



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 36

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) International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence: report of the Conference;
- (d) Report of the Secretary-General

1. Mr. PÉREZ (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence was held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983. Subsequently, in May, the Security Council agreed to devote a series of meetings to the question of Namibia and adopted resolution 532 (1983), in which, *inter alia*, it entrusted the Secretary-General with certain tasks in connection with this problem, which is of such concern to the international community.

2. In fulfilment of his mandate, the Secretary-General visited South Africa, Namibia and Angola in August 1983 in order to hold talks which would at last make possible the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). In his report to the Security Council,¹ the Secretary-General reported on the progress made in his talks with the Government of South Africa and on how virtually all the issues that remained outstanding relating to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved.

3. Later, in October, the Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), requested the Secretary-General to produce a further report on the situation, to be submitted not later than 31 December this year.

4. That those four events of extraordinary importance occurred in the course of the year demonstrates the great concern felt by the international community regarding the Namibian cause.

5. When, 17 years ago, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to the Mandate that the League of Nations had given South Africa to administer Namibia, it never imagined that implementation of that resolution might be delayed almost indefinitely, in open opposition to the wishes and commitment of the vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

6. In many decisions, adopted both by the Security Council and by the General Assembly, the international community has invariably reiterated its determination to bring about the independence of Namibia as soon as possible and without any conditions additional to those

already expressed. The International Court of Justice has endorsed that position.

7. The United Nations Council for Namibia, of which my country is a member, was established by the General Assembly pursuant to its resolution 2248 (S-V) as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until its independence. This is perhaps the most reliable proof that the United Nations rejects the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. We must shoulder our responsibility which is none other than to guide Namibia towards independence as quickly as possible and by peaceful means.

8. In this connection, we support the effort being made by the Western contact group to arrive at a solution of this situation. None the less, we believe that those efforts must be redoubled in order to avoid a dangerous sense of frustration and distrust in the international community. We also understand how rightly impatient the front-line States and Nigeria are in seeking prompt and effective solutions to a problem which has already existed far too long.

9. Chile, which has been fighting for the cause of Namibia both in the Assembly and in the Security Council, in 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 in the United Nations Council for Namibia itself, has been advocating a peaceful solution to this problem.

10. In this respect, we are pleased with the initiative taken by the Secretary-General with all the parties directly concerned. Last year, in his report on the work of the Organization,² he called upon us to reflect on the need for additional efforts, since after many failures, at last the possibility of success was discernible. It is possible today for us to say that the international community is really beginning to see, by means of the steps taken by the Secretary-General, that seeking independence for Namibia is not Utopian. The cause of Namibia is the cause of the entire United Nations; we all have our share the responsibility and we have all pledged to advance it.

11. This is why we reject the extreme position of those who attempt to use Namibia as a forum for the discussion of disputes between East and West. We also reject once again, most energetically, the clumsy and unfounded accusation irresponsibly levelled against certain States of the southern tip of Latin America, to the effect that they have formed imaginary pacts with a country whose policy and practice of *apartheid* they have openly fought against. With the common aim of bringing about an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, we must unite our efforts and co-operate in the task of the Secretary-General and not weaken with gratuitous insults and demagogic practices the interest shown and the progress he has achieved.

12. Chile, as a country that has always promoted and supported the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes through the methods recognized in international law and supported by the Charter of the United Nations, believes that no effort should be spared towards the achievement of a prompt solution to the question of Namibia, without any delaying or distracting tactics, in

accordance with the plan endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). This is our responsibility and we shall not evade it. Unnecessary delays not only imply endorsing the illegal occupation of the Territory, but also may have the most serious of consequences for international peace and security.

13. Mr. STRUČKA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): The illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, which has continued for many years now, and the colonial oppression of its people are quite rightly described, not only by the Organization but by the international community as a whole and by world public opinion, as a problem of exceptional importance. For what is involved is a flagrant case of the preservation of colonial practices, a clear violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the norms of international law. It is not simply a question of undermining the authority of the Organization. South Africa, which occupies Namibia, applies to the people of the Territory those practices of *apartheid* that it applies in its own country, and it also wrongly uses the Territory of Namibia as a marshalling ground for acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States.

14. All this has helped to lead to a situation in which the southern part of Africa has become one of the most serious hotbeds of tension in the world today. In many respects, Namibia is very important to the economic prosperity of South Africa. Thanks to generous assistance from its Western allies and their monopolies, South Africa is impoverishing the Namibian people. Evidence of this is to be found, *inter alia*, in the data cited in a working paper prepared by the Secretariat,³ to the effect that in the late 1970s, some 45 per cent of Namibia's gross domestic product (GDP) consisted of the profits derived from the activities of monopolies of South Africa and certain Western countries; and, moreover, 36 per cent of the GDP of Namibia was taken out of the country. Less than 10 per cent of the value provided by the hands of the Namibians in exploiting the natural and material resources of the country is used for the benefit of the Namibian people. This plundering of the natural resources of Namibia continues despite the need to put an end to such a situation, clearly reflected in Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁴ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974.

15. The Pretoria régime also uses Namibia as a large military testing ground for military exercises and for testing new kinds of arms. From Namibia, it carries out acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States. And this happens in accordance with the political, military and strategic objectives of the leading imperialist circles headed by Washington, both in the region of southern Africa and throughout the world. The economic, strategic and military objectives and concepts of South Africa and its Western allies are the main reason for Pretoria's refusal to put an end to its occupation of Namibia or to provide the Namibian people with an opportunity to implement their right to self-determination, for its disregard of United Nations resolutions and for its blocking of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia; together with Washington, and in its interests, Pretoria presents trumped-up pretexts to postpone the implementation of that plan. Pretoria's and Washington's interests and ideas have been reflected in the blatant demand to link the question of granting Namibia independence with the withdrawal of the internationalist Cuban units from Angola. Pretoria, acting in the interests of Washington, intends to use the efforts being made for Namibian independence for flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of Angola.

16. At the same time, the Pretoria régime, using gross military force, is crushing the independence movement of the Namibian people, headed by the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]. It has turned Namibia into a huge military camp. It has now deployed over 100,000 soldiers and mercenaries in the Territory of Namibia. It recruits Namibians, using force and violence, and uses them to supplement the ranks of its oppressive occupying army, thereby forcing many young Namibians to leave their country. The Pretoria Government applies very broad-ranging oppressive measures against the civilian population of the country. It has imprisoned many Namibian political leaders and members of SWAPO, and tortures those imprisoned patriots. It is constantly trying to forge some kind of coalition of opportunists and traitors in order to impose some kind of colonial or neo-colonial system and perpetuate its dominion over Namibia. To that end, it continues its efforts to splinter the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

17. However, neither this enormous concentration of South African troops in Namibia nor any pressure or high-handed action by the occupying forces of the Pretoria régime has yet been able, nor will it be able, to crush the will of the people of Namibia to achieve freedom and independence. This has not stopped, and indeed cannot stop, the military activities of the military vanguard and philosophical leader of the Namibian people, SWAPO, whose freedom fighters are active in most of the Territory of Namibia.

18. South African aggression against independent States in southern Africa has not led to any reduction in the aid provided by them to the struggling people of Namibia, even though this assistance is made available at tremendous material and human cost.

19. In speaking of the continuing occupation of Namibia and aggression by the Pretoria régime we cannot fail to refer to the position taken by a number of Western countries, for the diplomatic, political, strategic and military support provided to the Pretoria régime by the United States and some other Western countries and Israel is a prerequisite for Pretoria's pursuit of its colonialist and aggressive *apartheid* policy. Support from the West creates fertile ground for all the most deplorable manifestations of the internal and external policy of the *apartheid* régime, including the flouting of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people. Pretoria is also helped by those States which, during the Security Council's consideration of the question of economic sanctions against South Africa, repeatedly use their veto.

20. The IMF most generously granted South Africa a loan of over \$1 billion. Pretoria receives, either through direct deliveries or through the provision of licences, the armaments and military equipment that it needs in order to spread terror throughout the country and to carry out its occupation of and aggression against other States. I refer in particular to arms provided by the United States of America and Israel and arms produced under licence from France, Italy and other Western States. The assistance provided by the West and Israel has helped, and indeed continues to help, South Africa to make considerable progress towards establishing itself as a nuclear Power, which causes concern and gives rise to fear not only in neighbouring States but also among all those in the human race that cherish peace.

21. The monopolies of the Western States, through their economic relations, contribute significantly to supporting the military machine of *apartheid* and, together with South African companies, are deeply involved in plundering the basic potential of a future Namibian economy. The working paper prepared by the Secretariat³ indicates

that, in addition to South African companies, the transnational corporations of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada are also involved in exploiting the natural and human resources of Namibia. It is therefore no coincidence that the completion of decolonization, respect for fundamental human rights and security and peace in southern Africa are opposed by those forces, headed by the Reagan Administration, which are now trying to destabilize the situation in Europe and throughout the world. These are forces that have even gone so far as to whip up the arms race and increase the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war, acting against the vital interests of the peoples of all continents.

22. Czechoslovakia's position on the question of Namibia is well known. As stated in the message from the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Gustáv Husák, to the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris earlier this year, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic condemns the continuing illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the troops of the *apartheid* régime, the illegal obstruction of any opportunity for the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and the overt acts of armed aggression against independent African States for the purpose of which South Africa is misusing the Namibian territory. We call insistently for the granting of independence of the entire Territory of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We strongly condemn any attempt to link this obligation to grant Namibia independence with other matters that have absolutely nothing to do with the issue.

23. Czechoslovakia, in accordance with the principles of its foreign policy, has always acted in solidarity with the African peoples in their liberation struggle. Czechoslovakia has always supported and continues to support the people of Namibia, led by their sole legitimate and authentic representative, SWAPO, in their just struggle for self-determination, freedom and independence. We advocate the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the settlement of the Namibian question in accordance with the aspirations of the people of Namibia.

24. We shall continue to work for the adoption of effective measures that could lead to the implementation of all the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, in particular of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We believe that the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would force the Pretoria régime to implement the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. In this way, it would be possible to ensure the immediate exercise by the people of Namibia of their inalienable right to self-determination, independence and free development in their own land, in accordance with their aspirations, in which they have the support of the entire international community.

25. Mr. DA LUZ (Cape Verde) (*interpretation from French*): May I first of all pay a sincere tribute to the freedom fighters of Namibia, who, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, are waging a glorious struggle for national liberation and making any sacrifice to gain the status of free men in a united homeland, including Walvis Bay. That tribute, in addition to being irrefutable proof of the unconditional commitment of the people of Cape Verde to the cause of our Namibian brothers in their struggle against exploitation, repression and racism, is also our recognition, as members of the international community, of those heroic, valiant

people who are struggling and dying not only to free their homeland but also in defence of the principles and values of the Organization.

26. In 1978, following the successive military, political and diplomatic victories of SWAPO and the declarations of the South African régime that it would be prepared to participate in the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question, we believed that all the objective and subjective conditions for the independence of Namibia existed and that all that was lacking was the institutional framework for its realization. The Western contact group then took on the responsibility of preparing a corresponding plan, which was embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, after consideration, was accepted by the international community as the politically possible framework for the independence of Namibia.

27. We do not intend to relate the history of the question of Namibia in the United Nations since the Mandate of South Africa over that Territory was terminated by the General Assembly [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. Nor do we intend to describe the arrogant and disdainful attitude of the Pretoria racists to the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, with which the Assembly is all too familiar.

28. None the less, so that we can correctly assess this debate, it is appropriate for us to recall that the five years since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have been characterized by, on the one hand, a clear demonstration of the political maturity and great sense of responsibility of the SWAPO leadership in the constant search for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia, and, on the other, the recalcitrance and intransigence of South Africa, which has created a series of allegedly political pretexts to prevent the accession of Namibia to real independence through a negotiated solution.

29. These two positions remind us a great deal of the fable of La Fontaine of the wolf and the lamb. There are only two differences between the fable and the reality. In the fable, the wolf admits its real intention to eat up the lamb, whereas South Africa has not yet had the moral courage to admit that it does not want real independence for Namibia. In the fable, the lamb is alone and cannot defend itself, but Namibia has the strength of its people, prepared to make every sacrifice to win its freedom, and the foresight of its leadership, SWAPO, which is unfaltering in its loyalty to the principles whose application will lead to the genuine independence of its homeland. It also has by its side Africa and the entire international community, which cherishes peace and freedom. Therefore, in this case victory is certain.

30. In our view, the debate on this important agenda item will make sense only if the international community represented here by its members firmly shoulders its responsibility concerning the question of Namibia in accordance with the real situation. It is no longer a matter of raising the real problems or of clarifying the issues. The Secretary-General, in his report on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978),¹ states that South Africa agreed that all the substantive issues concerning those resolutions had been resolved.

31. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General on the tireless efforts he has been making in the search for a negotiated solution leading to the true independence of Namibia.

32. According to the report in question, the only prevailing problem is the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. In the view of the Cape Verde delegation, the presence

of Cuban troops in Angola stems from the full exercise of sovereignty by two States, Angola and Cuba, backed by the Charter of the United Nations. There is no spatial or temporal link between this situation and the independence of Namibia, which is the subject of a conflict between South Africa and the international community. Resolution 539 (1983), in which the Security Council categorically rejected the idea of linking Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), definitely closed the issue.

33. Therefore, this debate must result in a firm position being taken by the international community, which, within a specific time-frame, can put an end to this conflict which is inflicting such suffering on the Namibian people and which, owing to direct or indirect responsibility, weighs upon the conscience of us all. If a clear and firm position is not taken at this session of the Assembly, the only result will be the exacerbation of tensions in that very explosive part of Africa, tensions whose unforeseeable consequences could in no way benefit international peace.

34. A few Western countries with historic, economic and other relations with South Africa have not unambiguously shouldered their responsibilities in this process; they have either echoed Pretoria's positions or have placed the question of Namibia in the framework of situations which have nothing to do with the problem of southern Africa. We call on those countries to give serious and calm thought to the question. We invite them to reconsider their approach to the situation in southern Africa and we urge them to make use of their relations to convince the Pretoria régime that, in its own interest, it must renounce its intransigence and participate sincerely in any future opportunity to find a peaceful solution to the conflict.

35. The question of Namibia is a colonial question and it must be analyzed and resolved in that context. Placing it outside that context—in the context of East-West or other relations—distorts its real nature and increases the difficulties, which will not help in the establishment of peace in the region.

36. Like every anti-colonial struggle, the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, is part of the universal struggle of peoples to win their inalienable right to independence and freedom. The efforts of the oppressed Namibian masses to overcome repression must be given a more appropriate response by the international community, which must understand that it is not those legitimate efforts by the Namibian people but rather repression, racism and oppression by the Pretoria régime that are responsible for the crisis in southern Africa, which is not a temporary but an organic crisis, in other words, an economic, political and ideological crisis. Therefore, mere reforms, internal settlements or constitutional adaptations cannot suffice to overcome it. Overcoming it requires a new balance of power, the emergence of new elements and new political and philosophical structures, and a basic restructuring of the State and its ideology. That cannot result from reforms. The process is irreversible but it must be carried through. The Namibian people has already shown sufficient readiness to make its contribution to the building of a society in which all Namibians can live harmoniously in peace and democracy.

37. It is up to the Pretoria régime to understand the phenomenon in all its complexity and to show genuine willingness to make an effective contribution to the solution of the problem. It is up to the Pretoria régime to understand that the contradiction is not to be found outside Namibia and South Africa; it is to be found within

Namibia and South Africa. That contradiction is producing the revolutionary energy which, marshalled by SWAPO, will overthrow oppression, exploitation and racism. How high the price in pain will be for all will depend on the extent to which the ruling circles in Pretoria and their Western friends really understand the question of southern Africa and, in particular, that of Namibia.

38. Those in the Assembly who hesitate in assuming their responsibilities are, to a certain extent, lending credibility to the Pretoria régime and encouraging it to pursue its inhuman policy of racist colonialism. Sooner or later they will come to regret, as do we all, that the violence has escalated along with the repression. They will be judged by history along with the racist minority as enemies of the Namibian people and of Africa as a whole.

39. In order that this debate should be as useful as we want it to be, and in order that the credibility of the Organization—called into question by the arrogance and continuing defiance of South Africa—should be restored, we must all commit ourselves to a series of measures essential to the establishment of peace in southern Africa. Among those measures, my delegation would highlight the following: a firm condemnation of successive South African attacks against the front-line countries, especially Angola, Lesotho, Mozambique and Zambia; an immediate halt to all material, military and manpower support by South Africa for the armed bandits who are carrying out acts of destabilization in the territory of Angola, Mozambique and other front-line countries; the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory; and the issuance of a mandate to the Secretary-General to organize within a specific time-frame a Geneva-type conference to agree on practical modalities for Namibia's accession to independence.

