

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



79th
PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 29 November 1984,
at 3.35 p.m.

NEW YORK

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. KRISHNAN (India): The Government and people of India take considerable pride in the fact that, 39 years ago, at the very first session of the General Assembly, our delegation was among the first to raise the question of Namibia, then known as South West Africa, in this forum. The question of Namibia thus belongs to that category of issues of overriding importance that, in this forum, are as old as the United Nations itself. India's interest and active involvement in promoting the Namibian cause are equally rooted in history.

2. However, what we do not consider a matter of pride—indeed, none of us in the Assembly could consider a matter of pride—is the continued inability of the United Nations to put an end to the terrible ordeal of the Namibian people in spite of the nearly four decades of endeavour towards that objective. The delay in bringing about the independence of Namibia is all the more unconscionable in the light of the fact that for nearly two of those four decades Namibia has been a direct and unique responsibility of the United Nations. For over six years now, a universally endorsed settlement plan for Namibia, adopted by the Security Council with much hope at that time, has remained a dead letter. The failure of the United Nations to give effect to its own resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia constitutes the biggest blot on the otherwise commendable record of the Organization in the field of decolonization and has, indeed, cast a shadow on its very credibility.

3. Why is it that, in spite of years of concerted international effort aimed at liberating Namibia from the colonial yoke, we should have to countenance the frustration of having to witness—or rather, deplore—the completion of a century of colonialism in that country this year?

4. Our tribute to the valiant people of Namibia on the occasion of one hundred years of struggle cannot but be tinged with a sense of disappointment, even a feeling of shame, that Namibia's ordeal should have been allowed to last so long. How is it, we must once again ask, that the sustained and unanimous demand of the international community for the independence of Namibia is rebuffed repeatedly and persistently? Why does the United Nations find itself—and why do we, the vast majority of the international community, find ourselves—so impotent in the face of such arrogant defiance of resolutions and decisions of the Assembly and of the Security Council, of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and of the universal will?

5. The reasons are not far to seek. They lie first and foremost in the very nature of the racist régime of Pretoria, which has habitually treated with scorn and contempt the will of the international community in remorselessly pursuing the obnoxious policy of *apartheid* within South Africa, continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and repeatedly indulging in wanton acts of aggression and destabilization directed against independent African States. We all realized long ago that the Pretoria régime did not subscribe to recognized norms of State conduct and that moral suasion could have no impact on it.

6. The reasons for South Africa's intransigence must lie also in the support, overt and tacit, that the racist régime has received from its powerful friends and allies. Through political and diplomatic support and continued co-operation with South Africa in various fields of activity, certain Governments have helped to shield South Africa from international pressure and, indeed, served to create a situation in which South Africa has felt encouraged to pursue defiantly its reprehensible policies. Indeed, the hiatus between the professed commitment of those countries to bringing about the independence of Namibia, on the one hand, and their actual deeds, on the other, has proved to be a crucial impediment to the international effort to isolate and put pressure upon South Africa.

7. I need hardly dilate on the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, which has been firm, consistent and unequivocal. That position was reiterated most recently at 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. The non-aligned countries have always supported the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We believe that the Namibian people are fully justified in carrying on their struggle by every means at their disposal, including armed struggle. We

recognize the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. SWAPO is a full member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

8. The non-aligned countries believe that the United Nations bears primary responsibility for Namibia and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) represents the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. That resolution must be implemented immediately and unconditionally and without the introduction of irrelevant and extraneous elements. We deplore South Africa's repeated attempts to undermine the responsibility of the United Nations and to circumvent resolution 435 (1978) through attempts at an internal settlement. We have urged the Security Council to meet once again and to assume fully its responsibilities, including taking urgent action to ensure implementation of its own decisions, if necessary by the adoption of enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

9. South Africa has demonstrated time and again its utter lack of sincerity and seriousness in the course of the negotiations relating to Namibia's independence. In spite of the admirable spirit of compromise and accommodation shown by SWAPO in the diplomatic arena, South Africa's attitude has been characterized by duplicity and prevarication. Flimsy pretexts and irrelevant considerations have repeatedly been adduced to subvert agreement and to renege on commitment. The rupture of the Namibian independence talks at Lusaka and Mindelo earlier this year constitutes the most recent evidence of Pretoria's bad faith and subterfuge.

10. The letter dated 17 November 1984 from the President of the People's Republic of Angola to the Secretary-General [A/39/688], which has now been brought to our attention, together with the letter of 23 November 1984 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa to the Secretary-General [A/39/689], makes it clear that, even in these negotiations between Angola and South Africa, the Pretoria régime is pursuing the same policy of deception and prevarication, notwithstanding the flexible and positive attitude taken by Angola.

11. We consider it imperative that any efforts made outside the framework of the United Nations to find a way out of the current impasse must be in consonance with the United Nations plan and must lead to the early and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Such efforts should serve to reinforce those of the United Nations, not run counter to them or undermine them in any manner.

12. We wish to place on record our appreciation of the efforts made by the Secretary-General towards bringing about the independence of Namibia. His deep personal commitment to the Namibian cause is well known. He needs the support of all of us in discharging his difficult mandate. We reiterate to him our pledge of full co-operation.

13. Allow me also to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under your stewardship, Sir, continues energetically to carry out its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence and to promote the Namibian cause. The report of the Council [A/39/24] provides eloquent testimony to the active role of the Council in continually monitor-

ing the situation in and around Namibia and organizing manifold activities designed to mobilize further international awareness of and support for the Namibian cause. As a Vice-President and founding member of the Council, India has contributed its mite to the Council's activities. We would also like to express our deep appreciation to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra, for his continuing devoted service to the Namibian cause.

14. I began my statement with a recollection of the fact that my country was a pioneer in espousing the cause of Namibia's independence, as indeed we were in imposing comprehensive voluntary sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. About a month ago, on that fateful day when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was assassinated, I had the sad privilege of forwarding to the Symposium on A Century of Heroic Struggle by the Namibian People against Colonialism a message from Mrs. Gandhi pledging the unflinching support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of India to SWAPO and the people of Namibia and sending her good wishes for the success of the Symposium. That message was one of the last official acts of the Prime Minister. It will remain eternal testimony to Mrs. Gandhi's deep personal attachment to the cause of the Namibian people as, indeed, to that of all peoples under colonial subjugation. So will it remain a manifestation of the abiding solidarity of the Government and people of India and of the entire Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with our brothers and sisters in Namibia. We know that they will ultimately prevail.

15. Mr. SUCRE-FIGARELLA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is with great satisfaction that the delegation of Venezuela is once again participating in the General Assembly debate on such an important issue as the question of Namibia. We find the report submitted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on the activities entrusted to it by the Assembly extremely interesting; it shows the great sense of responsibility and dedication with which the Council has carried out its task.

16. Venezuela, as a member of that Council, has endeavoured to work in a spirit of solidarity consistent with its clear-cut international position, which is to do everything in our power to enable the people of Namibia to enjoy their full right to independence, putting an end to the outrage of colonial domination by South Africa, which refuses to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

17. For many long years we have wondered whether the express mandate of the United Nations calling for the independence of Namibia would succeed or fail.

18. In the present report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, an account is given of the most recent events that have taken place in connection with that question. We note with regret and indignation that South Africa's answer has been to maintain its intransigent refusal to comply with the request of the international community.

19. The initiatives taken by the Secretary-General to give practical effect to the Security Council's mandate are clear proof that all his tireless, unremitting efforts, which have been carried out to the full satisfaction of the Organization, have been to no avail in the face of the insistence of the colonialist South African Government on distorting the specific nature of the problem. There can be no justification

for refusing to grant independence to Namibia. It is a legitimate right that stands on its own merit, since it derives from the principles of the Charter, which govern the very existence of the United Nations.

20. My delegation considers that Namibia's independence brooks no further delay. Elections must be called immediately and the electoral system governing those elections established forthwith. It is unacceptable that the South African Government should have refused to set a reasonable period for the calling of elections in accordance with the United Nations request, a failure that is recorded by the Secretary-General in his further report of 29 December 1983.¹

21. Thus we are faced with a reality that is difficult to change and which shows how insufficient the enforcement measures are which are available to the United Nations for the achievement of its ends.

