all States Members to extend increased and effective material, financial, political and diplomatic support to SWAPO.

30. At the same time, the international community must increase its support to the front-line States, which, because of the support which they render to the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, must endure a never-ending wave of assaults by South

Africa against their sovereignty and territorial integrity, with the most injurious effects on their economic structures, and extensive loss of life and material damage.

31. Guyana has read carefully the communication of 29 November addressed to the Secretary-General by the President of the People's Republic of Angola, and we reiterate our support for and solidarity with the Government and people of Angola in their efforts to safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity. We also express our appreciation for Angola's commitment to ensuring Namibia's early liberation. As we in Guyana see it, Angola is fully entitled to make such arrangements as it considers appropriate for the defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

32. The essential counterpart of and complement to a concern with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola must be, it seems to my delegation, more effective action, by those feeling this concern, to restrain South Africa from its attacks against Angola and from rendering support to those bands which wish to destabilize and undermine the Government of Angola. The Pretoria régime must be made to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and must refrain from intervening in the Territory and from interfering in its internal affairs.

33. The Assembly must also strive to ensure that international action for the freedom of Namibia regains momentum. There must be an early return to the modalities of transferring power to the legitimate representatives of the people of Namibia. The Security Council must shoulder its responsibility to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

34. The United Nations Council for Namibia has been pointing the way for action by the international community in these respects. My delegation wishes to commend and express its appreciation for the leadership provided by Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia in this regard. In the face of indifference and even open hostility from certain quarters, the Council, under his guidance, has striven tirelessly and steadfastly in the fulfilment of its mandate. The year 1984 has been a year of solid achievement in the area of attracting and mobilizing support for the Namibian struggle; 1985 must be, and will be, a year of even greater action and achievement in response to the new challenges facing the United Nations in respect of Namibia and the evolving opportunities in the wider struggle. A priority area of action must, of course, be the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>1</sup> enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1984. The Council has ample evidence, among non-governmental organizations in Western Europe and the United States, of the most enthusiastic support for such action. We must make the best use of that enthusiasm and good will and proceed to give effect to the Decree which we enacted 10 years ago.

35. In 1985 we need to apply our creative energies, as never before, to Namibia's liberation. Through our joint efforts we must also identify areas of action for making a greater assertion of the authority of the Council and for giving more practical expression to the seriousness with which we take our responsibility as legal Administering Authority. Our first concern in this regard must certainly be resolution 435 (1978).

36. In all these aspects I have identified and in any programme of work that may be agreed upon for the Council, the commitment and dedication of the Government and delegation of Guyana remain secure.

37. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): Few problems have engaged the attention of the international community over the last 18 years as has the illegal occupation of Namibia by racist South Africa. In the years since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of *apartheid* South Africa over Namibia numerous attempts to elaborate political arrangements for its peaceful transition to independence have been made. None, however, has engaged the international community more and generated more corresponding optimism than the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the Organization's plan for the independence of Namibia. The political and diplomatic activity which ensued and was sustained over a period of five years made necessary the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva in January 1981 and the proximity talks in 1982 here in New York. Indeed, we recall the sense of optimism which was generated by the positive pronouncements of the parties to those talks and in particular the concluding declaration of the proximity talks that, save for the system to be employed in the elections, all issues relating to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved.

38. Speaking on this item at the thirty-eighth session [78th meeting], my delegation expressed deep regret that the hopes which had accompanied the conclusion of those proximity talks and the reaching of the agreement on the framework for the commencement of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been frustrated by the introduction by the racist régime of new and irrelevant demands and by its predicated the independence of Namibia on their fulfilment. This regret was shared by the overwhelming number of delegations. Today, a year later, the refusal of the *apartheid* régime to allow the implementation of the plan persists. Efforts by the front-line States, by SWAPO, the Secretary-General and by the United Nations as a whole to find a way out of the impasse have been frustrated by the consistent refusal of the *apartheid* régime to heed the demands of the international community.

39. While the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, an inherently aggressive régime, is opposed in principle to the independence of Namibia, no framework of a political relationship with any other country has done more, in its reinforcement of that aggressiveness and opposition, to undermine the international efforts to free Namibia than the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Put into effect four years ago, the policy, in a two-pronged strategy, has been instrumental in the elaboration of a political partnership which is mutually complementary. On the one hand, the *apartheid* régime sustains a political objective of constructive engagement in its insistence on linkage, and, on the other, it is rewarded by collaboration in all fields, as well as by general political protection. That collaboration has found concrete expression in the forging of closer diplomatic ties with the régime, as evidenced by the many exchange visits of high-level officials on both sides and the signing of a consular treaty.

40. *Apartheid* South Africa is the recipient of the most sophisticated armaments and delivery systems,



including technology and personnel, to assist in the development of the *apartheid* nuclear-weapon capability, in contravention of the arms embargo in force against that régime.

41. In the economic field, the certificate of political respectability accorded it by constructive engagement has paved the way for billions of dollars in new investments and loans, including those directly sponsored by the proponents of constructive engagement.

42. At the political level, constructive engagement has meant unfaltering consistency in support of the *apartheid* régime. Close identification with the preoccupations of *apartheid* on the diplomatic front by some of its allies, the frantic efforts to rehabilitate the régime, and the ready resort to the use of veto in the Security Council to protect it have emboldened it and sustained its defiance. Indeed, the Assembly remembers the way the *apartheid* régime flaunted that political support and protection when it contemptuously rejected Security Council resolution 539 (1983) in a letter dated 29 October 1983 from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General.<sup>2</sup>

43. As it relates to linkage, the strategy is subsumed in making the independence of Namibia conditional upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In due course, however, it has become evident that these troops are being used to mask the deep-rooted political opposition of the *apartheid* régime and its allies to Namibia's independence, thereby protecting the multinational interests which have convergent desires to continue plundering the natural resources of Namibia. As an added incentive, the *apartheid* régime and its friends have succumbed to the temptation to use the presence of those troops to obtain a long-standing political objective against the People's Republic of Angola, which would otherwise not be attainable. As a result, resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented. It is linkage which stands in the way.

44. These consequences apart, the so-called constructive engagement violates the ruling of the International Court of Justice, which in its advisory opinion of 21 June 1971 stated:

"States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia . . . and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration."<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, linkage has facilitated continued occupation of Namibia.

45. We continue to regret that a party to the understandings reached at the conclusion of the proximity talks—the United States—has not only decided, largely on the basis of ill-conceived ideological considerations, to opt out of that consensus, but in fact turned around and decided to undermine those delicate arrangements. Since the invention of the so-called Cuban factor, new excuses in the form of numerous impossible demands on the People's Republic of Angola and SWAPO have been created. As a result, the door to Namibia's independence has been closed and the world is forced to await the satisfaction of political desires long held by the patrons of *apartheid*.

46. These tactics are not new. Politically, they embody the underlying opposition of the *apartheid*

régime and its allies to independence for the Namibian people. From the point of view of strategy, they are reminiscent of the ludicrous claims of the intangible element of the so-called mutual trust and confidence or the so-called United Nations impartiality in the years preceding the proximity talks—these demands being of course aimed at thwarting the putting into place of arrangements for the independence of Namibia.

47. Linkage has been rejected and condemned by the international community as a whole. It has been rejected in its philosophy and application as it relates to the reinforcement of *apartheid*, to the sustenance of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, in particular the continued occupation of Angola, and to the denial of the Namibian people's right to self-determination and independence. That rejection still stands. Africa, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the international community as a whole have reiterated that the issue of the presence of Cuban troops is not a problem and is without consequence to the decolonization process in Namibia. It is an artificial creation, conveniently given to racist South Africa to justify obstinate endeavours to prevent the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

48. Since the last session, as the international community has continued to grapple with the problem of Namibia, this position has been reiterated. The Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984, as well as the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, also underlined the position. Both meetings reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence. In conformity with that fundamental consideration, both meetings rejected any attempt or manoeuvre to deny the Namibian people this right. In particular, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity reiterated its rejection of "any 'linkage' and 'parallelism' between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as being manifestly incompatible with the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)"<sup>4</sup> and reprehensible and gross interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

49. The present stance of the other members of the contact group is no less regrettable. We are concerned that, by allowing the unwarranted preoccupations of one member of the group to cloud their collective judgement on Namibia, they have in large measure, even given statements dissociating certain members from the insistence on linkage, facilitated the sabotaging of a plan of which they were the authors and which they promoted for international acceptance and, in consequence, turned their backs on the freedom of the Namibian people.

50. If the *apartheid* régime has found renewed vigour in the execution of its policies of intimidation and repression inside Namibia, of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring African States or of brazen disregard of international opinion, both in its actions and in its pronouncements, it is obviously because of the moral support and political protection that constructive engagement affords it. The régime

is, through a combination of various forms of pressure, in particular armed aggression, now poised to try to reverse the victories achieved over the past decade.

51. Inside Namibia itself, the situation has greatly deteriorated as the régime has stepped up repression in its bid to neutralize the opposition. Through a combination of tactics the régime has, on the one hand, been busy trying to set up a coalition of puppets under the so-called Multi-Party Conference umbrella and, on the other, intimidated, arrested and even killed those who have expressed opposition to colonialism and *apartheid*. In particular, members of SWAPO have been targeted for indiscriminate arrest, torture and other forms of violence and even death. Through this two-pronged strategy of the force of arms and political manipulation, the *apartheid* régime hopes to transform Namibia into another bantustan. The so-called Multi-Party Conference is nothing but another scheme hatched by the régime to undermine SWAPO by presenting an alternative in order to pave the way for the establishment of a bantustan. Yet, despite these manoeuvres and repressive measures, the people of Namibia have not succumbed to disillusion or despair. Instead they have remained undaunted in their resolve to oppose the occupation of their country. This resolute determination in the face of such violence has found expression in ever-increasing support for SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

52. Since the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, there have been further attempts to bring the racist régime to the negotiating table. The Namibian independence talks, held in 1984 at Lusaka and Mindelo, were among such attempts aimed at securing South African agreement to begin the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Despite the serious reservations it had regarding the seriousness of the *apartheid* régime, SWAPO attended the talks and expressed its willingness to pursue constructive negotiations on the modalities of a cease-fire. Perhaps not unexpectedly, the *apartheid* régime used those opportunities to demonstrate yet again its contempt and arrogance. It invented new demands which had the express purpose of sabotaging those talks.

53. In this as well, the *apartheid* régime was not alone. The proponents of constructive engagement also took full advantage of those talks to try to impose on Angola and SWAPO unacceptable conditions for the withdrawal of the racist troops and for the independence of Namibia, not surprisingly in a framework different from the plan embodied in resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, the letter from the *apartheid* representative to the Secretary-General dated 23 November 1984 [A/39/689] illustrates the nature of those conditions, without whose fulfilment, the proponents seem to be saying, the independence of Namibia will not be facilitated.

54. This most recent twist in the position of the racist régime has brought to the surface the real problem of South Africa and its allies. It is not the Cuban troops; rather it is the independence of Angola and that of the other neighbouring African States and their principled opposition to racism and colonial occupation in South Africa and Namibia. It is not because of any security concern. It has been suggested, legitimately, that constructive engagement, as it relates both to the political, military and economic partnership with *apartheid* and to linkage, does in

fact suggest some racial overtones; for how can it be morally acceptable and politically tenable to embark on a relationship with a racist white minority on the basis of arrangements which seek only to perpetuate racism and aggression? The black people of South Africa are denied the most fundamental human rights, excluded from political activity, uprooted from their homes, banished, tortured, killed, stripped of the nationality of the land of their ancestors; yet they are told to endure that humiliation and oppression, as the perpetrators of these heinous crimes are given tools for the further entrenchment of *apartheid*. The people of Namibia are told they cannot get independence unless the *apartheid* régime is rewarded for its aggression against Angola. It is Angola, whose territory is occupied, which should express security concerns. It is Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe themselves, constant victims of the *apartheid* régime's policies of economic pressure, sabotage, destabilization and armed aggression, which have legitimate security concerns. It is therefore unacceptable that attempts should be made to present distortions of the political situation in the region to justify South Africa's aggression.

55. The problems of southern Africa should be seen in their true context. *Apartheid* in South Africa and the occupation of Namibia, made necessary by the desire of the racist régime to create a buffer State to cushion itself, constitute the root cause of the conflict. If, after numerous efforts, the people of Namibia still have not been able to determine their political future, it is because this goal has been constantly separated from the real nature of the struggle against colonial domination and racism in that country.

56. No excuses, falsifications or even outright lies can obscure that fundamental element; attempts to interpret the struggle for the dismantling of *apartheid* and for securing independence for Namibia in the context of ideological confrontation between the East and the West have to be strongly rejected.

57. The manoeuvres of the *apartheid* régime in the course of the past year have reinforced the universal recognition that the Namibian problem is a United Nations problem and that, hence, it should be dealt with under the auspices of the Organization. Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) both underline this imperative. In this respect, I wish to register Tanzania's satisfaction with the manner in which the Secretary-General has dealt with the question, in particular by reasserting the central role of the Organization in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia.

58. Consistent with this position, we continue to believe that the United Nations plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the most viable framework within which the Organization can play that central role. The resolution embodies the international consensus. Despite the passage of time, it retains its intrinsic validity and continues to be the most acceptable basis for a negotiated settlement. We continue to demand its immediate implementation, without qualification or modification. Correspondingly, this Assembly must continue to reject linkage, demand the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and call for respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with Security Council resolution 432 (1978). Similarly, the Assembly must energetically condemn the *apartheid* régime's policies of destabilization and

aggression against neighbouring independent African States, in particular its continued occupation of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola.

59. The continued illegal presence of South Africa and *apartheid* in Namibia poses a unique challenge to the international community, and in particular to the United Nations, which, 18 years ago, decided to assume direct responsibility for the Territory. The persistence of this aggression against the Namibian people has serious implications for international peace and security. Clearly, in its persistent occupation, the régime has also prevented the realization by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Moreover, the *apartheid* régime has continuously used the Territory as a staging-ground for its acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The *apartheid* régime has not shown any regard for the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. As a result, conflict is bound to escalate. Failure to act now will only pave the way for a total conflagration in the region.

60. The Security Council has to act and institute effective measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, against the racist régime, so as to force it to end its occupation of Namibia and to dismantle *apartheid*. This represents the last non-violent option for securing the régime's compliance.

61. Allow me next to pay a deserved tribute to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. Its commitment to the liberation of Namibia and the high sense of statesmanship demonstrated by its leadership in the face of the ever-multiplying insidious manoeuvres to delay independence underline its continued readiness to seek a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. At the same time, we continue to support their struggle, on all fronts and by every means available, including armed struggle, to wrest their freedom from the *apartheid* régime.

62. My delegation has had the pleasure of working closely with the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, during this session. His release from the notorious Robben Island and his presence in our midst resulted from support for the international campaign for the release of political prisoners. Many still languish in *apartheid* prisons. We should continue to demand their unconditional release.

63. I wish finally to record Tanzania's appreciation for the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and for the excellent manner in which its President has guided its work over the past year.

64. Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore): The history of Namibia is characterized by decades of painful colonization and denial of self-determination. In the first part of my statement I shall briefly review the history of the problem.

65. From 1884 to 1915, South West Africa, as Namibia was known then, was under German administration. After the outbreak of the First World War, South African forces invaded and occupied the Territory. From 1920 to 1938, the League of Nations Mandate over South West Africa was held by "His Britannic Majesty, [and] exercised on his behalf by the Union of South Africa".

66. The United Nations, in 1946, recommended trusteeship status for South West Africa. However, in 1949 South Africa informed the United Nations that

it would no longer transmit information on the Territory as recommended by the international system for Territories. The International Court of Justice, in 1950, ruled that "South West Africa is still a Territory under international Mandate assumed by the Union of South Africa . . . [and] that South Africa continues to have international obligations".<sup>5</sup> In 1964, South Africa decided to implement the policy of establishing separate non-white "homelands" and exclusively white areas. South Africa's Mandate, therefore, was terminated by the United Nations in 1966 [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] and an *Ad Hoc* Committee for South West Africa, composed of 14 Member States, was established to recommend practical means for administering the Territory. In 1967, a United Nations Council for South West Africa, composed of 11 Member States, was set up [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*] to administer the Territory until independence. In 1968, the General Assembly proclaimed that South West Africa would thenceforth be known as "Namibia", and decided that the United Nations Council for South West Africa should be called the "United Nations Council for Namibia" and that the United Nations Commissioner for South West Africa should be called the "United Nations Commissioner for Namibia" [*see resolution 2372 (XXII)*].

67. In 1971, the International Court of Justice ruled that States Members were obliged to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and to refrain from assisting that régime. This opinion was supported both by the Security Council and by the General Assembly. In fact, as history clearly shows, from 1969 to the present, numerous resolutions and declarations calling on South Africa to withdraw from Namibia have been adopted by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority of the United Nations membership.

68. Over a span of almost four decades, the United Nations has steadfastly supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a free and united Namibia. These efforts culminated in the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which established the modalities by which the people of Namibia would be able to determine their future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

69. In this regard, it is indeed regrettable that, notwithstanding the progress made in the negotiations thus far, obstacles have continued to be placed in the path of the people of Namibia in their efforts to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence. My delegation regrets that the United Nations plan, which South Africa accepted six years ago, has not been implemented. The deplorable behaviour of South Africa only prolongs the agony and travail of the Namibian people, causing more bloodshed and endangering peace and development in the region. We, in Singapore, regard South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia as illegal and as lacking in legal, political or moral justification.

70. Moreover, it must be noted that there are other States that defy United Nations resolutions calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from occupied territories. By their examples, those States are contributing to South Africa's defiance by suggesting that United Nations resolutions have no impact on them. Just as those States ignore United Nations resolu-

tions on such issues, so South Africa continues to be intransigent and flouts United Nations resolutions on Namibia.

71. The Government of Singapore therefore reiterates its conviction that the people of Namibia should be given the right to self-determination, freedom and independence. This is a right enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and the Government of South Africa cannot take it away from the Namibian people.

72. We also regard the imposition by South Africa in Namibia of its policy of *apartheid* as morally repugnant and contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. We call for an immediate end to the racist practices of the South African authorities in Namibia.

73. Finally, my delegation supports the struggle of the Namibian people to liberate themselves from South African colonialism and racism. We welcome the leading role played by SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in their struggle to end the illegal occupation of their territory by South Africa. We also call upon the international community to continue its support for the people of Namibia in their efforts to attain their independence.

74. We deeply regret the continued lack of co-operation by South Africa in the implementation of the Bangui Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia [A/39/24, part two, chap. III, sect. B], adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 25 May 1984. We cannot but condemn the various obstacles and excuses which the Government of South Africa has put forward over the past six years in order to avoid implementation of the United Nations plan. My delegation hopes that South Africa will not create additional obstacles to impede the peace process that would finally give Namibia its independence.

75. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Many words have been spoken both before and during the current General Assembly debate on the question of Namibia, but I should like to add a few more from the delegation of Ghana as our expression of disapproval of the illegality that continues to attend that Territory and as an expression of our solidarity with the people of Namibia. It is the conviction of my delegation that the international consensus on this vexed question should be loud and clear so that posterity can judge those who supported the intentional hindrance of Namibia's independence.

76. My delegation's intervention in the current debate is also testimony to the keen desire of the Government and people of Ghana to see the people of Namibia immediately exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence and thereby end the suffering under the notoriously oppressive colonial administration of the racist South African régime.

77. It is nearly 40 years now since the United Nations was first seized of the question of Namibia, yet all efforts by this body to seek a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia's independence have persistently been frustrated by the *apartheid* régime. The General Assembly and several of its subsidiary bodies have adopted hundreds of resolutions and decisions on this question, but to no avail. The International Court of Justice, to which recourse has been had on the many aspects of the Namibian

question, has given its unequivocal opinion, but this has not changed the situation. Even the revered Security Council remains defied by South Africa through certain procedural contradictions of that body itself.

78. It is worth recalling today that South Africa's Mandate over Namibia ceased in 1966 after the General Assembly, having failed to persuade South Africa to subject its administration of Namibia to United Nations supervision, rightly assumed legal authority over the Territory. That decision was endorsed by the Security Council in 1969 and later in 1970, when the Council declared South Africa's continued hold on Namibia illegal and, consequently, called upon all States to ensure that neither they nor their companies engaged in economic activities in the Territory without prior recourse to the United Nations. This latter decision received the backing of the International Court of Justice, which, a year later, enjoined all Member States to consider it obligatory to acknowledge the illegality of South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia.