40. We wish, before concluding, to express our great appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia which, under the dynamic leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, has done exemplary work in discharging the mandate given it in 1967 [*see resolution 2248 (S-V)*] as the legal authority for Namibia until independence.

41. We pay a sincere tribute to the front-line countries for the human and material sacrifices they have made in defence of the honour of Africa and the principles of the Organization.

42. Further, we reaffirm the unconditional solidarity of the people of Cape Verde and of its party, PAIGC,⁵ with the fraternal peoples of Angola and Mozambique and their vanguard parties—the MPLA⁶-Workers' Party and FRELIMO,⁷ respectively—which, because of their unswerving defence of their principles, have been the victims of constant aggression by South Africa.

43. Finally, we wish to reaffirm to the heroic Namibian people and its vanguard movement, SWAPO, that until the complete liberation of their country they may rely on the militant solidarity of the people of Cape Verde.

44. Mr. KHOO KAY POR (Malaysia): We are gathered here for the thirty-seventh consecutive year to consider a problem which continues to reproach our conscience. As we are well aware, 17 years have elapsed since the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in Namibia and that thenceforth the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. Since then, the question has been a topic of increasing concern in various forums and in the resolutions emanating from those forums.

45. Countless sessions and the passage of countless resolutions, however, have not altered the situation as it existed then. Namibia remains under the illegal control

of the repressive régime of South Africa, and its people continue to be denied their fundamental rights of self-determination and independence. Today the question of Namibia remains the oldest and most tragic decolonization problem before this body, and one of the biggest challenges posed by a single country—in this case South Africa—to the integrity and principles of the United Nations system.

46. South Africa's illegal rule represents a perpetuation of colonial subjugation in a decolonized world, a fundamental affront to human dignity and a threat of increasing severity to regional and global peace and security. I do not wish to labour the historical details of this question, as they have been well documented. The records of South Africa's treachery, deceit and acts of defiance of and contempt for United Nations resolutions are by now very familiar to us. Such acts exist in many forms, the most obvious being the creation of an administrative structure to protect the régime's own political and economic interests; the brutal acts of repression against the Namibian people; the militarization of Namibia; the repeated acts of aggression, intervention and subversion against neighbouring independent African States; the systematic attempts to discredit and destroy SWAPO; the ruthless exploitation of Namibia's rich natural resources; the development of nuclear-weapon capability; the establishment of direct rule over Namibia; and, last but not least, the tactics of raising new objections and diversions to stall indefinitely the negotiation process for the independence of Namibia. Indeed, no introduction is needed to document the true motives and graphic violence of South Africa's illegal rule over Namibia, nor is it necessary to remind the Assembly of the régime's brutality, which has permeated every fibre of Namibian social life.

47. These records provide incontrovertible evidence that South Africa has systematically and deliberately resorted to all means possible to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). It is very obvious that South Africa has absolutely no intention to commit itself to Namibia's peaceful transition to independence, much less to a free and independent Namibia.

48. It is also evident that South Africa has been able to continue its illegal and dangerous activities in Namibia and to defy the collective view of the international community because of the support and collaboration it receives from certain countries, particularly in the military and economic fields. For this reason, the repeated calls by the international community for mandatory sanctions and the political, economic and social isolation of South Africa have become meaningless. It is indeed intolerable to see one country rejecting with utter contempt the will and the resolution of the international community and yet remaining seemingly immune from international sanction and censure.

49. It is equally frustrating and most unfortunate that the so-called linkage issue—an issue which is extraneous to the United Nations plan—has been injected into the negotiation process and has now, it seems, become a major impediment to the speedy implementation of the plan. South Africa's insistence that this issue remain a prerequisite for the settlement of the Namibia problem is of course one of the latest examples—and I am sure it is not the last—of the deliberate delaying tactics employed by the Pretoria régime. Representatives will recall that recent as well as past negotiations have time and again floundered because of such a display of bad faith on the part of the régime.

50. The international community has considered Pretoria's linkage policy to be totally unjustified and well

outside the framework of the United Nations plan. The international community has long recognized the question of Namibia as fundamentally strictly a decolonization problem. The policy has been repeatedly condemned and rejected in past sessions of the General Assembly and, more recently, at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, and at the meetings of the Security Council held in October of this year. The Secretary-General, in paragraph 25 of his report to the Security Council,¹ stated:

“the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan”.

51. It is clear that South Africa has repeatedly and with open contempt tested the limit of the international community's patience. It is most urgent that this dangerous trend be stopped. It is vital that the endeavours of the international community be brought to fruition instead of being continuously thwarted by the bravado and intransigence of the brutal racist régime. What we need now is effective implementation of existing resolutions. What is called for is sincerity, honesty and a sense of responsibility on the part of those who continue to maintain economic and military ties with South Africa.

52. Malaysia's position on this question is well documented. My Government wishes to reiterate its strongest condemnation of South Africa's policy in Namibia and its acts of defiance against the will of the international community. We wish to reiterate our continuing support for the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, their sole, legal and authentic representative, in their just struggle to achieve freedom, self-determination and independence in a united Namibia. We call upon the international community to rally behind the people of Namibia in their hour of need.

53. We remain fully convinced that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only basis for the peaceful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

54. My delegation would like to reassure the Assembly of its continued commitment, in principle and practice, to the total boycott and isolation of the white minority régime of South Africa as long as it continues to hold on to its racist and colonial policies.

55. My Government would like to reiterate that Malaysia stands ready to contribute to United Nations peace-keeping efforts in Namibia.

56. My delegation also wishes to place on record its appreciation to the Secretary-General and the United Nations Council for Namibia for their courageous efforts and constructive role in expediting an end to South Africa's illegal control over Namibia.

57. Mr. DICHEV (Bulgaria): More than a month ago, the Security Council considered, for the second time this year, the question of Namibia with a view to achieving its immediate settlement in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. This year the question of Namibia's independence has acquired the character of a particularly urgent international issue. This question was the topic of discussion at such authoritative international forums as the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned

Countries, the nineteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June 1983, and others, at which the vast majority of States in the world expressed their solidarity with the just and legitimate struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence, waged by the Namibian people.

58. At the same time, the international community continues to voice its profound concern at the attempts to raise new obstacles to this struggle, to deprive the Namibian people of the fruits of its victories, to delay indefinitely the granting of its independence and to perpetuate the illegal occupation of the Territory. This concern stems also from the fact that the activities of Pretoria and its allies have openly made the question of Namibia's independence directly contingent on the global strategic interests of United States imperialism, which leads to serious complications and dangerous consequences for all countries of southern Africa, as well as for international peace and security.

59. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with all peace-loving States, reiterates from this rostrum its steadfast and consistent position that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and genuine national independence is not dependent and cannot be dependent on any extraneous factors or interests. There is no doubt that the peaceful solution to this question can only be achieved through the immediate implementation of all relevant United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), in which the Council endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and that the United Nations plan must be implemented without any further modification, distortion or introduction into it of any extraneous elements whatsoever.

60. In only a month's time, Namibia will enter upon the year marking the one hundredth anniversary of its colonization. This is a sad anniversary. The last 100 years of the history of the Namibian people have been years of repression and genocide, plunder and poverty, gross denial of elementary human rights, brutal exploitation and repression. Throughout this period, the people of Namibia have borne the brunt of the most brutal and flagrant manifestation of racism—the policy of *apartheid* of the racist régime of Pretoria. The Namibian people has been forced to live in the poorest and least fertile parts of the country, in the so-called homelands, where it has been deprived of the elementary means of subsistence, where hunger, disease and deprivation are part of day-to-day life. The annual per capita expenditure on medical care for the local inhabitants of the Territory is in some regions as low as \$5.40, while the same expenditure for whites is \$270. It is not surprising, then, that the child mortality rate of the African population is 163 per thousand, whereas among the whites that rate is 21.6 per thousand. At the same time, the exploitation of the black population of Namibia by the white colonizers and settlers has taken on grotesque proportions. According to the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the black workers of the mining industry earn wages which are equal to 5 to 6 per cent of those earned by white workers [see A/38/24, chap. VIII]. Nevertheless, the black population of the country is forced to seek employment in the mines and other enterprises owned by whites because of the considerably worse conditions of life offered by the homelands.

61. The Namibian people has never become content with this situation. In the past few years, its heroic struggle for self-determination and independence under

the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, has assumed the character of popular armed resistance against the occupiers. The legitimacy of this resistance has been recognized by the United Nations and by the OAU. By choosing the path of armed struggle after having exhausted all available peaceful avenues for gaining its independence, the Namibian people has thus expressed in categorical terms its determination to gain its freedom. Despite this determination and in defiance of United Nations decisions, including the decision taken 17 years ago by the General Assembly to terminate South Africa's Mandate over the Territory [see resolution 2145 (XXI)], and of the numerous resolutions calling for an immediate end to its occupation, South Africa continues to refuse to leave Namibia, and prolongs and expands its aggressive colonial war against the Namibian people. The militarization of Namibia has reached record levels. At the same time, Pretoria actively uses the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for its policy of aggression against the neighbouring independent African States, for the destabilization of their Governments.

62. It is hardly necessary to ask what are the factors making possible the continuation of the racist, colonial and aggressive policies of the Pretoria régime. It has been proved repeatedly and incontrovertibly that at the core of these factors is the convergence of the strategic and economic interests of the major imperialist States, headed by the United States, with the interests of the *apartheid* régime. In spite of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁴ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, and many other United Nations resolutions, a number of Western—mainly United States and British—corporations have continued to plunder the extremely rich natural resources of the Territory. We have repeatedly heard the statements of representatives of these countries trying to justify the activities of their corporations in Namibia as being in the interests of the people of that country. The facts, however, demonstrate that these activities are directed towards the export of national income through the repatriation of the greater share of the profits realized by the predatory exploitation of the black workers under the conditions of *apartheid*. The structure of foreign economic activities in Namibia provides no opportunity for the development of its independent national economy as the basis for the country's free development, while the extracted resources are being exported at a rate which is threatening to deprive the Namibian people of its own national heritage. This is particularly true of the uranium deposits of the Territory, which are among the largest in the world.

63. The events of the five years that have elapsed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) clearly demonstrate that South Africa and the United States have been pursuing a course designed to perpetuate colonial domination over Namibia, to strengthen the *apartheid* régime and to bring pressure to bear on, and destabilize, the Governments of the front-line States, with the aim of forcing upon them a policy which is convenient for the imperialists and the racists. At the heart of this course are the ambitions of United States imperialism for global domination, which have found their most explicit reflection in the policy of constructive engagement with the racist régime of Pretoria adopted by the current United States Administration, a policy which openly proclaimed the *apartheid* régime to be friendly to the United States, and termed the national liberation movements of the peoples oppressed by that régime "terrorists".

64. Another expression of this policy is the persistent attempt to link the question of Namibia to the presence

of Cuban forces in Angola. Quite rightly, these attempts are described in the relevant United Nations resolutions as being aimed at delaying Namibia's independence and consolidating the illegal occupation of the Territory, and as blatant and open interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Angola with the purpose of creating favourable conditions for the overthrow of the Angolan Government. There can be no doubt that the wide-scale aggression and the occupation of large parts of Angola's territory by South Africa are a continuation of that policy by military means.

65. Yet another expression of the same policy is the all-round co-operation of the United States with Pretoria, which has enabled the racists to build an economy that is self-sufficient in its major strategic sectors, above all the military industry, as well as to obtain a nuclear capability. The development of South Africa's military and nuclear capabilities underscores the grave danger which the policies of the racists pose to international peace and security. In view of the necessity for concerted efforts to eliminate this threat and to compel the *apartheid* régime to comply with the numerous United Nations resolutions, the General Assembly has repeatedly called upon the Security Council to impose upon South Africa the comprehensive mandatory sanctions envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter.

66. Showing consistency in their support for Pretoria, the United States and its allies have invariably blocked all the efforts of the Security Council to adopt such measures. We call upon those States to respond to the appeals of the international community and to desist from preventing the Security Council from fulfilling its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in southern Africa. Experience so far indicates that this is the only peaceful road to the settlement of the question of Namibia and of the other problems of the region which stem from the policy of *apartheid* pursued by Pretoria.

67. As I have mentioned, over the last 100 years a grim page has been written in the history of the people of Namibia. The cruel trials, however, have not been able to stifle the will of the Namibian people to enjoy freedom and independence. These 100 years have been a time of steadfast and heroic struggle, in which thousands have lost their lives, but which have led to the affirmation of the people of Namibia, represented by SWAPO, as an equal member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the OAU, as well as to its participation in the work of the United Nations. The Namibian people has demonstrated its fortitude, and the day is near when it will win its freedom, despite all obstacles.

68. The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria expresses its solidarity with the people of Namibia and its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, as well as its whole-hearted support for their struggle. We will continue to render all necessary assistance to SWAPO until its final victory.

69. I wish also to express our support for the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose tireless activities have made a substantial contribution to efforts to ensure Namibia's independence. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to participate actively in the work of the Council with a view to achieving our common goal—genuine independence for a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, on the basis of the resolutions of the United Nations. We congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia on its excellent report [A/38/24] and fully accept the recommendations contained in it.

70. Miss AL-MULLA (Kuwait): Kuwait attaches great importance to the current debate on the question of

Namibia. It is another instance in which the international community is demonstrating its quest for peace and justice for the Namibian people, a people which has suffered for far too long from military occupation, political suppression and economic exploitation. It is a quest for justice for a people which has repeatedly been denied the prospect of freedom and self-determination.

71. The case of Namibia remains a decolonization issue, that of a Territory under illegal occupation by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. It is an issue for which the United Nations bears a special responsibility as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia.

72. So far, the situation has remained a source of comfort for South Africa; so far the situation is disheartening. The *apartheid* régime continues to thrive on a situation devoid of pressures and replete with rewards. It enjoys a unique relationship with Western economic and strategic interests. It has been granted unlimited licence, willingly or inadvertently, by the policies of certain Western Powers—more specifically, policies pursued by the present United States Administration, in particular the policy of constructive engagement.

73. On the political level, the intransigence of the *apartheid* régime, its delaying tactics and procrastination have not only been tolerated but have also been encouraged at times. It has often been given the reins to control the situation, and so it has, by imposing its own interpretation of the plan for a peaceful settlement, and by indicating its choice of government for Namibia, as well as its choice of the allies and the political régimes of the neighbouring African States. These tactics have been contained at every turn by the sheer will of the front-line States, the political resolve of SWAPO and the support and solidarity of the international community. The latest manifestation of such a turn of events came with the mushrooming issue of so-called linkage, which has finally been identified by the Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), as incompatible with Council resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly relevant to Namibia, including resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

74. Rather than licenses being handed down to the *apartheid* régime, curbs and controls should be applied in view of its intransigence. The time is past due for the adoption of effective measures to control the situation and to stop South Africa from blocking the implementation of the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. Such measures need not be beyond the reach of the international community. The arms embargo already imposed by the Security Council in its resolution 418 (1977) could be reinforced; and the oil embargo imposed by some States could be more tightly applied against South Africa. My delegation has been negotiating such measures with other committed delegations. Kuwait supports all efforts towards the application of sanctions in other fields. We believe that by seriously pursuing these measures and with co-operation among States, the international community could achieve the desired results.

75. Effective control measures constitute one aspect of assisting the Namibian people in their struggle for freedom. Another aspect lies in extending technical and financial assistance to their cause. The role of the United Nations Council for Namibia towards this end has been indispensable. We pay tribute to its tireless efforts. Kuwait, for its part, has continued to shoulder its responsibility in this respect both through the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and through the United Nations.

76. As a consequence of the Namibian problem, the front-line States have borne great suffering. They have been direct victims of military aggression, political

intervention and economic destabilization. We would like to reaffirm our solidarity with them. We will continue to extend all possible assistance in their efforts towards their economic development and political stability.

77. We believe peoples derive strength in their struggle for freedom and independence from collective support and assistance. We are confident that our debate here will be an asset in that respect.