22. All the sanctions laid down in the various resolutions have proved ineffective simply because the spirit of co-operation to comply with them has been lacking. Venezuela, for its part, has been categorical and firm in applying sanctions to isolate the colonialist South African régime. But what can one country do when other countries do not have the same determination?

23. The strength of the United Nations depends on the will of all its Members. It is quite clear that the Namibian question will not be solved unless we understand this fact. If complete co-ordination of economic, diplomatic, cultural and military actions against the country that is violating international commitments were put into effect, there is no doubt that a favourable solution in the not-too-distant future could be attained.

24. It is true that there are geo-political problems in the region which complicate the issue. Domestic strife in several areas bordering on Namibia create a climate of tension which does not favour understanding. But who can seriously deny that racism and colonialism, the heinous practices of the Government of South Africa, are connected with these circumstantial geo-political tensions? Those tensions have existed for a very long time. The reverse would be true in this instance: if such practices were to be eliminated, the effect of their removal would be to create more favourable conditions for dialogue and thus facilitate the achievement of peace and stability in the region.

25. We therefore appeal once again to the conscience of all countries to ensure that, in dealing with the question of Namibia, they will abide consistently by the principles of international justice and morality. If they proceed thus, peace may be closer at hand and more easily achieved than many believe.

26. If the occupation of Namibia by South African forces is allowed to continue, it could well lead to a much broader conflict. Each day the people of Namibia are more determined to defend their rights. Their decision to fight for independence by any means is backed by a resolve that should give us food for thought if we wish to avoid greater suffering for that country. The heroism of the Namibian people is something that should be recognized by the international community, because those people participate actively and consciously in the struggle for their legitimate rights. That is why the international community should press for an acceptable solution as soon as possible, inasmuch as the problems being discussed here could lead to a climate of greater tension.

27. The problem of Namibia, as is well known, is not just one of its independence. It involves the worst excesses of racism, exploitation, of what is called *apartheid*, excesses which are offensive to the conscience of mankind. To insist on maintaining a state of affairs that is liable to criticism is to minimize the effectiveness of the United Nations.

28. We were happy to receive the news of the recent release of Comrade Andimba Toivo ya Toivo, Secretary-General of the South West Africa People's Organization, who for 16 years was detained in the gaols of *apartheid* and colonialism. Many of those years he spent in the infamous Robben Island prison, where after a sham trial he served time for the crime of defending the sacred right of Namibia to independence. We hail this triumph, and through it we regain the strength to continue this struggle for independence against the South African racists.

29. Of course, we must not underestimate the fact that, in the process aimed at achieving Namibia's independence, important progress has been made, especially in the manner in which peoples and Governments perceive the problem. There is no doubt that there is a wider awareness of its implications than in the past and that the number of countries which take seriously their responsibilities *vis-à-vis* Namibia is increasing considerably.

30. As far as Venezuela is concerned, I wish to confirm here that our participation in the United Nations Council for Namibia, as I recalled at the beginning of my statement, has been based on our constant concern for the total and definitive independence of that region. Our attitude has been proclaimed in all forums, and no opportunity is missed to emphasize arguments consistent with our practices. Repetition, in a case such as this, does not diminish the importance of the facts. On the contrary, it obliges diplomacy to find a solution.

31. The fact is that, since the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, after the Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, had declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations with regard to the administration of the Territory of Namibia, the attributes accorded the Council have turned it into a truly authoritative body capable of representing the legitimate interests of the Namibian people. Their missions of consultation abroad to discuss problems with Governments in different regions, such as the missions in 1984 to Latin America, Western Europe and the Pacific region, have helped the international community to understand that in the Council they have a true interlocutor and champion of the rights of Namibia.

32. In this connection, my delegation attaches great importance to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which provides for action to terminate the exploitation and plundering of natural and human resources by foreign economic interests in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

33. Despite all the difficulties, the obduracy of the Government of South Africa and the geo-political complications that may have arisen, it is a fact that the United Nations Council for Namibia has wisely prepared a transition period that will ensure for the Namibian people in its inevitable future, when it

achieves independence, sounder bases to guarantee its own development.

34. The comprehensive action of the Council has been oriented towards guaranteeing the emergence of a free nation committed to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The level of representation of the Council within the Organization is one way of fully recognizing its true value, and that has given it the necessary backing so as to provide the Namibian people with real possibilities of achieving its historic objectives.

35. The Council has not merely denounced abuses against the Namibian people. With a true vision of the future, it has co-ordinated the tasks aimed at creating a highly civilized State. This policy includes technical training of cadres, co-operation with representative political forces and the organization of seminars and forums where current problems relating to subsequent stages of Namibia's development can be discussed.

36. Among these tangible achievements of the Council, we are especially gratified, in our capacity as Vice-Chairman of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, to declare open the United Nations Vocational Training Centre for Namibia where 200 Namibian refugees, in the province of Kwanza Sul, in the People's Republic of Angola, are carrying out basic studies in automobile mechanics, carpentry and other basic skills necessary for the efficient functioning of independent Namibia.

37. In this connection, we are committed to and participate in the work of the United Nations Institute for Namibia, based in Lusaka, where Namibians are also preparing for the future task of leading their country.

38. Never before has the United Nations had such a clear understanding of its responsibilities. In a difficult and tragic situation it is doing everything in its power to give to persons living in their own territory, unlawfully occupied by others, the assurance that they do not stand alone and that the international community understands the need to establish an effective degree of co-operation. The right of Namibia to freedom is being recognized not only with words but also with deeds.

39. I am convinced that history will record this as one of the most meritorious undertakings of the United Nations: the creation of a world free from its worst enemies. May I express on this occasion to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia—today President of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly—Mr. Paul Lusaka, our deep satisfaction at the work he has done for the goals that speak so highly of international solidarity.

40. It is clear that the more intensified the steps taken and the greater the understanding of the problem, officially and individually, the more the pressure on the South African régime will become unbearable. Despite the disappointments and setbacks, the credibility of the United Nations, through its direct intervention in the question of Namibia, is still at an acceptable level.

41. In the Council's daily work we have benefitted from the constructive criticism and suggestions of Comrade Toivo ya Toivo on the Council's activities. Thus, in the Council we supported the idea that the Council should continue to work with a view to ensuring better protection for Namibia's natural resources, the use of a greater number of Namibians

in the Council's work, and greater contacts between the Council and current Namibian realities by means of visits to refugee camps for Namibians.

42. That is why it is desirable to initiate next year an even more intensive campaign, so that, when we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, we can do away with all the heavy burdens imposed on these people who have been deprived of their rights for so long.

43. We wish to emphasize the efficient and skilful work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Brajesh Mishra, and the members of his office, to whom we express our gratitude.

44. May I take this opportunity to convey to the non-governmental organizations concerned with the promotion of the Namibian cause our sincere gratitude and encouragement for their work.

45. In view of our commitment to the Council's work, and taking into account what we have said in this statement, the Venezuelan delegation will unreservedly support the draft resolutions proposed by the Council in its report [see A/39/24, part four].

46. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): One of the items which has been given the greatest attention in the General Assembly is the question of Namibia. The Assembly and a number of subsidiary bodies have considered the evolution of the situation of that Territory starting from the establishment of the mandate, which was revoked by the General Assembly on 27 October 1966, at which time the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory and the people of Namibia. In 1967, the General Assembly established as a subsidiary body the United Nations Council for Namibia, to which it gave the role of legal Administering Authority of that Territory until independence.

47. Since the General Assembly does not have the necessary powers to ensure the withdrawal of the foreign administration, it decided to bring the matter to the Security Council. Thus, in resolutions dating as long ago as 1969, the Security Council recognized the termination of the mandate and requested the Government of South Africa to withdraw immediately from that Territory.

48. The International Court of Justice has on repeated occasions examined the international status of the Territory of Namibia and the legal consequences deriving therefrom. That principal United Nations organ has recognized since 1950 the competence of the General Assembly as regards that status and, as is well known, in 1971 issued an advisory opinion³ stating both the obligation of South Africa to put an end to its unlawful presence by withdrawing its administration from the Territory of Namibia and of States Members of the United Nations to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence.

49. Those obligations entail the duty not to establish conventional relations in those cases in which the Government of South Africa would presume to act on behalf of Namibia or in respect of that Territory; not to accredit in South Africa diplomatic or consular missions the jurisdiction of which might extend to Namibia and not to send consular agents to that Territory; not to maintain relations which might strengthen South Africa's authority in Namibia; and

to recall that the unlawful presence of South Africa is prejudicial to a people which needs the assistance of the international community to achieve the objectives corresponding to the sacred task of civilization.