79. All these measures having failed to secure the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the sole legal Administering Authority of the Territory, was compelled to issue its Decree No. 1,<sup>1</sup> the provisions of which are well known to all delegations.

80. The irrefutability, under international law, of Namibia's right to independence cannot be questioned in this Assembly or anywhere else. Not even the friends of South Africa can question the legal foundation of that right. The *status quo*, which was imposed on Namibia by South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, is therefore unacceptable, since it represents an insidious and consistent attempt by South Africa to hang on to political control of the Territory and thus maintain an atmosphere which allows the unrestrained and depletive exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by itself and its allies. It also means the denial to the citizens of Namibia of the exercise of their God-given right to self-determination and justice. Above all, the *status quo* in Namibia constitutes a flagrant violation by South Africa of the universally accepted principles prescribed by such international forums as the General Assembly. In the face of all this, it is stunning that the international community continues to be powerless to get the question of Namibia resolved once and for all. South Africa is thus an undisputed perpetrator of colonialism, exploitation and discrimination which Member States seen collectively to be too scared to bring to book.

81. Only the cynical and the economically greedy would accept the present situation as satisfactory, even in part. The overwhelming majority of the international community knows that the current impasse over Namibia's independence is something that has been contrived to give political, economic and racial advantage to the racist régime and its friends, and that the sincere political will of all of us is necessary to end the suffering of the Namibian people from the most heinous colonial system mankind has ever known.

82. Indeed, we know as a fact that the lack of progress towards independence for Namibia derives from the encouragement that the colonial Power continues to receive from certain powerful Member States of the United Nations. Whether they realize it



or not—and we suspect they do—their quaint political theories and practices have the unfortunate effect of propping up the *apartheid* régime in the Territory and in South Africa. The whole world can now see that these friends of South Africa will continue to support the régime for as long as the persistence of that régime advances their own global, economic and hegemonistic ambitions.

83. These powerful Member States I have referred to are the same countries which extol the virtues of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and even give the impression of sparing no effort to ensure its application to their own societies. Yet their Governments refuse to see the universality of this Declaration when it involves the criminal and dehumanizing practices of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa and Namibia.

84. The duplicity of South Africa's allies is now clear to all, and we again implore them to join the voices of international decency in calling a halt to the suffering of Namibians. It is now only too obvious that these allies of *apartheid* share South Africa's guilt in unceasingly creating one technical obstacle after another to postpone Namibia's independence indefinitely. Refusal to listen to the voice of moderation will continue to attract violence and ultimate retribution, as was the case, for example, with the practitioners of nazism.

85. The question of Namibia remains a decolonization issue which ought to be tackled purely within the context of the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], as well as other relevant United Nations resolutions. The injection of extraneous conditions into the process of Namibia's decolonization, therefore, constitutes an unjustifiable affront to the international will expressed in these United Nations decisions. It is in this regard that the delegation of Ghana wishes to reaffirm the continuing relevance of Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which implicitly determined that the creation by the United States Government and the *apartheid* régime of South Africa of the parallelism concept, which links Namibia's independence to extraneous factors, particularly the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, was incompatible with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which defines the acceptable process for the granting of independence to Namibia.

86. Because of our own commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to decolonization especially, my Government cannot accept the delaying tactics that this linkage theory seeks to introduce into the entire negotiating process. While it unfortunately drags the independence of Namibia into the intractable quagmire of the cold war, one can also see in it an attempt to buy time for the South African Government to promote its own sham independence process, which is bound to leave the *status quo* unchanged. It is an old and dirty political game, practised with dubious success elsewhere, and we will contribute our strength in fighting it.

87. The United Nations Council for Namibia draws our attention to the seriousness of the problem in its report when it states:

“At the same time, South Africa sought further to entrench its illegal occupation of Namibia through the massive militarization of the Territory and brutalization of the Namibian people, as well

as detention and assassination of supporters and members of SWAPO.” [See A/39/24, part two, chap. II, sect. A, para. 160.]

This is a charge that the friends of South Africa cannot deny. And, if that is so, why do they aid and abet illegality?

88. The mechanism prescribed by the United Nations, as endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), remains, in the considered opinion of my delegation, the only legitimate basis for securing true justice and independence for the Namibian people. After all, Namibia is the legal responsibility of the United Nations and this world body is itself bound by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) to work for the true exercise of the right to self-determination by the Namibian people.

89. Having said this, I must add that my delegation can no longer expect any good to come from the efforts of the Western contact group with regard to Namibia's independence. Perhaps it is superfluous to say this since the group is now moribund, but for purposes of clarification it ought to be recorded in this debate. Following the group's own history, characterized by the persistent granting of concessions to the *apartheid* régime, we have seen the group's credibility seriously undermined by the policies of its members, particularly the United States, whose so-called constructive engagement policy towards South Africa has been found to be responsible for the intensification of the régime's repression of the people of South Africa and Namibia and the escalation of tension in the southern African region.

90. In our own view, the group's clout has been severely diminished by the activities of one particular member and it needs to decide whether to proceed differently or relinquish the initiative. How can the international community continue to rely on a group some of whose members have been found to be pursuing policies that are negating the very cause they are supposed to be working for?

91. The struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation is legendary and will certainly be noted in history as one of the most heroic struggles of this century. With only a small population and very few resources they continue to wage an armed struggle which has won the sympathy and respect of the international community. They have been denied assistance and called terrorists by certain Western countries, although the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/146 of 20 December 1976, recognized the legitimacy of the armed struggle of the Namibians. Namibian combatants have successfully confronted 100,000 South African troops. South Africa has been forced to spend over 3 million rand a day to hang on to the Territory. In terms of human and material resources, this wastage can be ill-afforded by either side. We call on Member States, therefore, to join in the effort to bring Namibia to independence in the year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

92. The United Nations is our only hope, and we urge that concrete steps now be taken to ensure the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We hope that the Security Council will, as a matter of urgency, apply all the rules and forces at its disposal to end South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, as well as its repressive policies at home. The imposition by the Council of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime as

provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations is overdue.

93. We also wish to reiterate an appeal to Member countries and their multinational corporations to cease forthwith all collaboration with the *apartheid* régime and to ensure full compliance with Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia.<sup>1</sup> These countries and their multinational corporations should be reminded that legitimate economic activity in independent Namibia stands everybody in better stead than the current looting that is going on in the Territory. The people of Namibia have a legitimate right to benefit from the exploitation of their natural resources and this must not be denied them through the feet-dragging and prevarication of some of our membership.

94. Finally, Ghana will continue to uphold its commitment to the struggle of the Namibian people to attain freedom and justice, as we sincerely believe that our own independence remains incomplete while a part of Africa remains under colonial oppression.

95. May I conclude by paying tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the able manner in which it has been able to keep alive the question of Namibia on the international front. The Council can count on Ghana's continuous support in all its efforts in the time ahead until final victory is achieved for Namibians and for human decency.

96. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Namibia poses a growing challenge to the community of States. For decades, the United Nations has been obliged to tolerate one of the most flagrant violations of international law within our memory, yet it has not been able to enforce its decisions, many of which were adopted unanimously.

97. There has been practically no progress since 1966, when the General Assembly decided to end the Mandate over Namibia. We have made progress, of course, in defining principles and in consolidating international support for Namibia's independence, but it is also true that the plundering of Namibian resources and the exploitation of its inhabitants is on the increase, that the support which South Africa receives from its allies is becoming more open and that we have failed to put an end to the *apartheid* régime or to the constant acts of aggression by Pretoria against the countries of the region.

98. The difficult economic situation currently affecting the African continent, combined with the strengthening of the links on the part of various Powers with the South African régime and the re-emergence of hegemonistic theories and practices, have provided today a political framework that is propitious for encouraging covert recolonization.

99. The independence of Namibia is not only a symbol which tests the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; it is also a test case, the outcome of which will tell the developing countries what they can actually expect of us in the near future.

100. If the community of nations truly wishes to solve the problem of Namibia, it should use the methods provided for under the Charter and make them sufficiently deterrent that the Pretoria régime and its supporters will abide by our decisions.

101. We cannot go on accepting indefinitely the impotence of the United Nations. Our frustration must be translated into collective action to end the

impunity of South Africa, otherwise we will be consenting to the submission of the will of the international community to intimidation and to the strategic interests of great Powers.

102. Mexico reaffirms its conviction that the solution to this problem lies in the application of resolutions adopted by the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The various diplomatic efforts that have been made should be understood exclusively as a search for ways and means of enforcing those decisions. In no way should they be seen as a stratagem for distorting them, forgetting them or violating them.

103. It would appear that some of the parties involved in the process of negotiation are not yet committed to resolution 435 (1978). The application of that resolution has been postponed because of the emergence of new requirements that have nothing to do with the question of Namibia and which, furthermore, constitute an encroachment on the sovereignty of independent States. As the independence of Namibia is postponed, so we see an increase in acts of destabilization designed to strengthen, over the long term, the domination of the South African régime and assure the survival of *apartheid*.

104. We should make sure that the terms of the problem are not distorted. The Summit Meeting of the Front-line States, held at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, on 29 April 1984, confirmed the wholehearted support of the Heads of State and Government and the leaders of the liberation movements for the struggle of the people of Namibia against colonialism, and that of the people of South Africa against *apartheid*.

105. The Final Communiqué of that Meeting,<sup>6</sup> welcomed by the Council for Namibia at its most recent special meeting, makes it clear that in both countries the peoples of Namibia and South Africa, led by SWAPO and the African National Congress of South Africa [ANC] respectively, are waging a political struggle for their liberation and sovereignty. Those struggles, supported by the United Nations, are between the people of Namibia and the occupying Power, and between the people of South Africa and the Pretoria régime, respectively.

106. Genuine stability and just and harmonious progress in the region must be based on the full exercise of national and human rights by the peoples of southern Africa. Any other approach is unacceptable in the light of the resolutions of the United Nations and serves only the goals of strategic, political and economic domination.

107. Most Member States take part in good faith and with a deep commitment to peace in the effort to resolve this long-standing controversy. If the principal allies of South Africa were to do the same, Namibia would already have won its self-determination, and southern Africa would today be a zone of independent development.

108. It is worth noting that the Security Council has practically ceased to try to enforce its resolution 418 (1977), imposing an arms embargo against South Africa. The report of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa,<sup>7</sup> which was submitted on 19 December 1980 to a meeting of the Security Council, has not even been discussed, so that the work of that body has been wasted. All this serves to

consolidate the impunity of the Pretoria régime and to enable the States which support it to do so freely.

109. The gravity of the violations committed in the region demands a more effective response by the international community. On a number of occasions we have spoken in favour of the total isolation of the Pretoria régime and the imposition of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The repeated refusal to take such measures, on the pretext of the alleged efficacy of persuasion, has served only to cover up complicity and to strengthen the position of the transgressor State.

110. It is time for an energetic reaction by the United Nations now that we are approaching the celebration of its fortieth anniversary. We cannot allow that date to pass without bringing about the independence of Namibia. The responsibility of all States in the matter is undeniable, and the conduct of each State in this regard will give clear evidence of its respect for the provisions of the Charter and binding international commitments.

111. The delegation of Mexico once again expresses its support for the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which we are a loyal and active member. We believe that they should be adopted in their entirety, so as to reaffirm our full support for the Council, our respect for its decisions and our recognition of the facts that it denounces, and to promote relevant international action.

112. Mexico's position has been consistent with United Nations decisions, which we enthusiastically helped to draw up and whose implementation we fully support. Our attitude is based on respect for the fundamental principles of international coexistence: the peoples' right to independence and self-determination, the peaceful coexistence of States and the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations—principles that my country has always and in all circumstances defended.

113. Those values, which have been denied in southern Africa, are increasingly being flouted in other parts of the world. We must reaffirm them today with the greatest vigour, because they could be severely damaged if their interpretation or application were subordinated to agreements between Powers.

114. In the debate on the question of Namibia at the thirty-fifth session [109th meeting, para. 194], my delegation opposed the division of the world into spheres of influence. We said then that we could not tolerate a situation in which our countries would have the doubtful honour of becoming strategic frontiers; nor could we accept their being turned into battlefields by those seeking world domination.

115. Today, when we see signs of a possible improvement in relations between the super-Powers, we believe that that should be repeated. The relaxation of tension between the Power blocs can contribute to solving international problems, as long as it does not give rise to a new definition of zones of influence or security which would frustrate the desire of most States for independence and development.

116. That will be the principal challenge facing the United Nations in the years to come. Therefore, we must strengthen its authority and prestige in the immediate solution of problems that, like the Namibian problem, are a test of the principles that justify

the existence of the United Nations and make it democratic.

117. Mr. MAYE ELA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is 16 years since my country became independent. I should like to recall here the words spoken on 12 October 1968 by the man elected our first constitutional President, in his address marking that historic event. He said:

"Today we are celebrating the accession of Equatorial Guinea to the status of a free, sovereign and independent State, but Equatorial Guinea cannot feel itself completely free while there continue to exist on the African continent Territories under the yoke of colonial domination and until the inhuman *apartheid* régime in South Africa has been abolished."

118. I have made that reference in order to repeat the appeals made by the international community to South Africa, through resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, to grant independence to the African people of Namibia and to abolish the hateful *apartheid* régime that prevails in South Africa—the only place still experiencing the horrors and sufferings inflicted by colonial systems.

119. In his statement to the General Assembly on 11 October this year, during the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Equatorial Guinea said:

"We reiterate our position that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and must be ended. We renew our support for the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] and reaffirm that conditions and circumstances outside the Territory of Namibia should not affect or delay the process of its independence." [31st meeting, para. 22.]

120. It is surprising to note that all Member States agree about the need to maintain international peace and security, but that this unanimity does not seem to extend to the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In South Africa, the black majority continues to suffer from the effects of the policy of *apartheid*, an inhuman system imposed upon them, which we all abhor and condemn. However, some are selective in their condemnation, and their opposition takes different forms in different circumstances—apparently because of economic, strategic and ideological interests. Because people believe that those interests are at stake, they take us further away from the great objective of defending fundamental human rights and freedoms. We believe that there must be deep soul-searching and that, even though it may be difficult, we must all admit that nature itself dictates recognition of the fact that all peoples are entitled to enjoy the same rights, and that therefore *apartheid* must be abolished.

121. We congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, who has guided and directed its work with wisdom and skill. The valuable and ceaseless efforts in the search for a peaceful solution ending in the total and unconditional liberation of Namibia deserve our commendation.

122. We would also like to commend the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts to maintain contacts with all Member States that have expressed their convergent opinions and views [4/39/508]. The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and

Peoples, has exhaustively and fully set forth its decisions and general views in its reports and working documents now before us, and we commend them.

123. A short while ago, we commemorated the one-hundredth anniversary of the heroic struggle of the valiant people of Namibia against the diabolical, inhuman régime of *apartheid*. We have seen how men like Mr. Toivo ya Toivo—who honoured this Assembly with an important statement [78th meeting]—having been imprisoned as young men full of energy, are today emerging from the Robben Island prison as grandfathers, but nevertheless have preserved their lucidity, vitality and militancy in the struggle for ultimate victory.

124. Equatorial Guinea will continue to support all processes leading to the unconditional freedom and independence of Namibia. At the same time, we vigorously condemn the repeated acts of aggression committed by the South African armed forces against neighbouring sovereign States, as well as the use of Namibian territory for launching those attacks, which have caused the loss of innocent human life and considerable material damage.

125. We should like to express our gratitude to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

126. In 1985, we will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. My delegation believes that the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration will lose all significance and sense if the deplorable colonial situation of Namibia persists. We exhort Member States and the international community to exert the maximum pressure on South Africa and the States which co-operate with that country to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the other resolutions of the United Nations.

127. Mr. HERNÁNDEZ RESTREPO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Eighteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated the South African Mandate in Namibia and proclaimed the inalienable right of its people to self-determination, freedom and independence.

128. Yet the people of Namibia are still under the illegal occupation of South Africa. Even as 100 years of struggle against foreign occupation is being commemorated, a last bastion of colonialism still exists in Africa.

129. The international community has almost unanimously reiterated in all the forums of the international system and those of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that the Namibian people should be enabled freely to exercise their inalienable rights.

130. There is no excuse for the prolongation of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. My delegation deplores the obstructive actions and policies that have prevented the full exercise of sovereignty by Namibia in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the resolutions, mandates and declarations of the United Nations.

131. Similarly, my delegation deplores the fact that despite the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971,<sup>8</sup> in response to a request of the Security Council in

resolution 284 (1970), the people of Namibia have not as yet achieved independence.

132. My delegation calls urgently for the withdrawal of the forces occupying the Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

133. My country rejects the arbitrary South African colonial occupation, which is in open violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and appeals, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which, as has been stated, are considered to constitute the most appropriate framework for the peaceful solution of the problem, without the subjection of resolution 435 (1978) and the plan for independence endorsed therein to any extraneous pre-conditions which are nothing but delaying tactics on the part of South Africa.

134. The Security Council, after having considered the further report of the Secretary-General<sup>9</sup> on the question of Namibia, following his trip through southern Africa, adopted without opposition, on 28 October 1983, resolution 539 (1983), which calls upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General forthwith in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

135. Our delegation considers that, if the activities of South Africa are preventing the achievement of the just objectives put forward in that resolution, the Security Council should adopt all necessary measures as provided for in the Charter to ensure that the process of independence of Namibia will not continue to be frustrated and that independence will indeed soon become a reality.

136. The United Nations Council for Namibia—whose admirable work deserves our praise because of the enthusiasm for the Namibian cause that it, together with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples has aroused among the world public—has clearly described the magnitude of the natural resources of Namibia and indicated that the exploitation of those resources by foreigners is a factor that works against the cause of freedom and independence for that Territory.

137. The people of Namibia and the people of Namibia alone should administer and supervise the exploitation of those resources, especially the non-renewable resources. That is why the delegation of Colombia calls upon the United Nations Council for Namibia to implement Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult for us to accept a situation in which, while foreign enterprises are illegally benefiting from the wealth of Namibia, its people suffer from discrimination and poverty.

138. My delegation is convinced that the elimination of that intervention and of the abhorrent practices of *apartheid*, which have been condemned and rejected by the international community, are essential in order to ensure that the peace, justice and prosperity desired by the whole region prevail in the countries of southern Africa.

Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) resumed the Chair.

139. The United Nations has an unavoidable responsibility to ensure the speedy solution of the question of Namibia, and the international community has an undeniable commitment to consolidating



the Territory's independence. Namibia's cause is the common cause of mankind and a priority objective of the international policy of my country.

140. The delegation of Colombia would like to reiterate its thanks to the Secretary-General for his objective and diligent efforts to achieve a definitive solution to this question, and considers that his work should enjoy the full support of the international community.

141. Similarly, we should like to express our thanks to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the work it has accomplished under the guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka who, with such flair, has been presiding over the proceedings in the Assembly.

142. My country would like to emphasize the role that has been played by SWAPO, as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, to assure that Namibia will achieve independence. We would also like to celebrate the release of Mr. Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, its Secretary-General.

143. Colombia, together with all countries sincerely committed to peace, freedom and justice, supports the people of Namibia in their just cause and would like to reiterate its unswerving solidarity with them.

144. We urge the international community to intensify its efforts and reaffirm its commitment so that we may soon see a free, united and independent Namibia.

145. Mr. BORODULIN (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, like the delegations of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations which have already spoken from this rostrum, considers that, in the struggle for the speedy liberation of peoples still in the shackles of colonialism and racist oppression, the question of the genuine independence of Namibia—which is unlawfully occupied by the racist régime of South Africa—is one of the most topical, calling for an immediate solution.

146. Almost two decades ago, in a decision of the General Assembly, the United Nations deprived South Africa of the Mandate to administer Namibia and itself assumed the direct responsibility for that Territory until the Namibian people could reach genuine self-determination and national independence.

147. The international community, and in particular the United Nations, has, since then, made numerous efforts aimed at ending the domination of the racist régime of South Africa over Namibia and at securing the lawful interests of the Namibian people and its right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a unified Namibia.