78. Mr. LOEIS (Indonesia): This year has witnessed an intensification of international pressure to overcome the intransigence of the Pretoria régime which continues to place obstacles in the path of the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia. This global pressure was reflected in the International Conference in Support of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983; in the meetings of the Security Council, which was called into session last May on the basis of a decision by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983 [see *A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49*], in the visit by the Secretary-General to southern Africa in August; and in the subsequent Security Council meetings held in October to consider the report of the Secretary-General.¹

79. These important meetings have kept the international community continuously seized of the situation in Namibia throughout the year. It would, therefore, be superfluous to repeat at this juncture the plethora of South Africa's detestable policies and practices in Namibia or in the entire region of southern Africa. Nor should it be necessary to recall the volumes of resolutions and decisions that have been adopted by United Nations bodies over the course of more than two decades. Rather, I will focus attention on the actions that the Assembly should consider to reinforce this year's international efforts to compel the racist Pretoria régime to heed the decisions of the Organization.

80. The final documents of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, including the Paris Declaration and the Programme of Action on Namibia,⁸ fully and comprehensively detail the insidious array of measures and policies instituted by the Pretoria régime to perpetuate its illegal control and domination of Namibia. Among the important findings was that South Africa's colonial occupation and exploitation of Namibia, its attempts to impose fraudulent constitutional and political schemes, its policies of internal repression and external aggression, including stepped-up attacks against the front-line States and SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, have reached such levels that greater hostilities, which would pose a grave threat to peace and security, may break out in the region. To meet this challenge, the Conference urged the immediate imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. In addition, it reaffirmed the United Nations plan for Namibia as the only universally acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, expressed its full support for the Secretary-General's efforts to achieve implementation of the plan urgently and firmly rejected all attempts by certain quarters to establish any linkage between the independence of Namibia and extraneous issues.

81. I would like to recall that the Indonesian delegation to the International Conference in Paris stressed the imperative need for all States, including South Africa's friends, to cease and desist from all policies and actions which serve to strengthen Pretoria's stranglehold over Namibia. This would necessarily include rejecting as totally unacceptable attempts to interject questions unre-

lated to Namibian independence; gaining universal compliance with all partial sanctions, voluntary embargoes and boycotts; and resolute support for the imposition of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

82. The unanimity of the determination expressed by the international community in Paris should also be considered in the light of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, at which the question of Namibia figured prominently. That Conference unambiguously called upon the Security Council to regenerate movement in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and thereby keep the United Nations plan for Namibia on its proper and previously agreed upon course. It is clear that this initiative was predicated upon deep concern not only with South African intransigence, but also because of its continuing efforts to undermine the basic framework of the United Nations plan.

83. In response to the decision of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and in the context of the final documents of the International Conference, the Security Council was convened in May to respond positively to the consensus voiced by the international community that the United Nations plan was on the verge of becoming a dead letter. The seriousness of this concern was fully reflected by the fact that the vast majority of representatives who participated in that meeting were at the level of minister for foreign affairs, in response to the call of the Seventh Conference. This unprecedented gathering before the Security Council prompted the unanimous adoption of resolution 532 (1983).

84. At that Council meeting, my Minister for Foreign Affairs stated:

“The obdurate refusal by South Africa to comply with its obligations under the Charter has not only undermined the credibility of the Organization: it poses a challenge to the international legal system as well. The question of the decolonization of Namibia, therefore, transcends the achievement of the legitimate national rights of the Namibian people and impinges upon the principles and cherished values of all civilized nations.”⁹

85. Many of us here were, at that time, heartened by the convergence of views and unity of purpose that Security Council resolution 532 (1983) reflected. Its operative paragraphs, *inter alia*, called upon South Africa to cooperate with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and entrusted him with the task of undertaking consultations with the main parties concerned. It was in this positive atmosphere that the Secretary-General undertook the weighty mandate entrusted to him. However, as has happened so often in the past, our hopes were dashed by South Africa's arrogant insistence on linking the obligations that it assumed under the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia to issues which are totally unrelated to and inconsistent with the terms of the plan.

86. Following his trip to the region, the Secretary-General issued a report¹ which stressed the irony of the situation. On the one hand, he concluded, in paragraph 24, that “we have never been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)” and, on the other hand, he pointed out, in paragraph 25, that

“the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan”.

87. On the basis of the Secretary-General's report, the Security Council adopted resolution 539 (1983) of 28 October 1983, in which it condemned South Africa for its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and rejected Pretoria's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues. It further emphatically declared that the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are unrelated to Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

88. My delegation strongly supports Security Council resolution 539 (1983), as it has been the long-standing position of Indonesia that for the international community to entertain the contention that the issue of Cuban troops in Angola has any bearing whatsoever on the question of the decolonization and independence of Namibia would be nothing short of a violation of the sacred principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. Indeed, if the international community were to countenance such a contention, it would be sanctioning a denial of a sovereign right to one Government in return for independence for a colonial people. My delegation is of the firm view that such an anomaly could never be accepted by the Organization as it would establish a dangerous precedent whereby a State or group of States, or even the international community, could justify an infringement of such a basic sovereign right.

89. By adopting resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council has put South Africa on notice that it can no longer count upon dilatory manoeuvres to delay further the implementation of the United Nations plan. My delegation also believes that this resolution squarely places the Security Council in an unambiguous position, for if the Secretary-General's further report, to be issued shortly, continues to reflect South Africa's insistence on linking extraneous issues to Namibian independence, the Council will be obliged to act forcefully and adopt concrete measures. There is no question but that inaction by the Council will only hasten the advent of a conflagration of unprecedented proportions in southern Africa. These are the stark choices that the Security Council will have to face in the ensuing weeks and the Assembly should do all that it can to ensure the implementation not only of resolution 539 (1983) but also of the United Nations plan for independence of Namibia itself. It should be apparent to all that time is perilously short for achieving independence for Namibia through a peaceful process. Thus, we must act now, as any further delay could irreparably undermine the terms of the United Nations plan and thereby plunge the region of southern Africa into a cataclysmic upheaval beyond anyone's control.

90. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The subject of Namibia is of direct relevance to Ecuador because it involves fundamental aspects of legal coexistence in our time, such as respect for the tenets of the Charter and the resolutions, decisions and declarations of the organs of the international system, as well as the solidarity that my country has always maintained with our brothers from Africa in the course of independent life and development.

91. That is why Ecuador takes this opportunity to reaffirm its solidarity with the Namibian people and to reject the rebellious position of the Government of South Africa, which has disregarded the resolutions and appeals of the General Assembly and the Security Council—above all, Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which we consider provides the most appropriate framework for a peaceful, internationally acceptable solution to the problem—and has ignored the advisory opinion of the International

Court of Justice,¹⁰ which determined South Africa's presence in Namibia to be illegal. Seventeen years ago, the General Assembly put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*see resolution 2145 (XXI)*], and that is why any measure or act on the part of that country concerning that Territory is lacking in validity.

92. Ecuador advocates the prompt withdrawal of the foreign occupation troops maintained by the Pretoria Government on Namibian territory as a fundamental element in enabling the people to express in a free and sovereign way its will in respect of its political future. We also reiterate the need to respect Namibian territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

93. Of course, the independent status of Namibia must not be made the subject of force or a matter of bloc rivalry. Its independence must arise clearly from free elections under international supervision, so that the Namibian people may decide its own destiny.

94. The role of the international community must be to promote the development of Namibia and to provide it with technical and financial co-operation with all the characteristic political independence and objectivity of the operational services and programmes of the United Nations, and without any sort of foreign price tag which could aggravate tension or any transfer to the issue of Namibia of the connotations of the East-West struggle which has done so much damage in other regions and centres of tension, in particular in the developing world.

95. Ecuador notes with real concern that in spite of the United Nations plan to settle the problem of Namibia, no significant progress has been made thus far because of South Africa's obstinate refusal to heed the will of the organized international community, and the situation has been aggravated by the military actions of the Pretoria régime against sovereign States neighbouring Namibia, aimed at destabilizing the internal situation of those States, and by the familiar abuses of the South African forces of repression within Namibian territory in violating the human rights of Namibians. It is also regrettable that there has been no progress towards a solution in spite of the recent approaches of the Secretary-General to the South African authorities.

96. The aberrance and odiousness of *apartheid* aggravate any situation and render more tragic the plight of the peoples subjected to that reprehensible policy, just as they make the independence of Namibia more urgent, so that an end may be put to that violation of basic human rights. Perhaps it may yet be possible to achieve a negotiated settlement, that is, Pretoria's acceptance of United Nations resolutions. Violence must not be allowed to have the last word on crucial issues in which the destiny of a people is at stake.

97. Those who are the precursors of freedom in South Africa also give hope to the Namibian population. The Latin American countries gave a heartfelt welcome to the recent action by UNESCO, an action also supported by the world community here, when in June of this year an international high-level jury selected from 30 candidates two outstanding individuals whose life and work exemplify the universal message of the ideals of Simón Bolívar, at the time of his bicentenary, and gave them the Simón Bolívar prize, awarded in Caracas. One prize went to King Juan Carlos of Spain for having helped to transform a dictatorship into a democracy, and for his identification with Latin America and the third world, and the other was given to a South African prisoner, detained since 1962 and condemned to life imprisonment, Nelson Mandela, who speaks from jail to reject violence, and has told the world: "My ideal is a society of freedom

and democracy. I hope to live to attain it. I am prepared to die for it." This is the message that also inspires the Namibian people, which has our full sympathy and support.

98. Before concluding, I wish to express the deep appreciation of my delegation for the important report submitted to us by Mr. Paul Lusaka on the work done last year by the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24], over which he presides with such dignity and ability. The admirable work done by that Council, in spite of the obstruction represented by the recalcitrant attitude of Pretoria, has succeeded in mobilizing international public opinion in support of the Namibian cause. The Council has also rightly pointed to the danger and threat to international peace and security posed by the development of nuclear weapons in South Africa, a danger which is increasing with the South African racist régime's continuing delay in applying the relevant resolutions of the world organization.

99. On behalf of Ecuador, I appeal to the Government of South Africa to fulfil its obligations as a Member of the United Nations and to respect the basic principles which are the very foundation of the Organization, since, if it persists in its refusal to co-operate in the quest for a final solution to this problem, it will sooner or later compel States Members to re-examine the situation and adopt the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

100. Mr. KURODA (Japan): In September 1978, with the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the United Nations gave new impetus to its efforts to establish UNTAG and conduct elections in Namibia. In the five years since then, the achievement of these goals has regrettably eluded us, although there were times when we were given reason to believe it was within our grasp. Japan deeply sympathizes with the people of Namibia who have had to endure many long years of frustration and distress under the illegal occupation by South Africa. During this time, many lives have been lost and many more people have been driven to despair by the armed conflicts that have continued to erupt in the region.

101. We are convinced that until Namibian independence is achieved and, needless to say, the practice of *apartheid* abolished, peace and prosperity will not prevail in the countries of southern Africa. Indeed, peace and prosperity throughout the region is dependent upon the solution of these problems. It has recently become painfully clear to us, however, that they will not be solved without further perseverance. It is imperative, therefore, that the international community persist in applying constant pressure to South Africa. We hope, in particular, that the Western contact group, the front-line States and other parties concerned will continue, with patience and in good faith, their efforts to this end.

Mr. Ali (Singapore), Vice-President, took the Chair.

102. Although the overall situation with regard to Namibia is still disheartening, as we review the developments of the past year we note that there was limited but tangible progress and that gives us cause for hope. Last May, for example, at the series of Security Council meetings on this question in which many Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other ministerial-level representatives participated, the international community demonstrated its strong commitment to the achievement of Namibia's independence. We were particularly encouraged that member countries avoided unproductive confrontations and sought a constructive approach which could gain the unanimous support of the participating countries. As a result of those positive efforts, resolution 532 (1983) was adopted unanimously. Thanks to that unity and also to

the Secretary-General's efforts, which enjoy the unanimous support of the countries concerned, South Africa could not but agree to receive, without pre-conditions, the Secretary-General's visit at the end of August.

103. The consultations between the Secretary-General and members of the South African Government resulted in an agreement on the impartiality of the United Nations and on other long-pending technical matters related to the operation of UNTAG. Although the so-called linkage problem—which lies outside the scope of the Secretary-General's mandate from the Security Council—remains unresolved, his trip to southern Africa was a notable success. Japan appreciates the Secretary-General's efforts and congratulates him on his achievements.

104. The spirit of unanimity and co-operation among the countries concerned prevailed also in the Security Council meetings in October, when the diligent efforts of its member countries were rewarded with the adoption, almost by consensus, of resolution 539 (1983) on this subject. Thus we hope that, with his renewed mandate, the Secretary-General will continue to make steady progress in the cause of Namibian independence.

105. As we are all too well aware, the road towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is not a smooth one. However, it is Japan's conviction that, if the spirit of unanimity and co-operation prevails in the international community, Namibia will one day achieve its independence. Although Japan is not among the countries most directly involved in the solution of this problem, my Government has been making various efforts to hasten the realization of this objective.

106. First, in its disapproval of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, Japan minimizes its contact with South Africa and refrains from taking any measures which would in effect acknowledge the present status of Namibia. For example, Japan prohibits direct investment in Namibia by Japanese nationals or by corporate bodies under its jurisdiction. More specifically, no Japanese national or enterprise has a natural resource concession in Namibia. Further, the Government of Japan does not extend co-operation—such as grants, loans or technical assistance of any kind—to the authorities in Namibia. Moreover, fully recognizing the political significance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁴ which was enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, the Government of Japan took measures in May 1975 to bring that Decree to the attention of the general public by publishing it in an official bulletin of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry and in the *Trade and Commerce Report*, a publication of the Japan External Trade Organization. Although Japan maintains normal trade relations with Namibia, the volume of trade is minimal.

107. Secondly, Japan has been providing, to the extent of its ability, humanitarian assistance to the Namibian people. In fact, Japan has been making voluntary contributions to the United Nations Fund for Namibia since 1972 and to the United Nations Institute for Namibia since 1976. Japan's pledged contributions to those two programmes this year amount to a total of \$220,000.

108. Thirdly, looking to the future, the Government of Japan reaffirms its commitment to extend positive support in various forms to the operation of UNTAG once it is established. And, following the achievement by Namibia of independence, Japan will make every possible effort to extend its co-operation to the people of Namibia throughout their nation-building period.

109. Before concluding my remarks today, I wish to state that my country appreciates the efforts of the United

Nations Council for Namibia towards the solution of this problem. At the same time, I am regretfully obliged to note that the Council very often accuses a particular country or group of countries by name. This year Japan was the subject of unfounded allegations in the Council's report to the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, which was held in Paris last April. That is particularly regrettable since those allegations have no factual basis and Japan has been no less vigorous than other countries in making efforts for the attainment of Namibian independence. Japan strongly urges that the Council hereafter duly appreciate Japan's efforts and refrain from making unfounded allegations in its future reports.

110. My country sincerely hopes that, at this session of the General Assembly, Member States will reaffirm their commitment to seek a solution to the question of Namibia and will preserve the spirit of co-operation and solidarity which has characterized their efforts thus far.

111. Mr. HUCKE (German Democratic Republic): My delegation was given the opportunity for the second time this year only a few weeks ago to explain its views on the question of Namibia before the Security Council.¹¹ If today we speak again, in the plenary General Assembly, it is because the situation in southern Africa continues to give us reason for deep concern. Valuable resolutions adopted by the Security Council which provide a fixed framework for granting independence to Namibia have not so far been implemented. Efforts aimed at perpetuating the illegal occupation of the Territory and its misuse for colonial purposes are being undertaken with undiminished intensity. In addition, the condition favouring both, namely, the policy of support for South Africa pursued by certain Western States, in particular the United States of America, continues—with one difference: this support has become increasingly obvious in past years, be it in the form of growing collaboration between imperialist transnational corporations and South Africa or direct backing of Pretoria by the Governments concerned.

112. We are in full agreement with the majority of the States Members of the United Nations in our judgement of this situation and in voicing our deep concern about it. Ample proof of how urgently States are demanding an immediate solution to the Namibia problem is provided by the two series of meetings held this year by the Security Council on the Namibia issue, and by the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, in Paris. Almost all the statements made by representatives on those occasions called attention to the great danger to peace and security—not only in the region, but in the world at large—emanating from the delaying tactics pursued by certain countries with regard to the granting of independence to Namibia.

113. We have repeatedly made known our position that the elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* would constitute a significant contribution to the elimination of dangerous hotbeds of conflict. Numerous examples even from the recent past testify to the accuracy of that. Again and again, events taking place in southern Africa shock us and warn us forcefully about the situation prevailing there.