50. The content of that advisory opinion reflected the legal elements at play, all of which have been reiterated repeatedly as being mandatory by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General. The direct responsibility of the United Nations, which is recognized both politically and juridically, includes promoting the well-being, development and progress of the Namibian people and safeguarding their rights and interests. Those objectives can only be achieved through the self-determination and true independence of the Namibian people in the face of external pressure or attempts at external pressure, which come or may come from different ideological horizons.

51. Thus, in 1978, the Security Council adopted a resolution laying down the modalities for free elections which, under the supervision and control of the United Nations, would guarantee the expression of all trends of thought among the Namibian population, so as to ensure true free determination, while creating a democratic, pluralistic and united society.

52. Honduras is taking part in this debate in order to say that we are aware of the duties incumbent upon all States Members of the United Nations deriving from the responsibilities that the United Nations has assumed *vis-à-vis* the people and Territory of Namibia.

53. Honduras has repeatedly expressed its views on this situation. During the general debate, on 9 October, our Minister for Foreign Affairs reiterated those views before the Assembly when he said:

“Honduras rejects the presence of foreign troops in Namibia and deplores the delay in establishing an independent, sovereign State. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia is the basis for a lasting, peaceful solution.” [26th meeting, para. 227.]

54. Eighteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa, subsequently proclaimed and known as Namibia, and six years have elapsed since the United Nations plan to ensure peaceful transition towards independence for the Namibian people was adopted.

55. Honduras supported the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly aimed at concluding as soon as possible all the arrangements relating to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and the peaceful settlement of the question on the basis of the immediate implementation of those resolutions, thus avoiding any attempt to hamper the process that would lead to that end.

56. But what has happened to date? Despite the pronouncements of the organs I have referred to concerning the international status of the Territory and the illegality of the presence of South Africa, in spite of the fact that there is a United Nations plan, accepted by the Republic of South Africa itself, for the peaceful transition to independence of Namibia, in spite of the fact that the General Assembly and the Security Council continue to adopt resolutions which express the concern of the international community at the continued unlawful occupation of the Territory of Namibia, in spite of all the foregoing, the occupy-

ing country has not permitted the implementation of that United Nations plan and continues to violate the rights and fundamental freedoms of the Namibians, including their right to exercise permanent sovereignty over the natural resources of the Territory.

57. We must not be discouraged by this situation. Rather, as representatives of States Members of the United Nations, we must exercise our right, which derives from our special responsibility for Namibia, to participate in the collective and institutional activities carried out through United Nations bodies in order to achieve as soon as possible the objectives we set for ourselves when we assumed that responsibility.

58. In this connection, we should give full support to the efforts of the Secretary-General and, as he requested, we must agree that the question of Namibia should be considered as a priority question in its own right and that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) continues to be the sole basis for a solution. We should also reaffirm that all agreements and arrangements arrived at to date by the United Nations remain valid and in force. Therefore, we must give full support and co-operation to the Secretary-General so that he may pursue and intensify his efforts to achieve a rapid solution to the Namibian question.

59. Honduras reiterates its conviction that we should not establish any link or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and matters that are extraneous to that question and which were not taken into account when the United Nations plan for Namibia was adopted. Nothing should be allowed to delay independence.

60. However, as we have stated on other occasions, Honduras cannot disregard the fact that there are elements of insecurity and tension in the southern part of Africa and that those conflicts must be resolved peacefully for the benefit of the peace and security to which all States without exception in that part of the world are entitled. This would also promote the consolidation of the expected independence of Namibia, which, let me say again, should not be delayed or hindered by conditions relating to the achievement of this ultimate regional objective. We therefore agree with the views of other Members of the United Nations, such as, for instance, Austria, whose representative, in his statement at the thirty-eighth session, on 29 November 1983, said:

“such elements should not be linked to the United Nations transition plan for Namibia but should rather be discussed directly with the interested Governments in an overall effort to reduce tensions and to put an end to the conflict in the area as a whole, perhaps including appropriate guarantees for the territorial integrity of the States concerned”. [75th meeting, para. 173.]

61. The international reality shows that those contacts and negotiations are already under way.

62. The search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question must be accelerated, given the justified impatience of the Namibian people. That is why we emphasize that it is desirable to give the Secretary-General the greatest possible support in his actions aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Contact Group can co-operate in expediting the attainment of a solution to the conflict, which derives from the foreign occupation of Namibian territory.

63. In the meantime, we should strengthen the international status of Namibia by encouraging acceptance of the participation of its representative, the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is under the competent direction of Mr. Lusaka, as a full member in the largest possible number of specialized agencies and bodies of the United Nations system, as is already the case, for instance, with the IAEA, ITU and the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Similarly, we should advocate the participation of Namibia as a party to international treaties of primary importance, as has happened in the case of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106A (XX), annex*], the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid [*resolution 3068 (XXVIII), annex*] and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.⁴

64. Assistance in the training of the Namibian people should continue to ensure maximum self-sufficiency. Support for the United Nations Council for Namibia in all its activities, as well as for the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia, should be strengthened. All co-operation with the State occupying the Territory of Namibia in the way of assistance that would help it to maintain or strengthen its illegal presence in that Territory should cease.

65. To this end, conferences, symposia and seminars should be held in different regions of the world in order to bring to the attention of public opinion in all continents the duty of the international community to ensure the rapid accession to independence of Namibia through the genuine self-determination of its people by means of free, impartial elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

66. It is to be hoped that the solution to the problem of Namibia will, at the latest, coincide with the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. Let us remember that by 1985, almost 40 years will have elapsed since we began to deal with the question of Namibia. We must therefore regard it as one of our priority questions, and we must strengthen our efforts to bring this question, and our direct responsibility with regard to it, to a conclusion, thus providing yet further proof that, in the words of the Charter, the United Nations is in a position "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

67. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Since the beginning of this year, two rounds of talks have been held, in Lusaka and Cape Verde, respectively, between the South African colonial authorities and SWAPO, which represents the Namibian people. However, owing to the lack of sincerity on the part of the South African authorities, these talks have produced no results, with no progress made whatsoever in the process towards the independence of Namibia. Now, not only do the Namibian people continue to live in an abyss of misery under South Africa's colonialist rule, but the sovereignty of the already independent countries in southern Africa has been subjected to repeated encroachments, and the situation in the region as a whole remains unsettled. Facts show that the root cause of tension in southern Africa lies in the South

African authorities' flat refusal to implement the relevant United Nations resolutions and abandon their colonial rule over Namibia, and in their persistent pursuance of regional hegemonism.

68. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has provided a realistic basis for a reasonable settlement of the Namibian question and attainment of independence by Namibia. According to this resolution, South African troops and SWAPO guerrillas should cease their hostilities, South African troops should gradually withdraw from Namibia, the Namibian people should hold elections under United Nations supervision, and the country would achieve complete independence. This settlement formula has been universally accepted by the Namibian people and the international community and was once accepted by the South African authorities as well. However, six years have passed and this solemn United Nations resolution remains to this day a mere scrap of paper, without being translated into action.

69. The key to the settlement of the Namibian question lies in terminating South African colonial rule so that the Namibian people may enjoy the inalienable right to self-determination and independence which they ought to enjoy. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) adheres to those principles while taking into account the many aspects of the realities both within and outside Namibia. In the course of negotiations, SWAPO, which represents the Namibian people, has over the years always taken a reasonable and constructive approach, demonstrating patience and flexibility to the greatest extent. But the South African authorities have stubbornly stuck to their colonialist position, constantly varying their tricks and resorting to both hard and soft tactics to delay the settlement of the question in order to protect their own strategic and economic interests in Namibia and preserve the system of *apartheid* in South Africa itself.

70. Intensifying their military repression, they have recently forced all males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve with the South African occupation troops. In order to strengthen their political rule, they have fostered puppet representatives and refused to recognize SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, as acknowledged by the United Nations. They are attempting to steer clear of the United Nations under the cover of a "regional settlement" and to proceed with their own plans.