148. In numerous resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and other authoritative international forums, it has been definitely indicated that the presence of the administration and armed forces of South Africa in the Territory of Namibia is against the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and must be halted unconditionally. The continuing unlawful occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an act of aggression against the Namibian people and a challenge flung at the United Nations. The South African racist régime's cruel repression of the people of Namibia, its armed aggression against independent African countries and its policy of *apartheid* constitute a threat to international peace

and security, not only within the region but also beyond its confines.

149. Genuine ways and means of settling the problem of Namibia are clearly and definitely defined in United Nations decisions on this question as a whole, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In those decisions and, in the first instance, in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), we find the political basis for a just solution of the problem and the ensuring of a transition of Namibia to an independent and autonomous State.

150. Unfortunately, those decisions remain unimplemented because of the fact that the racist régime of South Africa is cynically continuing to ignore the clearly expressed will of the international community.

151. The South African colonialists are not simply being stubborn in their attempt to maintain their unlawful presence in Namibia, but they are also making feverish efforts to perpetuate the enslavement of its people. For these purposes, the racist clique is intensifying mass terror and oppression of the indigenous African population and is speedily building up the military potential of the occupation régime in Namibia by means of the enlistment of foreign elements and compulsory conscription of Namibians into military formations. It is also carrying on manipulations with the so-called system of self-determination in the occupied Territory.

152. Particularly dangerous is the South African régime's use of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for unceasing acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African countries, in particular the People's Republic of Angola. Considerable areas of that sovereign State are to this day being occupied by the aggressor. The heinous policy against the indigenous population of the Republic of South Africa and the oppressed people of Namibia and the growing aggressiveness of the racist régime of Pretoria against the African front-line States are the principal sources of the dangerous tension in southern Africa and constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

153. There is no doubt that the South African *apartheid* régime would not have been able to behave in such a defiant way if it had not received, as will be seen from various United Nations documents and other material, economic, military and other support from a number of Western countries—primarily the United States and Israel.

154. In the meeting and intertwining of the economic, political and strategic interests of the Western Powers and the racist Pretoria régime lurks one of the principal causes of the continuing tragedy of the Namibian people.

155. It is known that economic, financial and other circles in those countries are participating with the South African colonialists in the piratical exploitation of the natural and human resources of Namibia. Of 88 transnational corporations operating on Namibian territory, 35 are based in South Africa, 25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, 8 in the Federal Republic of Germany, 3 in France and 2 in Canada. According to the most modest estimates, 45 per cent of Namibia's gross national product is taken up by the net incomes of foreign monopolies. Approximately 36 per cent of the gross national product is taken outside the country in the form of profits, dividends and taxes. The indigenous people,

constituting more than 90 per cent of the population of the Territory, receive less than 10 per cent of the gross national product.

156. With the active co-operation of the Western Powers I have mentioned, and of Israel, the *apartheid* régime has succeeded in establishing the most powerful military machine on the African continent, by means of which it is trying to perpetuate its unlawful occupation of Namibia and to use the Territory as a bridgehead for subversive action and aggression against neighbouring independent African countries. The build-up of armed forces in the Territory is continuing, reaching such a level that today there is one racist soldier to every 12 inhabitants of Namibia.

157. The international community is particularly concerned about the unceasing co-operation of the United States, certain other Western countries and Israel with the racist Pretoria régime in the development of South Africa's nuclear potential. It is not difficult to visualize the possible dangerous consequences of this co-operation, which in fact gives the *apartheid* régime direct access to nuclear weapons.

158. In spite of the numerous appeals of the United Nations to all Member States to co-operate in ending the unlawful occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to adopt legislative, administrative and other necessary measures effectively to isolate the *apartheid* régime, certain well-known Western countries continue their policy of open support for it. The United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] are doing everything in their power to hinder the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, in applying effective international sanctions, provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, against South Africa.

159. Moreover, the United States, which only recently had donned the mantle of self-styled mediator, has now dropped that disguise. The United States Administration has openly proclaimed racist South Africa to be its "historic ally", and it is developing relations with the *apartheid* régime on the basis of the notorious policy of "constructive engagement".

160. In justifying this sinister alliance, its members are trying by all means possible to distort the character of the Namibian problem and to link a just solution to totally irrelevant questions. At the same time, the United States and the *apartheid* régime of South Africa are increasing their overt pressure on African countries to complicate the situation in southern Africa, with the object of taking the question of Namibia out of the framework of the United Nations and solving it on a neo-colonialist basis in accordance with the narrow, selfish interests of the Western Powers.

161. The Byelorussian SSR firmly condemns the continuing unlawful occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and the unceasing manoeuvres of the United States and other Western Powers and racists to maintain the *apartheid* system in South Africa and implant a puppet régime in Namibia with the aim of undermining the foundations of a political settlement to the problem of southern Africa, a settlement that has been built into decisions of the United Nations—above all, those of the Security Council.

162. The Byelorussian SSR speaks out in favour of a speedy, unconditional implementation by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to self-determi-

nation and independence, on the basis of the maintenance of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, the immediate, total withdrawal from its Territory of all South African troops and administration, and the handing over of all authority to the people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity [OAU] as the sole authentic representative of that nation.

163. We again declare our solidarity with, and total support for, the courageous struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia. The Byelorussian SSR has sided with, and will continue to side with, the peoples of the African front-line States in their efforts to defend their national independence and territorial integrity against the aggressive tendencies of the South African colonialists.

164. The United Nations—primarily the Security Council—bears a direct responsibility for ensuring that its decisions on Namibia are implemented so that a just solution to the Namibian problem may be found as soon as possible. In this connection, we support the demands of the African countries that the Security Council should introduce comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the South African régime, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

165. The time has long since passed for the Security Council fully to assume the main role in ensuring effective and permanent control over Namibia and guidance of the Territory towards total independence. This role includes the questions of the composition, leadership, location and activities of the United Nations mission to provide assistance to Namibia, as well as setting a date and a timetable for the mission.

166. In conclusion, I should like to refer to the important and very useful work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia in defending the interests of the Namibian people. We express our gratitude to the representative of Zambia, Mr. Lusaka, who directs the Council's work with such competence.

167. Our delegation will support the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Council [A/39/24, part four, chap. I] because the measures proposed there are aimed at the speedy attainment of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia.

168. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): As this is the first time during the present session of the General Assembly that I have had the honour of speaking, Sir, I cannot refrain from expressing my delegation's gratification at your presidency of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. Your presence in the Chair during consideration of this item in particular is especially fitting in view of the involvement in the issue of Namibian independence on the part of your President, your Government, your people and yourself. In fact, Zambia, as a front-line State, and Zambians have been part of all the initiatives and moves aimed at securing Namibian independence.

169. The continuing colonial status of Namibia is a source of anger and regret for all of us and should be a source of shame and embarrassment to those that

perpetuate this situation and those that support the racist colonial occupation authorities.

170. The history of the illegal South African occupation of Namibia is well known and I will not repeat it. Suffice it to say that if, to paraphrase Gibbon, history is the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind, then the modern history of southern Africa is the register of the crimes and follies of the *apartheid* State and its imperialist allies, of its military adventurism and of the misfortunes of the oppressed people of the region.

171. Since 1978, the issue of genuine and complete independence for Namibia has been a priority issue for the People's Republic of Angola in particular and for the front-line States in general, but the issue has been bogged down by one obstacle after another manufactured by the racist South African régime and its imperialist allies. It has been the commitment of SWAPO and the Government of Angola to the fulfilment of the aspirations of the people that has led to the breaking of the deadlock on each occasion.

172. Surely the international community remembers the 1979 proposals put forward by the Angolan leadership which allowed the stalemate created by the Pretoria régime to be broken. Since then, despite the most terrible and trying times for the Angolan nation, of which the international community in general and the Security Council in particular have been made aware, Angola has been in the forefront of the support for SWAPO and the liberation struggle of the Namibians.

173. In fact, the unwavering championship of the Namibian cause has earned the Angolan people a terrible retribution from the racist régime in Pretoria: massive invasions of my country; armed aggression; the military occupation of parts of southern Angola since 1981; the systematic destruction of national property far beyond that caused by conflict, in fact, vandalism of a strategic kind aimed at harming and sabotaging national reconstruction; the destruction of transportation and communication lines; the kidnapping of technical assistance advisers working with our people; the brutal treatment of children; the murder of unarmed civilians, including women and children; the killing of livestock—in short, a sustained battering at the Angolan Government, institutions, infrastructure and people through invasions, occupation, artillery attacks, air raids, bombings and sabotage.

174. It is a matter of record that in the face of this adversity the Angolan Government and people, true to the principles of their revolution, have remained firm in their solidarity with the people of Namibia.

175. We have made a pledge to see the liberation and genuine independence of Namibia, through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), come about. To that end, even at considerable human, national, economic, political, territorial and diplomatic cost, the leadership of Angola—the MPLA Workers Party<sup>10</sup> and the Government—has displayed creativity and flexibility, without compromise, regarding the problems which impede or are said to impede the independence of Namibia and threaten peace in southern Africa and has sought solutions to the real as well as the manufactured problems.

176. The position of the Government and the people of Angola has always been clear, consistent, constant and unequivocal: solidarity with and sup-

port for SWAPO and the Namibian people in their effort to wrest from the jaws of the racist Power the independence and freedom which are theirs by history, by law and by right.

177. Recently, the Secretary-General and the international community were informed of the steps taken by the Government of the People's Republic of Angola with the essential objectives of guaranteeing the independence of Namibia through the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), achieving the withdrawal of South African forces from the south of Angola, securing international guarantees for Angola's security, independence and territorial integrity and contributing to the establishment of lasting peace in southern Africa.

178. Angola has bled and has been bleeding for over 500 years. First there were five centuries of oppressive colonial rule, then 14 years of a heroic and brutal war of liberation, then a racist war of aggression from the day of the announcement of our independence, then a military occupation of parts of southern Angola since 1981.

179. In December 1983, the racist invaders, to deflect mounting international condemnation, presented proposals on the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola, to which my Government gave an encouraging response. A year later, in December 1984, South African troops are today still in occupation in southern Angola, 25 miles inside Angolan territory, hundreds of miles from the South African border, and we are being asked to take seriously the words of the racist régime. South Africa continues to support the quisling UNITA<sup>11</sup> bands in its continuing attempts to destabilize the legitimate Government of Angola.

180. South Africa supplies these puppets and lackeys, trains them, arms them, finances them and gives them bases in northern Namibia to which they retreat when faced with the wrath of the Angolan people. The traitor Savimbi betrayed his people, his country, his history, and shamed an entire continent by being the only black man present at the Botha investiture ceremony. The rest of Africa remained silent at this blatant betrayal.

181. Despite all these problems facing us, the President of Angola, Comrade José Eduardo dos Santos, and the Angolan people have given proof of their goodwill and seriousness in seeking peace for the solution of the Namibian problem. The international community knows that the Angolan President and his people will never walk away from their responsibility to the region and to the African continent.

182. However, I will presume on the Assembly's patience to examine for a moment the ludicrous racist assertion that the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola pose a threat to the security of South Africa. Luanda is 2,300 kilometres from the Orange River and Cabinda is 2,740 kilometres from the Orange River. By this token, if we apply the racist assertion to a geographical trajectory, over three fourths of the African continent is in danger from the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola. The racist charge of "danger" is laughable, especially when not a single Angolan, let alone a Cuban soldier, has ever set foot outside the sovereign borders of Angola, while the racist armed forces of South Africa and its lackeys and mercenaries have been illegally present in over half a dozen sovereign African countries. And

Angola, I need not remind the General Assembly, does not share even a centimetre of a border with South Africa, a fact which the racist régime conveniently chooses to overlook.

183. Even a cursory analysis of the situation leads us to conclude that the Pretoria régime intends to perpetuate *apartheid* and exert by force and sabotage its political, economic and social domination in southern Africa, with an expansionist thrust towards the entire African continent.

184. No, a far greater threat to the racist régime, system and structure is not from some internationalist forces in Angola—and Pretoria well knows this—but first and foremost from within South Africa, from its 22 million oppressed and exploited blacks, who are supported by Africa's population of over 250 million. To paraphrase an ancient proverb: "Dictators ride on tigers which they dare not dismount, and the tigers are getting hungry".

185. The Assembly has heard enough on the problems of Namibia. Now we need to see action on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) for the attainment of independence by Namibia. I say with regret that in the past decades political problems have been dealt with bilaterally or regionally, outside the United Nations, thus negating one of the main reasons for the existence of the Organization. But the question of Namibia is unique because the United Nations, through the Security Council and the United Nations Council for Namibia, is the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia. Therefore, it is mandatory that the United Nations take action and retrieve the authority to speak on and for Namibia, authority which it has allowed to be usurped.

186. My delegation read with interest and some amusement the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa very shortly after I had handed over my President's letter to the Secretary-General. The irrelevant and extraneous factor of the presence of the Cuban internationalist forces in Angola was not manufactured by South Africa and its allies until 1981, while the operative resolution on the implementation of Namibian independence dates back to 1978.

187. The independence of Namibia has occupied the attention of the Angolan leadership and people almost as much as our own independence. As my President declared in his statement at the twentieth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, the platform contains the fundamental official position of the Angolan Government on the question of Namibia and southern Africa. He further stated that the Governments of the United States and South Africa now have the opportunity to demonstrate to the world their seriousness in the negotiations and their desire to contribute effectively to the solution of the problems of our region with respect to the issues of sovereignty and territorial integrity.

188. Angolans are still prepared to say: "Victory at all costs. Victory in spite of all terror. Victory however long and hard the road may be. For without victory there is no survival."

189. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

190. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): By this debate we mark the end of another frustrating year in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian

conflict, the end of the sixth year in the fruitless and precarious life of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the second anniversary of the 1982 agreement, equally fruitless to date, by which all the remaining impediments to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) were deemed by all parties to the Namibian conflict to have been successfully negotiated and finally resolved.

191. For the people of Namibia, this debate and the year 1984 mark on the one hand the culmination of a century of wrong and on the other the commemoration of a century of heroic struggle against colonialism, led by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The occasion is both one to be reviled and condemned and one to be remembered and honoured. It is an occasion which must permit us the opportunity to look back with a mixture of pride and sorrow, to seek counsel from the past 100 years of colonial oppression and anti-colonial resistance in Namibia, as we prepare for the future with a new affirmation of faith in the ultimate triumph of the forces of justice over those of injustice.

192. Yes, the Namibian struggle will triumph, even if for the present we are forced to admit that the revelations of the past week, particularly those in South Africa's letter of pre-conditions for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), constitute a very serious obstacle. Yes, even if it is painful to admit that for the moment the grand vision of a free, independent and proud Namibia, as laid out so carefully and meticulously in the United Nations plan for the peaceful liberation of Namibia, remains nothing more than a vision yet to be fulfilled—indeed, even though it may appear that we are seeing the dying days of resolution 435 (1978). Yes, but the dream and love of freedom will never die in the minds and hearts of Namibians whatever fate befalls Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This fact, this nagging reality, must be understood by those who would have us share the mistaken belief that the Namibian freedom struggle can be frustrated to death.

*Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

193. We remain committed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in the shape and form in which we have known it over the past six years. That is why we are adamantly opposed to the linkage by which South Africa seeks to tamper with the integrity of that resolution. One has only to consider seriously the contents of the letter contained in document A/39/689 to realize that the linkage has burgeoned into a full-fledged parallel plan for Namibia—parallel to resolution 435 (1978). Armed with the inflated arrogance of a self-appointed regional super-Power, South Africa, through its plan, seeks to ensure not only that Namibia proceeds to independence on Pretoria's terms but also that the affairs of the entire region of southern Africa are reordered in the image of a South Africa dedicated to the preservation of white domination and supremacy.

194. The South African plan is replete with latter-day interpretations of resolution 435 (1978) and with ingenious and nefarious assertions of new understandings cunningly twisted to explain away Pretoria's attempt to clothe the chicanery of its intentions in the garb of good faith. Consider, as just one instance, the assertion under the heading "Political



Principles" that "resolution 435 does not preclude the establishment of a cessation of hostilities prior to its implementation" [see A/39/689]. And this is an assertion made by a South Africa which utterly refused in Geneva in January 1981 at the pre-implementation meeting to sign a cease-fire when challenged to do so by the President of SWAPO. Why is a cease-fire so attractive now? We are extremely suspicious and wary, fully conscious, as we certainly are, that the South African cease-fire, the so-called cessation of hostilities, is one whose real purpose is known only to South Africa but which, we can safely conjecture, is meant to involve SWAPO in an unsophisticated conspiracy to sabotage the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). It is a cessation of hostilities prior and in addition to the United Nations cease-fire. It is a ploy either to buy time for South Africa's occupation of Namibia or to lure SWAPO into the trap of capitulation.

195. The United Nations plan, as we have known it in the past six years, would become so deformed as to be totally unrecognizable and unimplementable if South Africa's parallel plan were to be incorporated into it. There is a clear indication in the South African letter to which I have already referred that the withdrawal of Cuban forces would serve as a mere appetizer for a deluge of insatiable demands, made not only on Angola but on the region of southern Africa as a whole. For we must ask: What would stop South Africa from demanding that all the countries of southern Africa take a census of their Cuban and East European guests and report to Pretoria for instructions? What would stop South Africa from making such a demand?

196. We are saying this to sharpen the sensitivity of the Assembly to the linkage issue and its consequences and ramifications for our region. The front-line State of Angola is no longer being asked simply to send Cuban internationalist forces home in return for an indefinite commitment on the part of South Africa to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); it is now being asked to undress in public: first, to restrict the number of Russian, East German and "other communist" advisers to 1978 levels; secondly, to furnish a list of East European advisers and their functions and whereabouts; and, thirdly, to furnish a list of all Cubans stationed in Angola. And all this is in addition to the arrogant demand that the Cuban forces not be replaced "by any other foreign forces" [*ibid.*]. That is the level to which the linkage issue has degenerated—as has, I am afraid, our hope and faith in the peaceful decolonization of Namibia.

197. Namibia cannot be peacefully decolonized in the face of the fact that the concept of simultaneity and/or parallelism, against which we have so often raved and ranted, has become so firmly entrenched that it is a position away from which it is not possible to move South Africa and the United States, even with a bulldozer. South Africa's letter states categorically and unashamedly:

"It has been the consistent position of the South African and United States Governments that Cuban withdrawal from Angola should be carried out parallel with the reduction of South African forces in terms of United Nations Security Council resolution 435." [*ibid.*]

But we all have to understand that the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia is the heart and soul of the United Nations plan for Namibia, for

there can be no independence—peaceful independence—for Namibia so long as the Territory remains occupied by South African troops. Mortgage the removal of these troops to something else beyond the competence of SWAPO and the Namibian people and one has virtually ruled out Namibia's peaceful evolution to independence and encouraged the alternative of independence by bloody revolution.

198. That is the state of affairs in which we find ourselves at this most frightening period in the history of our region. The Security Council is in effect being challenged to accept South Africa's far-reaching and subversive amendments to resolution 435 (1978) and face the inevitable consequences, or to come to terms with the painful prospect of the United Nations plan becoming another failed attempt to liberate Namibia by peaceful means.

199. We have wasted six years trying, in the most futile way, to decide whether or not Namibia should proceed to independence through a process in which we all, ostensibly without exception, claim to repose our faith and confidence, a peaceful process whose central purpose is to stop Namibia's needless and wasteful bleeding and preserve its young generation for the daunting task of independence and nation-building.

200. We, the front-line States, and SWAPO have spared no effort to be reasonable; we have even tolerated a series of thinly disguised manoeuvres contrived to hijack the United Nations plan for Namibia. All this has been to no avail. And yet we stand ready to give peace, real and indivisible peace, a chance. As we have stated so often in the past, there can be no real, lasting peace in our region so long as millions of our fellow southern Africans, in Namibia and South Africa, remain in bondage. We challenge South Africa to co-operate with us in this collective endeavour. We challenge South Africa to demonstrate its peaceful intentions by co-operating in the implementation of a plan—Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—by which we seek to avoid further needless waste of the precious lives of young Namibians and South Africans in a war which, for South Africa in any case, is an exercise in sheer futility, because it cannot win that war.

201. South Africa has more than enough on its plate in South Africa itself, where a catastrophic revolution is threatening to erupt. There too we challenge South Africa to live up to its protestations of peaceful intentions by opening the floodgates of freedom before it is too late.

202. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): The year 1984 marks the centenary of the struggle of the people of Namibia to throw off the yoke of colonialism. Despite heroic efforts and countless sacrifices by these martyred people, despite the understanding and increasing assistance given to them by the international community, and despite the untiring and devoted efforts of the various bodies of the United Nations, which has been directly responsible for the fate of Namibia since 1966, the matter of the illegal occupation of the country by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is still before us. It is a totally unacceptable anachronism.

203. My delegation fully endorses the analysis of the present situation in Namibia, as well as the background and nature of the question of Namibia, as was set out in such a detailed and wise way on 29

November 1984 before the General Assembly. We would like to add the voice of our people to the universal indignation provoked by the stubborn manoeuvres of the racist régime of Pretoria aimed at perpetuating colonialism in Namibia through a policy of savage repression against the Namibian people and through a policy of aggression, subversion and constant pressure against neighbouring African countries, thus committing a dual crime, both against mankind and against peace.

204. Namibia is in fact the last significant bastion of old-style colonialism. Given the victorious progress of national liberation movements that have developed spontaneously and continually over the last four decades, the persistence of the colonial régime in Namibia today has become an insupportable paradox and a glaring injustice which weighs heavily on the conscience of our times. This is all the more so since the fate of this martyred country was directly linked to the League of Nations, and later to the United Nations, for more than 60 years. And, since the United Nations took the decision to assume direct responsibility for Namibia, more than 70 resolutions have been adopted in the vain search for a solution which would grant true independence to Namibia.

205. Why do we see this situation arise? The fundamental obstacle which continues to obstruct the road to independence for the Namibian people is the considerable body of interests, economic, strategic and so on, built up by the racist South African settlers in direct association with their powerful Western allies, primarily the United States of America along with other countries of NATO, and Israel.

206. These interests, which are essentially colonialist and imperialist, represented by the powerful transnational corporations, are indeed carrying on feverishly the pillage of the natural and human resources of Namibia and thus maintaining the Namibian people under foreign domination. To perpetuate this domination, the Pretoria régime in Namibia is practising a policy of "divide and rule" by setting up puppet institutions and organizations and by resorting to military conscription, thereby forcibly drafting Namibians into the colonial army in order to "Namibianize" the war against the Namibian people. But the most dangerous aspect and the most heinous aspect of the colonial policy of Pretoria in Namibia is the introduction into this Territory of the institutionalized racist system of *apartheid*, through which the whole of the indigenous population is rendered into virtual slavery; and methods of bantustanization have been introduced, on a par with Hitler's nazism, by forcing population groups to resettle, by regrouping tribal entities and ethnic entities, and by destroying the entire socio-economic structure of the Namibian nation.

207. In April 1983, my delegation had an opportunity to listen to the President of the South West Africa People's Organization, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and heard him, in the Security Council, excoriate the *apartheid* junta, which through all means wishes to maintain the illegal occupation of Namibia. My delegation could not help but recall the grimmest periods of the long war of resistance of the Vietnamese people against American imperialists. Indeed, those were similar adversaries, with matching criminal targets and virtually identical manoeuvres and plans of action. As in the case of South Viet Nam at the time, the enemy of the Namibian people is trying

to find, at any cost, a way of turning Namibia into a neo-colony and thus transforming it into a vast garrison and an immense military base, which will serve as an infernal machine to perpetuate the illegal occupation of the country through repressive terror of the most atrocious sort, and a springboard for aggressive armed attacks against the front-line African States.

208. But the obstacle to the independence of Namibia is all the more tremendous in that Washington continues to throw in its lot with Pretoria. Did not President Reagan himself proclaim emphatically this strategic alliance by saying: "Can we abandon a country that is strategically essential to the free world in its production of minerals that we must all have?"\*

209. In fact a militarily powerful South African régime is perfectly in keeping with the strategic interests, both regional and global, of the United States. That is why, together with Israel, the United States is increasing its military assistance to Pretoria and opening the door for the régime's acquisition of nuclear capability, thus leading to an increasing threat to peace and security in southern Africa and indeed throughout the world. At the same time, it is Washington itself that, up to now, has guaranteed political protection for Pretoria by exercising its veto against any Security Council resolution calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime.

210. The struggle of the Namibian people against South Africa's colonial yoke took a decisive turn when SWAPO was established in 1960 and rapidly—six years later—proceeded to the phase of armed resistance, with the creation of the People's Liberation Army for Namibia, in order to meet effectively the ferocious repression carried out by Pretoria's army. Indeed, this is an essential requirement for many liberation movements at a particular phase of their development, as a guarantee of their final victory. The legitimacy of the armed struggle of the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence has in any case been emphasized on several occasions by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and has been emphatically stated in many resolutions of the General Assembly.

211. On behalf of the people of Viet Nam, we should like at this stage to share some thoughts with our brothers and sisters in Namibia.

212. In the first place, although oppressed peoples must as a last resort use armed struggle because of the blindness of their enemies in using violence and weapons against them, it is nevertheless useful that at the same time they should take up the struggle on other fronts, such as the political and diplomatic fronts. This is what Viet Nam has done. This is what friends are doing now in Central America and elsewhere. This is also what SWAPO has undertaken with admirable patience, in order to achieve an honourable cease-fire which would lead to the termination of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. However, as always, our enemies use diplomatic means for delaying purposes and diversionary purposes and as a way of bringing pressure to bear in the hope that they will obtain maximum concessions. This is what is happening at the present time in Central America, as well as in southern Africa and in

\*Quoted in English by the speaker.

the Middle East. Indeed, we need only mention the attitude adopted by the United States Government in its conversations with the Nicaraguan Government with regard to the Contadora Act on Peace and Cooperation in Central America [A/39/562, annex] or, for example, the warning issued during the course of the El Salvador talks to the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front calling on it to lay down its arms and accept a general amnesty. That is why all peoples must be in a position to negotiate from strength; they must be vigilant and constantly on their guard. In this regard, we welcome the position reaffirmed by SWAPO on 13 August last, to the effect that Pretoria should set a date to begin the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the only fair and acceptable solution to the problem of Namibia.

213. In the second place, my delegation wishes to emphasize the fact that the victory of oppressed peoples depends first and foremost on their own efforts in the struggle but at the same time it depends on support from their friends throughout the world. With regard to the importance of international solidarity for Namibia, the oppressed South African people themselves are called on to play a primary role. That is why the strengthening of the present struggle of the South African people and the ANC against the *apartheid* régime gives valuable support to the Namibian people. In the same way, greater awareness on the part of United States public opinion in order to increase pressure on the Reagan Administration so that it will renounce its negative policy of constructive engagement with regard to Pretoria, stop disguising the colonial nature of the issue by regarding it as an East-West conflict and stop the artificial linkage with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola is of the greatest importance.

214. As was the case with the question of the policies of the *apartheid* régime, which was dealt with by the General Assembly last week, the question of Namibia demands that the international community, and particularly the United Nations, which has had direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory for 18 years, take positive and immediate action and no longer make mere exhortations or empty promises, as was stated by the President of the South West Africa People's Organization in the Security Council in April 1983.

215. It is indeed obvious that verbal condemnations are powerless to shake the obstinacy of the racist settlers of Pretoria and their protectors and accomplices. Repeated appeals made respectively by the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, 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, the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as many outstanding international figures, have all been unanimous in emphasizing the need for concerted international action of a more energetic nature against Pretoria.

216. In this regard, it is for the Security Council, in the first place, to deal with the Namibian question firmly and to take full responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council should establish a precise timetable for its implementation and keep the matter constantly before it until the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been fully realized. It is time the

Council considered the convening of a special meeting in order to discuss the means of overcoming the present deadlock. It must continue to encourage the Secretary-General in his good offices, while undertaking serious preparations for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

217. At the same time, it is essential that the community of nations reinforce its assistance in many forms—material, moral, political and military—to SWAPO and to the front-line States in order to help them to increase the strength of their resistance to Pretoria's repression and pressure of all sorts.

218. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has invariably given its complete understanding and militant solidarity to the just cause of the independence of Namibia. In August 1981, in receiving a mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia in Viet Nam, my Government solemnly reaffirmed its position of principle of total support for the legitimate struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its only authentic and legitimate representative.

219. Here in the General Assembly, let my delegation reaffirm once again our unwavering support for the Namibian people, as well as our fervent wish for the rapid victory of their national liberation struggle.

220. Mr. OCHIENGHS-WELLBORN (Uganda): A few weeks ago, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle of the Namibian People against Colonialism. To the people of Namibia that marked a century of barbaric and brutal oppression, the denial of the most elementary human rights and the exploitation and plunder of their human and natural resources. This year also marks 100 years of heroic struggle against colonialism and oppression by the gallant people of Namibia. That struggle, today spearheaded by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, continues to register victories against South Africa.

221. For the past several years, concerted efforts have been made to secure independence for Namibia. In spite of its adoption and universal recognition six years ago, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, still remains unimplemented. The Pretoria régime has continued to use every pretext to frustrate the implementation of that resolution. Negotiations have been held in the hope that, in spite of South Africa's known intransigence, those Western countries with massive economic and other ties with South Africa would use their leverage with it in favour of the independence of Namibia. It is regrettable that the United States, a member of the Western contact group, in pursuance of its policy of constructive engagement, instead prompted and encouraged racist South Africa to insist on the irrelevant and extraneous issue of the linkage of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola with the independence of Namibia.

222. Uganda continues to reject any further attempts to insist on linkage as a pre-condition of the independence of Namibia. We refuse to accept that the future of the Namibians should be sacrificed to selfish interests or on the altar of East-West rivalry. We maintain that the trading of a people's freedom and national independence is not only reprehensible

but immoral. I wish, therefore, to reiterate Uganda's position that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is a matter between two independent and sovereign States. It has no relation whatsoever with the colonial situation in Namibia.

223. In the course of all the negotiations, SWAPO has continued to display considerable patience, flexibility and statesmanship. Even in the face of equivocation and prevarication, SWAPO has continued to express its readiness to sign a cease-fire immediately so that the implementation process can begin. In contrast, South Africa has strewn one obstacle after another in the path of dialogue, insisting on elements that have no bearing on the process envisaged in resolution 435 (1978). The contrasting attitudes of the two parties were demonstrated early this year in Lusaka, when South Africa failed to respond to SWAPO's offer to sign an immediate cease-fire.

224. Clearly, the Pretoria régime could not have demonstrated such brazen intransigence and duplicity if it had not enjoyed the encouragement and support of powerful friends which selfishly defend it in order to protect their own vested interests.

225. Aware that SWAPO would win any free and fair election held in Namibia under United Nations auspices, South Africa is more than ever determined to stall SWAPO's victory through the imposition of puppet political institutions. The latest attempt to regroup the internal quislings in the so-called Multi-Party Conference is clear proof that South Africa has no intention of complying with the letter and the spirit of the United Nations plan. On the contrary, it is seeking to circumvent the United Nations plan and to consolidate its illegal hold on the Territory of Namibia.

226. A serious aspect of the Namibian colonial situation is the formidable military machine which South Africa has built in Namibia. This has been accomplished through the creation of tribal armies, the recruitment of mercenaries and the introduction of compulsory military service for all male Namibians between the ages of 17 and 55. The objective of these measures is to divide the African patriots and to intimidate the population with a view to undercutting support for SWAPO inside Namibia.

227. South Africa has also continued to use the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. The racist forces still occupy the southern part of Angola and continue to prop up the renegade forces of Savimbi. It has embarked on a systematic programme of political and economic destabilization of the front-line States, aimed at forcing them to withdraw support for the liberation struggle.

228. The policies pursued by racist South Africa and its continued occupation and militarization of Namibia are a threat to international peace and security and consequently call for decisive action by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

229. The natural resources of Namibia are being plundered, in total contravention of Decree No. 1.<sup>1</sup> The United Nations Council for Namibia and the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations have often highlighted the callous disregard of the legitimate interests of the Namibian people by transnational corporations from certain Western countries. Such activities, coupled with the policies of co-operation and friendship with South Africa,

only lend legitimacy to and encourage South Africa's occupation of Namibia and must be condemned. In this connection, Uganda denounces the opening of foreign consulates in occupied Namibia under any pretext whatsoever. It is therefore imperative to call upon those Western countries to desist from frustrating the United Nations efforts towards the independence of Namibia.

230. There has in fact been a dramatic intensification of the propaganda emanating from Pretoria and certain Western capitals to the effect that the consultations in the region are well on their way and will consequently lead to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The real situation has been clarified by the President of the People's Republic of Angola in a communication he addressed to the Secretary-General [4/39/688]. He makes it clear that, in spite of the flexibility and political will displayed by Angola to reach an amicable solution to the related problems and to achieve immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), racist South Africa has continued to pursue contrary policies. We in Uganda continue to support Angola's firm position on its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

231. We maintain that Namibia remains the unique responsibility of the United Nations and that resolution 435 (1978) is non-negotiable and the only acceptable basis for a settlement. We reject any attempt or attempts by South Africa and its backers to hijack the central role of the United Nations in the decolonization of that Territory. The Security Council should therefore immediately shoulder its responsibility to implement its plan regarding that Territory.

232. I wish also to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until its independence, which has discharged its responsibilities with a sense of deep commitment and competence. Although the degree to which the Council can make an effective impact on the daily lives of the Namibian people is circumscribed by factors beyond its control, my delegation notes with satisfaction that the work done by the Council to promote the interests of Namibia and its oppressed people in preparation for independence and to mobilize international opinion concerning the cause of justice in Namibia has been enormous. In this connection, my delegation pays a special tribute to Mr. Paul Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their untiring efforts and dedication in preparing Namibia for nationhood. Our appreciation goes equally to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari.

233. In conclusion, I wish to commend the front-line States for the steadfast support they have given to the liberation struggle in southern Africa in spite of the heavy odds they face. I also take this opportunity to reaffirm the solidarity of the Government and people of Uganda with the people of Namibia in their just struggle for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

234. Mr. NGONDA (Zambia): In 1966, the General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia because, as the record clearly shows, Pretoria had—as it is still doing today—systematically violated the letter and the



spirit of that Mandate it assumed in 1920 for the sole and unambiguous purpose of advancing the well-being of the inhabitants of that Territory.

235. Subsequent resolutions and decisions by the General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations, which sought to achieve the same objective defined in resolution 2145 (XXI), have to all intents and purposes come to naught because successive racist régimes in South Africa have resorted to every conceivable trick in the book to stifle the will of the international community.

236. The net effect of South Africa's negative attitude is that Namibia stands out, as my Minister for Foreign Affairs stated during the general debate [11th meeting], as a blot and aberration in an otherwise virtually complete decolonization process in Africa. Thus, in Namibia today, the hallowed principle of the self-determination of countries and peoples, a principle which the United Nations has reaffirmed from time to time, continues to be trampled upon with sickening regularity and impunity by the racist Pretoria régime.

237. It is against this background of increasing South African intransigence that the annual debate on the question of Namibia's independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is taking place.

238. There is certainly no evidence to suggest South Africa's willingness to withdraw and end its illegal occupation of Namibia. Available evidence demonstrates very clearly that Namibia is, in fact, a bastion of South Africa, with more than 100,000 racist troops and mercenaries in the Territory, who continue, in their usual trigger-happy fashion, to slaughter countless Namibians. The latest decision by the racists to conscript all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in the very army of occupation which has brought untold suffering to the Namibian people is incontestable evidence of South Africa's sinister design to persist in its illegal occupation and exploitation of Namibia, which has been the victim of foreign domination and exploitation for the past 100 years.

239. The implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia has not been proceeded with, but not for any reason which can be attributed to SWAPO or to the front-line States. The plan has not been implemented because South Africa and certain of its allies continue to create obstacles in an effort to scuttle that plan. It is a fact that over the years South Africa has made desperate attempts to sidestep the plan by working out schemes designed to exclude SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the oppressed people of Namibia, from participation in any electoral process. The racists have preferred internal settlements with puppet groups, because those groups have neither the vision nor the desire to promote and safeguard the interests of their country and people.

240. The Pretoria régime, which has extended its evil system of *apartheid* to Namibia, has no desire whatsoever to end its illegal occupation of Namibia because, apart from its incredible appetite for continuing to exploit the human resources of that beleaguered country, it plans to continue to use the Territory as a springboard for launching acts of aggression against independent countries of our region in an effort to blunt our support for the heroic struggle which the oppressed are waging to dismantle

the citadel of injustice in South Africa itself. South Africa's insensitivity to the chorus of demands that it end its illegal occupation of Namibia is a function, in no small measure, of the unparalleled moral, diplomatic and material support it continues to enjoy from certain Western countries. Specifically, the United States' constructive engagement policy, coupled with the decision to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, has had the undesirable effect of encouraging the racist and neo-Fascist Pretoria régime to maintain its defiant and hostile posture in relation to any and all efforts designed to accelerate progress along the road to freedom and independence in Namibia. The international community has rightly rejected the linkage issue and all attempts by South Africa and its allies to portray the Namibian people's quest for independence as an East-West issue in the context of super-Power rivalry. Namibians are waging a just struggle to achieve their freedom and independence. That struggle deserves the fullest support of the international community.

241. There can be no doubt that South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and decisions, is a serious challenge and an insult to the Organization. The international community has an inescapable duty not to remain passive in the face of this insult and challenge.

242. As we prepare to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, it is the hope, indeed, the expectation, of the oppressed people of Namibia, who have reposed so much confidence and trust in this world body, that a very clear message will this time be sent to the racists to compel them to end their illegal occupation of Namibia. We have an obligation to continue to uphold the lofty principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. We should not fail the oppressed people of Namibia.

243. Mr. FARAH DIRIR (Djibouti): The stalemate in the Namibian crisis presents a situation whose consequences constantly endanger the peace and security of the southern African region. This is because the Pretoria régime has refused to comply with the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations with regard to the liberation of the Namibian people and their aspiration to freedom and national independence.

244. It is 18 years now since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and took over the direct responsibility of the administration of that Territory with a view to assisting the Namibian people to attain a peaceful transition to genuine independence. A few months later, the General Assembly, by resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, established the United Nations Council for Namibia and entrusted to it—rightly—the responsibility of administering the Namibian Territory, with a clear mandate to defend the rights and interests of the Namibian people until they achieve genuine national independence.

245. Unhappy with that transfer of mandate and bent on its unjustified intention to cling to Namibian territory, the South African régime refused to submit to the wish of the international community to free Namibia and persisted in imposing its colonial policy of illegal occupation on the Territory. Indeed, since

then all actions emanating from the South African régime have clearly demonstrated its evil intention of blocking all prospects of achieving self-determination and genuine independence for the Namibian people.

246. The South African régime, determined to consolidate its colonial policy of domination and to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibian territory, embarked on a massive military build-up, carrying out massive military operations throughout the Territory and beyond its borders to intimidate the Namibian people and the front-line States. It employed repressive methods of arbitrary arrest and torture of civilian detainees. It imprisoned and executed political prisoners and freedom fighters, in defiance and flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

247. It is obvious that in these circumstances the South African régime invited perpetual tension and confrontation in that region. Alarmed at South Africa's inhuman policy of occupation and colonial domination of Namibian territory, the international community has repeatedly condemned and declared that policy null and void. At the same time, it has stood fast by the Namibian people and firmly supported their courageous struggle to achieve complete independence.

248. We believe very strongly—and history will prove—that no matter how strong South Africa is or appears to be, with its massive military machinery and other related repressive apparatus, the reign of terror, brutality and torture by the South African régime over the Namibian population will never suppress or stifle the courage and determination of the Namibian people and their liberation movement, SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, to win their struggle for genuine independence.

249. Nevertheless, it has been very painful to realize that the political, economic and military activities of the racist régime of South Africa and its allies have proved able to undermine the efforts and frustrate the aspirations of the Namibian people to protect their territorial integrity, freedom, natural resources and independence. We do not condone the policy of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa against the wish of the struggling people of Namibia and their liberation movement. We are convinced that that policy undermines the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people and the black majority of South Africa for their freedom and national independence.

250. We see no justification whatsoever for the continued illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibian territory. We reject the presence of the South African armed forces of occupation and the illegal administrative machinery, which should be withdrawn from Namibian territory.

251. The brutal repression by the South African régime of the Namibian people, the persistent violation of their human rights, the exploitation and depletion of the mineral and other natural resources of the Territory and the illegal use of Namibian territory as a springboard for attacks on and efforts to destabilize independent neighbouring States of southern Africa must be condemned and stopped.