114. My delegation resolutely condemns the war that is being waged by South Africa—with the help even of terrorist gangs, and with the unscrupulous use of mercenaries—from the Territory of Namibia against the People's Republic of Angola. We also condemn the acts of aggression perpetrated by the racist régime against Mozambique, Lesotho and other sovereign independent States in the region.

115. If the Namibian people is still suffering today under colonial oppression and exploitation by the *apartheid* régime, it is first and foremost because of the plot which exists between imperialist States and the racist régime in South Africa. Pretoria not only enjoys political and diplomatic recognition by the major Western Powers, but also receives massive support from them in the military and economic fields. This has contributed to the transformation of Namibia into a huge military camp. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia entitled "The military situation in and relating to Namibia"¹² provides information about the role played by leading States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] in creating this huge military build-up. The report reveals that, in addition to more than 100,000 South African soliders, thousands of mercenaries from the United States and other Western countries are being used for the oppression of the Namibian people and for perpetrating acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

116. A number of countries and their transnational corporations are increasingly involving themselves, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, in economic activities in South Africa or illegally occupied Namibia. The main partner of the racists calls such engagement constructive. It should, rather, be called lucrative. The simple fact is that 53 out of the 88 transnational corporations plundering the riches of Namibia have their headquarters in the States of the so-called Western contact group.

117. So why should we be surprised at the delaying tactics employed so far by the members of that group, and why should we be surprised at their persuasive optimism, or their determination to achieve a settlement by persistently granting concessions to South Africa—in other words, their determination to prevent a solution which would be in accordance with the will of the majority of the States Members of the United Nations? We agree with the view held by Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, who wrote in number 5 of the 1983 volume of the periodical *New Perspectives* that, on account of the destructive policy pursued by the Western contact group, SWAPO had come to the conclusion that the five Western Powers today no longer play the role of honest mediators in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Those Powers, and especially the Reagan Administration, Mr. Nujoma said, must be prevented from taking advantage of the negotiating process in Namibia and misusing it for the achievement of their own selfish aims.

118. The documents adopted at the International Conference in April⁸ and Security Council resolution 539 (1983) adopted in October this year emphasize the fact that the United Nations bears direct responsibility for the decolonization of Namibia and for granting genuine independence to that country. A settlement of the question of Namibia will be possible only on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions in their entirety, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

119. The world Organization, and in particular the Security Council, must now focus its attention on measures preventing from the very outset any separate attempts made by certain countries with a view to settling the problem in question. As many States have underlined, the achievement of a final and just solution to the Namibia issue will become a touchstone for the United Nations.

120. What matters most is the unity of all States which are interested in an early elimination of the colonial and racist exploitation and oppression of Namibia. In this context, all obstacles which obstruct the common goal have to be removed. The German Democratic Republic,

therefore, noted with satisfaction that the Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), rejected South Africa's insistence on the so-called linkage between a solution of the question of Namibia and extraneous issues. It resolutely opposes any demand that so-called regional security in the south of Africa or a so-called principle of reciprocity be taken into account. Such considerations can only be interpreted as another useless attempt to delay the granting of independence to Namibia and to play into the hands of the rulers in Pretoria. It requires a great deal of impudence to try in the present situation to put any security interests of the racist and Fascist State of South Africa on the agenda.

121. It is South Africa which illegally occupies Namibia, persistently breaches the peace in the region and grossly violates the security of independent neighbouring States. It is South Africa which ignores the demands of the international community that it stop its policy, pursued in contravention of international law, and which continues its efforts to consolidate its colonial power. Its very recent attempts to set up in place of the failed Democratic Turnhalle Alliance a so-called State Council, whose members should be appointed by the South African Administrator-General, demonstrate once again its intention of achieving an internal settlement.

122. The German Democratic Republic advocates the immediate exercise by the Namibian people of its right to self-determination, and the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, with the preservation of its territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands.

123. We demand the immediate and complete withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia and the handing over of power to the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, as recognized by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

124. SWAPO has developed into the internationally recognized political leader of the Namibian people. Also, on the occasion of the visit by the Secretary-General to southern Africa in August, it demonstrated political flexibility and reaffirmed its readiness to sign a cease-fire and to co-operate with the Secretary-General and with UNTAG.

125. The German Democratic Republic continues to stand in solidarity by the side of the Namibian people and its liberation organization, as the Chairman of the Council of State, Erich Honecker, emphasized on the occasion of his recent meeting with Sam Nujoma at Berlin. We regard the support for the just struggle of the Namibian people waged under the leadership of SWAPO as a necessary prerequisite for the elimination of a dangerous hotbed of tension and for the preservation and strengthening of world peace. Now, as before, it is absolutely imperative for the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The arms embargo against Pretoria must be strengthened and monitored, in accordance with Security Council resolution 421 (1977). We advocate strict and complete implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Security Council should resolutely reject any delaying manoeuvres and prevent any attempts by the racists to achieve a so-called internal settlement.

126. In compliance with its own decisions, the United Nations bears great responsibility for the fate of that Territory. Let us strengthen the unity of our forces so that the day will soon come when the courageous people of Namibia is finally able to control its own destiny.

127. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): About 37 years have elapsed since the General Assembly first discussed the question of Namibia. The United Nations responsibility for Namibia has been confirmed and reconfirmed. First, in 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations pending the people's exercise of its right to self-determination and independence. Then, in 1967, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2248 (S-V), by which it established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory on behalf of the Organization. It was also mandated to defend the rights of the people until Namibia became independent.

128. From the outset, the Government of South Africa adopted an approach contrary to that of the international community regarding Namibia and did not comply with United Nations resolutions on the subject. It created obstacles to prevent the United Nations Council for Namibia from fulfilling its responsibilities. That Government continued to carry out its plans to ensure its domination of the Territory, to continue to plunder its natural and human resources, and to apply its inhuman racist policy to the inhabitants.

129. However, when the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), the international community felt somewhat optimistic, for it defined the bases of a just and equitable settlement to lead Namibia towards independence. This framework came to be known as the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

130. The optimism of the international community was strengthened when the parties concerned indicated their acceptance of the plan. Five Western States took a diplomatic initiative to guarantee implementation of the plan. But, here we are, five years after the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) and the Western contact group was established, and there has not been the slightest progress worth mentioning towards Namibian independence.

131. The racist régime of Pretoria has, in fact, been strengthening its control over the Territory of Namibia and intensifying its efforts to plunder the wealth of that Territory. Moreover, it has been carrying out acts of armed aggression against neighbouring African countries and has even occupied the territory of some of those countries, as part of a plan clearly designed to create trouble, disrupt the political and domestic stability of those countries and prevent them from lending assistance to the people of Namibia and to SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people, and from fulfilling their responsibilities in that connection.

132. Pretoria has now created new pretexts for postponing the granting of independence to Namibia. It has established a kind of linkage between independence for that Territory and another matter that is completely extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and completely beyond the control of the other party involved, SWAPO. I am referring to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. This is allegedly now the only obstacle to the implementation of the Security Council resolution, as is mentioned in the Secretary-General's report.¹ This was also made clear by the Foreign Minister of the racist régime of Pretoria in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General in which he said that the choice to be made in the electoral system in Namibia was not of great importance and would, in fact, not cause unnecessary problems, but that "What is important . . . is that no settlement plan can be implemented unless a firm agreement is reached on Cuban withdrawal from Angola".¹³

133. It is hardly necessary to say that the international community has on several occasions expressed its firm conviction that Namibia should accede to independence as soon as possible, pursuant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without any change or amendment thereto and without the intrusion of any extraneous factors. I would just mention here the Political Declaration adopted by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983 [*A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I*], and the Paris Declaration on Namibia, adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence,⁸ which was held in Paris in April and in which 138 States participated. We would draw attention particularly to Security Council resolution 539 (1983), which was adopted following a debate in the Council on the question of Namibia and showed quite clearly that the Council rejected the attempts by South Africa to link the question of independence for Namibia to any other factor alien to Council resolution 435 (1978).

134. Despite the intransigence of the South African Government and the failure to find a solution to the question of Namibia, however, SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, has demonstrated its positive attitude and sense of responsibility, and it enjoys the support of the international community. The position was clearly shown by the statement made by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, in the Council's debate in May 1983,¹⁴ when he confirmed his approach to the cease-fire and his interest in co-operating with the Secretary-General, and also by the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council.¹⁵ It was also confirmed by the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO in his statement before the Assembly yesterday [*72nd meeting*].

135. Egypt has adopted an unwavering position of principle on Namibia. This has been stated in various forums and at various times. I should like to sum it up as follows: first, Egypt condemns the continuing occupation of Namibia by South Africa, South Africa's refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions and its hindrance of a solution of the problem; secondly, Egypt supports the struggle of the people of Namibia for independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, authentic representative, and will continue to do all it can to provide material and moral assistance to the people of Namibia through SWAPO; thirdly, Namibian independence must be attained on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), because it is the only internationally accepted plan for a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia and there exists a commitment to abide by and implement that resolution without any change or amendment thereto; fourthly, we reject the establishment of a linkage between Namibian independence and any other matter quite extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to the interests of the Namibian people, because we cannot allow any interference in the form of extraneous problems; fifthly, the problem of Namibia is a primary responsibility of the United Nations and we must strengthen the role of the Secretary-General in finding a solution to the problem; sixthly, since it has become quite clear that the South African Government has absolutely no intention of abiding by the norms of international law nor any desire to do so, it has now become essential to consider the question of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and here we call on all States that have already approved the resolutions of the General Assembly on sanctions against South Africa to renew their commitment and to translate those resolutions into

practical action; seventhly, we support the front-line African States in their position of principle to continue supporting the struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, despite the aggression and pressure to which they have been subjected by the racist Pretoria régime. We draw attention here to paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report [*A/38/525*], which states that there are urgent needs for international assistance to allow these countries to carry out their normal development programmes in spite of the special difficulties arising from their geopolitical situations, including their proximity to South Africa.

136. The time factor is an important element in any international problem, but in the context of Namibia it is of special importance because, at the human level, we have a people crushed under the yoke of a colonialist régime that is applying racist, inhuman policies and practices unprecedented in the international community and, indeed, the horror is beyond description. Each day that passes while Namibia is still colonized adds still more to the pain and suffering of its people. At the political level, there are factors relating to the possibility of an outbreak of violence that might go beyond southern Africa and engulf regions further afield. If Namibia does not achieve independence soon, a conflagration of immeasurable consequences will be even closer. Moreover, the Organization's prestige is suffering quite considerably from the postponements of Namibia's independence, particularly as far as public opinion in the third world is concerned. This is why, once again, we emphasize the need to implement immediately and fully the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which, incidentally, was adopted unanimously.

137. Mr. ROA KOURÍ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Ever since the General Assembly, on 14 December 1946, adopted resolution 65 (I) at its first session, the question of Namibia has appeared on the agenda of all its regular sessions, of its fifth and ninth special sessions and of its eighth emergency special session. Similarly, several subsidiary bodies of the Assembly have considered the situation of that Territory; the Security Council has adopted several resolutions in this connection and the International Court of Justice has examined related aspects of the question and has handed down decisions on them.

138. In 1966, the General Assembly declared an end to South Africa's Mandate over South West Africa [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*], now Namibia, in response to the expressed wish of its people and, in 1978, the Security Council adopted its resolution 435 (1978), in which it endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

139. Since then, the racist régime of South Africa has not heeded the decision of the Assembly by withdrawing from the Territory of Namibia, nor has the Security Council been able to implement its resolution 435 (1978), in spite of the removal of all the technical obstacles which allegedly prevented the implementation of the United Nations plan. None the less, the member countries of the so-called Western contact group, inventors of the plan, and the racist régime of Pretoria, according to the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General himself and the General Assembly itself agree the Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is "the sole basis for a peaceful settlement" of the question of Namibia, have in one way or another, all expressed their readiness to begin its implementation as soon as possible.¹⁵

140. The truth, however, is that between 1978 and 1983 there has been no progress whatsoever in the situation of Namibia, except on paper. Quite the contrary, the

Pretoria leaders—encouraged by their constructive alliance with the new United States Administration, which has increased its ties of all types with the *apartheid* régime, with which it feels deeply and ideologically linked—have placed one obstacle after another in the way of all United Nations initiatives aimed at implementation of the plan.

141. Not only has the process of irrational and massive exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory continued, in violation of the resolutions of the Organization, and in particular of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁴ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, but rather, there has been an acceleration in the process of implanting the institutions of the system of *apartheid*, an increase in the repression of Namibian patriots and in attempts to divide the people by encouraging the creation of neo-colonial puppet parties, as well as an increase in acts of aggression against the front-line countries that are selflessly forming a strong rear guard for SWAPO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

142. Several factors therefore combine to obstruct and delay the independence of Namibia. On the one hand, the global and hegemonic ambitions of imperialism in the region, whether economic, political or military; on the other hand, the specific, selfish and sordid interests of the South African racist régime, which now wishes not only to preserve the structure of racist exploitation in South Africa and Namibia, but also to neutralize or subjugate the independent States of southern Africa.

143. The interplay of these interests, which have always been present in the relations of the imperialist countries with South Africa, intensified notably following the election of Ronald Reagan to the Presidency of the United States. The real defeat to the hegemonistic and expansionist designs of those forces, as represented by the downfall of Portuguese colonialism and the attainment of independence by the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, and of Zimbabwe, *inter alia*, would have to be reversed at all costs by the little Fascist-style group that governs the White House, through the destabilization and overthrow of their independent governments and the imposition of neo-colonial systems in all of them, including Namibia.

144. Hence the technical obstacles, the hesitations, the questionings of Pretoria about United Nations impartiality and, more recently, the introduction of questions extraneous to the question of the independence of Namibia, as set forth in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), with the objective of postponing that independence indefinitely.

145. The so-called question of linkage of the independence of Namibia with that of the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola, which is defined in Security Council resolution 539 (1983) as being incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), is as spurious and false as are the arguments used by the Yankee Government to justify its piratical occupation and invasion of Grenada, which does not convince or delude any one.

146. Prior to 1975, there were no Cuban internationalist forces in Angola. The country was dominated by the Portuguese colonialists, close allies of the Pretoria racists. What prevented South Africa's withdrawal from Namibian territory then?

147. Today it is affirmed that there are no "technical obstacles" to the independence of Namibia. There is a suspicious silence concerning the spurious obstacles alleged by the racists and their Western partners, which acquiesce if not promote the repulsive manoeuvres of Mr. Botha.

148. The international community must denounce the duplicity, the bad faith and the complicity of all those

who in one way or another play into the hands of the *apartheid* régime and allow the illegal occupation of Namibia and the suffering and exploitation of its people to continue. The sovereign agreements between Cuba and the People's Republic of Angola, by virtue of which the Cuban internationalist contingent is in that country, will be maintained as long as our respective Governments do not decide otherwise. If, as affirmed in article IX of the Declaration signed on 4 February 1982 by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Cuba and Angola, the self-sacrificing struggle of SWAPO—the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people—and the demands of the international community succeed in achieving a genuine solution to the problem of Namibia based on strict compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and lead to a genuinely independent government and to the total withdrawal of the South African occupation troops to the other side of the Orange River, thus considerably reducing the danger of aggression against Angola, the Angolan and Cuban Governments will begin to study the implementation of a programme for the withdrawal of Cuban forces within the time period agreed upon by both Governments.

149. Let no one be mistaken as to the position of my Government and of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola. Together with the overwhelming majority of the international community, we reject the attempt of the United States, through its Pretoria allies, to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of our forces from Angola. Neither the bribery nor the pressures nor the threats of imperialism intimidate us, nor could they induce us to give an inch with regard to our positions and principles.

150. As has already been stated, this is, in fact, the thirty-seventh year that the General Assembly is compelled to consider the question of Namibia. Today, as in the past, Western transnational corporations continue to give direct support to the *apartheid* régime—as we were reminded yesterday [72nd meeting] by the acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia—through the injection of vast sums, while several capitalist countries continue to give it support of all types, including military assistance and assistance in the field of nuclear technology, in flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions.

151. In spite of the firm position of the Assembly, the Security Council, the front-line States and the international community in favour of the independence of Namibia, of the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and of their rejection of the obstacles and preconditions set by the South African racists and their allies, the *apartheid* régime illegally continues to occupy the Territory of Namibia; it continues to attack neighbouring countries and the front-line States and it occupies part of Angolan territory without the Security Council or the Organization as a whole having been able thus far to prevent it from doing so.

152. It is therefore high time to progress along the course we have set for ourselves in resolutions and decisions adopted year after year; first of all, through the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in order to achieve the implementation of the resolutions, starting with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in all its parts and without any modification whatsoever.