71. Moreover, having stalled for a long time, they still refuse to withdraw their troops from Angola, following their invasion, and insist on linking the independence of Namibia with Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola and making the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) conditional on this troop withdrawal. Boasting that theirs is the only powerful military force in southern Africa, they have wantonly subjected neighbouring countries to their invasion and threats. These arbitrary acts of regional hegemonism perpetrated by the South African authorities have not only met with rejection by SWAPO and the African front-line States, but also have aroused the bitter resentment and indignation of the international community.

72. The struggle of the Namibian people has received extensive sympathy and support from all the countries and peoples in the world that uphold justice. At the Summit Meeting of the Front-line States held at Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania,

on 29 April 1984, the African front-line States reiterated their support for the Namibian people's struggle for independence. In June, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the African front-line States and the Nordic countries held a meeting in Stockholm to voice their support for the people of southern Africa in their struggle for liberation. In early September, the African front-line States and the Socialist International held a meeting at Arusha. 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, and 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, both reiterated that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the basis for the settlement of the Namibian question, expressed opposition to linkage of any kind and voiced resolute support for the just struggle of the Namibian people. In the past year, the United Nations Council for Namibia, under your dynamic guidance, Mr. President, has made new efforts for the cause of the liberation of the Namibian people.

73. It should be pointed out that the intransigence of the South African authorities is inseparable from a big Power's policy of "constructive engagement" towards South Africa and its insistence on a settlement that links Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola with the independence of Namibia. We hold that it should abandon the practice that inflates the arrogance of South Africa and runs counter to the aspirations of the vast majority of African countries and the international community as a whole, so that it may discharge its responsibilities in strict observance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

74. Namibia covers an area of over 820,000 square kilometres and has a population of more than a million. Subjected to colonialist oppression for over a century, it remains today under the rule of the South African racist régime and is the largest colony left on earth. This is a disgrace to the human society of the 1980s. We wish to call on all States Members of the United Nations strictly to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in the interest of the early achievement of the independence of Namibia, to carry out the Security Council resolution on an arms embargo against South Africa and to observe Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia. As regards the South African authorities, who refuse to abide by the relevant Security Council resolutions, sanctions should be taken against them in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

75. I wish to reiterate here that the Chinese Government and people vehemently condemn the racist authorities of South Africa for their illegal occupation of Namibia, strongly support the Namibian people's independence struggle in all its forms, including armed struggle, and will continue to render moral, political and material support and assistance to SWAPO. We firmly support the countries of southern Africa in their struggle to defend their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We resolutely support the people of South Africa in their just struggle against the system of *apartheid* and for basic human rights and racial equality, and we shall continue to provide whatever assistance lies within our power.

76. There may still be obstacles of all kinds in the process towards Namibian independence. We are convinced, however, that the Namibian people, strengthening their solidarity and persisting in their struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, will gain final victory and achieve the independence of Namibia.

77. Mr. ABDULLATIF (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At its thirty-ninth session the General Assembly is considering items and questions discussed at many previous sessions. What is really striking is that very few such problems have been solved effectively; others have become a permanent feature of the agenda of the General Assembly since the founding of the United Nations.

78. Yesterday [77th meeting], the General Assembly concluded its debate on agenda item 36, on the situation in the Middle East; today it is considering the question of Namibia; and in a few days, it will begin its consideration of the question of Palestine.

79. These three questions share a common factor: the existence of foreign occupation. As in Palestine and the Middle East, there is in Namibia an obnoxious foreign occupation. Another common factor in these three questions is the claim by the occupying authority to ownership of some or all of the territory under occupation and its attempts to annex it. In Palestine and the Middle East, Israel claims ownership of certain lands, as it colonizes and imposes its laws on others. The same thing is happening in Namibia; South Africa claims ownership of parts of that Territory. Yet another common factor in these questions is the existence of a racist policy which discriminates between population groups on the basis of race, religion or colour. Just as in Palestine, we see in southern Africa racial discrimination, which is condemned by the entire world. It is no wonder, therefore, that Zionism has been declared a form of racism and South Africa's policy of *apartheid* has been characterized as another form of racism.

80. These are but three examples of the links connecting the three questions, because there is another common feature—namely, the intransigence and arrogance displayed by the forces of occupation. This feature is demonstrated in the Middle East and Palestine by Israel and in Namibia by South Africa. Both occupiers are faced with categorical rejection by the populations, which express that rejection by all possible means recognized by international law.

81. Oman is geographically near to parts of the African continent and, historically, has had excellent relations with that continent. This for us is a source of pride and honour, but above all it is the reason for our extreme interest in the affairs of that continent. The Sultanate of Oman shares the aspirations of the African continent and its hopes for just and lasting solutions to the problems that beset it. The Sultanate of Oman also fully shares the continent's grief and sorrow at Africa's plight resulting from deteriorating economic conditions, which derive mainly from a number of natural factors beyond Africa's control. The tragedy of the refugees and the famine afflicting millions of Africans are but two manifestations of the difficult situation facing the African continent.

82. My country reaffirms its solidarity with the peoples of the African continent and its hope that the African countries will occupy a better place in the constellation of nations. It is therefore no wonder that my country shows great interest in the question

of Namibia. We believe that the cause of Namibia is the cause of decolonization, which should be solved on the basis of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as related United Nations resolutions.

83. Any attempt to characterize the question of Namibia otherwise is but an attempt to distort the true nature of this cause.

84. On the basis of these principles, my delegation wishes to reaffirm the direct responsibility of the United Nations towards Namibia pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V). Moreover, we should like to reaffirm that the Namibian people have an inalienable right to self-determination and independence within a unified Namibia.

85. On the other hand, the occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an act of aggression under the definition contained in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX).

86. We consider the racist Government of South Africa fully responsible for the failure of all attempts made, whether by the United Nations or by others, including the failure of the talks held in 1984 at Lusaka and in Cape Verde regarding the question of Namibia.

87. The obstacles raised by South Africa during these negotiations are but a manoeuvre intended to perpetuate its régime, which is based on suppression, the occupation of Namibia and the exploitation of its natural resources.

88. My delegation firmly believes that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which has been internationally recognized, should be fully implemented. It is to be regretted that this resolution has not yet been implemented.

89. Continued delay and procrastination can lead only to the prolongation of the suffering of the Namibian people and to more bloodshed and, moreover, are a danger to international peace and security not only in the African continent but in the world at large.

90. It is high time to put an end to the continued illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibia and to its aggression against the Namibian people and its exploitation of Namibia's natural resources.

91. The international community should assume its responsibilities clearly and unequivocally. Namibia must attain its full independence without any infringement of its territorial integrity, which includes Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. The international community should categorically reject the South African claims to ownership of that gulf and those islands, pursuant to the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly which have affirmed that Walvis Bay and the offshore islands are integral to Namibia and that any measure taken by South Africa to separate those areas from Namibia is null and void.

92. The international community has the direct responsibility of preserving the resources of Namibia and putting an end to the plundering of them. The resources of the Territory are the rightful property of the people of Namibia. The United Nations, which has assumed the responsibility of administering the Territory, is duty bound to preserve that right so that the Namibian people will be able to put these resources to good use after its independence is achieved.

93. The refusal of South Africa to comply with resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly or the Security Council or of other international organizations reminds us of the intransigence of Israel towards similar resolutions.

94. The international community is invited, today more than at any time in the past, to impose its will on racist South Africa by taking concrete and tangible measures. The international community should utilize all possible measures, including a comprehensive oil embargo and comprehensive compulsory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to compel South Africa to comply with the United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

95. Among the important measures that could be taken by the international community are those which could lead to weakening the military capabilities of the racist régime in South Africa, whether at the level of conventional or nuclear armaments. A feeling of might and power is the main motivating force behind the reckless behaviour of South Africa, which defies and disregards the will and resolutions of the international community. It is also the reason for the brutal oppression against the Namibian people. In addition, it is behind the actions taken to destabilize and commit aggression against the independent African States. The policies and practices of *apartheid* are but a reflection of this feeling of superiority and power. Is it strange in such circumstances that the people of Namibia are resisting this intransigence by all means and methods available to them?

96. The weakening of the military capabilities of South Africa cannot be brought about except by imposing an embargo on the shipment of conventional weaponry. Moreover, action should be taken to withhold the acquisition by South Africa of sophisticated technology in the nuclear field which might enable it to become a nuclear Power.