252. The international community must exert every possible effort to give adequate moral, financial and material support to the liberation front of the Namibian people to counter South African aggression and to

enable them to carry on their liberation struggle until they achieve genuine independence.

253. We are gratified that the United Nations expressed its will, through the Security Council, to arrest the intransigence of the South African régime and to bring about a peaceful settlement in the area by adopting resolution 435 (1978), which carefully sets forth the basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

254. This resolution has won world-wide recognition and has been accepted as a genuine basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question because of its careful plan for a democratic election in Namibia under United Nations supervision. It invites the South African régime to co-operate with the United Nations in the effort to prepare the people of Namibia for their independence through legally supervised, democratic elections. We are greatly concerned, however, that despite the concerted efforts exerted by the international community, the election plan has yet to be implemented, six years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), because the South African régime has chosen to frustrate all peace efforts and has deliberately rejected any responsibility for reaching a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. The South African régime has used every trick to gain time for its manoeuvres and delaying tactics, designed to perpetuate its domination over the Namibian people and further exploit and plunder the natural resources of their land, in violation of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, as well as of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.<sup>1</sup>

255. Moreover, the establishment by the South African régime of the pre-condition of an unrelated linkage has made it impossible to implement the United Nations plan to resolve the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

256. It is very regrettable that, while the international community continues to appeal to South Africa to comply with resolution 435 (1978), which provides the only valid basis for achieving a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem, South Africa continues to step up its brutal methods of repression and intimidation by extending its obnoxious system of *apartheid* and its policy of bantustanization to Namibian territory. In addition to its regular army of occupation, South Africa has reverted to reliance on the massive recruitment of mercenary forces, which are deployed throughout the Territory and across the borders to stifle the growing resistance of the liberation struggle in the Territory. Recent reports have also indicated that the South African régime has extended compulsory military service to the local population. This latest manoeuvre has forced a considerable number of the Namibian people to flee into exile rather than submit to the colonial strategy of setting Namibian soldiers against their own people.

257. The encroachments of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa have not been limited to Namibian and South African territory, but have gone beyond these borders. The South African régime has repeatedly intimidated and waged war against the neighbouring front-line States so as to destabilize them, disrupt their economic and social structure and thus prevent them from extending support to the courageous people of Namibia, the black majority of South

Africa and their liberation movements. The Pretoria régime could not have sustained its defiant acts of repression and aggression against the southern African States had it not been encouraged by the collaboration of the transnational corporations protected by certain Member countries which, for the sake of selfish gains and short-term interests, have jeopardized the right of the Namibian and South African people to self-determination and national independence, thus endangering the peace and security of the entire region.

258. We believe that any economic and financial collaboration with the South African régime will only increase the aggressive and repressive capacity of the *apartheid* régime further to intensify its brutal repression of and colonial domination over the oppressed Namibian and other southern African people.

259. At this point, the delegation of Djibouti would like to pay a tribute to the brave Namibian people, who, against the odds, have shown great courage in their heroic liberation struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

260. My delegation also expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the experienced and competent leadership of Mr. Lusaka of Zambia, has fulfilled the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly and discharged its responsibilities with diligence, in defence of the rights and interests of the Namibian people, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. We are very happy to commend the tireless efforts of the Council in mobilizing concerted international support and action to promote the Namibian cause and to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. We express our confidence that the persistent endeavours of the Council will augment the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence. In this regard, my delegation is pleased to concur with the conclusions of the Council as set out in its report and expresses its full support for its recommendations [A/39/24, part four, chap I].

261. The international community must exert the utmost effort to reject all measures by the South African racist régime and its allies aimed at blocking the ongoing peace efforts in United Nations forums and at the regional, sub-regional and interregional levels to achieve independence for Namibia. We believe that any negotiations in the search for a political solution in Namibia should strive for a complete and simultaneous cease-fire, followed by the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South Africa's occupying forces from the Territory, so as to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

262. The search for genuine peace requires that effective leverage be applied, if constructive results are to be achieved. In this regard, we firmly believe that it is a primary responsibility of the Security Council—the sole international peace-keeping apparatus of the Organization—to reaffirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence, and accordingly to achieve the essential objective of guaranteeing the long overdue independence of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

263. The Security Council has been repeatedly advised, in the face of South Africa's defiance in rejecting all United Nations resolutions and decisions, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Such sanctions should include an arms embargo, an oil embargo, economic sanctions and other suitable measures as referred to in General Assembly resolutions ES-8/2 and 36/121 B.

264. We cherish the hope that the chronic lack of unanimity in the deliberations of the Security Council and the consequent absence of decisive action to settle the Namibian question will be redressed, and that all Governments will one day—very soon—comply with the provisions on the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions in Chapter VII of the Charter as regards the South African régime.

265. We believe that only through the application of such sanctions will the South African régime be compelled to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia.

266. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 28 October 1983 the Security Council adopted resolution 539 (1983), by which, among other things, the Security Council reiterated that resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for Namibia, was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. It also affirmed that the electoral system to be used for the elections of the Constituent Assembly should be determined prior to the adoption by the Security Council of the enabling resolution for the implementation of the United Nations plan. It called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to communicate to him its choice of electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). The Council expressed its indignation that South Africa's insistence on an irrelevant and extraneous issue of "linkage" had obstructed the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), just as it has obstructed implementation of other Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on Namibia.

Mr. Farah Dirir (Djibouti), Vice-President, took the Chair.

267. In his further report to the Security Council<sup>12</sup> in compliance with its resolution 539 (1983), the Secretary-General deplored the lack of progress in his conversations with South Africa, which had given him no positive response on its choice of electoral system to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations plan. There were 14 votes, including that of our delegation, in favour of the resolution. The United States abstained. We ask ourselves whether South Africa's attitude to the resolution would have been the same if that permanent member had acted differently, voting in favour of the resolution. A positive vote by the United States would have been possible only if that country were truly a champion of human rights, equality and respect for the right of peoples to independence and self-determination.

268. As on other occasions, the abstention by the United States was a manifestation of its policy of constructive engagement, but "engagement" by whom and "constructive" for whom?

269. The engagement is certainly not with the suffering people of Namibia or the South African

people. Rather, it is with the Pretoria Government, resulting only in the consolidation and institutionalization of the shameful *apartheid* system and the policy of aggression practised by South Africa against its neighbours.

270. The international community, including even those countries that support South Africa because they believe that the racist régime protects their economic, political and strategic interests, is aware that the racist régime will never cease of its own accord its illegal occupation of Namibia.

271. Over the past four decades, the racist régime has continued to entrench its illegal occupation. We must emphasize the illegal nature of that occupation, because the use of force does not make illegal actions legal. That has been clearly stated in resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly and in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,<sup>8</sup> delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Security Council in its resolution 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970.

272. The total lack of respect on the part of South Africa for the legal framework of the United Nations and its principal organ with regard to international law—that is, the International Court of Justice—is similar to the attitude adopted by this protecting super-Power, which this year has used every type of manoeuvre and subterfuge to evade its responsibilities with regard to international law. Another manifestation of the total lack of respect for the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, as well as for Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, is the establishment of the so-called Liaison Office of the United States in Windhoek.

273. The President of the United States, in referring to my country almost two years ago, said that our neighbours ran the risk of being contaminated by us. Over the 45 years of the dictatorship of Somoza, the Government of the United States was not much concerned by the fact that the neighbours of Nicaragua could have been contaminated by that dictatorship. Today, it is no more concerned by the fact that the Pretoria régime is imposing the inhuman system of *apartheid* beyond its boundaries through its illegal occupation of Namibia.

274. This export of *apartheid* began in 1955, when the South African Government implemented that policy officially in Namibia, and was entrenched between 1966 and 1976, when the racist régime extended the *apartheid* legislation to Namibia. Thus the Terrorism Act of 1975 was applied to Namibia, and thus the constitutional conference controlled by the white majority was established. The so-called Proclamation AG 8, of 24 April 1980, divided the country into mutually exclusive racial and tribal groups. As far as housing is concerned, laws have been applied which stem from *apartheid*, as for example the Native Urban Areas Proclamation of 1951, which applies in the urban zones. Namibians in the urban centres of their own country live in areas separate from the whites and the Coloureds. The health service is organized in a different way according to whether it concerns whites or blacks; there are special hospitals and dispensaries for blacks, which have to inform the South African Defence Force of all cases of gunshot wounds.

275. The racist régime also makes a distinction between expenditure on health depending on whether it is dealing with the black or the white population.

The latter, as under nearly all the headings of the national budget, receives a disproportionately high allocation.

276. *Apartheid* has also had its effect on the education programme, in the salaries of teachers, investments per student, the ratio of teachers to students and the establishment of separate schools.

277. The repression of the South African and the Namibian peoples by the racist régime is practised through a system of terror. In both South Africa and Namibia, detention, arbitrary arrest, torture and assassination are part of daily life. The statement made by Mr. Toivo ya Toivo at one of the solemn meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia to commemorate the Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia and their Liberation Movement, SWAPO, was very moving. Mr. Toivo ya Toivo, one of the bravest sons of Africa and Namibia, who recovered his liberty after 16 years of unjust detention, said among other things:

"I am out of gaol but I am not free. I will feel free only when my country and my people are truly free. That day is not yet here. Instead, down the road I still see before me a long and bitter struggle. Nevertheless, I remain confident today as I was in 1968 when I said the struggle would be long and bitter, but my people would wage that struggle whatever the cost."<sup>13</sup>

278. History has shown how true the words of Mr. Toivo ya Toivo were, because the aspirations to freedom of the oppressed cannot be denied forever by those whose principal—indeed, only—weapons are violence, oppression and force.

279. The co-operation of certain Western Powers, particularly the United States, with the inhuman régime of *apartheid* only prolongs and makes more bitter the struggle to which Mr. Toivo ya Toivo referred. The *apartheid* régime has felt strengthened by the increased economic, political, military and nuclear co-operation of, in particular, the United States.

280. My delegation will welcome the day when it does not have to vote on resolutions in which the name of the United States appears. In the particular case of Namibia, this would mean that the United States, breaking out of its isolation within the international community, was offering its support for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It would also mean the withdrawal of the military, economic and political support that today it gives to the most shameful system in the world, that of *apartheid*. Those who would rejoice most at this change of attitude would be the people of Namibia, because they would benefit most from the disappearance of one of the main obstacles to the full exercise of the right to independence and freedom. However, until that day dawns, we must stand firm and firmly maintain our position of assigning the guilt and naming the guilty party. We are convinced that the great majority of the international community will act in the same way.

281. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Nicaragua has been a member since the overthrow of the Somoza régime, is happy to count SWAPO among its members and as a full member. The Movement, which is based on the principles of opposition to racism, colonialism and imperialism, gives its full solidarity and support to the Namibian people and their sole and legitimate representative,



SWAPO. In the Final Communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984 [see A/39/560, annex] that support and solidarity was reaffirmed. In that Communiqué the Movement expressed its indignation at the continued non-implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It also condemned and rejected the persistent attempts by the present United States Administration and by South Africa to obstruct the implementation of that plan by their insistence on a linkage and parallelism between the independence of Namibia and extraneous and irrelevant issues, in particular the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The Ministers also called on the Security Council to meet and to assume fully its responsibilities by taking urgent action to implement its decisions, if necessary by the adoption of mandatory sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

282. It is clear that South Africa has not given any indication of a change in its attitude or policy or, for that matter, with regard to its constant and repeated violations of United Nations resolutions and decisions.

283. My Government, therefore, unreservedly supports the view that the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter is the only way to ensure that South Africa will respect United Nations resolutions and decisions, as set out in the draft resolutions submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

284. Finally, we take this opportunity to express also our gratitude for the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the wise and effective leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, and to reiterate our will and determination to continue to give our support to any actions which will further the just cause of the independence of Namibia.

285. Mr. ARCILLA (Philippines): The question of Namibia stands out as the one issue on the agenda that may well serve as the litmus test for the United Nations.

286. On 27 October 1966, by resolution 2145 (XXI), we, the Members of the United Nations, decided to place under our direct responsibility the Territory of Namibia. A year later, we decided to exercise this direct responsibility through the United Nations Council for Namibia, to enable the people of the Territory to enjoy their right to self-determination and to achieve genuine national independence.

287. That was 18 long years ago. Today, Namibia and its people are still in the cruel and vice-like grip of the racist Pretoria régime. How could we have assumed such responsibility, and almost by wilful default—sometimes through perverse acts—failed to discharge it? I address myself in particular to those nations which took part in that fateful decision 18 years ago, but whose subsequent actions plainly contravened the very essence of that decision, which was to enable the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and the achievement of genuine national independence. Through their lack of co-operation in effectively isolating South Africa, they encourage the racist régime in Pretoria to continue its blatant defiance of

United Nations resolutions and measures designed to solve the Namibian problem.

288. Like many countries here represented, the Philippines has its own history of struggle for independence. Our people know by heart how difficult and painful it is to be subjugated by a foreign Power. It is for this reason that we identify very closely with the aspirations of the people of Namibia. It is also for this reason that my country, in the person of our venerable former Foreign Minister, General Carlos P. Rómulo, fought an uphill battle for the inclusion of the words “or independence” in Article 76 b of the Charter of the United Nations, concerning the trusteeship system.

289. Today, my delegation wishes to reiterate its unequivocal support for Namibia’s independence, and we call upon all States Members of the United Nations to support the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other resolutions we have adopted on the subject. My Government firmly opposes the moves of the South African authorities to impose puppet political institutions in the Territory in an obvious attempt to settle the problem internally. It is we, the Members of this Organization, and no one else—certainly not South Africa—who have the sole and direct responsibility of solving the problem in a manner which we perceive to be in the best interest of the oppressed people of Namibia.

290. My delegation also reiterates at this time its support for the imposition of sanctions and other enforcement measures against South Africa to force it to comply with all the relevant resolutions and decisions concerning Namibia. In this connection, my delegation is fully aware of the dedicated work of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory. To Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, in his capacity as President of the Council, and to the Council members, we extend our appreciation and felicitation.

291. Next year we shall celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Organization. What could be a more fitting way to celebrate the occasion than to give substance to our avowed commitment to the principles of self-determination and independence for all nations—yes, by giving birth to an independent Namibia.

292. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again we meet to consider the situation in Namibia, which has become a perennial item on the agenda of the sessions of the General Assembly, the OAU, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and, indeed, all international forums.

293. The fact that, in the general debate of the thirty-ninth session, numerous speakers took up this item bears witness to the importance the international community attaches to this subject.

294. Unfailingly, at any meeting where the matter is considered, the international community has consistently condemned linkage and has qualified it as a racist pretext to prevent Namibia from acceding to independence.

295. In a new contribution to peace, Angola transmitted a letter to the Secretary-General from President José Eduardo dos Santos [A/39/688], in which he set out in a precise, objective, reasonable and constructive manner a set of proposals to pave the way for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and thereby allow Namibia to

achieve its independence. Cuba supports these proposals presented by Angola. What more can be expected of Angola? Angola has suffered a cruel war waged by the UNITA<sup>11</sup> bands because of the financial and logistical support of, and training by, South Africa and some of its allies. Racist South African troops are still trampling underfoot the soil of the southern part of Angola.

296. And how does South Africa respond? With the defiance, arrogance and contempt so characteristic of its leaders and its policy. Mr. Botha's letter sets out new conditions, which lead us to believe that South Africa's disdain for the international community is overriding. It shows that Pretoria has no real desire to reach an agreement that would ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and would thus lead to independence for Namibia and peace in the area. South Africa wants only one form of peace, *pax apartheid*, under which Namibia would remain under its domination and Angola would no longer be what it is: a free and sovereign State.

297. Why does South Africa behave in this way? Why does it mock and deride the clamouring of peoples and States? There is a clear answer: because it feels that it has greater support than ever before from the architects of the so-called policy of constructive engagement. Let us look at the debates in the Security Council, and we shall see that it is they who have vetoed draft resolutions condemning South Africa. It is they who, in the Fourth Committee during this session, submitted amendments to ensure that the names of the country in question and Israel would not appear in the draft resolutions relating to South Africa. It is they who have presented further amendments calling for the deletion of their names from draft resolutions on Namibia that are to be voted upon by this Assembly.

298. What kind of respect is shown for the African peoples and the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, who met from 12 to 15 November 1984 at Addis Ababa at the twentieth ordinary session of their Assembly, and examined the situation in southern Africa, and Namibia in particular, in accordance with the spirit and letter of the draft resolutions on this item? How can we ask the members of the OAU to delete from the draft resolution on Namibia the name of those who support the Namibian people's oppressors, who, thanks to this encouragement, have become increasingly brutal and arrogant? How can they be asked to delete the name of those who collaborate with Israel so that South Africa is able to develop its military technology, including nuclear technology? How can they be asked to delete the name of those who enable the transnational corporations to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in South African industries, who make it possible for the IMF and the World Bank to grant huge loans to the racist South Africans? In my delegation's opinion, these draft resolutions should be adopted by acclamation. In so doing, we shall pay a tribute to the heroic sons of Namibia, to SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, and to the Heads of State and Government of Africa.

299. Throughout this statement we have referred to those who invented the so-called constructive engagement, to those who thought up and have advocated linkage, to those who veto in the Security Council draft resolutions against South Africa, despite the fact that the racist police assassinated 87 black citizens, with impunity. So far, we have not men-

tioned the name of that country. We believe that it is more than well known that it is the United States Government which combines all these characteristics that have such a negative effect on the people of Namibia and the African peoples in general.

300. Mr. AL-BOAININ (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In 1966, the General Assembly decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over what was then known as South-West Africa. Despite this, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia continues today, in complete defiance of the will of the international community and in total disregard for international law and the right of peoples to self-determination. The many resolutions that have been adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council since then have all been to no avail. This has been true despite the economic sanctions imposed by most countries of the world against South Africa, in compliance with United Nations resolutions.

301. My country therefore supports the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/39/24, *part four, chap. I*]. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution proposed by the Council on the situation resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa as well as the draft resolution it proposes on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

302. My delegation takes this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia for their efforts. We pay a tribute also to the Department of Public Information for its efforts to support the struggle of the Namibian people by disseminating information and mobilizing international public opinion in support of Namibia. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the idea of convening, at United Nations Headquarters in 1985, an international conference in which eminent persons, scholars, members of support groups and mass media personnel from all over the world would participate, in order to mobilize and promote more international support for the just struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the heroic Namibian people.

303. The Government of Qatar has discharged, in word as well as in deed, what it considers to be a legal and moral obligation. Thus, in 1973 it enacted Decree No. 130, which imposed economic sanctions against South Africa, in compliance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Decree provided for an oil embargo against South Africa. My country also enacted in 1973 Decree No. 140, under which it severed all cultural, trade and economic relations with South Africa.

304. The Government of Qatar, in co-operation with its Arab sister countries, is seeking to consolidate the embargo against South Africa through the adoption of more effective arrangements designed to eliminate the loopholes and the attempts to evade the embargo resolutions, to which my country is committed in letter and in spirit. The mass media in Qatar spare no effort in publicizing the violations of human rights in Namibia and in exposing the racist régime's false propaganda designed to deceive world public opinion. In this regard, my delegation cannot fail to express its regret at the fact that some States do not seriously implement economic sanctions against

South Africa, and this supports South Africa in its continued illegal occupation. It encourages South Africa to persist in its denial of the rights of the Namibian people and its defiance of United Nations resolutions aimed at achieving independence for Namibia.

305. Regrettably, the racist régime in Pretoria was encouraged to persist in blocking the implementation of United Nations resolutions and preventing the United Nations Council for Namibia from shouldering its responsibilities in the Territory when one of the permanent members of the Security Council used its right of veto in August 1981. My delegation calls upon all Member States to bow to the will of the international community and to support, rather than impede, the efforts aimed at achieving the independence of Namibia, so that the last remnants of colonialism may be eliminated from the African continent and future efforts may be crowned with success, following the unfortunate failure of the talks on Namibia's independence held in Lusaka and Mindelo earlier this year.

306. Mr. ALAUKLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Arab Libyan people believe that the Namibian question and the question of the dignity of Africa are indissolubly linked. That is why we have always believed that the Namibian problem and the presence of the racist régime in South Africa is a priority matter on two levels—the international and the African—especially since the problems of liberation, independence and recovered dignity of the African and Arab peoples are cardinal features of our foreign policy.