153. At the same time, Member States should, in accordance with the appeal made by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, give SWAPO every possible support, material and otherwise, so that it may continue its patriotic struggle for the independence of Namibia, and also

support the front-line countries, SWAPO's strong rear-guard, which are heroically resisting the primitive fury of the Pretoria Fascists. Member States will be doing so in the certainty that Namibia, too, will be victorious.

154. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, at the 72nd meeting, I had an opportunity, in my capacity as acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to introduce the report of the Council on its activities since the thirty-seventh session [A/38/24]. I should like to say at this time how proud Algeria is to be a member of this very important body, which is a part of the Organization. This body is attempting to carry out its mandate in particularly difficult circumstances. The efforts made by the Council to date, in mobilizing international public opinion in particular, have been most successful, as has the support that it has given to SWAPO. I should also like to say that the role played by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Mishra, has very effectively complemented the work of that Council. I hope that Mr. Mishra will accept this as a well-deserved tribute.

155. Never has a problem of decolonization suffered as many vicissitudes as that of Namibia. For several decades, South Africa has been called upon to respect its international obligations regarding Namibia. An analysis of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions demonstrates that the aggression against the Namibian people continues despite all appeals and that peace and security have been seriously compromised within the region. After the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, the Security Council held two series of meetings, in May and in October, to condemn yet again the persistence of this illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, and the obstacles created by South Africa to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Like the Paris Conference, the Security Council, in its resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983), called upon Pretoria to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to facilitate the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

156. In spite of this, when the Secretary-General went to southern Africa in August 1983, in accordance with the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council in its resolution 532 (1983), to undertake consultations with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the South African leaders, fortified by the support of certain Powers, reiterated their categorical refusal to abide by Security Council decisions. The Secretary-General emphasized, in his report to the Council dated 29 August 1983,¹ that:

“the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan”.

After the adoption of resolution 539 (1983), the South Africans, as if to emphasize their challenge to the world, indicated in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General, that it did “not intend to succumb to the Council's threat”.¹³

157. One could go on endlessly reciting the deadlines set but always ignored right up to the present day. This constitutes constant humiliation of the international community and a serious blow to the credibility of our institutions.

158. The racist régime of Pretoria, while continuing to reject the appeals of the international community, is

attempting to impose its own internal settlement. A potential threat in the whole of the southern part of the African continent has now become a true breakdown of international peace and security. The process leading to the independence of Namibia has been delayed, distorted and diverted from its proper course. The restoration of legality has been impeded. The national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries of the region and their efforts to create the conditions necessary for stability, security and development, are daily thwarted by the aggressive actions of Pretoria.

159. In a concurrent action, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice and the Security Council have blazed injustice and rectitude the necessary trail towards the restoration of law and the enshrinement of the consensus of the nations for the independence of Namibia in full sovereignty and with complete territorial integrity.

160. South Africa's Mandate over Namibia has been terminated and its presence in the Territory has been declared illegal. The unique and legitimate status of SWAPO's representation has been endorsed. The independence of Namibia has thus become the objective of all. In its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), the Security Council carefully defined the negotiated political framework for the attainment of that objective. Today, more than five years after the adoption of the last of those resolutions, it is clear that the international community's hopes have been dashed. In fulfilling its self-imposed duty, the Western contact group has not brought sufficient pressure to bear on South Africa. Pretoria's intransigence and its delaying tactics have been supported by complacency and complicity, even within the contact group.

161. We cannot help wondering, in view of the various deadlines that have not been met, whether there is not now an attempt to impose a neo-colonial course on the Namibian people, against its will and in spite of its legitimate aspirations; a neo-colonial course imposed by South Africa with the blessing of some members of the Western contact group.

162. In the process of the decolonization of Namibia, already encumbered with conditions, the link which has been improperly established between the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and the independence of Namibia is now encouraging to South Africa in its violation of international standards. Indeed, this link is likely to harm the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia; it distorts its logic and delays its implementation.

163. It is clear that this new condition, imposed at a crucial stage in the process of the decolonization of Namibia, delays even further the implementation of a plan which has already suffered excessive delay. The deliberately devised confusion of a sovereign decision of a State and a genuine problem of decolonization on which there is international unanimity is a threat to the effort which the community of nations has organized with such patience and perseverance.

164. This demonstrates the heavy responsibility borne by the members of the Western contact group, which made a solemn commitment in 1978 to end the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia as soon as possible.

165. It has thus been with great disappointment that Africa, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the General Assembly have seen the general outline of a settlement plan quite different from that of the United Nations, which the international community had so patiently drafted for Namibia. It is now a neo-colonial

plan, drawing its inspiration from the East-West conflict, a plan designed to ensure the establishment of the total supremacy of South Africa over southern Africa.

166. The problem of Namibia is and will continue to be a problem of decolonization. It is subject to a framework for action that has been carefully laid down by the United Nations and to a series of unanimously adopted decisions. Such basic truths must be reaffirmed with all necessary force in order to ensure that Namibia will be decolonized despite all attempts to contravene that process.

167. Given the delaying tactics of South Africa and the intensification of its policy of oppression and aggression the United Nations must, as a matter of urgency, translate into deeds its determination to have its decisions respected.

168. At this session, we must once again express our firm solidarity with the Namibian people's legitimate struggle for national liberation and call upon the Security Council to organize a collective world response to South Africa's challenge and to implement comprehensive mandatory sanctions should the carefully defined United Nations plan not be carried out.

169. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): The United Nations bears a unique and very special responsibility for the future of Namibia. The international community has entrusted the Organization with the task of securing a genuine and peaceful transfer of power to the Namibian people with the aim of establishing a free Namibia which, after long years of illegal occupation, should finally assume its rightful place as a sovereign and truly independent State.

170. Austria's position on the modalities for achieving a negotiated settlement in Namibia has been consistent over the years. Austria has, from the outset, fully supported the United Nations plan for Namibia's peaceful and negotiated transition to independence. We regard this plan as the most promising way to end South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and to enable the Namibian people to exercise fully their inherent right to self-determination, territorial integrity and independence, as well as to elect their own Government, free from outside interference or coercion.

171. In the view of the Austrian Government, any political settlement which aims at stability and durability has to rest on the broadest possible base and include all the parties concerned. The United Nations plan, originally put forward by five members of the Security Council in 1978,¹⁶ meets these basic requirements. Five years of intense and painstaking negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have resulted in a wide area of agreement, including the details of the implementation of the transition plan.

172. We wish to express again our gratitude and appreciation for the determined efforts exerted by the Western contact group, by the front-line States and other Governments involved and by the leadership of SWAPO, as well as by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. The co-operative spirit and constructive attitude of all of them helped to overcome many stalemates in the negotiations and to keep alive their momentum.

173. There can be no doubt that the search for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question has now arrived at its most critical stage. As a result of his recent efforts and negotiations, the Secretary-General in his latest report to the Security Council¹ was in a position to state that in fact we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978). Thus we are certainly more than pleased to learn that all elements which form part of the transition plan seem

finally to have received the agreement of all parties concerned. There should therefore be no further delay in the final decision to launch the United Nations plan. Elements which in our view have no direct relevance to the independence of Namibia must not delay this process. Austria feels that such elements should not be linked to the United Nations transition plan for Namibia but should rather be discussed directly between 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. To lose further momentum now and further time, after agreement on all aspects of the United Nations plan has been achieved, could only once more jeopardize the solution of the issue. We therefore strongly support the Secretary-General's efforts to break the deadlock and finally to bring about the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The consequence of any further delay would be very dangerous both for Namibia itself and for the region as a whole.

174. The South African Government should realize that such a course of action would only lead to a further destabilization of the area, rendering increasingly impossible any future attempt to establish an atmosphere of peaceful and mutually fruitful co-operation in southern Africa. It would inevitably lead to further violence and further bloodshed and would only intensify—and rightly so—the impatience of those who for so long have been deprived of the right to self-determination and independence.

175. But urgency is called for not only with regard to the situation in southern Africa as a whole but also with respect to the internal situation in Namibia, where economic, agricultural and social circumstances are gravely deteriorating. International economic developments have had an adverse impact on economic conditions and add another serious facet to the prevailing political instability in Namibia. This dire situation is compounded by the serious drought which currently afflicts Namibia and calls for urgent international humanitarian assistance. Furthermore, the existing administrative system for the Territory appears to be hugely wasteful and thus constitutes an exceedingly heavy burden on the national budget. In addition, the current administration obviously does not attempt to provide a base of skills which would be urgently needed in preparation for independence. In view of these considerations, it is more than high time that the people of Namibia be allowed to assume responsibility for their own fate. In this connection, they must be able to rely on the assistance of the international community. The activities of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia have, in our view, a special bearing on the future development of an independent Namibia. Both programmes have received and will continue to receive the support of the Austrian Government.

176. The issue of Namibia is indeed, as I said at the outset, an issue of special significance for the United Nations and for its role in today's international politics. At stake are the freedom and independence of a people. At stake is the right of a whole region of the African continent to peaceful development, prosperity and stability. At stake are fundamental values and principles of pluralistic and democratic societies, values and principles on which the Organization has been built and which inspire the confidence States place in it. Last, but not least, at stake is the chance for South Africa to arrive at a solution to its problems and achieve a transformation into a viable, democratic, multiracial and open society.

Therefore all parties concerned must realize their high responsibilities.

177. Namibia is a special trust of the United Nations and, thus, of the whole international community. The United Nations plan has now been awaiting implementation for five years. Surely the time to end this untenable situation has come.

178. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): Recently, the General Assembly considered the question of the policies and practices of *apartheid* of the South African régime. The general debate on this question amounted once again to a clear indictment by the international community of the South African régime for its diabolical system of *apartheid*, which thrives on the subjugation and repression of the majority of the citizens of South Africa.

179. In its attempts to entrench *apartheid* and perpetuate the denial of the inalienable rights of the black majority in South Africa, the Pretoria régime has enacted various draconian laws and concocted wicked schemes, such as establishing the bantustans. The latest in the series are, of course, the so-called constitutional proposals, which the Assembly has already rightly denounced and rejected.

180. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, which is the question now being considered by the General Assembly, also bears directly on the policies and practices of *apartheid*. Like its persistent acts of aggression against the front-line and other independent African States in the region, South Africa's continued stranglehold on Namibia is essentially in defence of that abomination called *apartheid*.

181. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is an affront to the international community, and in particular to the United Nations, which assumed direct and unique responsibility for the Territory as far back as 1966 [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. Not only is South Africa in illegal occupation of Namibia, but also, in yet another breach of international law, it uses the Territory as a launching pad for its acts of aggression against sovereign and independent African States.

182. South Africa purports to be interested in terminating its illegal occupation of Namibia and in the accession of the Territory to independence. Time and again we have heard protestations from South Africa supposedly in favour of a negotiated "internationally acceptable settlement" of the Namibian question. In practice, however, the record is replete with manoeuvres by the South African régime designed to perpetuate its stranglehold on Namibia. We know about the so-called political parties in Namibia instigated by, and on the payroll of, South Africa. We know about the active attempts by South Africa to concoct a so-called internal settlement in Namibia, and thus, by implanting a puppet régime, to turn Namibia into nothing more than a bantustan, similar to those existing in South Africa itself.

183. The United Nations has spared no effort to promote a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. There has been a series of specific initiatives to this end, in spite of the striking record of bad faith on the part of South Africa. Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) are perhaps the most prominent and concrete manifestations of the disposition of the United Nations to resolve the problem of Namibia in an orderly and peaceful manner. They epitomize the willingness of the United Nations to help South Africa withdraw from Namibia honourably—if, indeed, it has any honour. Above all, they seek to provide for the Namibian people an opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control.

184. The holding of free and fair elections is a democratic principle to which even the Pretoria régime purports to be committed. Yet, since the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976) seven years ago and Security Council resolution 435 (1978) five years ago, it has not been possible to hold free and fair elections in Namibia because of South Africa's intransigence. Perhaps South Africa would have co-operated in the implementation of these resolutions if only it had been sure that its puppets in Namibia, and not SWAPO, would win the elections. Because it fears a SWAPO victory, South Africa has continued to procrastinate and prevaricate.

185. Indeed, South Africa has done everything to undermine, if not destroy, SWAPO in Namibia. Members of SWAPO are special targets of the agents of the South African régime in Namibia. They are constantly harassed, arrested, tortured and imprisoned. But these tactics have not weakened SWAPO. They have not undermined its grass-roots support among the Namibian people. Not unexpectedly, they have resulted in a stronger determination among the Namibian masses to be united under the leadership of SWAPO, convinced that it is the only genuine custodian of their aspirations to freedom and independence.

186. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains, of course, the topical issue in relation to Namibia's independence. SWAPO remains ready and willing to see the implementation process begin. We in Zambia, together with our other front-line colleagues, also remain committed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO and the front-line States together have done everything possible to facilitate the implementation of the resolution. Some of the demands of South Africa in the long-drawn-out negotiations to give effect to that resolution have been unreasonable, to say the least. Yet SWAPO has made concessions time and again in the hope that the resolution can be implemented.

187. Such is the positive attitude on our part which has culminated in resolving virtually all of the outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), as pointed out in the report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council.¹ The only relevant issue remaining is that of the electoral system. South Africa's choice is still awaited. But, even in these circumstances of virtual agreement on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978), South Africa has not relented in pursuing its all-too-familiar manoeuvres to maintain its stranglehold on Namibia. Our good will and determination to press ahead for a Namibian settlement have not been reciprocated by South Africa.

188. South Africa now insists on linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. It seeks to predicate Namibia's independence on the extraneous issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola and to depict Namibia's independence, which is purely a decolonization matter, as coming within the context of East-West rivalries. South Africa, of course, shares this perception with one of the members of the Western contact group. How ironic indeed, I might add, that a key member of the contact group should now join hands with the South African régime in preventing the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted by the Security Council at the initiative of that group.

189. Let it not be forgotten that the Cuban forces went to Angola at the invitation of the Angolan Government to defend that country against South African aggression. Let it also not be forgotten that, to date, South Africa occupies a large part of Angolan territory which it invaded

from Namibian territory. All in all, South Africa remains a threat to Angola's security, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. What legal or moral ground does South Africa have to demand the removal of Cuban forces from Angola?

190. There is absolutely no reasonable and just premise for accepting the linkage between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That is why we in the front-line States have rejected and condemned the so-called linkage. Our Heads of State or Government reiterated our clear position on this matter at their recent summit meeting, held at Lusaka on 12 November 1983.¹⁷ We are glad that the Security Council also rejected the so-called linkage in its resolution 539 (1983).

191. We want to proceed with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) without any further delay. We therefore demand of South Africa a positive reaction to the call by the Council in its resolution 539 (1983) that South Africa communicate to the Secretary-General its choice of the electoral system to be used in Namibia. We urge the General Assembly equally to call on South Africa to communicate its choice of electoral system and, henceforth, to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in his efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to commend the Secretary-General for his tireless and dedicated efforts in the cause of Namibia's freedom and independence.

192. If South Africa continues to avoid the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), can anybody blame the Namibian people for intensifying their armed struggle to liberate their country? Would it not be logical and just, in the circumstances, for the international community to increase its material and other forms of support for the Namibian people, through SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative?

193. The cause of the Namibian people is the cause of all freedom-loving and justice-upholding countries and peoples. Only clear-cut positions and actions by us in support of this cause, not ambivalence and double standards, will convey to South Africa in no uncertain terms the message that the international community is fed up with its continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

194. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya): I speak on the item under consideration not to fill out the background papers but, rather, to examine why Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has not been implemented. On the background papers, suffice it to say that in 38 years of United Nations history, irrefutable records of the illegal and brutal occupation of Namibia by the racist minority régime of South Africa exist. South Africa, not content with the illegal occupation, has converted Namibia into a military base to serve as a springboard from which it has carried out and continues to carry out frequent, unprovoked armed attacks against the neighbouring State of Angola, including the occupation of southern Angola and of other neighbouring States. My delegation commends to the United Nations, and to the Security Council in particular, a serious deliberation and a firm pronouncement with deeds on the course of action that must be taken now in order to fulfil the mandate and obligations entrusted to it by the international community, particularly with regard to Namibia.