97. We are looking forward to the day when the people of Namibia will be able to exercise fully their right to self-determination and independence. We hope that that day is near. We are confident that the roles the United Nations, through the United Nations Council for Namibia under the direction of Mr. Lusaka, and the Secretary-General can play, in accordance with the relevant resolutions, will enable the people of Namibia to achieve their aspirations to independence and freedom.

98. Mr. MINIKON (Liberia): As the United Nations approaches the fortieth anniversary of its founding, my delegation believes that a high point of its celebration and a timely tribute would be to have Namibia, represented by Namibians, rightly seated among the ranks of States Members of the United Nations. Regrettably, it would be unwise, in view of negative signals, to entertain any such false hopes or idle speculations that that will be the case. However, Liberia remains cautiously optimistic that good reasoning, moral courage, political will and justice will eventually prevail in the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of the people of Namibia.

99. In reflecting upon the accomplishments of the United Nations, my delegation would like to observe that, to date, the question of Namibia cannot be listed in the annals as having even come near to making meaningful progress towards self-determination, freedom and independence in a united Namib-

ia. However, my delegation wishes to acknowledge the gains made by the United Nations in other directions concerning this matter, to which it will later address itself.

100. Liberia feels it both a duty and an obligation to participate in the debate on the question of Namibia, a question which has been a perennial item on the Assembly's agenda. In the past, the crescendo of hypocritical, contrived, contradictory and even self-defeating rhetoric has often exceeded meaningful and concerted action. This practice has led to the conclusion by some that such a situation could only encourage South Africa's intransigence towards United Nations decisions and resolutions, enabling the racist régime to continue further its illegal and colonial occupation of the Territory, an occupation terminated by the United Nations 18 years ago. Liberia will continue to condemn South Africa and its collaborators, who are known to come from all the various regions of the world.

101. Indeed, the United Nations has to its credit the implementation of historic resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly, which has resulted in a majority of countries with colonial conditions similar to those of Namibia joining the family of nations represented here, enabling them thus to mark in 1984 the hundredth anniversary of their own struggle against colonial occupation and the plundering of the natural resources of their countries. Many of these countries have gained their independence by violent means, some through eloquence and charisma and others through proud defiance. Their liberation struggle, whether violent or peaceful, required the mobilization of the whole nation.

102. Similarly, the liberation struggle of Namibia has enjoyed the support of the Namibian people, under the sole and authentic leadership of SWAPO. They have employed all the means I have just mentioned and, best of all, they have the support of international public opinion on their side as at no other time. But the Namibians have been confronted by set-backs and failures, inasmuch as South Africa has attempted to weaken their spirit of determination for that for which their forefathers so gallantly fought and for which so many of them continue to be oppressed and suppressed, that for which so many of them languish in gaols. However, nothing will deter them from achieving their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

103. What is the United Nations to make of the persistent colonial and illegal situation existing in Namibia? Have we unconsciously abandoned Namibia and its people and taken solace in the echoes of our own voices and the records of votes on resolutions relevant to this matter? Has the interpretation of the uniqueness of Namibia as a United Nations responsibility engendered a hard core of resistance to the applicability of the principles of self-determination, thereby ensuring the furtherance of the economic and strategic interests of some countries in southern Africa?

104. Namibia and its people are being shamelessly exploited and humiliated, and it is our view that the United Nations would not have found itself in such an awkward position had it moved swiftly and stood on firm ground, calling South Africa's bluff, in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), when the racist régime informed the Council that it had accepted that resolution in its final and

definitive form. For its part, SWAPO accepted all the provisions of that resolution at that time, as it still does to this day. The time was ripe, the goal was definite and the target clear, but no definite action was taken.

105. Subsequently, there has been a divergence of interpretation by a few concerning some of the resolutions. The inescapable conclusion of many, to which my delegation adds its voice, is that South Africa will not yield to any decision which does not confirm its role as the undisputed regional power in southern Africa. This will force all its neighbours and other African Governments to reconsider their policies towards the Pretoria régime and, indeed, will win it international recognition.

106. The fortitude with which the Secretary-General has carried out his mandate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), and his own personal efforts, will continue to be admired and praised. His report to the Security Council,⁵ dated 19 May 1983, confirming that all the outstanding issues under resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved was thereafter challenged by South Africa, which reintroduced the subject of partiality by the United Nations towards SWAPO and insisted on extraneous issues, such as the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

107. The Assembly will recall that, on 3 October 1984, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liberia, in his statement to the Assembly [*19th meeting*], clearly emphasized that it was difficult for Liberia to accept the linkage question, and this remains our position today.

108. The linkage question, however, has been emphatically rejected by the majority of the international community. My delegation is of the view that all southern African States have as much right as South Africa does to ensure their security interests. Therefore, we cannot acquiesce in any position that would compromise the sovereign decisions or jeopardize the security interests of those States for the benefit of South Africa.

109. But these extraneous issues should not be further permitted to grind to a halt, or even eclipse or overshadow, the heart of the Namibian question, which includes the illegal occupation and militarization of Namibia, the violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² the attempt to impose the inhuman policy of *apartheid*, the violation of human rights and the continued acts of aggression against neighbouring African States by South Africa. In this context, my delegation believes that countries having leverage on South Africa should endeavour to avert a situation which has been declared a threat to international peace and security.

110. My delegation believes that, in our endeavours to persuade the friends of South Africa to bring pressure to bear on the racist régime, we should at the same time speak out frankly and not hesitate to let them know about our attitude towards their alliance, which it is felt is undermining the United Nations position on Namibia.

111. At this juncture my delegation would like to make some observations concerning the policy of constructive engagement of one of the Western members of the Contact Group. Our perception of other aspects of this policy is not viewed as generally negative, but it poses some difficulties as applied to certain matters which are in direct conflict with the

objectives of the United Nations with regard to South Africa and Namibia.

112. I recognize, however, that convictions on this matter are held at such profound levels and raise such deep questions of the perception of this policy that it is doubtful how far it would be useful for my delegation to attempt a rational analysis of the merits of the respective positions or to attempt to persuade those that hold the view that every aspect of it is negative and that belonging to a particular regional group or organization means total opposition to this policy. We are not surprised at South Africa's capitalizing on the policy of constructive engagement to embarrass and blame its proponent for the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

113. What we had considered a positive initiative was the diplomatic trafficking which has been taking place during the course of the year involving SWAPO and some African and front-line States and which we had hoped would yield some fruitful results that would contribute to a process that would lead to the signing of a cease-fire and implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Unfortunately, closed issues have once again been reopened by South Africa, which has misused the opportunity on each occasion to make a mockery of the entire exercise for its own selfish gain. However, future initiatives, as such, should not be dismissed.

114. The people of Namibia have had to contend with difficulties unknown, perhaps, to any other colonial peoples, and with noble fortitude they are grappling manfully with them, to overcome them or die in their legitimate armed struggle. Liberia is certain that the Namibians will succeed and that any initiative designed to buy time for South Africa will fail.

115. My delegation would like to commend you, Sir, as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, of which Liberia is a member. Under your wise guidance and direction, the Council has been able to fulfil its mandate and to mobilize international public opinion on the question of Namibia. It would be a deserved tribute to you for Namibia to become independent during your leadership as President of the General Assembly and of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

116. My delegation reiterates that, in the event of the United Nations plan for Namibia not being immediately implemented, it would support urging the Security Council to meet again to shoulder its responsibilities fully, including taking urgent action to ensure implementation of its decisions and, if necessary, imposing sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. In the meantime, we also urge States, individually and collectively, to impose economic sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime. Such an action would indicate unswerving support for the efforts towards self-determination, freedom and independence for the Namibians.