307. On the basis of this position of principle, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya feels compelled to share all the commitments of every African country and has always provided encouragement and assistance to SWAPO, as well as to the African front-line States. We have, moreover, demonstrated publicly that we consider ourselves to be a front-line State by prohibiting direct or indirect collaboration of any kind with the *apartheid* régime.

308. The position of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya with regard to the Namibian question is based on our position with respect to the theocratic régime in occupied Arab Palestine. Indeed, the Namibian and South African peoples and the Palestinian people are the victims of attacks on, respectively, their African and Arab identity. Indeed, Arab and African dignity is the subject of repeated assaults because of the existence of racist entities with common ideologies and with complementary rules, accomplices in the establishment of a single strategy for entrenching hegemony by oppressing the Arab and African peoples.

309. The similarity of the threats facing these two peoples caused them to realize from the outset the indivisibility of that infernal trio, that three-faced enemy: racism, zionism and imperialism. The final document adopted by the first Arab-African summit, which was held in the Egyptian capital in March 1977, reaffirmed this indivisible link. The document contained a group of principles which are the basis of the common struggle against the régimes of racism and racial discrimination in occupied Palestine and in South Africa, régimes and policies that extend to Namibia, as well as to Arab and African front-line States. This document constitutes the springboard of the Arab-African common struggle, and also indi-

cates a judicious historical choice, namely, open war against a situation in which Arab and African men and women suffer constantly. The document also affirms the close link between the challenges facing the Arab and the African peoples, which make it inevitable that they close ranks and strengthen their struggle.

310. First, in South Africa and Namibia and in occupied Palestine, there are settlements of foreigners who have made a doctrine of racial discrimination and who deny the indigenous population its right to self-determination and plunder their natural resources.

311. Secondly, in South Africa and Namibia, as well as in occupied Palestine, an expansionist policy has been adopted as an instrument for the implementation of the hegemonistic plans which have become the official ideology of these racist régimes at the expense of the rights of the indigenous peoples and on the pretext of security and the suppression of terrorism.

312. Thirdly, in South Africa and in occupied Palestine, there is a trend which runs counter to civilization and history, because these régimes believe that their only chance of survival lies in the application of force. That is the reason for the collaboration between them in all areas, the military and nuclear fields in particular, with the aim of intimidating the peoples of these regions and forcing them to capitulate.

313. Fourthly, the Zionist entity and racist régime of Pretoria are trying to defy United Nations resolutions by imposing partial solutions that ignore international legality. The solution proposed by South Africa to the question of Namibia very strongly resembles the Zionist thesis concerning Palestinian autonomy. Indeed, the South African attempts against the African front-line States resemble the attempts to impose the Camp David accords on the Arab homeland.

314. Fifthly, the implementation of the Zionist project in the Arab homeland and the imposition of the racist régime of Pretoria in the southern part of the African continent represent a new page in the history of colonialism, aimed at perpetuating illegal exploitation. Indeed, through the Zionist threat and the aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime, there is intensive pillaging of Arab and African natural resources and human potential.

315. Sixthly, the generous assistance provided by the United States is one of the principal factors making it possible for the two racist régimes to defy the will of the international community. The so-called constructive engagement between the United States and the racist régime of Pretoria is no different from the strategic co-operation between the United States Administration and the Zionist entity.

316. All this reveals the true nature of the challenge to the Arab and African peoples, which makes it essential that they unify their efforts and close their ranks in order to struggle against the last bastion of racism, exploitation and aggression.

317. For nearly 40 years now the United Nations has been dealing with the Namibian question, and it is more than 18 years since the General Assembly adopted the resolution ending the South African Mandate over Namibia. It is six years since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), by which it approved the United Nations plan for the

independence of Namibia. In spite of the passage of time, the large number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and all the efforts made so far, we have unfortunately not yet succeeded in shaking the racist régime of Pretoria, which continues to defy the will of the international community.

318. My delegation, when it studied the reports presented by the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and listened to the statements made by the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization and the spokesmen of the African front-line States was confirmed in its conviction that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has reached a critical point. That imposes upon the international community the need to adopt practical measures to compel the racist régime of Pretoria to comply with the international will.

319. The delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that any delay in the implementation of these measures would only speed up the implementation of the South African plan, which South Africa is trying to substitute for the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

320. The racist Pretoria régime has decided to implement a so-called internal solution by establishing fictitious institutions, such as councils of State and multi-party national conferences, by applying a policy of forced militarization of the Namibian people aimed at strengthening the occupation forces, by forming tribal armies, by establishing military posts and by refusing to recognize SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. Pretoria is following a repressive policy based on violation of human rights. This demonstrates that it is still resolved to bypass the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This makes it necessary to implement the provisions of Security Council resolution 439 (1978), which warned the Pretoria régime that if it did not co-operate with the Security Council in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the Security Council would meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the two aforementioned resolutions.

321. It is high time the Security Council honoured its own decision. Nothing can justify delay in the implementation of these resolutions, especially since all the parties have recognized that, although SWAPO has shown a great sense of responsibility, Pretoria has shown greater intransigence and has attempted to introduce new elements that were not included in resolution 435 (1978), in an attempt to impose a new *fait accompli* which would make it possible for South Africa to perpetuate its domination and occupation of Namibia and illegally plunder the natural resources of Namibia, transforming that Territory into a link in the security belt surrounding South Africa, so that it can launch attacks against the African front-line States.

322. Many factors have encouraged the racist régime of Pretoria to continue to flout the will of the international community. The Libyan Arab Jamahi-

riya believes that the most important of those factors are the following.

323. First of all, this problem cannot be considered without taking into account the role of the United States, because to do so would mean ignoring the problem in its entirety. Indeed, the Reagan Administration has qualified the Pretoria régime as an "historical ally". It has also declared that, for economic and strategic reasons, southern Africa is one of the regions of vital interest to the United States.

324. Secondly, in view of the foregoing, the United States Administration's policy of constructive engagement with Pretoria is a sophisticated alliance in all fields, which has helped to strengthen South Africa's grip over Namibia in order to preserve the economic interests of the two allies in that Territory.

325. Thirdly, the pretext of the presence of Cuban forces in Angola to justify the continued occupation of Namibia has been concocted by the United States in order to link the Namibian problem with ideological questions and include it in the East-West conflict.

326. Fourthly, the United States Administration, certain other Western States and the Zionist entity have refused to comply with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), concerning the arms embargo against South Africa. These States are continuing to collaborate with Pretoria in the technical field, thus making it possible for South Africa to occupy Namibia and to destabilize the neighbouring countries.

327. Fifthly, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) endorsed the plan for the independence of Namibia proposed by the States of the so-called Western contact group. It was hoped that those same States would exert pressure on South Africa, but the reality of the past few years has been quite different. It seems that those States are much more concerned with having their multinational corporations exploit Namibian resources than with putting an end to South Africa's occupation of Namibia.

328. Sixthly, through hypocrisy, pressure and blackmail, South Africa has succeeded in temporarily throwing its opponents off guard, thereby advancing its own racist policies and theses.

329. That is how these various factors have combined and brought us to this situation. Hence, the international community must redouble its efforts so as to put an end to South Africa's delaying policies and manoeuvres, for any further delay in this matter would hold the United Nations hostage to the régime in Pretoria which seeks to upset the geopolitical facts of the problem through the imposition of its own solutions and through attempts at occupation of neighbouring African territories by overthrowing their régimes and replacing them with puppet governments.

330. As we have already pointed out, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the Namibian problem is of concern to the African continent as a whole. That is why we have always helped the Namibian people in their struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO. We should like to emphasize the following points with regard to our position on the principles constituting a basis for a just solution of the problem.

331. First of all, to resolve the Namibian problem it is necessary to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in its entirety. There can be no question of introducing any new elements that have nothing to do with the subject. We must not accept any substitute solutions outside



the framework of the United Nations which would be detrimental to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

332. Secondly, my country considers that SWAPO is the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and it recognizes no other artificial entity that might take away SWAPO's legitimacy. SWAPO continues to wage its heroic struggle, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has decided to provide it with every form of assistance—political, military and material—so as to increase pressure on Pretoria and bring it to comply with the will of the Namibian people for liberation and independence.

333. Thirdly, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that the independence of Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations and calls for the convening of the Security Council and the adoption of effective measures to guarantee the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978), in conformity with the timetable which is provided for, thus speeding up Namibia's accession to independence and making it possible for its people to exercise sovereignty throughout the whole of the Territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

334. Fourthly, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya believes that South Africa's stubbornness in refusing to comply with the international will requires us to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against it under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, since all attempts so far have not succeeded in compelling South Africa to withdraw from Namibia.

335. In conclusion, the Jamahiriya would like to thank the Secretary-General for his efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Likewise, we wish to praise the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka, who is also President of the current session of the General Assembly. Those efforts have made it possible to promote international awareness of the true dimensions of the Namibian problem and the true nature of the policy of the racist régime of Pretoria.

336. My delegation takes this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who was recently released after long years in Pretoria's gaols. He and some of his colleagues, who were also imprisoned, have emerged from this experience strengthened in their determination to pursue the struggle until the ultimate victory of their just cause.

337. Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): Ever since its inception, the United Nations has been preoccupied by its principal task—not only making the world a safer place to live in, but also shaping the global human environment in such a way as to enable the collective genius of mankind better to serve man's yearning for freedom, justice and development. Of course, it cannot be claimed that the United Nations has succeeded in all the endeavours it has undertaken since its foundation nearly 40 years ago, but it can certainly be said that one of the areas of activity in which it has had a notable success is that of decolonization.

338. The various initiatives taken by the United Nations to enable the oppressed and exploited masses in colonial Territories to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence have led to the emancipation of literally

hundreds of millions of people in Africa, Asia and Latin America. That there are today 159 States Members of the United Nations as compared to 51 at the time of the signing of the Charter in San Francisco is indeed eloquent testimony to the brilliant contribution the United Nations has made to the historical and progressive development of the national liberation struggle of peoples under colonial domination.

339. The otherwise proud record of the United Nations in the effort to bring about the emancipation of colonial peoples unfortunately remains incomplete as a result of the continued existence of colonial domination and racial oppression in the southern part of the African continent. As a result of the intransigence that continues to be displayed by the Pretoria régime, the issue currently being debated by the General Assembly under item 29 of its agenda—that is, the question of Namibia—has for a long time remained a familiar item of discussion, without any tangible results. Consequently, the suffering of the peoples of southern Africa continues, and peace and stability in the region as a whole remain in jeopardy.

340. It is unfortunate that a case as straightforward as that of Namibia should be deliberately rendered complex by the racist régime in Pretoria, for it is abundantly clear that no matter what South Africa does it cannot—I repeat, cannot—for ever frustrate the determined struggle of the people of Namibia to liberate their Territory from its colonial clutches.

341. Namibia does not belong to South Africa. It is a Territory that at one time fell into its hands by an accident of history, when, after the First World War, it was transferred to South Africa's trusteeship as a Mandated Territory. What South Africa should have done was follow the example of other colonial Powers with Mandated Territories and live up to its obligation to prepare the people of Namibia for control of their own destiny. However, what the racist régime did instead was betray a sacred trust given it by the international community by imposing an illegal occupation on Namibia, with all its attendant evils of racism, repression and the greedy exploitation of the resources of the Territory.

342. The racist Pretoria régime having proved totally impervious to earlier repeated attempts at persuading it to recognize its responsibilities not only to the people of Namibia but also to the entire international community, the United Nations had no alternative but to adopt in 1966 a decision to revoke the Mandate entrusted to South Africa by the League of Nations. That decision, it will be recalled, was endorsed in June 1971 by the International Court of Justice in an advisory opinion.<sup>8</sup>

343. Momentous though these decisions are, in terms both of content and of the degree of broad international support generated, the fact remains that the racist Pretoria régime continues characteristically to ignore them with impunity, as it has the many other decisions that preceded them. Indeed, Pretoria's reaction was to intensify its repression against the Namibian people, while at the same time adopting other illegal measures designed to bring about the further entrenchment of its illegal occupation of the Territory. Indeed, the more the flagrant and continued violations by the racist régime of the relevant decisions of the United Nations went unpunished, the more the Pretoria régime was encouraged in its misguided perception of its position and policies

with respect to the question of the independence of Namibia.

344. Thanks to the generous support of its friends and partners in the West, trade and investment were not only unaffected but, in some sectors, even registered dramatic increases. In connivance with the racist régime, foreign economic interests continued to plunder the resources of the Territory in spite of the international injunction declaring the resources of Namibia to be the inviolable heritage of its people. In the military and strategic spheres, overt and covert co-operation with South Africa have continued, to the point where that country can now be counted among those with advanced military industries. The effort to assist South Africa in developing and accelerating its nuclear potential cannot but be described as one of the tragedies of our time.

345. It was in September 1978 that the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the independence plan for Namibia. As that resolution was a product of broad and serious consultations with all concerned, it was then hoped that the time had at last come when the agony and repression long endured by the heroic people of Namibia would end and the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence would be restored. However, over six years have now elapsed since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted and, not surprisingly, the racist régime in Pretoria has proved to be no more willing today than it has been in the past to honour its obligations. Resolution 435 (1978) has thus inevitably joined the ranks of countless other relevant resolutions which remain dead letters.

346. It has now become evident that those States Members of the Organization which, at the time of the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), expressed pessimism and warned that whatever signals South Africa was purported to have given that it would co-operate within the framework of the resolution were a mere trick designed to buy time have been vindicated. Indeed, I submit that the international community has been effectively hoodwinked by a handful of racists in Pretoria.

347. All the same, as if all the time wasted so far were not enough, the racist régime in Pretoria continues to pay lip service to resolution 435 (1978). Not long ago P. W. Botha declared to the South African Parliament that "South Africa remains committed to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as an independence plan for Namibia", but he went on to add that "the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is an absolute prerequisite".

348. The Pretoria régime has long recognized that the outcome of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) would not serve its neo-colonialist interests in Namibia and has from the outset been making frantic attempts to wriggle out of the deal by searching for pretexts. As the Assembly is fully aware of the South African catalogue of subterfuge, distortion and prevarication designed to scuttle the application of resolution 435 (1978), I do not find it necessary to burden it with a recapitulation. However, I should like to emphasize at this juncture that South Africa's so-called prerequisite for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)—that is, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola—is not only outrageous but an interference in the internal affairs of the sister Republic of Angola and far-fetched as well, since it is

irrelevant and extraneous to the decolonization of Namibia. The linking of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola cannot but be seen as yet another transparent attempt by the Pretoria régime to find an excuse to torpedo the application of resolution 435 (1978). In this connection, my delegation would wish to express its satisfaction that the Security Council, in resolution 539 (1983), has rejected the linkage proposal insisted upon by South Africa and its partners as being clearly incompatible with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia.

349. South Africa's audacity in rejecting co-operation with the United Nations in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) cannot be viewed in isolation from the so-called policy of constructive engagement *vis-à-vis* the Pretoria régime. If the policy of constructive engagement was meant, as claimed, to enable the United States Government to exert pressure on the racist régime in Pretoria and to find an alternative to the violence raging in the region by opening a path to change that builds rather than destroys, then the policy is, indeed, a failure. The Pretoria régime has certainly not become any more amenable to persuasion than it was before. It still occupies Namibia, and parts of southern Angola are also under its aggressive sway. Its destabilization efforts directed against the front-line States continue unabated, aimed at imposing a *Pax Pretoriana* on the entire southern region of Africa.

350. One of the destructive effects of the policy of constructive engagement has been the fact that it has allowed the racist Pretoria régime to break out of the isolation in which it had found itself as a result of its inhuman policies of *apartheid* and its consistent and impudent defiance of international public opinion. Now that the policy of constructive engagement has conferred respectability on a régime that deserves only banishment, its leaders are welcomed with flower bouquets in the various capitals of the Western world.

351. The question of Namibia is the responsibility of the United Nations and calls for determined action by the United Nations. The leadership in Pretoria is beholden to the benighted policy of racism, colonialism and exploitation and, as such, it would be naïve to expect it to respond to mere acts of persuasion. It is time for the Security Council to invoke the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and to adopt a decision on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. My delegation is convinced that unless the international response is principled, firm and unequivocal, the racists in Pretoria will not abandon their determination to continue to enslave the people of Namibia.

352. The people of Namibia in 1984 observe their one-hundredth year of struggle against foreign domination. A century is a long time for a people to be subjugated, exploited and degraded in their own land. Indeed, that is why the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, had to take up arms to wage a national liberation struggle. Namibians realize from first-hand experience that the enemy is ruthless and, backed as it is by international imperialism, merciless in meting out indiscriminate violence with the more than 100,000 troops it maintains in their territory.

353. That notwithstanding, the people of Namibia are prepared to continue to make the sacrifices required of them to win their freedom, and they know that the progressive and peace-loving forces of the international community are on their side in fraternal solidarity to assist their struggle for national liberation. Still, they would much prefer to see the bloodshed and destruction end and the wounds of bitterness heal as quickly as possible.

354. If victory is not theirs today we have no doubt that it will be theirs tomorrow. It is this fact, the historic inevitability of the victory of the struggle of the Namibian people, that must motivate the international community to muster wisdom, tact and, above all, courage to end forthwith South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and with it also end the horror and carnage daily being committed by the occupation forces now entrenched in Namibia. In this regard, it is our hope that the United Nations will face up to its responsibilities.

355. As for Africa, its position has been clearly stated in the Declaration on Southern Africa made by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twentieth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 12 to 15 November 1984, which, *inter alia*, declared as follows:

"Africa will be satisfied with nothing less than majority rule in an independent and united Namibia and majority rule in a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa. The whole experience of Africa's history, and of world history, confirms that only self-determination for the people of Namibia and South Africa can create for southern Africa an opportunity for peace and stability or remove the threat to international peace and security which now emanates from this area."<sup>14</sup>

356. Mr. BOUNDOKOU-LATHA (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): For close to a century now Namibia has been at the centre of international relations. The international community follows this question with particular attention because it derives from a colonial situation which the United Nations has opposed since its establishment in 1945.

357. For Gabon, whose head of State, Mr. Omar Bongo, President of the Republic, has never spared any effort in championing the right of African peoples to independence and peace, the Namibian problem is a subject of great concern. It is therefore a source of true satisfaction for my delegation that it has been placed on the agenda of the present session.

358. Gabon has at all times supported and will always support the just cause of the Namibian people, who are still under the colonial yoke. Their history needs to be recapitulated here.

359. The struggle of the Namibian people for independence is all the more important for us since it reflects the determination of every people aspiring to freedom. The legitimacy of this struggle derives from the major legal instruments of the United Nations relating to self-determination, and the struggle is a very old one.

360. The fact that the resistance of the Namibian people to colonialism goes back as far as 1884 is evidence of this, as are, in particular, the uprisings in 1907 which were savagely crushed by German imperialism.

361. As everyone knows, that resistance took a decisive turn in 1959 with the establishment of

SWAPO, whose creation may be explained by the opposition of South Africa to independence for this country over which, since 1929, it had held the trusteeship Mandate which had been entrusted to the United Kingdom by the League of Nations. The United Nations terminated that Mandate in 1966 in order to lead the Namibian people to State sovereignty.

362. The establishment on 19 May 1967 of the United Nations Council for Namibia also constitutes an important phase in the history of that struggle, especially since that body, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), was given various decision-making and administrative powers and was instructed to represent Namibian interests in international organizations and conferences. Lastly, the recognition of SWAPO by the United Nations and the OAU as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people confirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people for its right to freedom and independence.

363. Unfortunately, however, the tireless efforts undertaken since then by this Organization, in which the international community has joined, have still not brought a solution of the problem. We recall, for instance, that several proposals have been made for the attainment of Namibian independence. Among these was the initiative of the Western contact group—consisting of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America—which proposed a plan providing for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, under the auspices of the United Nations, in application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Similarly, the United Nations Council for Namibia has continued to devote an important part of its activities to seeking ways and means to bring about the early implementation of the negotiated settlement plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). Finally, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council under resolution 532 (1983), visited in 1983 all the States of southern Africa to hold consultations with all the parties concerned with a view to bringing about a cease-fire which would lead to the application of resolution 435 (1978).