195. When, five years ago, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), we shared a general sense of optimism that Namibia would speedily move to independence in peace and tranquillity. But, to our profound dismay, this has not happened, for racist South Africa, in a calculated manner, has brought into the picture obstacle

after obstacle. In our view, this manner of political dealing cannot be anything else but bad faith—in effect, hostility to the inhabitants of Namibia. In no circumstances can we tolerate the attitude of South Africa in its attempts to move the clock backwards and thereby perpetuate a situation of grave tension and instability in the southern African region, threatening the peace of Africa and the rest of the world.

196. I wish to reiterate my Government's considered view that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia remains the only basis for a peaceful transition towards the independence of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO. All of us, particularly those of us in Africa, have waited with extreme patience for the implementation of the United Nations plan. In the majority of cases, we have been told by those close to the racist minority régime of South Africa, who had opted to negotiate on its behalf, that that régime was ready to accept the implementation of the United Nations plan, as embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On that understanding we moved along, having no illusions about the sincerity of South Africa concerning these negotiations. Our fears and apprehensions were proved right when we started getting diverse signals differing from what we had been led to understand by the Western contact group. Instead of South Africa faithfully agreeing to implement the plan fully, it has introduced an unrealistic and unrelated and, for that matter, unacceptable demand which it endeavours to link to the issue of independence and which presumes to hold Namibia hostage on issues far removed from the Namibians' right to be free of occupation and attain independence under the supervision of the United Nations.

197. It is pertinent at this point to say that the Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council,¹ confirmed that all the outstanding issues relevant to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved. Now, we wonder what it is that further prevents the independence of Namibia. Is it not true that South Africa is not acting alone? We are aware that certain Western members of the Security Council, in fact members of the contact group, have been encouraging South Africa to flout the terms of Security Council resolutions. We know for certain that South Africa, without the support it enjoys from certain Western countries, cannot withstand the demands and pressures exerted by the international community.

198. In spite of the report of the Secretary-General, Namibia is still occupied by racist South Africa. Namibia's independence and its right to exercise self-determination are being held hostage to the removal of Cuban troops from Angola. In the view of the Government of Kenya, Namibia is not a party to the presence or otherwise of Cuban troops in Angola. We cannot accept a matter that concerns any two peoples to jeopardize the progress of a third non-party to the original matter. We have vehemently rejected the idea of the linkage of Cuban troops in Angola to the attainment of Namibian independence. Those who encourage the South African linkage idea should reconsider their position and try to render the international community a better service by disassociating themselves honourably from the racist South African régime's efforts to continue holding Namibia in servitude. We are conscious of the fact that the linkage concept has been designed in the context of big-Power and super-Power rivalries in spheres of influence. In this regard, the delegation of Kenya wishes to say that the Namibian people have every right to determine who will be their friends in a free Namibia. They must be enabled by the international community to do just that. We urge the international community to support fully the Namibian

people, through SWAPO, in their legitimate struggle for their independence.

199. The international community is faced with a serious challenge and must respond squarely to this challenge. The Security Council, having adopted resolution 539 (1983), should now move to ensure the full implementation of its resolution 435 (1978). The Council should do all that it is empowered to do under the Charter and unanimously contribute, along with the other members of the international community, to the efforts to dislodge South Africa from Namibia. We also urge all those who have been violating existing sanctions against South Africa to desist from so doing.

200. Kenya will continue to support, in every way possible, the liberation forces of Namibia in their struggle against oppression and for the attainment of national independence for the Namibian people. We shall continue to reject the introduction of irrelevant issues into the subject of Namibian independence and condemn South Africa's non-co-operation with the United Nations in respect of Namibia. We shall support existing and future, strengthened international actions against South Africa, including the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Vice-President, took the chair.

201. Finally, my delegation wishes to express its thanks for the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [see A/38/23, chap. V], the working paper prepared for the Special Committee by the Secretariat³ and the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24], as well as the report of the Secretary-General, and to state that Kenya will fully support the draft resolutions contained therein.

202. Mr. TRAORÉ (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): In his report to the Security Council pursuant to resolution 532 (1983),¹ the Secretary-General, aware of the need to accelerate the process of independence "of a peaceful, prosperous, independent and united Namibia", made an "appeal to all concerned not to be distracted from this objective by other issues".

203. After more than three decades of waiting and of bloody trials, the people of Namibia still have not determined their political future precisely because this goal has been constantly diverted from the real nature of the battle against colonial domination and racism. Instead, it has become a justification for purposes totally alien to it. The independence of Namibia, we recognized, was already in sight in 1978. It was no longer a question, after long and delicate negotiations, of doing anything more than ensuring the correct implementation of resolution 435 (1978), adopted unanimously by the Security Council and accepted without any reservation whatsoever both by SWAPO and by the Pretoria régime.

204. SWAPO, despite its heavy responsibilities to its own people and despite the mistrust which it was entitled to show for South Africa, kept its word and silenced its weapons in favour of a rapid resort to democratic methods for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. By contrast, the illegal racist Pretoria régime, which had already attracted the attention of the international community by constantly pulling back the moment a solution to the Namibian crisis appeared on the horizon, once again played the part of perjurer, a role it expected to be given.

205. New obstacles have thus blocked the process to independence of Namibia. One of those obstacles was the

establishment of a link between independence and the presence in Angola of Cuban troops. This argument is the same in nature and in logic as those termed arguments in bad faith. Indeed, can we forget that, having barely emerged from long years of an implacable war of decolonization, Angola was treacherously attacked by South African forces? Can we forget that, when confronted with this flagrant violation of the Charter, in spite of pressing appeals, Angola did not receive the assistance it had requested from the United Nations to help it preserve its independence and guarantee its security, its sovereignty and its independence?

206. The situation in which Angola found itself brutally placed was as clear as could be: either accept that so many lives and so much energy had been sacrificed in gaining independence but still fall back under the racist colonialist system of servitude, the most hateful system there is, or else gain the support of friendly countries to preserve its independence.

207. Furthermore, need we recall that Cuban troops were already in Angola when Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted and that none of the provisions of that resolution alluded to Angola? Furthermore, it would be surprising if it were otherwise, because what was involved then, and what is still involved, is assistance to the Territory of Namibia in regaining its independence; the purpose is not to pass judgement on agreements freely concluded among States.

208. Angola, a sovereign State, exercises, like each of the States in the international community, the right to its sovereignty by taking action for which it is accountable only to its own people. Maintaining order, ensuring the security of its citizens, defending its territorial integrity—these are undoubtedly the priority tasks of any State worthy of the name.

209. The artificial linkage of the independence of Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is an attempt to relate questions which are completely alien to each other. The real problem is that, in spite of many promises and in spite of the adoption of many resolutions on Namibia, that Territory remains under South African colonization. The truth is that, in spite of the relevant resolutions, in spite of the Charter, in spite of the rules of international law with regard to the non-use of force in international relations, South African troops are occupying Angolan territory. Over and above this military occupation of Angola, without any declaration of war, the Pretoria racist régime sets itself up as the champion of the establishment of a security zone in southern Africa and it makes that a further pre-condition of the independence of Namibia.

210. The history of international relations teaches us rather that pre-conditions to negotiations make the negotiations meaningless, because those pre-conditions are a scarcely veiled form of diktat. The establishment of a true security zone anywhere in the world results from the common will of the parties involved to go beyond situations of the moment, which may be filled with tension, in order to seek a serene future of understanding, co-operation and peace. That is practical and possible only among States which have similar respect for sovereignty and human dignity. It can happen only in a climate of confidence and reciprocal tolerance. It can never serve as a reward for acts of aggression.

211. An analysis of the situation in southern Africa clearly shows that it is South Africa alone that is creating disorder and tension there. The Security Council has devoted so many meetings to considering South African military attacks on Angola, Mozambique, Lesotho, Botswana and Zimbabwe that it is not possible to have

any doubt about the threats which South Africa has brought to bear on southern Africa, thus contributing to a further deterioration in international relations.

212. The insecurity in southern Africa has indeed been provoked and maintained by South Africa. That is how the Security Council itself understood the situation when, refusing to be sidetracked from the true nature of the question of Namibia, it adopted resolution 539 (1983), in which it stated that it was

“*Gravely concerned also at the tension and instability prevailing in southern Africa and the mounting threat to the security of the region and its wider implications for international peace and security resulting from continued utilization of Namibia as a springboard for attacks against and destabilization of African States in the region*”.

213. The presence of foreign troops in Angola is, we repeat, alien to the question of Namibian independence, just as are the prior establishment of a security zone and, especially, the resolution of some kind of ideological conflict in the region. The ideological conflicts and the present dangerous international tensions are kept alive for much more serious reasons than the exercise of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. The non-aligned countries have clearly signified that they refuse to be used as pawns in these vain quarrels and that the way to improve international relations is through full understanding of all the provisions of the Charter and strict respect for fundamental human rights, including the right to freedom, dignity and a full and complete life.

214. The Pretoria régime has claimed for itself a certain ideology. The ideology of South Africa and its vision of the world are known to us. They are the ideology and the vision of racial hatred, of the primitive instinct for domination, of belief in the use of force in international relations. The ideological arguments South Africa has used to delay the independence of Namibia are in reality manifestations of the *apartheid* policy of South Africa.

215. Indeed, South Africa, like Namibia, is illegally administered. There should no longer be any illusions in the minds of those who believed in a humanization of the *apartheid* system after South Africa, its hands covered with the blood of thousands of the opponents of *apartheid*, on 2 November 1983 removed the black majority of the country from the civil and political process by the announcement of the so-called “new constitution”, which in fact is merely the most systematic and merciless implementation of the policy of bantustanization. Those who believe in the good faith of South Africa in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia should shed their illusions. If they do not, tomorrow the Pretoria régime may no longer link the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola but to that of extra-terrestrial forces which have landed in Mozambique, in Angola, in Botswana, in Zimbabwe, in Lesotho or in Zambia.

216. In the statement he made on 14 October 1983 from this very rostrum [33rd meeting] with regard to Namibia, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of my country affirmed that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was sufficient of and by itself. Let us therefore side with the men of peace and redouble our efforts to help SWAPO, the only authentic representative of the people of Namibia, in liberating its homeland.

217. South Africa, by maintaining its illegal presence in Namibia, does damage to peace and violates the Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VII of which specifically calls for a package of measures to be taken in order

to deal with a breach of the peace. This is the exercise which we must resolutely devote ourselves to, because tomorrow, when it has nuclear power, South Africa will carry its blatant expansionist war beyond its immediate neighbours.

218. The Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), has reaffirmed

“... the legal responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and the primary responsibility of the Security Council for ensuring the implementation of its resolutions, in particular, resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978)”.

All that remains, then, is to accomplish the final process of the independence of Namibia by organizing free elections under international supervision. It is left to the United Nations to ensure respect for its commitments and its decisions, so that Namibia, a country whose sons are united in defending their dignity, will finally find itself free of the harmful effects of colonialism and racism.

219. Mrs. CORONEL DE RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again the question of Namibia is before the General Assembly and once again my delegation considers that now more than ever it is a matter of urgency to find a solution to the problem of Namibia. It is a matter of urgency because it seriously detracts from the image of the United Nations and confronts it with one of the most serious challenges in its history. It is a matter of urgency not only because it openly defies international peace and security but also because, despite the collective will of the entire international community, the racist régime of South Africa is aggressively and arrogantly ignoring the decisions of the supreme world body. It is a matter of urgency because it violates the most sacred principles underlying the present system of relations of peace and coexistence among all peoples and nations.

220. Many efforts have been made by the United Nations to ensure that Namibia becomes a free and sovereign nation. Here I would like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, who has worked tirelessly to find a solution which would enable the people of Namibia to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. Unfortunately there have been very few results and the problem remains before us, while daily the situation in southern Africa continues to deteriorate. In addition to the actions by the United Nations and its Secretary-General, the struggle waged by the Namibian people, which requires determination, courage, sacrifice and patience, has also had the tenacious support of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, who, in his capacity as President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, has worked tirelessly, despite obstacles and adversity. It is only fitting at this time to pay a warm tribute to Mr. Lusaka and offer him our firm support.

221. The United Nations bears an unavoidable responsibility concerning the solution of the question of Namibia, and the international community will have an undying commitment until Namibia has achieved independence, because the cause of Namibia is the cause of mankind. It is a just struggle for liberty, justice and peace, based upon universal principles founded upon the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

222. In 1983, now ending, there have been new and serious efforts; important meetings have been held under the auspices of the United Nations, at which the international community has considered the question of Namibia in detail, and where each nation and people has joined in the common ideal of supporting the Namibian people in its struggle to achieve independence.

223. In April 1983, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence was convened in Paris. At that Conference, the Paris Declaration on Namibia⁸ was adopted. Its text reflects the condemnation and rejection by the international community of the persistent aggression and military, political and economic destabilization carried out by the racist régime of South Africa against Namibia and the independent States in the region. The Paris Declaration condemns the régime of South Africa for its ruthless repression, its policy and practice of *apartheid* and other gross violations of the human rights of the Namibian people, and demands that an immediate end be put to those policies. The Conference paid a tribute to and expressed its solidarity with the historic and valiant struggle of the Namibian people, under the guidance of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, to throw off the colonial yoke and foreign exploitation and achieve what belongs to it of right, that is, to see human dignity and liberty in an independent Namibia.

224. As the Paris Declaration states, the people of Namibia does not stand alone in its struggle for its noble cause. It can count upon the support of all peoples and Governments which are truly committed to justice in a world of peace. The people and Government of Venezuela is among them and today we reiterate our most resolute commitment, as we did in Paris, to support the independence of Namibia and to stand together with the Namibian people and SWAPO in its struggle to achieve sovereignty and self-determination. The continuing solidarity of the international community and support of free peoples is the best assurance that the day is near when an independent Namibia will become a Member of the Organization.

225. On 23 May of this year, the Security Council, at the request of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49], which met at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, decided to devote a series of meetings to considering the question of Namibia, and new measures relating to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). On 31 May, the Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), which condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant defiance of resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council. It also called upon the South African régime to make a firm commitment as to its readiness to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) for the independence of Namibia. At the most recent meeting of the Security Council on the question of Namibia, which was held on 28 October, resolution 539 (1983) was adopted. In that resolution, the language of previous resolutions was repeated and South Africa was again condemned for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which provides the only basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem.

226. We cannot conceal our concern about what appears to be the obvious inability of the Security Council to decide upon more firm action which would force South Africa to abide by Council resolutions. However, there is another fact which is more serious and from every standpoint even more bizarre. I am referring to the letter of 31 October 1983 sent to the Secretary-General by the South African representative to the United Nations.¹³ This incorporates the statement made by Mr. Botha, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information of the Pretoria régime, who

stated, with reference to the noble, martyred SWAPO freedom fighters, that "South Africa is determined to act against terrorists . . . even if it brings us into conflict with the whole world". He went on to say: "We do not intend to succumb to the Council's threat".

227. This insolent letter not only is a serious challenge to the Organization, which was established to maintain peace, but, indeed, is a serious challenge to and defiance of the entire international community. It reflects the ignoble designs of the racist, segregationist régime of Pretoria. Venezuela categorically rejects this language and considers it to be unacceptable, as in no way whatsoever does it facilitate the process leading to the independence of Namibia.

228. It would be very difficult to find in a single one of the meetings concerning the question of Namibia, any contradiction of the unanimous desire of the world community for the independence of the Namibian people. Nearly two decades have elapsed since the United Nations took the problem of Namibia into its own hands. Throughout all this time no solution has been found. The Namibian people have continued to suffer inhuman degradation and savage repression unprecedented in the history of colonization.

229. In recent years, the international community has observed with disappointment the process towards independence of Namibia go through cycles of hope and frustration. During every period of optimism, however, when it appeared that the moment was coming when there would be an independent Namibia, this has been counteracted by the determination of South Africa to impede the exercise of self-determination by the people of Namibia and deliberately to impose its illegal, abnormal presence. It has always imposed one obstacle after another to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the United Nations plan for independence. First, constitutional principles and the composition of UNTAG were adduced. These obstacles were overcome and during the recent visit of the Secretary-General to Pretoria everything seemed to have been resolved, but once again the barbaric régime of Pretoria goes against reason.

230. Recently, there has been an attempt to connect the independence of Namibia with alien elements and to base a pre-condition on them. The problem of Namibia has been placed within the context of the East-West confrontation and ideological connotations have been attached to it, in an attempt to disguise its colonial dimensions. We are referring to the theory of a linkage between the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and the independence of Namibia.