117. Finally, it would be remiss of my delegation not to express our appreciation to all those countries which have contributed consistently and without any reservation to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia, educational and relief assistance and fund-raising missions, as noted in a report of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia under the symbol A/AC.131/L.139. My delegation can only

appeal to those with the means to do so to continue to contribute as generously, or more generously, to these activities. With the concern of all Member States for educated and trained Namibians to manage their affairs in the event of their independence and with a new set of commitments to the Territory's independence, it is possible for the Namibians to forgive and forget the injustices that have been inflicted upon them. We look forward to their joining our ranks in 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

118. Mr. SIEF (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): May I say, Sir, that my delegation considers your election to the presidency of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly to be a tribute and an honour to the steadfast people of Zambia on the front line of the racist régime that is occupying Namibia, as well as a tribute to you personally. At the same time, since you are also the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we see in your election an expression of the will and determination of the international community to help the liberation struggle in that Territory and to put an end to the long suffering of the Namibian people, who have been waging an heroic struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative. Therefore, we are confident that the coming period will be one of intensive work to help secure the independence of Namibia and enable it to occupy its official place as an independent State when we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

119. In spite of the great progress made by the United Nations and the national liberation movements since the adoption in 1960 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, thanks to the valiant struggle of the peoples of colonial territories, with the support and solidarity of the United Nations and anti-colonial forces throughout the world which cherish freedom, progress and peace, the Namibian people have not yet been able to enjoy their right to self-determination and national independence in accordance with decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and other international bodies. This is solely because of the intransigence and defiance of the racist Pretoria régime, which resorts to treachery and manoeuvres to bypass the resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly so as to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

120. The racist régime occupying Namibia does not confine itself to entrenching its illegal occupation of that Territory. In the very recent past it has reinforced its military presence there, set up tribal armies and imposed compulsory conscription on the Namibians. This feverish military activity is designed to suppress the national liberation movement of the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO and its companions. This activity has also transformed the territory of Namibia into a base from which to launch acts of sabotage and aggression against neighbouring States, especially Angola, parts of which are still occupied by the racist forces. These acts of sabotage and aggression against neighbouring States have become a source of great danger to stability and security in the region and in the world and are a violation of United Nations resolutions

prohibiting the use of colonial territories as bases for military activities against other States.

121. On the other hand, and notwithstanding Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, the interests of racist South Africa, as well as those of the United States and other Western States, have dictated the continuance of their immoral exploitation of the natural and human resources of that Territory. A report of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations⁶ mentions that there are 90 such exploiting companies, 64 of them Western and American. The same report shows that the resources thus exploited and plundered cover all sectors, including strategic materials such as uranium and others necessary for the Western strategic-arms industries.

122. The information available to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples reveals that 60 per cent of the profits generated in Namibia is appropriated by group interests in racist South Africa and other foreign interests, especially Western and American, which transfer those profits to their countries of origin. Those economic activities in Namibia are completely alien to the basic interests of the Namibian people and do nothing to promote the development of the various economic sectors for Namibia's benefit after independence. Indeed, those activities constitute an obstacle to Namibia's independence.

123. The evidence contained in the relevant documentation submitted to this session and the debate in the Fourth Committee—at its 3rd, 5th and 19th meetings—on foreign economic and military activities in Namibia show the existence of collusion between South Africa and some Western countries, especially the United States and Israel, to sustain and encourage the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its occupation of that Territory.

124. The so-called policy of constructive engagement pursued by some States towards the racist régime of South Africa has indeed helped and encouraged that régime to continue its inhuman policy of *apartheid* and has strengthened its hold over Namibia.

125. The so-called policy of constructive engagement is nothing but a manoeuvre and an attempt at deception. It is one of the pretexts used to put obstacles in the way of the implementation of United Nations resolutions on the granting of independence to Namibia. The truth is simply that the interests of South Africa and its friends are the main reason for delaying the granting of independence to Namibia and for the pressures exerted against its population and neighbouring independent African States. The racist régime could not continue its defiance of the international community without the ongoing assistance of the United States and some other Western countries and Israel in the military, economic and diplomatic fields. It is that support which emboldens the racist South African régime to refuse to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the granting of independence to Namibia. In recent years that support has extended directly and indirectly to the military and nuclear fields, including secret arms shipments as well. That can only lead to increasing

that régime's arrogance, thus permitting its continued occupation of Namibia. It also encourages it in its acts of aggression and sabotage against neighbouring countries and peoples and the national liberation movements in southern Africa.

126. The United Nations bears special responsibility for securing independence immediately for the Namibian people and protecting its natural wealth and resources, as well as for ensuring full compensation for the plunder visited upon it. In this connection, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) calls for the independence of Namibia, and a comprehensive plan was formulated to implement that resolution. We hope that that resolution will be implemented without further obstacles or obstruction.

127. The cause of Namibia is one of national liberation and decolonization. There is therefore no room to view the problem from an ideological perspective or as part of the East-West confrontation. The United States bears special responsibility in respect of the granting of independence to that Territory in view of the fact that it is a permanent member of the Security Council.

128. Moreover, linking the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of internationalist Cuban forces from Angola is unacceptable. It is completely extraneous to the issue of Namibian independence. In addition, it is known that the People's Republic of Angola and Cuba have declared that the gradual withdrawal of the Cuban forces is possible, subject to the following conditions: first, withdrawal of the racist forces from Angola; secondly, implementation of the Security Council resolution granting independence to Namibia and the withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia; thirdly, an end to all acts or threats of aggression by South Africa, the United States and their allies; and, fourthly, an end to all assistance by the United States and the racist régime in South Africa to the counter-revolutionary forces in Angola.

129. The people of Namibia are victims of the racist colonial policy of the South African régime and its allied imperialist forces which provide that régime with military and economic assistance. They are the same forces which provide the racist Zionist régime with the wherewithal to oppress the Arab Palestinian people, brothers of the Namibian people suffering the same plight. The similarity between the two racist régimes of South Africa and Israel is today the prime reason for their close collaboration in all fields, especially in the military and nuclear fields, in the hope of continuing their oppression and perpetuating their domination over the African and Arab peoples.

130. Democratic Yemen, while calling for the prompt implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) regarding the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, wishes to reaffirm its unlimited support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative. Democratic Yemen also reaffirms its support for the African front-line States in confronting all imperialist and racist conspiracies designed to weaken their resolve to resist racism and occupation.

131. We call upon the United Nations and the international community to impose comprehensive, mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime in South Africa and to ensure the total isolation of that inhuman régime.

132. The military and nuclear co-operation between the racist régime and some Western States, especially the United States and Israel, should be duly condemned, in view of its serious and dangerous implications for the struggle for the liquidation of imperialism and racism in southern Africa.

133. In conclusion, I would like to say that the questions of Namibia and Palestine are subjects of international concern. We are confident that the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia, as well as the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people, will be crowned with success, thus removing the dangers of racism, which constitute today a source of threat to world peace and human justice and to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

134. Mr. SILWAL (Nepal): For more than 25 years the Namibian people have been under the domination of South Africa and its policies of *apartheid*. The problem of Namibia has been a concern of the United Nations since the beginning of the Organization. The United Nations, under the "principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples" contained in the Charter, has been working to free the Namibians from their helpless plight under the colonial system and to establish an independent Namibia.

135. In 1966, the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate and assumed the responsibility for administering South West Africa. This was followed by an historic decision by the International Court of Justice, in 1971,³ which obliged States Members to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and refrain from assisting that régime. Yet, after so many years, South Africa blatantly continues to defy the United Nations and is illegally occupying Namibia under the *apartheid* system. The delegation of Nepal reiterates its full support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination, which, in our view, is just and legitimate and fully in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

136. In April 1960, in response to the need of the Namibian people, SWAPO was established. This movement was declared the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia by the General Assembly in 1976, in its resolution 31/146. Even in the conditions of the frequent arrests, repression and atrocities perpetrated against Namibia, SWAPO has been waging an heroic struggle against South Africa and the abhorrent system of *apartheid*. My delegation would like to commend the efforts of SWAPO in the brave struggle for independence and self-determination. We are convinced that, under the leadership of SWAPO and with the support of the African people and all peace-loving nations of the world, the Namibian people will overcome any obstacle put up by the South African régime and achieve the independence of Namibia.

137. The South African Government, in total disregard of the feeling of the international community, has resorted to increasing use of military force. A number of military, paramilitary and police units are deployed in Namibia to strengthen the illegal occupation and the *apartheid* system in South Africa, to suppress the popular resistance in Namibia and to destabilize neighbouring countries, especially Angola. Nepal firmly supports the African front-line States in their struggle to safeguard their national indepen-

dence and territorial integrity and joins the international community in the demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola.

138. The Government of South Africa has for decades been exploiting the rich natural and human resources of Namibia for its own purposes. The exploitation of the Territory's natural resources is a violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and thus is of concern to all of us. In our view, the exploitation of Namibian resources stands as an obstacle to the independence of Namibia and its eventual economic independence.