364. Unfortunately, however, in spite of all these efforts, to its indignation the international community is faced with the fact that Namibia is still under the colonial yoke. Our indignation is all the greater because South Africa, on various pretexts, is deliberately circumventing all the international decisions relating to the independence of Namibia. Instead of complying with the decisions of our Organization, South Africa continues to tighten its grip on Namibia, whose territory it is occupying militarily and whose abundant natural resources it is plundering.

365. In view of all this, Gabon joins other members of the international community in calling for the application of the various resolutions on this question, in particular Security Council resolutions 432 (1978) and 439 (1978), which provide for the independence of Namibia and for elections under the auspices of the United Nations. In this connection, I wish to remind representatives of the statement on this question made by Mr. Martin Bongo, Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Gabonese Republic, from this rostrum on 10 October 1984:

"As we have done in all our meetings, we have continued to call for strengthening the United Nations role and wish tirelessly to work to achieve respect for the resolutions adopted for the benefit of Namibia. In this connection, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides for Namibian independence and elections to be held under United Nations auspices, must be strictly implemented. South Africa must prove to the international community its willingness to put an end to its despicable policy of *apartheid* and establish with its neighbours and the rest of the world relations based on mutual respect, non-interference and non-intervention." [29th meeting, para. 128.]

366. Our country rejects and condemns any link between the accession of Namibia to international sovereignty and the departure from Angola of the Cuban troops which are there by virtue of bilateral agreements concluded in full sovereignty and in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

367. Although it is true that certain foreign Powers are engaged in all kinds of activities in an effort to control this part of the world, in which geopolitical conditions remain favourable, our country considers that the Namibian problem is, first and foremost, a colonial one. Therefore, it can be resolved only in accordance with the principles of self-determination and independence embodied in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. It is therefore for the international community to develop further its actions designed to compel South Africa to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia, whose people aspire to freedom, sovereignty and independence.

368. From this standpoint, my delegation can only deplore the scornful attitude of Pretoria towards the action of the United Nations and the OAU with respect to both *apartheid* in South Africa and the independence of the Namibian people. Should we not grasp this opportunity to ask the authorities of Pretoria to consider the lessons of the past? The majority of our countries which were colonized do not have the slightest difficulty in recognizing the need to establish the most diverse relations with our former administering Powers. Once it is independent and sovereign, Namibia too will be able to consider in the best possible conditions the question of its relations with all its neighbours in the region.

369. This reflection leads me to affirm, in conclusion, that the sooner Pretoria respects the relevant resolutions of the United Nations both on Namibia and on South Africa, the better will be the guarantee of peace and security in this part of the world.

370. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): For almost 38 years now the General Assembly has, thanks to its resolution 65 (I), included the question of Namibia on the agenda of each and every one of its sessions.

371. For how much longer shall we include on our agenda this item, "Question of Namibia"? For how long will arrogant South Africa continue to flout the international community, scorning the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for a settlement of the painful Namibian problem? For how long will the martyred people of Namibia continue to suffer and be denied the exercise of their inalienable rights to self-determi-

nation and freedom? When will there be a social and international order capable of ensuring respect for the rights of the Namibian people?

372. The words of the Secretary-General to which I will refer are of paramount importance at a time when, once again, the General Assembly is considering the item on its agenda concerning the tragedy of the people of Namibia:

"When together we search for ways to achieve the ideals and goals of the Charter, let us not forget the quality of the world we seek to build, the final *raison d'être* of all our activities: the human being as an individual of whom the Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right to a social and international order whereby human rights and fundamental freedoms will be fully enjoyed and respected."

It seems that those who deny Namibia its independence have lost from sight the type of world we want to build and the real *raison d'être* of all our activities, for how else can one explain the constant disdain shown by some when the question of the freedom of the Namibian people is taken up? While waiting for the advent of this social and international order, the Namibian people will continue to suffer—and how much longer?—the injustice, the harassment, the tortures they are subjected to, while their inalienable rights are flouted. Atrocities are being committed against a people whose only crime is to wish to be free.

373. South Africa wants to perpetuate a situation of domination which the international community rejects. SWAPO, the sole genuine representative of the Namibian people, is waging a heroic struggle for the liberation of Namibia and has become the target of South African military action. Under the pretext of pursuing SWAPO, South Africa has carried out vast offensives against Mozambique and Angola, violating the rights of those sovereign States, which only wish to live in peace in order to deal with the development problems facing all developing countries. The Government of Togo understands the reasons which led those two countries to conclude the Lusaka and Nkomati agreements, which, while not in any way jeopardizing the continuation and the final victory of the liberation struggle of SWAPO, also maintain peace in the region. There would have been no need for those agreements had Security Council resolution 435 (1978) been implemented.

374. The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) raised the hopes of the international community, but since that time those hopes have been waning. My delegation still wonders whether all the efforts undertaken, in particular by the Secretary-General, to whom we wish once again to pay tribute, have been made in vain.

375. Resolution 435 (1978) clearly sets out the process which should lead to an independent and sovereign Namibia. But hypocritically, by using delaying tactics and subterfuge, South Africa has always deferred implementation of the aforementioned resolution and has continued to undertake military action against the neighbouring countries, thus defying the Organization. Worse still, there are members of the Security Council which collaborate with South Africa in its delaying tactics, the latest of which is to link the independence of Namibia to the unilateral denunciation of international agreements concluded by sovereign States. As was stated by Mr.



Koffi Amega, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Togolese Republic, in the course of his address in the general debate:

“ . . . the position of the Togolese Government has always been clear. SWAPO enjoys the unswerving support of Togo and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) cannot be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops, whose presence is legally justified by the existence of an agreement entered into by Angola and Cuba as sovereign nations.” [5th meeting, para. 182.]

376. We welcome the fact that negotiations have been started concerning the appropriate procedure for the withdrawal of those troops within the framework of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In this respect, the message from the President of the People's Republic of Angola addressed a few days ago to the Secretary-General is most edifying.

377. It is quite clear to Togo that the Namibian problem is a problem of decolonization.

378. My delegation understands that in the region there is a question of security for all concerned and that that security must be guaranteed. But that security cannot be assured by force or by military action. It can only be assured through the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), leading to the advent of an independent Namibia, a country which will then be able, in full sovereignty, to conclude agreements with the States in the region, thus guaranteeing peace and security for all in the region.

379. My delegation cannot conclude without commending the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia to accelerate the process towards independence for Namibia and paying a well-deserved tribute to its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, for his personal commitment and dedication to the Namibian cause. While understanding the feelings of frustration that may overcome him at times, my delegation asks him not to lose faith in the future. Whatever happens, the struggle of the Namibian people is part of the irreversible development of the history of all peoples that aspire to live in freedom and independence. The fortitude and the wisdom of the Namibian people are the surest guarantees of the dawn of that freedom and independence.

380. The victory of the Namibian people will be the triumph of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is therefore essential that each Member State ask itself whether the self-determination of the Namibian people must wait indefinitely upon the goodwill of South Africa, and that each State commit itself to shouldering its responsibility to ensure, in accordance with the Charter, the establishment of a free and independent Namibia.

### AGENDA ITEM 139

#### Critical economic situation in Africa (concluded)\*

381. The PRESIDENT: May I remind representatives that the debate on this item was concluded at the 52nd plenary meeting, held on Tuesday, 6 November. In this connection, the Assembly has before it draft resolution A/39/L.22. I now call on the representative of Cameroon, who wishes to introduce that draft resolution.

382. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): It is an honour and a privilege for my delegation to introduce this important draft resolution and its annexed declaration regarding the critical economic situation in Africa. Since we first introduced the subject to the plenary meeting on behalf of the Group of African States at the commencement of the formal debate on the issue [47th meeting], the General Assembly has heard expressions of universal concern for the plight of our young nations at this dangerous and painful juncture of their economic and social history. The African delegations derived a strong sense of solidarity with the rest of mankind from the statements by representatives of Member States, large and small, rich and poor, statements which lend weight to our mutual aspirations for the forging of an international community spirit for solving crucial global and regional problems. Support came from all power blocs and all geographical regions.

383. Guided by that expression of universal concern, the African Group set to work to put on paper its perception of the political framework within which international activities could in future be carried out to alleviate the malaise at present destroying human life and in the long term threatening disasters, even the survival of man. The document produced did not seek to call for humanitarian attitudes on the part of non-African members of the international community. It avoided diatribe and other elements of confrontation that might have been introduced out of disruptive mischief, prompted by past misgivings. It told the story of the African experience underlying the overworked clichés employed by others to show that we ought fundamentally, as Africans, to be masters of our own economic and social destiny. The document pointed out that in spite of golden opportunities exploited, the truth remained that the economic performance of many African countries was characterized by declining per capita incomes, stagnant or negative rates of growth and declining per capita food production.

384. The document also points out that “According to all projections, prospects for recovery, growth and development remain very dim unless the efforts currently under way in African countries are fully supported by the international community.” [See A/39/L.22, annex, para. 4.] This perspective of the situation was generally shared by all who spoke to us during consultations thereon. We consequently proceeded to consult all groups, both regional bodies and those with substantive interests, on aspects of our draft proposals that addressed practical steps for common agreement towards arresting the course of events. Africans consented to abandon certain cherished ideas, some of which had been meticulously moulded by testing and experience at home, in order to make sure that a consensus statement of the determination of Member States would be reflected in the draft declaration to be adopted. We wish to express appreciation for the frankness of our colleagues in the various regional and interest groups who made concrete written proposals.

385. The negotiations were prolonged partly because they were difficult and partly because of the prevailing desire to produce general agreement and consequently consensus. We do not wish to go into the details of the negotiating efforts between our group and each of the others. Suffice it to say that what is now before the Assembly today is far removed from Africa's original ideas at this session,

\*Resumed from the 52nd meeting.

and even farther removed from those presented by us during the exchanges at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council at Geneva.

386. It is our view that the text now formally presented for adoption belongs to all the groups, because it now reflects modifications intended to meet concerns expressed by interests as varied as those presented by Western European bodies, notably the European Economic Community and the Nordic countries and their supporters, and by the socialist group, which also showed sufficient understanding, and by very many others.

387. Compromise that leads to consensus is constructive. It does not pretend to cover all the concerns of everyone; it only represents a basic statement with which all sides can live. On an issue as important as this, having regard to the diversity of claims to leadership and the irreconcilable economic and social systems across the globe, the attainment of this text demonstrates the scope of the existing political will over the issue of the African economic crisis. The emergency measures being taken, as well as those contemplated, further demonstrate the attending constructive attitude.

388. The broad question now is: Where do we go from here? A declaration is not enough; it merely states a political basis for future action. The elaboration of this declaration has demonstrated once again that in addressing the problems faced by the African continent we cannot afford to insist that solutions be based only on the perspectives of the experience of our friends in the developed world—experience gained in different worlds, from history written at different periods of scientific and technological development.

389. Let historians say of us that this was a generation inspired for the common good. President Paul Biya of my nation, Cameroon, recently asked his own countrymen what future they wanted for their children. We too must ask what we desire to hand to future generations. The present situation in Africa and in some other parts of the world calls for United-Nations-Charter-style co-operation. We must look at the dangerous provocations to international peace and security, not in temporary and unproductive humanitarian terms. We must all, in our generation, endeavour to see that we grow in an international community that is not infested by hunger, disease and underdevelopment fostered by a type of economic *apartheid*. It is conducive to lasting peace that the fruits of global development be seen and felt in the poor areas across the globe. Deprived peoples grow in an atmosphere of hate and revolt. They must be removed from that plight if pockets of potential explosions are not to endanger world peace.

390. We consequently call for massive mobilization of efforts, not only to adopt this declaration by consensus, but also to make clear to history our full engagement with its objectives.

391. We wish to express special appreciation to the co-ordinator, Tomohiko Kobayashi of Japan, for his excellent assistance in the process of negotiations. He ensured that the parties got together whenever they wanted to, and he remained an optimist whose political instincts sustained his indefatigability. The co-ordinator has made certain suggestions which could further the cause of wider acceptance and strengthen consensus on this text. We should be

happy to subscribe to these suggestions if, indeed, that would remove all reservations.

392. We commend the draft resolution with the annexed declaration to the General Assembly for adoption now by consensus and by acclamation.

393. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the co-ordinator of the informal consultations on this item, Tomohiko Kobayashi of Japan.

394. Mr. KOBAYASHI (Japan): It is my honour and pleasure, as co-ordinator on this subject, to inform the General Assembly of the amendments to which, as indicated by Mr. Enge, the parties concerned have agreed as a result of extensive consultations among themselves. The amendments are in paragraph 17 of the draft declaration and are as follows: First, following the phrase "extended multi-year rescheduling are among the measures", the words "which deserve urgent action" have been replaced by "to be dealt with urgently". Secondly, in the sentence beginning "Furthermore, it is essential to ensure", the word "Furthermore" has been deleted. All those amendments were agreed upon with the understanding that all Member States would give their full support to the declaration, without reservation.

395. Allow me to take this opportunity to express my highest appreciation and deepest gratitude to all those involved in these negotiations for their spirit of co-operation and determination and for their very constructive attitude aimed at finding common elements to resolve the critical situation in Africa. Finally, I wholeheartedly thank the President of the Assembly and the Secretary-General for their guidance in the achievement of this constructive consensus.

396. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/39/L.22. May I take it that the Assembly adopts the draft resolution?

*Draft resolution A/39/L.22 was adopted (resolution 39/29).*

397. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Secretary-General.

398. The SECRETARY-GENERAL (*interpretation from French*): Circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to speak at the beginning of the debate on the critical economic situation in Africa. I therefore take great pleasure in addressing the Assembly today, when it has adopted the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa that constitutes the felicitous conclusion of its deliberations on this item.

399. This Declaration is a sign of hope for Africa. It attests to the will of the international community, in particular the African countries, to act effectively together in order to solve African problems. It clearly indicates the need not only to meet emergency situations but also to take action in regard to the deep reasons for those situations.

400. Indeed, we all know that climatic conditions, however unfavourable they may be, do not suffice in themselves to explain the scope and intensity of the African crisis. We all know that it is not a mere coincidence that the most severely affected countries are those that have been classified as least developed. Because of the vulnerability of African economies and their structural weaknesses, immediate action must be taken, as the Declaration recommends.

401. As we are meeting here, millions of Africans, threatened by malnutrition and famine, are struggling to survive. A large number of those who escape death, in particular young children, will suffer irreversible physical and intellectual harm that will affect them for the rest of their days, and they will be unable to live the life they had the right to expect.

402. This is a situation which is morally unbearable for the international community and we are all duty-bound to do our utmost to help our brothers in Africa. In this connection I am gratified to note that the agencies of the United Nations system involved in the African crisis have taken diligent and effective action, in keeping with their means, from its very beginning.

403. The time is no longer for talk, but action. This is precisely why in my note dated 1 November regarding the critical economic situation in Africa [A/39/627], I made concrete proposals for action. I was pleased to note that these proposals were generally well received. I intend to follow them up.

404. As a concrete measure towards the implementation of the Declaration which the General Assembly has just adopted, I have decided to convene a meeting on Africa on 17 December next. The purpose of that meeting will be to draw attention to the particularly worrisome situation in some African countries and to the most urgent action the international community must effectively undertake together in order to combat the famine, as well as to make possible renewed growth and development. We shall invite to that meeting representatives of all States Members of the United Nations, as well as representatives of United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations.

405. I think that we entirely realize the complexity and gravity of the crisis Africa is experiencing. If we do not act quickly together, the situation may deteriorate further. The Declaration lays down the guidelines for our action. I therefore urgently appeal to all Member States to implement it as speedily as possible. For its part, the United Nations has already begun this work.

406. The PRESIDENT: The adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa is a historic event. This is the first time in the history of the United Nations that the General Assembly has endorsed a document prescribing concerted international action for the economic well-being of the African continent. I am particularly gratified that it has been adopted by consensus. This explains the long negotiating process which started in the Economic and Social Council in Geneva last July and continued here in New York over the past two months. We have indeed, in the words of the Charter of the United Nations, harmonized the views and actions of States, and we have employed international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of peoples—in this special case the advancement of the African peoples.

407. I would like to thank all delegations representing the various regional groups, which participated in the negotiations culminating in the agreement which we have just approved. I wish, in particular, to thank the co-ordinator of the negotiations, Mr. Kobayashi, for his perseverance and determination to see this document to its successful conclusion.

408. I wish also to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for the initiative he took earlier this year to

draw attention to the seriousness of the situation in Africa, a concern he demonstrated by his two visits to the continent this year. In addition, I wish to thank him for the practical action which he has undertaken so far to alleviate the situation. His efforts paved the way for our consideration of the issue in plenary meetings of the Assembly and for the adoption of this Declaration, which, in my view, is perhaps the most articulate expression of political will the Assembly has made in the course of its current session.

409. The African continent is now facing a crisis of unprecedented dimensions, whose intensity is becoming more visible every day in terms of human suffering and as a serious threat to human survival in certain countries. We must translate this Declaration into action in order to deal more effectively with the emergency situation.

410. Let me point out, however, that the African crisis is not a sudden crisis. It is deep-rooted. This is why the Declaration should also be translated into action for dealing with the long-term aspects of the situation, namely, the chronic problems which have characterized the economic and social life of the African continent. The constant deterioration of economic and social conditions in several African countries bodes ill for the future. They paint a picture of misery and hopelessness. The document which has just been approved represents a golden opportunity for us to take urgent action to prevent a further deterioration of the situation and thus create conditions favourable not just for growth but, more so, for economic and social self-sufficiency.

411. As the African States have emphasized, especially since the adoption in 1980 of the Lagos Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Monrovia Strategy for the Economic Development of Africa, the primary responsibility for the development of Africa rests with the Africans themselves. However, the task to be accomplished is so immense that they need the support of the international community. The Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa represents a new and concrete reaffirmation of such support. I hope the international community will not disappoint the millions of people in Africa, most of them children, whose lives could be spared by the full implementation of this vital document.

412. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on draft resolution A/39/L.22.

413. Mr. KURODA (Japan): My delegation wholeheartedly and most warmly welcomes the adoption of the Declaration by consensus, which is a result of the combined efforts of both developed and developing countries to respond effectively to the critical economic situation in Africa. The adoption of the Declaration by consensus clearly reflects the recognition by Governments and their representatives here in New York of the urgent need for concerted action *vis-à-vis* the extremely grave situation.

414. In his statement in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of Japan appealed [9th meeting] for an active response to the problems of hunger and economic difficulties afflicting Africa. Moreover, he recently made a trip to Africa and personally observed the dire situation there. As a result of his first-hand observation, the Foreign Minister became determined to see that much more is done to meet the needs of the people of Africa. Upon his return to

Japan, he issued an appeal to the international community. This appeal has been distributed as document A/39/724, the main part of which I shall quote as follows:

"While on this tour, I became acutely aware of the need to strengthen not only food assistance to those afflicted African countries, but also co-operation with them in such areas as storage and transportation of food, water supply and agricultural development. From this point of view, I announced in the course of the tour that my Government intended to extend to Africa in financial year 1984 supplemental food and agricultural assistance amounting to approximately \$50 million, in addition to the food-related assistance of more than \$115 million which my Government had approved by the end of October this year. Such assistance is, however, far too insufficient to meet the needs of the African people suffering from starvation and malnutrition, estimated at about 150 million.

"I feel keenly that the calamity of drought is a menace to world peace and stability no less than armed conflict. I now wish to appeal to the international community at large to recognize the necessity and importance not only of emergency assistance to African countries, but also of positively carrying out agricultural and food-related assistance for them based on medium- and long-term points of view and supporting their self-reliant efforts. I also wish to stress the importance, greater than ever, of the exchange of information and ideas among donor countries and between donor and recipient countries for the effective implementation of such assistance activities."  
[A/39/724, annex, paras. 2 and 3.]

415. The Declaration just adopted provides the international community with a basis for strengthening and consolidating efforts to help African countries overcome the present emergency and to establish medium-term and long-term development programmes. Vigorous action should be taken at all levels, national, regional and international. In this regard, all United Nations agencies have a special role to play. I take this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General my delegation's appreciation of his active efforts to promote an effective international response to the very grave situation in Africa. My delegation also expresses deep appreciation to the Secretariat members concerned for the efficient work they have carried out so far. I should like to urge, however, that in implementing the Declaration the United Nations system strive to provide assistance to Africa in an even more efficient and co-ordinated manner. It can best do so by more fully utilizing the existing consultative mechanism and by setting up task forces to supplement the co-ordination work now under way.