231. In this connection, as indicated in the Paris Declaration and in the Caracas Declaration [A/38/451, annex], which resulted from the Latin American Regional Conference for Action against *Apartheid*, held at Caracas from 16 to 18 September 1983, we consider that the question of the Cuban troops in Angola is a matter that is exclusively the concern of those sovereign States and can in no way be considered to be an impediment to efforts directed towards the attainment of independence by Namibia.

232. It is appropriate at this time to recall a part of the message of the President of the Republic of Venezuela to the Security Council last May, as follows:

"On the occasion of this solemn meeting of the Security Council at which homage is being paid to the heroic people of Namibia in their struggle for freedom, the Government of Venezuela reiterates its support for the inalienable right of Namibia to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, in

accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States.”¹⁸

233. In view of the justice of the cause of the independence of Namibia and the tradition of freedom and justice of the people of Venezuela, it is appropriate at this time of the bicentenary of the birth of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar, to transmit to the General Assembly one of his thoughts. It is this:

“If there is any just violence, it is that which is used for good, and therefore happy, men; and there is no true freedom but that which does honour to mankind and offers it a better future. He who does not seek such freedom shall bear the chains of misfortune and universal repudiation.”

234. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): Bangladesh believes that the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the principles embodied in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We are convinced that the relevant resolutions of the Council constitute the only viable basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence. The chronology of Namibian history speaks of broken promises, missed dates, a chronicle of colonial exploitation, racism and racial discrimination based on the obnoxious policy of *apartheid*. Even though the way for a successful solution of the problem has been paved, we are yet to see the dawn of Namibian independence and thus continue to see this item inscribed on the agenda of the Assembly.

235. We are satisfied by the lucid reports of the Secretary-General [A/38/183 and Add.1 and 2 and A/38/525]. We also have before us the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24], of which Bangladesh is a member, and the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [A/38/23], as well as the working papers prepared for the Special Committee by the Secretariat.¹⁹ We commend the authors of these reports for their valuable work, which is useful in understanding the thrust of the problem before us.

236. My delegation wishes also to congratulate Mr. Paul J. F. Lusaka, President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and Mr. B. C. Mishra, United Nations Commissioner for Namibia. We greatly appreciate their praiseworthy contribution to the cause of Namibia.

237. Bangladesh cannot accept any solution outside the framework of the United Nations. Our position on the question of Namibia is firm and unequivocal. It is founded on our enduring commitment to support oppressed people throughout the world, waging a just struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. We wish to reiterate that United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolutions, must be implemented in full without any modification whatsoever. We reject all attempts to link the independence of Namibia to extraneous issues. This is so fundamental a right that it cannot be linked to any other issue.

238. The policies of the Pretoria Government pose a serious and grave challenge to international peace and security. The impact cannot be limited within Namibia alone as it destabilizes the entire continent. It is an affront to the international community that the people of Namibia continue to suffer domination, racial discrimination and repression. The report of the United Nations Council

for Namibia speaks of discriminatory laws and practices governing health, education, housing, employment and various other facts of daily life of the Namibian people.

239. The racist régime of Pretoria, far from abiding by international opinion, has openly flouted United Nations resolutions and has progressively taken steps designed to destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia. It has occupied Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. The logical extension of this policy has been the systematic fragmentation of the Territory along ethnic and racial lines, exemplified by the system of “bantustanization”. The racist régime has made massive deployment of its armed forces to police the Territory and rule the people through terror and repression. These troops are not only attempting to suppress the struggle for liberation but have also extended their acts of aggression into neighbouring countries, thereby destabilizing peace in the region.

240. We congratulate the neighbouring States for their commendable restraint, patience and statesmanship. At the same time, we would like to join hands with the front-line States, Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Nigeria, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe, for their courage and fortitude and the invaluable support they have extended to the cause of Namibia in the face of intransigence and unprovoked aggression. We salute the leadership of SWAPO, the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, for their readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement and for accepting a date for the arrival of UNTAG that would set in motion the electoral process under United Nations supervision.

241. Bangladesh values deeply the trust and confidence reposed in it for assisting and facilitating the work of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in UNTAG. Within our modest means, we have offered training facilities in Bangladesh to students from Namibia and, despite our financial constraints, we have been participating in international efforts to provide assistance to the victims of the South African policy of *apartheid* by contributing to, *inter alia*, the United Nations Fund for Namibia and the Solidarity Fund of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

242. Since its independence, Bangladesh has never established political, diplomatic, cultural, economic or other relations with the racist minority régime in South Africa. In view of the policies of racial discrimination and *apartheid* followed by the South African régime, Bangladesh has enforced comprehensive trade sanctions against South Africa.

243. We cannot remain a silent spectator to the endless travail and trauma suffered by the Namibian people. Another year has passed and we find ourselves no nearer a solution of the question of Namibia. We greatly appreciate the efforts of the Secretary-General, who visited the region and almost managed to resolve all the issues under dispute. What should have been a triumphant journey that would have opened the way to Namibia’s independence was, to our dismay, blocked once again by the racist régime of South Africa refusing to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), insisting on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a prerequisite to its acceptance. This ridiculous, unjustified and ill-intentioned demand has been rejected by the entire international community, including most of the countries comprising the Western contact group. Bangladesh feels that this defiant gesture cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. We cannot remain a silent spectator to the endless travail and trauma suffered by the Namibian people. We have to act, and act quickly and decisively, to meet this situation. Bangladesh reaffirms its total and unflinching

solidarity with the heroic people of Namibia in their just and legitimate struggle for national independence and sovereignty under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole, authentic and legitimate representative, and will support all measures undertaken to bring to fruition the independence of Namibia.

244. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): The United Nations is registering 37 years of almost fruitless discussions on the question of Namibia's independence. It is a very long history of the decolonization process. I would even say it is one of the longest.

245. South Africa's involvement in Namibia began in 1920 when, under the League of Nations Mandates System, it was appointed to administer what had until then been part of Germany's African empire. When the League was superseded by the United Nations, the Mandates System was modified and became the United Nations Trusteeship System. However, South Africa refused to enter into a Trusteeship Agreement, arguing that its Mandate had expired with the winding up of the League of Nations and that South Africa's sovereignty over the Territory was unrestricted. So began a long legal and political tussle between, on the one hand, the people of Namibia, supported by the international community in general and the United Nations in particular, and, on the other hand, racist South Africa. For more than two decades, South Africa treated Namibia virtually as its province. It was ruled from Pretoria and the Territory's white inhabitants elected six members of Parliament, all of them belonging to the ruling National Party, to represent them in the so-called South African Parliament.

246. The United Nations responsibility for Namibia was transferred first to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Independence of Colonial Countries and Peoples and then to the United Nations Council for Namibia.

247. Until 1958, Batista, the dictator, was still in power in Cuba, and the national liberation struggle in Angola started only in 1961. What were the reasons for the continued colonization of Namibia until then? The only reason then advanced was simply that South Africa had unrestricted sovereignty over Namibia.

248. In 1966, South Africa's occupation of Namibia was declared illegal, but it refused to co-operate with the United Nations. In 1973, a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia was appointed, and South Africa continued to withhold its co-operation. Angola was not yet independent; it was still struggling for its independence.

249. In the 1960s, most African countries attained their independence. Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Zimbabwe were locked in a bitter struggle to wrest their people from the yoke of colonialism.

250. South Africa has always viewed the attainment and consolidation of independence by African countries as a threat to its *apartheid* policies and to itself. In the 1960s, it was actively engaged in the tragic events that took place in the Belgian Congo—today Zaire. As a staunch supporter of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, South Africa strenuously opposed the attainment of independence by Zambia and Malawi. When the liberation struggle got under way in the early to mid-1960s in Mozambique and Southern Rhodesia—today Zimbabwe—South Africa sent its troops to those countries to fight with the Portuguese and white settlers. When the colonialists were defeated in Mozambique in 1974, the South African authorities incited white settlers to try to prevent the Mozambique Liberation Front, FRELIMO,⁷ from taking over power. And when their agents failed to do

the same in Angola in 1975, they sent their armed forces and European mercenaries to invade that country.

251. South Africa might have continued to ignore United Nations resolutions and to consolidate its hold on Namibia had it not been for the collapse of the Portuguese empire in 1974 and the decolonization process in the world in general and in Africa in particular. This transformed the whole political balance in the region. Zimbabwe's independence in 1980 was the final phase in this process. The forces of nationalism, checked for a time around the Zambeze River, had moved south to the Limpopo River. All of this, coupled with the struggle waged by SWAPO, made South Africa realize that it could not continue to ignore the United Nations and that it would have to do something.

252. A multifaceted plan was envisaged and put into place with the assistance of some Western countries. Its scope was to encompass the territory of South Africa itself and neighbouring countries, as well as Namibia and the international community. The plan called for the creation of a puppet political force in Namibia, the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, not only to counter and defeat—or at least to weaken and neutralize—SWAPO as a political force but also to sap its military strength. It was envisaged that, given time and South Africa's support, the Alliance would be able to effect some political, social and racial changes perceptible enough to enable it to win over the electorate.

253. For this purpose, the so-called National Assembly, the Council of Ministers and the territorial forces were set up. The South West African Territory Force was set up in 1980. Later, the so-called Council of Ministers extended compulsory national service, which until then had applied only to whites, to all races living south of the northern border territories. Conscription was an important military manoeuvre intended to prevent SWAPO from taking over power in Namibia. It was intended to "Namibianize" the conflict and to turn the colonial war into a civil war.

254. At the same time, South Africa was striving to appear amenable to an internationally acceptable solution to the Namibian independence question. The Pretoria régime was prepared to design a scheme whereby it could appear to be co-operating with the international community, at the same time stalling the negotiations for as long as necessary to build the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance into a credible election force against SWAPO. So Pretoria kept talking, and it talked endlessly, but, as time has amply proved, it was not prepared to follow up its endless words and countless negotiations with actions and deeds. It is in the light of these manoeuvres that South Africa's delaying tactics, United Nations impartiality, the status of this or that party, and so on, should be viewed.

255. By 1980, all substantive issues on the Namibian independence question had been resolved, but a settlement could not be achieved, for racist South Africa, supported by the so-called contact group, was not willing. This support prevented the international community from rising above such pettiness and made it possible to affect the future of the Namibian nation and to prolong the war and the attendant acute agony and suffering of the Namibian people. This was not important to the racist South Africans and the so-called contact group. What was important was time to build the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance to counter SWAPO or to turn it into such a formidable force that it could win such widespread support among the electorate that it could unilaterally declare independence if everything else failed.

256. If SWAPO's overwhelming popular support was not as evident to the South Africans and their supporters

abroad, that ceased to be the case from 1980 onwards, with the victory of the Zimbabwe African National Union [ZANU] in Zimbabwe. The Pretoria régime is fully aware that support for SWAPO in Namibia is unquestionable.

Mr. Illueca (Panama) resumed the Chair.

257. For a time, it was thought that SWAPO's support derived mainly, if not solely, from the Ovambo-speaking people. But the South Africans are finding to their chagrin that SWAPO has forged very close ties with and enjoys widespread acceptance among all the people in Namibia, including the Nama and Damara ethnic groups. Even the Hereros, considered by racist South Africans to be the traditional enemies of the Ovambo-speaking people, harbour no special aversion to SWAPO.

258. The Pretoria régime has time and again amply demonstrated in words and in deeds that there will be no self-determination and independence for Namibia unless that régime is assured that there will be no victory for SWAPO. The racist South Africans are willing to hand over power to a party that will form a government that is responsible and favourably disposed to them, a friendly government, a government that will not establish diplomatic relations with socialist countries.

259. In his final speech of the election campaign in 1981, Pieter W. Botha is quoted as having said at a rally of the National Party that "As long as there is a National Party Government, we won't hand over South West Africa to the authority of SWAPO". This is reminiscent of Smith's "not in 1,000 years", later to be modified to "not in my lifetime".

260. When South Africa agreed in 1978 to the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it thought that the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance it had created and backed with its considerable resources and skills would score significant successes and defeat or neutralize SWAPO, thus ensuring for South Africa a friendly government in Windhoek. The Democratic Turnhalle Alliance was unable to live up to South Africa's expectations. In fact, the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance is no more. The so-called National Assembly was dissolved and direct rule by South Africa was re-imposed. The so-called State Council—a successor to the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance designed to draw up a constitution for Namibia and work out a system of government—was stillborn. Even the majority of the South African puppets were opposed to the idea. With the collapse of the so-called State Council, there has already been talk of a so-called all-party conference. It is beyond doubt that South Africa wants to retain Namibia for the foreseeable future.

261. Today more than ever before there is little chance that SWAPO could be defeated at the polls. It would smash any opponent in an internationally supervised election. The landslide would be even bigger than that of ZANU, some estimates placing it at well above 80 per cent.

262. The West has vast economic and financial interests in Namibia and South Africa. More than \$20 billion has already been invested in South Africa alone. A variety of precious stones and strategic minerals is to be found there. The United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany are the major purchasers of Namibian uranium, with the United Kingdom getting 50 per cent of its uranium from Namibia. The countries of the so-called contact group are heavily involved in the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, with three of them partly dependent on Namibian uranium for their own energy supplies.

263. It should be recalled that these activities are illegal under international law, for the United Nations ended South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in 1966. Therefore, one can understand the reasons why the West seeks

to guarantee unimpeded access to these mineral resources by guaranteeing the survival of minority rule in South Africa, by bolstering South Africa's war machinery and by installing a puppet régime in Namibia.

264. The five member States of the Western contact group are seeking a solution that would allay their fears about a take-over by SWAPO. They have been working on a plan providing guarantees for the entrenchment of their privileges and economic holdings in Namibia; hence their insistence on the so-called constitutional principles for Namibia.

265. It would appear that the West, too, is not prepared for a settlement, even in the context of a Westminster-type political system, as long as SWAPO is assured of a resounding and overwhelming victory. That is democracy at work.

266. The Namibia plan has an international dimension as well. Another element that was supposed to contribute to the defeat of SWAPO was the establishment of a string of fortresses along the Kunene River on the border between Namibia and Angola. This, incidentally, has made Namibia into a big buffer zone protecting the white bastion in South Africa. It also clearly shows that racist South Africa has no intention of granting genuine independence to Namibia, for if that had been its intention the military build-up would have been carried out along South Africa's border with Namibia along the Orange River. Just as Israel has done in southern Lebanon, the Pretoria minority régime, emboldened by the West's support, has extended its buffer zone 250 kilometres inside Angolan territory. The plan calls for drastically increased military pressure against SWAPO in Namibia and for aggression against Angola.

267. A settlement of the Namibian independence issue with a SWAPO victory could conceivably have unforeseeable, devastating consequences in racist South Africa. It could bring uncertainty to some, fear to others. It could throw the National Party and the *apartheid* policies it represents into disarray. It could increase the restlessness and boldness of the majority of the South African population in their quest for equality, freedom, justice and social and economic progress. The main disadvantage of such a settlement is obvious to the racists. That is why they have embarked upon a policy of creating, maintaining and increasing tensions in southern Africa. Hence the policy of direct and indirect acts of aggression and attacks against and occupation of the territories of neighbouring countries.

268. The West, in defence of its interests in the region, is seeing to it that the racist South African military forces are given a free hand and the go-ahead to escalate their military operations in Namibia, Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and Mozambique. The West is increasing its provision of various kinds of direct assistance in the form of military technology and hardware to the South African forces of aggression. The West is greatly strengthening South African military forces so that they can do the job for some Western countries. The unprecedented exchange of visits between South Africans and high-ranking Western military, intelligence and police officials attests to this ever-growing collaboration. All of this is to supplement the build-up of Western power on the African continent, which is designed to reverse the political and military defeats of the past two decades and annihilate the national liberation movement.

269. One can understand why South Africa, an aggressor against Angola, not only can escape moral punishment in the Security Council but can go scot-free and even be rewarded with a veto in its favour.

270. We should view in the same way the frantic attempts which were made at one time to repeal the Clark amendment that forbids overt or covert United States aid to Angolan traitors in the pay of South Africa.

271. One can understand why South Africa is not only allowed to go unpunished for its illegal occupation of Namibia but is even being assisted in sabotaging the Namibian independence plan the West itself drew up. This explains the reasons why racist South Africa can afford to ignore world public opinion while its *apartheid* policy is being condemned in no uncertain terms.

272. In view of this protective shield provided by some Western countries, and in view of the past record of the South African Government regarding the Namibian issue, it is difficult to believe that they are now sincere. On the contrary, they may be trying to use the lull to revamp their machinery for manufacturing legitimate and illegitimate obstacles as well as obstacles with the appearance of legitimacy. The ingenuity in this sense knows no limit.