139. Nepal has all along resolutely opposed and strongly condemned the South African racist colonial rule of Namibia and stood for resolving the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), so that the independence of Namibia may be achieved at an early date. Furthermore, we respect General Assembly resolution 38/36, the Paris Declaration on Namibia, and the report of the Committee of the Whole and the Programme of Action on Namibia adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.⁷ My delegation commends the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia and would like to pay a tribute to you, Mr. President, for the manner in which you have so wisely and ably guided the Council in the performance of its duty.

140. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, having assessed the situation in Namibia, expressed its dismay at the failure of the Security Council to discharge effectively its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Furthermore, it considered that comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter, if universally and effectively implemented, were the only available means to ensure South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the United Nations.

141. My delegation, therefore, calls upon the Security Council to meet at the earliest possible date to consider further action on the implementation of its plan for Namibia's independence, thereby shouldering its primary responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We believe that enough time has elapsed since the adoption of this resolution and that it is high time for the Security Council to assume fully the central role in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and establish its own time-frame for such implementation.

142. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): It is with a feeling of deep frustration that we come here again today, 18 years after the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, to denounce the continuation of the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa. It is incomprehensible that it has to this day been impossible to proceed to the application to the Namibian people of the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

143. The problem, which, along with that of Palestine, has been of great concern to the international community since the founding of the Organization and led to the adoption of the greatest number of resolutions and decisions by the United Nations is indeed the question of Namibia.

144. There is no need to recall here the various phases of this deplorable matter. We are all well aware of them, as the continuing debates in the United Nations indicate. They tell us that the attention of the world is still riveted to this problem and that the Organization remains firm in not allowing illegality to become the rule and strict respect for law the exception.

145. Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976), the United Nations has, through arduous, patient and commendable efforts, with the contribution of several States which have direct influence on South Africa and the African front-line States, succeeded in producing a compromise plan to break the impasse which had been willed and maintained by South Africa. The plan for the peaceful and democratic accession to independence of the Territory of Namibia, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), was accepted by all parties involved, including SWAPO—and here we must praise SWAPO's sense of responsibility and political courage. Only South Africa has been resorting to numerous subterfuges and delaying tactics to thwart the implementation of the plan and thus to delay the day when South Africa will have to leave Namibia—and one day, South Africa will have to leave Namibia.

146. In the six years that have elapsed since resolution 435 (1978), the fruit of those efforts, was adopted, no start has been made on its implementation. However, that resolution has given rise to hope for a negotiated and peaceful settlement. That hope, sustained with difficulty, has gradually been dispelled, given the blatant arrogance and renewed defiance of Pretoria.

147. From time to time, South Africa, to appease the impatience of almost all States and to supply excuses or alibis to some States Members of the United Nations, would have us believe, unsuccessfully, in its democratic mentality and its concern for the rights of the minority, the better to trample underfoot the rights of the majority.

148. Despite the unceasing efforts of States Members of the United Nations and of the organs directly concerned—the Security Council, the General Assembly, 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 despite a considerable number of decisions and resolutions adopted on the issue, the Namibian people, to whom we should like here once again to express our admiration, have not yet been able to achieve their most legitimate aspirations to freedom, dignity and independence.

149. I should also like to express our great appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the vigilant guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, who is now President of the Assembly and to whom I pay tribute, has spared no effort to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it in 1967, consisting basically in promoting the necessary conditions for the speedy accession of the people of

Namibia to independence, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

150. The courageous struggle waged by the Namibian people, under the enlightened leadership of SWAPO, has not yet overcome the criminal intransigence of the Pretoria régime in its espousal of the inhuman contradictions of *apartheid*, which has no other course than resort to brutal force and blind repression.

151. The Tunisian delegation takes this opportunity to reaffirm its full solidarity with the heroic struggle being waged by the Namibian people, under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, and to assure it of Tunisia's continued support until the advent of a free and united Namibia.

152. While the Secretary-General and SWAPO, supported by all of Africa, are sincerely seeking ways to promote the implementation of the United Nations plan, the South African Government, for its part, continues to flout the United Nations and openly to defy the international community.

153. Within Namibia, it has engaged in brutal acts of repression against the Namibian people in a desperate effort to stifle the people's fierce determination to regain their fundamental rights. There have been innumerable arbitrary arrests, house arrests and denials of fundamental human rights under the practice of *apartheid*.

154. At the same time, the Pretoria racist régime has pursued its crude constitutional and political manoeuvres aimed at imposing an internal settlement within the framework of the so-called Multi-Party Conference and in particular by setting up a council of state entrusted with producing a "Constitution".

155. Moreover, during the past few years, South Africa has continued to strengthen its military presence in Namibia, allowing it to carry out from that illegally occupied Territory repeated acts of aggression directed against independent African countries.

156. The racists of South Africa take advantage of their presence there to recruit and forcibly train Namibians to form tribal armies to fight against the liberation movements of southern Africa. In addition, they are setting up new military bases, in particular in the region near Namibia's northern frontier, from which they arbitrarily displace and expel civilian populations.

157. Confronted with this situation, we note with concern that some States, almost all of which are democratic and anti-racist, are continuing, strange as it seems, to collaborate with the Pretoria régime by supplying it with weapons and the means and technology to enable it to maintain its military supremacy in the region. Clearly, such co-operation is a serious violation of relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

158. Encouraged by the incredible, and inadmissible, benevolence of its allies, South Africa seeks to impose its own solution to the Namibian problem, without regard for the principles of international law that govern our civilized world or for the decisions of the international community.

159. It was the representative of South Africa who, on 23 October 1984, said before the Security Council that: "The South African Government rejects whatever decisions the Security Council may arrive at,

now and in the future, when it purports to address the domestic affairs of South Africa” and that “South Africa, as a regional Power in southern Africa, gives notice that it has no intention to capitulate.”⁸

160. That statement is indeed instructive. It clearly states the refusal of the racist Government of Pretoria to accept a peaceful solution which would make possible Namibia's accession to independence.

161. Moreover, on the basis of that negative attitude regarding principles, Pretoria has been attempting to alter the spirit and the letter of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by putting forward pretexts irrelevant to the question of Namibia, thus blocking the decolonization process for that Territory. Backed by the support it has been able to obtain in certain capitals, Pretoria contrives at each stage of the negotiations to introduce new conditions. In this connection, we reiterate that any attempt to introduce any element irrelevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is unacceptable.

162. The Contact Group, which shouldered a major responsibility in the preparation and adoption of the settlement plan, must demonstrate real political will and exert greater pressure on the South African Government to comply with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978), the sole valid framework within which a solution in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people may be found.

163. Furthermore, one of the members of the Contact Group, a permanent member of the Security Council, has itself pointed out the inadequacy of the action taken by that group. It has learned a lesson and at the same time shown us what little hope we can place in that group, unless, in a final push, it seriously sets about its task of bringing all its weight to bear on the side of law and justice. It would in that way have kept its promises to the Namibian people, to Africa and to the international community.

164. The United Nations, to whose principles we are firmly dedicated, must change its approach and compel South Africa to respect its resolutions, including resolution 435 (1978), which, as we have said, remains the sole valid basis for a negotiated settlement.

165. We believe that, in the interest of international peace and security, the Security Council should not hesitate, given Pretoria's arrogance, to take effective measures, in accordance with the relevant Articles of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to protect the territorial integrity of Namibia and the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

166. By making use of the possibilities offered by Chapter VII of the Charter, it is still possible to spare the peoples of southern Africa the risks of a serious confrontation. Moreover, those possibilities for action should not be subject to the political will of certain Powers which, particularly in the Security Council, have paralysed the United Nations and made its action ineffective.

167. We venture to hope that wisdom and realism will prevail and that by pooling our efforts we shall be able to ensure that long-term interests will take precedence over the short-term interests that rule the choices of some, and to compel Pretoria to face the single, clear reality and withdraw from Namibia in accordance with the United Nations settlement plan.

168. Efforts undertaken by all with sincerity and faith in the force of law and the obligations of the

United Nations can ensure that Namibia emerges from the long night of colonialism and at our next session becomes a full Member of the Organization and takes on all its international responsibilities as a free, sovereign and independent State.