416. In concluding, I should like to express my earnest hope that the Declaration will contribute to reducing the suffering of the peoples of Africa. Japan stands firmly committed to do its part in joint international efforts.

417. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): It is with great pleasure that the European Community and its member States welcome the adoption of this resolution containing the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. It is a clear reflection of the deep concern of the international community

at the grave crisis confronting Africa. The long historical ties between Europe and Africa make us all the more acutely aware of the alarming proportions the situation has now reached, threatening the lives of millions of people. When the Secretary-General warned of the danger of a downward spiral of economic decline, poverty and hunger, he was not speaking of a vague or ill-defined threat which might become real at some future date. In recent weeks we have seen tragic evidence that disaster has already befallen many African countries.

418. The crisis in Africa arises from many factors, and it is essential to come to grips with the underlying causes as well as to take prompt and effective action to deal with immediate emergencies. The efforts which are already being undertaken to help deal with the crisis have to be strengthened. The African countries recognize that they have primary responsibility for addressing the crisis. Nevertheless, it is clear that, despite the courageous and often heroic efforts of the African peoples, the dimensions of the crisis are beyond their ability to cope with on their own. The support of the international community is indispensable if further tragedy is to be averted and the African countries are to be able once again to resume the path of development. The Declaration we have just adopted expresses the determination of the international community to enhance its efforts to meet the needs of the African countries.

419. Africa is a continent of enormous potential endowed with great human and material resources. The African Governments and peoples have achieved considerable progress in meeting the challenge posed by the daunting problems of development they have had to face. Nevertheless, great though the achievement is, it has not been able to match the even greater and more immense need. These Governments have said that Africa has to strengthen its development capacity so that its peoples can enjoy a respectable standard of living and so that political and social stability can prevail. The African countries have set themselves this goal as well as that of establishing in the not-too-distant future truly dynamic, self-reliant and interdependent economies capable of functioning as effective partners in the international economic system.

420. The European Community and its member States wish to encourage our African friends in this endeavour, and we will do our utmost to help them realize this objective. Through the Lomé Convention we have entered into a contract of solidarity with the vast majority of these countries in which our major aim is to support their efforts to achieve self-reliant and self-sustained development.

421. We believe that the present Declaration will be of real value in providing a political impetus towards realizing the evident commitment of the international community to work together with the African countries in a common endeavour to find practical, realistic and effective solutions which will help them surmount this crisis and create a solid foundation for their future development and well-being.

422. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The adoption of the resolution containing the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa by consensus indicates the international community's awareness of the serious economic situation in Africa and international support for Africa. This



Declaration has political significance and shows the African countries that they are not alone at this time of distress resulting from the current economic situation.

423. We welcome the adoption of the Declaration by consensus, and at the same time would like to see in this consensus a true desire to reach agreements on the part of all groups, particularly the African Group, which has made many efforts in that direction because of its awareness of the vital nature of the subject.

424. I need not go into the details of the agreed formula. What is important at this stage is that an agreement has been reached and endorsed by the General Assembly by consensus. We all understand the meaning of words, and we hope that the Declaration will produce tangible results and make a positive contribution in assisting the African States in this tragedy, as mentioned by the Secretary-General a few moments ago.

425. Egypt, in its capacity as Chairman of the Group of 77, would like to express on behalf of that Group the hope that progress will be achieved in other spheres on the basis of good intentions and political will, in the spirit of a desire for dialogue and avoidance of confrontation. It was this attitude that characterized the atmosphere preceding the adoption of the Declaration. Such a spirit enhances our belief in the importance of international solidarity and co-operation, which are basic in dealing with the problems of the world and provide the only means of finding solutions.

426. Mr. RESHETNYAK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): In connection with the adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, I have been asked to make a statement on behalf of the delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

427. The socialist countries on whose behalf I speak share the international community's profound concern about the critical economic situation in Africa. They welcome the initiatives within the framework of the United Nations, and action by individual countries, by international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and by all those who have been working selflessly to help Africa overcome this critical situation.

428. The current economic and social crisis in Africa has its roots in the continent's colonial past and results from the neo-colonialist policies of the imperialist Powers, which are attempting to shift onto the shoulders of the peoples of the countries of Africa and other developing countries the burden of the economic crisis in the capitalist sector of the world economy. The unprecedented drought and other natural disasters have only further revealed the weakness of the African economy and its vulnerability to the "free play" of market forces.

429. The imperialist States bear full responsibility for the consequences of the past colonial exploitation of the human and natural resources of the African continent and of the continuing present neo-colonialist plunder of that continent. Therefore it is only too

reasonable to demand that those responsible for the difficulties now being experienced by Africa should compensate for the damage done to its economic and social development.

430. Certain Western circles would like to replace a radical restructuring of international economic relations with partial measures enabling them to retain the powerful levers of control over the economies of the developing countries, including those of Africa. On the pretext of "enhancing the effectiveness" of external assistance, and on other pretexts too, attempts are being made to interfere in the economic policies of African and other developing countries in order to force them to relinquish the goals of their national development plans, imposing on them, against the will of their peoples, an alien order and creating conditions propitious for the injection into their economies of private foreign capital—first and foremost that of transnational corporations. This would crudely trample underfoot the sovereign right of the African States to determine their own future themselves.

431. The socialist countries condemn the actions of those who, behind a mask of humanitarianism, are in fact capitalizing on Africa's difficulties and attempting to subordinate the countries of Africa, against the will of their peoples, to the "magic of the capitalist market-place" and to subordinate their future and their social and economic development to the caprices of private foreign capital. To that end, increasing use is being made of various "assistance" programmes, which are declared to be regional but which are actually earmarked only for countries prepared to agree to pursue a "policy of encouraging private initiative" and "private international investment". Such programmes, in essence, are one way of exerting pressure on African and other developing countries to compel them to turn away from the State sector and from their plans for independent national development—in other words, from their plans to bring about economic decolonization.

432. The course pursued by imperialist forces to turn Africa into an arena of global political confrontation includes the attempt to declare Africa, or parts of it, to be a "sphere of vital interests". That course runs counter to the interests of the independent development of African States.

433. The socialist countries on whose behalf I speak believe that only in circumstances of lasting peace will it be possible to solve the complex problems facing mankind. Arms reduction and disarmament would make it possible to release enormous sums for development purposes, for the struggle against hunger and malnutrition and for solving other social and economic problems of developing countries.

434. The socialist countries members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [CMEA] are staunch supporters of the adoption of effective decisions and measures to eliminate all forms of exploitation in international economic relations, of discrimination, artificial obstacles and inequitable terms of trade. They also support the establishment of a just, economically well-founded system of pricing for raw materials, food and industrial products. To this end, we favour increased control over the activities of transnational corporations. We are in favour of the democratization of currency and financial relations and against the policy of uncontrolled high interest rates. We are in favour of normalizing

conditions for granting and liquidating international credit, so that the present conditions—particularly in the light of the indebtedness of developing countries—should not be used to exert political pressure and to intervene in the internal affairs of States.

435. The socialist countries have consistently supported the efforts of African and other developing countries to do away with their unequal position in the world capitalist economic system. The communiqué of the thirty-ninth session of CMEA, held at Havana from 29 to 31 October 1984, stressed the view of the heads of Government of States members of CMEA that

“The States members of CMEA firmly support the young independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their struggle against imperialism, hegemonism, neo-colonialism, racism in all its forms and manifestations, and *apartheid*, and are in favour of strengthening their economic and political independence.”

436. The States members of CMEA have been providing considerable assistance to African States to build and strengthen the bases of their own national economies. With our help more than 1,700 industrial facilities have been built in African countries. These include 450 in the energy field, more than 200 in the food industry, 150 in agriculture, about 40 in the field of ferrous and non-ferrous metals and more than 300 in the area of health, housing and education.

437. With the help of specialists from CMEA member countries, there is prospecting in many African States for mineral deposits. Hydrotechnology installations have been established, along with irrigation systems, and high-yield crops have been introduced into agriculture. Among these States are Congo, Ghana, Guinea, Mozambique, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Mali, Angola, Tanzania, Ivory Coast, Zambia, Madagascar, Togo, Somalia, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco and other interested countries.

438. Analysis of the reasons for the hunger and malnutrition shows that food problems involve a complicated bundle of social and economic factors. Accordingly, these should be tackled comprehensively; they should not be resolved merely through technical or other organizational measures. The search for a genuine solution involves a concentration of efforts and resources on the part of the African countries themselves to take steps to strengthen the State's sovereignty over its natural resources, to initiate national food programmes, to enhance the role of the State sector and to introduce planned economic methods, in addition to the implementation of other progressive social and economic reforms, including democratic agrarian reform in accordance with national development plans.

439. The delegations of the socialist countries did not object to the adoption of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. We understand the desire of African countries for the Declaration to be adopted by consensus, in the hope of somehow finding a chance to ease their difficult economic situation. At the same time, however, we wish to point out that this Declaration is essentially technical in nature. It lacks any indication of the great number of true reasons for the critical situation in Africa or of specific ways of overcoming that situation in the interests of the long-term development of African countries.

440. The proper solution to the acute social and economic problems of the African continent is indissolubly linked with the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and equal footing and the strengthening, on the basis of a broad, anti-imperialist, anti-racist and anti-colonialist platform, of the unity and solidarity of the peoples of Africa with the developing countries of other continents.

441. Mr. KEYES (United States of America): My delegation very much welcomes the consensus adoption of this Declaration. We joined in the consensus as a sign of our solidarity with African peoples that are struggling today for their very survival and to lay the foundations for their better future. We consider the Declaration to be one more affirmation of the increasing world focus on the nearly overwhelming dimensions of Africa's immediate crisis. I would like to commend the efforts of the Group of African States to reach a consensus on this item. During the negotiations both at the summer session of the Economic and Social Council and here in the General Assembly they have shown a courageous determination to achieve co-operation among all delegations. For this they deserve our praise and appreciation.

442. This Declaration on Africa's critical economic situation reflects the tremendous efforts to mobilize the world community that have recently resulted in a surge of emergency food shipments to that ravaged region in an outpouring of compassion unequalled in recent years. But the Declaration goes beyond expressing the concern of the world at the current plight of Africa's peoples. It points the way towards the future and towards the efforts needed to ensure that Africa need never again witness the human agony now being experienced there.

443. We applaud the recognition in the Declaration that African countries bear the primary responsibility not only for addressing the present crisis but also for undertaking the painful adjustment measures needed to correct past failures and set-backs. Clearly, the international community is determined to continue its support of the reforms needed to improve the situation.

444. This Declaration makes a positive contribution by recognizing the urgent need to attain national and collective self-reliance in food production and, more important, by listing the sort of policy decisions necessary for this vital transformation. In the opinion of my delegation, first and foremost is the need to allow market mechanisms to create the appropriate incentives for increased food production. This idea is also reflected in the Declaration.

445. The efforts of national Governments will not be enough, however, if Africa is to overcome its structural imbalances. Urgent action is needed on many fronts to help ease external pressures on the sub-Saharan countries. This is implicitly recognized in the paragraphs on debt and trade. Nothing in the Declaration prejudices the outcome of the case-by-case consultations between creditor and debtor nations in the Paris Club and elsewhere. My delegation was therefore pleased to see the recognition these sections show for the case-by-case approach adopted by donor countries to help evaluate economic-adjustment policies of debtor countries and propose possible debt-relief measures.

446. We are also pleased to see that the Declaration embraces the World Bank's special programme for sub-Saharan Africa. My country stands fully pre-

pared to support these efforts to increase attention to this region. In this regard, we are not convinced of the need to create a new multilateral facility for African countries, but we encourage other countries to consider creating their own special facilities at the national level similar to our own, known as the Economic Policy Initiative for Africa. We further appreciate the fact that the Declaration encourages developing countries to make the improvements needed to meet the conditions for full use of the compensatory financing facility.

447. In closing, my delegation wishes to stress that although we all know that a declaration of this sort represents no binding commitment to specific actions at the technical level, it has vital importance as an indication of the firm commitment by the world community to deal effectively with Africa's problems. My country has demonstrated its commitment to doing everything possible to support effective efforts by African countries themselves. We have already been reacting swiftly to meet their needs. We will continue to do so. But if this Declaration helps to mobilize international public opinion and political will it will have made a critical contribution to achieving a better destiny for Africa.

448. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): On behalf of the Nordic countries—Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Norway—I would like to express our deep satisfaction that the General Assembly has been able to adopt by consensus a resolution and an action-oriented Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa. The Declaration gives the political signal from the General Assembly to the world community which we called for in our statement in the general debate on this issue [47th meeting]. The negotiations on the Declaration have been long, and it has been a difficult process. We commend the flexibility and spirit of compromise shown by all concerned.

449. The Nordic countries are prepared to do their share in the international efforts to help the affected countries in Africa to overcome their critical economic situation. As we stated in the general debate, it is now time for action.

450. Today I reiterate the commitment of the Nordic countries to increase their development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. We will provide emergency assistance to alleviate the suffering in drought-stricken African countries bilaterally as well as through multilateral institutions. We will also provide assistance for the longer-term development efforts of Africa. We will continue and increase our bilateral aid to countries in Africa, and we will continue our strong support of the important international development agencies, such as UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, the African Development Bank and the World Bank. We also intend to support the special programme recently presented by the World Bank. We have decided on or are considering special contributions to the World Bank for the benefit of Africa.

451. Furthermore, our delegations are prepared to join in discussions on measures in fields other than official development assistance.

452. We appreciate the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General to alleviate the critical situation in Africa. We are prepared to co-operate fully with him in his endeavour to co-ordinate international efforts for the benefit of Africa.

453. Mr. LEE (Canada): Over a month ago [51st meeting], during the debate on the critical economic situation in Africa, our representative, Mr. Lewis, expressed the Canadian Government's belief that a consensus declaration coming from this body could go a long way to foster that atmosphere of political will and international co-operation which could galvanize the efforts to mobilize human, financial and other resources, both nationally and internationally, to address the crisis in Africa. We are delighted that through good will on the part of all concerned such a declaration has now been adopted.

454. As the representative of Cameroon has just mentioned, during the course of our successful negotiations on this Declaration all of us accepted wording not precisely as we might have chosen ourselves. Realizing the importance of a strong consensus declaration, we have collectively taken the position that the value of a common statement on this critical situation far outweighs questions of detail. We pay a tribute to this flexibility and the positive spirit of co-operation that animated those most concerned, including notably the African countries themselves, in the desire for a consensus.

455. May I in this regard join in saluting our colleague Mr. Kobayashi of Japan, who served as co-ordinator, for his indefatigable efforts.

456. Africa will remain a priority for Canadian development co-operation, as it has been in the past. Our commitment will not diminish, but rather will be intensified, to address both the short-term humanitarian priorities and the longer-term development needs of the region. Declarations neither feed the hungry nor alleviate human suffering; they can only act as a catalyst for collective action. It is to that action that we must now turn.

457. Mr. MALIK (India): I would like to begin on this solemn occasion by reading out the statement on the critical economic situation in Africa made some days ago by the Prime Minister of India and Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries:

"Africa today faces a grave situation caused by a long spell of drought and famine. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the people of the affected countries. They have been facing hunger, disease and death. Children and old people have borne the brunt of the tragedy. We are deeply concerned at this colossal human suffering unprecedented in Africa. Appeals for emergency assistance have gone out from the Organization of African Unity, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as other international organizations and Governments. The Government and people of India express their solidarity with the Governments and peoples of African countries affected by this tragedy. As Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, we are in touch with other non-aligned countries on the question of short- and long-term assistance which can be given to the African countries in overcoming the present crisis. At the same time, India is ready to share her own experience and resources to the extent possible in helping our African brethren in meeting this stark challenge. We are willing to send grain, medicines, teams of doctors as well as other experts that may be needed by the most seriously affected countries of Africa. Our diplomatic missions in Africa have been asked to get in touch with the Governments of the countries concerned and to ascertain their specific

requirements for medical and other technical personnel to help overcome the present critical conditions.”

458. We are indeed deeply gratified at the adoption by consensus of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa by the General Assembly. It involves a clear recognition by the international community of its commitment to finding urgent and practical solutions to assist the African States in their efforts to overcome the emergency situation facing them.

459. Of equal importance to that of meeting the emergency needs of the countries concerned is the need to assist on a simultaneous, integrated and continuous basis in meeting the medium- and long-term requirements of Africa. The areas of priority attention have been reflected in the Declaration, particularly in paragraphs 11 through 14. It is obvious that to give positive action-oriented content to the programmes of rehabilitation, reconstruction and further growth-related development there has to be emphasis on the part of the international community on an assured basis for resource flows to the seriously affected States of Africa. This is appropriately stressed in paragraph 16 of the Declaration, wherein it is stated that “Without an increase in net capital inflows and urgent debt relief measures, prospects for recovery and development in Africa will be undermined.”

460. It is indeed gratifying that the international community has shown such solidarity in co-operating with Africa in its time of greatest need. Unless urgent action is taken, however, the rapidly deteriorating situation in Africa may well lead to disaster. We hope and trust that the response of the international community will be adequate to meet this challenge.

461. Mr. LAUTENSCHLAGER (Federal Republic of Germany): We have sent an important message to the world public that we consider the special problems of the African continent as a challenge we are resolved to take up jointly. The speaker on behalf of the European Community, the representative of Ireland, a short while ago expressed the satisfaction of the member States of the European Community with the result achieved. I, of course, fully associate myself with his statement. Like our partners in the Community we are prepared, within the scope of a dialogue based on partnership, to contribute to overcoming the critical economic situation in Africa by continuing and strengthening our extensive bilateral and multilateral development co-operation and by more effective co-ordination of our common efforts.

462. In this context I should like to refer to my statement in the General Assembly on 6 November [51st meeting]. It was in that spirit that my delegation participated in the negotiations on the resolution on the critical economic situation in Africa just adopted. My delegation has endeavoured for many years to devote particular attention to the specific problems of the African countries. Africa is one of the priority areas of my country's economic co-operation. By choosing a very flexible approach along the guidelines of the Economic Summit Meeting held in London in June 1984, my Government has taken account of the worsening debt situation. We feel committed to this policy in the future also. By consenting to an increasing number of rescheduling arrangements, my Government has contributed to

preventing the growing debt burden from cutting short the world development process. Indeed, by addressing the particular situation of the country concerned within the framework of close consultations, it will be possible to find the optimal solution to the individual case.

463. I am confident that in this way we shall be able, together with our African friends, to contribute towards overcoming the critical economic situation in Africa.

464. Mr. XIE (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all I wish to thank Mr. Engo, Chairman of the Group of African States, and Mr. Kobayashi for the introductory statements they have made.

465. My delegation has carefully studied document A/39/L.22, which contains certain emergency measures proposed by the African countries to alleviate the present critical economic situation in Africa. It also contains some very important measures for the short- and medium-term development of Africa. We have participated in the consultations on the draft and have given it full support from the very beginning. In our view, document A/39/L.22 is a carefully considered document. It was prepared not only with a view to solving the serious difficulties faced by Africa, but it has also taken into account the views of the parties concerned.

466. In view of the emergency needs of Africa for its survival and development, it was both timely and necessary for the General Assembly to adopt such a document. Its adoption serves as an expression of the sympathy and support of the Member States towards the African countries and peoples, an expression of their solidarity on such an urgent question. It also serves as an expression of the joint political will of the United Nations on the important question of the critical economic situation in Africa.

467. The result of today's meeting is most encouraging. We hope that the adoption of the Declaration will lead to more and more meaningful concrete action.

468. Lastly, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Engo and to Mr. Kobayashi for their efforts in getting the Declaration adopted.

*The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. I, annex II.

<sup>2</sup>See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983, document S/16106.

<sup>3</sup>See Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup>See A/40/87, annex, resolution AHG/Res.125 (XX).

<sup>5</sup>International Status of South-West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950, p. 143.

<sup>6</sup>A/AC.115/L.611.

<sup>7</sup>See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1980, document S/14179.

<sup>8</sup>Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding



*Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1979, p. 16.*

<sup>9</sup>*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983, document S/15943.*

<sup>10</sup>Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

<sup>11</sup>União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

<sup>12</sup>*See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983, document S/16237.*

<sup>13</sup>*See A/AC.131/PV.428.*

<sup>14</sup>A/40/87, annex, declaration AHG/Decl.1 (XX), para. 19.