169. Then, finally, we shall have fulfilled our commitment in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

170. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): This year is the one-hundredth year of the colonial occupation of Namibia. It also marks the centenary of the systematic brutal treatment and suppression of Namibia's human resources and the heartless exploitation of its natural resources. The Assembly knows only too well the tragic and pathetic plight of the Namibian people. There is, therefore, no need for me to rehearse the several resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council demanding the withdrawal of the racist régime of South Africa from Namibia. Nor is it necessary for me to bore the Assembly with details of the efforts that have been made—without any success, I might say—to secure the withdrawal of the racist régime from Namibia. All this is too well known to require any further elaboration.

171. My delegation remains seriously concerned about the situation in Namibia in particular and, indeed, in southern Africa in general. It is a matter for deep regret that the danger posed to international peace and security by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime is not recognized by those Powers that wilfully and in an arrogant manner continue openly to encourage the Pretoria régime to persist in its open defiance of the Organization.

172. The whole world has witnessed the bizarre spectacle of the past couple of weeks, in which the racist régime has launched a vicious, unprovoked and barbaric attack against innocent, defenceless blacks whose only crime is that they dare to speak out against *apartheid*, a system which, as we all know, dehumanizes them and renders them stateless in their own country.

173. Standing Committee II of the United Nations Council for Namibia, in its report on the activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia,⁹ noted that the plunder of the natural and human resources of Namibia by South African and other foreign economic interests continues unabated and in contravention of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted in 1974. That report further noted that the illegal occupation of Namibia by *apartheid* South Africa has resulted in a colonial economy characterized by the siphoning off of the Territory's extensive natural resources and its captive labour force by transnational corporations based in South Africa, Western Europe and North America.

174. Here lies the crux of the problem. While South Africa ignores the international community, the connivance of its Western allies makes it safe for their transnational corporations to exploit Namibia. We reject as hypocritical and tendentious the argument that the activities of these Western transnational corporations contribute in any meaningful way to the lives of the Namibian people.

175. The continual use of the veto by South Africa's allies in the Security Council, making United Nations actions and proposals impotent, must be

viewed against this background. We have witnessed certain Member States, which in February 1981 condemned South Africa for its duplicity and disruptive practices during the Geneva pre-implementation talks, later turn round and veto draft resolutions in the Security Council that urge the imposition of sanctions against the *apartheid* régime in Pretoria. This they have done in order to save the régime from economic, cultural and political isolation by the world community.

176. There have been paradoxes in connection with the Namibian question and, indeed, southern African problems generally. It has recently been shamelessly argued that *apartheid* is not one of the many violations of human rights. Such views need no response. They are at best to be taken as a convoluted rationalization of evil by a new breed of leaders of men and nations which have made it possible for otherwise rational human beings in this so-called civilized world to agree to coexist with *apartheid* South Africa. This has been the thrust of the so-called policy of constructive engagement, a policy that has enabled exponents of democratic principles in the world to help in nipping off the buds of freedom in Namibia, a policy that has encouraged the racist Pretoria régime in its defiance of the United Nations and strengthened racist South Africa in its continued massive militarization of Namibia. This policy has been defended as an instrument in getting the *apartheid* régime to evolve towards peaceful change.

177. We reject these pretentious premises, which are nothing but a smoke-screen to hide what is essentially an amoral, materialistic and racially biased policy. For, indeed, the constructive engagement policy has shown no results since its inception. Namibia is no closer to independence than it was four years ago, and the South African racists have not softened in their abhorrent and inhuman system of *apartheid*.

178. We hesitate to labour the point, but we reiterate our call to the United States—a country with which Nigeria, and, indeed, most of Africa, enjoys warm and cordial relations—to reconsider this policy of constructive engagement. We have no doubt that the United States Government is committed to democracy and freedom. We plead that pressure be brought to bear on *apartheid* South Africa to apply this same principle to the 23 million blacks who have been savagely dehumanized in their own country and to encourage South Africa to bow to the decisions of the United Nations and set Namibia free. The United States has more than enough leverage in this regard and, indeed, could make all the difference.

179. On behalf of my delegation, I dare to ask this question of the United States: can we hope to have Namibia celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations as an independent State? I hope it will answer in the affirmative, because the issue of Namibia's independence is one on which the whole of Africa is united, and no amount of pressure, such as the arm-twisting tactics that have been brought to bear on us in recent days, will make us change.

180. Nigeria remains committed to the solution of the problem of *apartheid* in South Africa and to independence for Namibia. The achievement of the independence of a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, continues to remain a cardinal objective of our foreign policy and we shall not relax in our efforts

until total victory is won. We reaffirm our unflinching support for SWAPO and our call for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, as endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without further delay and without modification, amplification or any pre-conditions. Resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted after a rigorous and protracted process of negotiations during which SWAPO was prevailed upon to make countless concessions, remains today, six years after its adoption, unimplemented. But we reaffirm our position that this resolution is the only acceptable basis for the solution of the Namibian question.

181. We are and shall ever remain convinced that, no matter how long it takes, the Namibian people will eventually emerge victorious over the colonialist *apartheid* forces of occupation. We maintain also that Namibia remains a direct and unique responsibility of the United Nations until the achievement of genuine independence.

182. Finally, let me take this opportunity to convey to you, Sir, my sincere and deep appreciation of the services you have continued to render to the United Nations Council for Namibia in your capacity as its President. I have no doubt that under your continued able leadership the Council will continue its vigorous efforts in the interests of the Namibian people and to ensure the attainment of their objective.

183. Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community.

184. Namibia has been an acknowledged international responsibility for more than 60 years and an issue before the United Nations virtually since the inception of the Organization. It is a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations and is one of the most serious problems which the Organization has faced.

185. The Ten have consistently reiterated the view that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end. The United Nations settlement plan, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) and accepted by both the Government of South Africa and SWAPO, provides for the peaceful transition of Namibia to internationally recognized independence. It alone embodies a universally accepted framework for a peaceful transition to independence in a manner which is guaranteed by the United Nations to be free and fair. The Ten firmly believe, therefore, that the people of Namibia must be permitted to determine their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in accordance with that settlement plan. The Ten do not accept that the settlement plan should be delayed or set aside for extraneous reasons or for arrangements inconsistent with resolution 435 (1978).

186. Strenuous efforts have been made over the years by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the front-line States, Nigeria, SWAPO, the Organization of African Unity and the Contact Group aimed at bringing about a just and peaceful solution to the Namibian question in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Ten have consistently supported these efforts. In this context, the Ten wish to confirm that they will continue to support the contacts of the Secretary-General with the parties concerned aimed at achieving a settlement within the framework of resolution

435 (1978) and in accordance with resolution 539 (1983).

187. The Ten recognize the significance of recent developments in southern Africa. They noted with satisfaction the agreement reached between Angola and South Africa on 16 February 1984 at Lusaka on the strengthening and monitoring of the military disengagement in southern Angola. They commend the efforts of all parties concerned to bring about increased security and stability in the region and express the hope that these developments will contribute to a climate of mutual confidence which will facilitate the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Ten deeply regret, however, that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia in defiance of resolution 385 (1976) continues and that hopes for a settlement remain as yet unfulfilled.

188. The Ten strongly condemn all acts of violence and intimidation committed in Namibia. These acts, including the practice of arbitrary arrests and detentions without trial, cause great suffering to the local population. The recent imposition by South Africa of military conscription of all Namibian males between the ages of 17 and 55 to serve in its army occupying Namibia is of profound concern to the Ten and they strongly deplore it.

189. There is deep international concern about the delay in securing Namibian independence. Implementation of the United Nations settlement plan is an urgent requirement. Six years have now passed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the plan. The Ten reiterate their rejection of any dilatory tactics employed by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to impose an internal settlement on its people. The Ten will continue to work for and support all

efforts aimed at the urgent implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

190. The European Community and its member States will also continue their aid to the Namibian people, particularly through their support for the United Nations Institute for Namibia, and they reaffirm their readiness to assist in the development of a free and independent Namibia.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTES

¹See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16237.

²*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. I, annex II.*

³*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. 16.*

⁴*Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, vol. XVII (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.V.3), document A/CONF.62/122.*

⁵*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1983*, document S/15776.

⁶*Policies and Practices of Transnational Corporations regarding Their Activities in South Africa and Namibia (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.II.A.5).*

⁷*Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25–29 April 1983 (A/CONF.120/13), part three.*

⁸*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-ninth Year, 2560th meeting.*

⁹See A/AC.131/115.