273. Therefore the struggle for the liberation of Namibia and South Africa should continue unabated. That is why we in Mozambique say: the struggle continues.

274. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): In speaking to the General Assembly today on the question of Namibia, my delegation has no intention of going back over past history, the long and tumultuous history which has linked the Organization, since its establishment, with the Namibian question. That history is well known to all.

275. Nor does my delegation intend to plead once more the cause of the Namibian people and its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Its cause has been heard and its rights acknowledged.

276. Nor does my delegation intend today to conduct a trial of South Africa, legitimate though that would be. The abject and anachronistic *apartheid* régime has been unanimously condemned. Its policy, based on oppression, repression and aggression, has been unanimously repudiated. Its delaying methods, based on subterfuges and on a succession of new pretexts, each one as false as the next, are understood by everyone and have been unmasked once and for all; the designs and aims directed to perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia, its domination of the Namibian people and its exploitation of Namibia's natural resources have been irrevocably unmasked.

277. Our purpose today is to express once again quite simply our surprise and astonishment, first, that a matter on which all are agreed and which, if we can go by the statements made in this Hall, has the support of the international community as a whole has not yet been finally resolved, and secondly, that an independent Namibia has not yet seen the light of day and come here to occupy its rightful seat, although the United Nations, which has in fact been empowered to lead Namibia to independence, is this year holding its thirty-eighth General Assembly session.

278. Our surprise and astonishment do not derive from South Africa's reluctance to agree to Namibian independence, since we have long since analysed and identified this reluctance as being a deliberate and inevitable refusal, inherent in the very nature of the Pretoria régime. Our surprise derives from the idea that there has been some success in distorting the debate on the question of Namibia. The device used was in fact to introduce some confusion into the debate in order to put on one side the substantive question, which is nothing less than the question of decolonization and of the right of a people to self-determination, while diverting the discussion to subsidiary questions artificially grafted on to the debate that were

thought likely to lead to controversy. By this means, it was doubtless hoped to introduce some cracks in the unanimity which had in fact been achieved on the substantive question. That is indeed an impossible ambition. But the device must still be regarded as Machiavellian. We must note that since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council, and especially since the wretched pre-implementation meeting, held at Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, the debate no longer deals exclusively with the United Nations settlement plan, but also, and above all, with extraneous questions, questions which are not before the United Nations at all and which in principle it is not called on to discuss.

279. We do not intend to dwell on such questions today. They have nothing to do with the struggle of the Namibian people for their dignity and independence. We have said as much in earlier statements, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. The summit conferences of OAU and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as the sessions of the General Assembly, have explicitly rejected them. The Security Council also rejected them in its resolution 539 (1983).

280. The essential point today is to determine what ways and means the United Nations intends to use to induce South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the settlement of the Namibian question.

281. In other words, the question is one of determining whether the implementation of the principle of self-determination for the Namibian people and the proclamation of Namibia's independence must await the good will of the South African authorities, or whether the right course is to place South Africa in a situation where it can no longer raise objections.

282. How can we do this?

283. The method of "moral" suasion, which some members of the Western contact group tell us they are using against the Pretoria régime, have produced a result which we can all see: the same arrogance and the same defiant attitude on the part of that same régime, reflected in a deliberate refusal to co-operate based on completely fallacious pretexts which the international community has already rejected.

284. There remains, first and foremost, the heroic and unremitting struggle of the brotherly Namibian people under the direction of their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO. We believe that its victory is not open to doubt, because it is part of an irreversible historical perspective.

285. All that remains to be done is to give practical form to the realities of international solidarity and to invoke the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the mandatory sanctions which alone can deprive South Africa of the means on which it relies to continue its arrogance and defiance.

286. Those who are opposed to this must provide convincing proof that mere moral pressure on South Africa can induce that régime to co-operate honestly in the plan for settling the Namibian question. Otherwise they can only cast the most serious doubts on the sincerity of their intentions, as well as on their statements in support of the emancipation and freedom of peoples. Freedom, we will never cease to emphasize, is indivisible and can never be selective.

287. In its resolution 539 (1983) of 28 October 1983, the Security Council decided that if South Africa persisted in obstructing implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), it would consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter.

288. By this display of firm determination, the Security Council has complied with its responsibilities. It will be judged by its decisions.

289. We may also wonder, in the light of the general consensus on the question of Namibia and of the fact that the modalities for implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) have for all practical purposes been drawn up, whether the United Nations is not entitled right now by itself to set a deadline for all the talks now under way and at the same time to decide on a date when the Namibian people will decide on their fate, a date for the independence of that country to be officially proclaimed once and for all.

290. We must see to it that the question of Namibia is finally withdrawn from the General Assembly agenda and that at the same time representatives of an independent Namibia take their seats here among us.

291. The endurance and tenacity shown by the Namibians and their admirable commitment to the principles of freedom, justice and law are guarantees of the positive contribution that they will be called upon to make to strengthen the principles of the Charter and to defend the purposes and principles of the United Nations. For at this stage their victory would be no more than the victory of the principles guiding our action within the Organization. The fate accorded to the question of Namibia by the United Nations will without any doubt have a significant bearing on the Organization's own future.

292. Mr. MOUMIN (Comoros): The task and the responsibility of satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Namibia to their inalienable right to self-determination and independence lie squarely on the shoulders of the United Nations.

293. Four decades of discussions and sweet-talk have gone by and yet the long-awaited independence of Namibia is still out of reach. Today, the international community can justifiably demand a speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and immediate independence for the people of Namibia.

294. Without entering into a historical analysis of the issue before us, I wish only to recall that ever since 1946 the question of Namibia has been on the agenda of the Assembly and since then all the major organs of the United Nations have, at one time or another, been seized of the question. Countless resolutions, the effective implementation of which is a test of the effectiveness of the Organization, have been adopted but are yet to be implemented by the racist régime of South Africa.

295. In 1966, the General Assembly in its wisdom terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of South West Africa [see resolution 2145 (XXI)] and the following year handed over the administration of the Territory until independence to the United Nations Council for South West Africa [see resolution 2248 (S-V)], subsequently renamed the United Nations Council for Namibia. The International Court of Justice, moreover, considered the question on several occasions and on 21 June 1971 an important advisory opinion was delivered by the Court,¹⁰ whereby it ruled the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia to be both unlawful and illegal.

296. When, in 1978, after extensive deliberations in which SWAPO and the front-line States did everything possible to accommodate the racist South African Government, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), hopes ran high as people saw in that resolution the prospect of immediate independence for the suffering people of Namibia. There was a widely-shared sense of optimism that at long last the day for Namibia's independence was fast approaching. But unfortunately, in spite of the best efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General and the flexibility and statesmanship of SWAPO,

the sole and legitimate representative of the struggling people of Namibia, and the accommodating attitude shown by the front-line States, it has not yet been possible to implement the United Nations plan as embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The reasons for the non-implementation are no secret to anyone; clearly they are the intransigence and prevarication of the South African Government and the total lack of political will and determination of some members of the Western contact group.

297. My Government and my delegation consider the persistent attempts by racist South Africa to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan by insisting on linking the independence of Namibia to the extraneous and irrelevant issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola to be totally unacceptable. Such attempts not only unjustifiably retard the decolonization process of Namibia but also clearly constitute gross and inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

298. The question of Namibia is a problem of the inalienable and undeniable right of a people to exercise their right to self-determination and independence and as such it is a question that concerns us all. Whereas, on the other hand, the problem of Cuban forces in Angola is a matter that falls directly and entirely within the jurisdiction and the sovereign right of an independent State Member of the United Nations. To insist on linking these two unrelated issues is, I submit, both irrational and irresponsible and it is for these reasons that my delegation is gratified to note that the international community rejects such linkage.

299. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, rejected linkage, and numerous subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, particularly the United Nations Council for Namibia, and above all the General Assembly itself at its eighth emergency special session, have rejected this odious linkage.

300. The Security Council, after its deliberations on the question last month, adopted resolution 539 (1983) in which it condemned South Africa for its refusal to comply with the Council's resolutions and expressed indignation, in particular, at the racist Government's insistence on the irrelevant and extraneous issue of linkage.

301. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June 1983, adopted a special resolution on Namibia [see A/38/312, annex, resolution AHG/Res.105 (XIX)] in which it categorically rejected linkage, which it regarded as a serious obstacle to the efforts undertaken to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

302. Let not this Assembly convey to the valiant people of Namibia, at this late hour in their struggle, the impression that the international community has lost hope of finding a solution to a problem very dear to them, the independence of their motherland.

303. Let us not lose hope; let us not lose sight of the situation in southern Africa, nor make light of it. Let us force the pace. Surely, the time has come for us to secure the independence of Namibia by every possible means. If South Africa and its friends continue to turn a deaf ear to the voice of wisdom and reason, the United Nations should invoke its moral and legal right and indeed its obligation to the people of Namibia to pressure South Africa and compel it to heed the will of the international community.

304. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Seventeen years have now passed since the General Assembly terminated South

Africa's Mandate over Namibia, since it declared the presence of South Africa in that Territory illegal, and assumed direct responsibility for the United Nations over the Territory of Namibia. Twelve years have passed since the International Court of Justice confirmed the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia. Five years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) providing for a peaceful transition to majority rule in Namibia through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. Over the years, the question of independence for Namibia has been one of the most important issues within the various United Nations forums and for the international community as a whole.

305. The adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was a major achievement. It embodies the outline of a comprehensive plan for Namibia's independence, a plan which has been accepted by the parties most directly concerned and also by the international community. This plan is still valid and constitutes the only framework for an internationally acceptable solution to Namibia's problems.

306. It was precisely the uniqueness and the significance of resolution 435 (1978) which was underscored during the Security Council discussions on Namibia held in October of this year. The reaffirmation of Council resolution 435 (1978) and the need for urgent implementation of that resolution was the essence of the Council's debate and of resolution 539 (1983), which it adopted on 28 October 1983. Prior to that debate, the Secretary-General consulted the parties concerned on the remaining problems in connection with implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We learned from the Secretary-General's report¹ that solutions had been found to virtually all outstanding questions. Only one problem seemed to remain with regard to resolution 435 (1978), and that was to decide upon the electoral system for the Constituent Assembly in Namibia.

307. I should like to add my voice to those who have urged the Government of South Africa to make publicly known now the choice of that Government for the electoral system for the Constituent Assembly. This would thus remove what now seems to be the only remaining problem in relation to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

308. The Secretary-General's report to the Security Council also highlighted the fact that an issue outside the scope of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had surfaced and caused considerable problems. I refer to the question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which has been made a prerequisite for implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Although my delegation recognizes that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola may give rise to questions of importance to the countries in the region of southern Africa, the right of the Namibian people to independence and self-determination must in no way be made dependent upon extraneous issues.

309. In our view, there is no realistic alternative to continued negotiations. My delegation would deeply regret it if the substantial progress which has been made on the various questions in connection with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) were jeopardized. We must continue to exploit all avenues for a peaceful settlement. This includes, whenever necessary, a dialogue with the Government of South Africa.

310. At the end of the Security Council's debate on Namibia in October, the Council adopted resolution 539 (1983). My Government supports this resolution and my delegation regrets that the Government of South Africa

did not respond positively to it. We appreciated the co-operation of the Group of African States, in particular the front-line States, and their spirit of compromise which made it possible for the Council to adopt such a resolution on Namibia at that time.

311. This spirit of consultation and compromise is in rather sharp contrast to this year's draft resolutions on the situation in Namibia submitted to the General Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/38/24]. My delegation will make clear its views on these draft resolutions when we take decisions on them at a later stage. Let it suffice for the present to say that we are disappointed and somewhat frustrated as the draft resolutions, both in content and in language, represent a further step away from what we consider to be generally acceptable. It is our opinion that such resolutions serve to undermine or weaken rather than strengthen the international unity which has hitherto been the most important tool of the United Nations in putting pressure on South Africa. Having carefully studied the draft resolutions, we cannot but be left with the impression that the United Nations Council for Namibia seems less and less interested in enlisting the support and co-operation of a number of countries which have persistently backed the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. This is a situation which in the view of my delegation is unfortunate; it is unfortunate both for the people of Namibia and its representatives, for the United Nations Council for Namibia itself and for those countries that want to demonstrate political and other support for the cause of the Namibian people both here in the United Nations and elsewhere.

312. The Secretary-General states in his report to the Security Council¹ that a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem is also the key to a peaceful and co-operative future for all countries in the southern African region. My Government could not agree more. The situation in that region is becoming increasingly dangerous. South Africa's attempt to destabilize the internal situation in many of the neighbouring countries is totally unacceptable. In the present circumstances, the bitterness and the frustrations of the black peoples in the region can only increase, making peaceful solutions more difficult to attain and yet more desperately needed.

313. The Norwegian Government remains committed to promoting peace and progress in the tormented region of southern Africa. This commitment is tangibly translated into extensive development co-operation with several of the front-line States. In our view, it is important to strengthen the economy of the majority-rule independent States of southern Africa and thus lessen their economic and technical dependence on South Africa. We have also recognized the need for humanitarian assistance to the many refugees in the region. The Norwegian Government is contributing financially to a number of United Nations projects and is also supporting, in close co-operation with SWAPO, several bilateral programmes designed to meet the needs of those refugees. At the United Nations pledging conference for Southern Africa for 1983, Norway was a major contributor to the United Nations Institute for Namibia and to the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. Our commitment to these activities remains firm.

314. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia): Over the years, much has been said about the failure of the United Nations to achieve the purposes and ensure respect for the principles of its own Charter. Nowhere is this more glaring than in the case of Namibia's independence.

315. The very first Article of the Charter of the United Nations, enumerating the purposes and principles of the United Nations, states that the Organization should take

“effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and 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.”

Because of its glaring failure to take “effective collective measures” in order to achieve its fundamental purposes, the United Nations—the sole legal authority over Namibia—has been unable either to exercise its authority in the Territory or to discharge its responsibility to the Namibian people. As a result, Namibia is today where it was in 1945 at the time of the signing and ratification of the Charter—that is, under South Africa’s colonial occupation. The purposes and principles of the Charter, too, as far as Namibia is concerned, are no nearer attainment than they were in 1945.

316. It is to be deeply regretted that, of all the international problems facing it, the United Nations should fail in such a clear-cut case as that of Namibia and against such a singularly lawless régime as that of Pretoria, a racist régime that has not only disregarded but indeed openly violated each and every purpose and principle of the Charter. It is also to be regretted that the very failure of the United Nations to take “effective collective measures” as prescribed in the Charter has further emboldened that régime to persevere in its lawless and immoral policies.

317. While one of the important purposes of the United Nations is the development of friendly relations among nations, based on the principle of equal rights and the right to self-determination of peoples, the South African régime has, on the contrary, based its domestic and foreign policies on the denial of those rights to the peoples of both South Africa and Namibia. Moreover, whereas the paramount purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security, the South African régime, through its policy of aggression and subversion against all its neighbours, has again positioned itself as a serious obstacle to the achievement of that purpose.

318. Further, Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter lays down as another purpose of the United Nations the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. But we all know that the hallmark of the South African régime is its policy of racial segregation and discrimination. Moreover, Pretoria’s respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, particularly of the Namibian people, is too well-known to need any elaboration on my part.

319. Paragraphs 2 and 5 of Article 2 of the Charter enjoin all Member States not only to fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them, but also to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter. How does Pretoria’s conduct measure up to these provisions? The answer is, of course, obvious. From the very beginning Pretoria has challenged the authority of the United Nations over Namibia. Neither the resolutions of the General Assembly nor the decisions of the Security Council have ever been accepted and implemented by South Africa. Indeed, South Africa has openly and with total impunity flouted all the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations. It is to be noted that despite the termination of its Mandate by the General Assembly Pretoria still occupies Namibia illegally. Despite the adoption of the United Nations plan over five years ago, Pretoria still blocks its implementation by raising all kinds of objections and extraneous issues. This is obviously in clear contravention

of Article 25 of the Charter, which obliges all Member States to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.

320. Furthermore, according to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, all Members of the United Nations should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. South Africa’s escalating acts of aggression against Angola and against its other neighbours, its occupation of parts of southern Angola and its subversion of the political independence and sovereignty of its neighbours are all clear violations of the provisions of the Article just cited. Moreover, these actions are of the same type as those referred to in Chapter VII of the Charter as calling for effective enforcement measures—measures which the Security Council has been prevented from taking by the friends and allies of South Africa.

321. It must be affirmed that the friends and allies of South Africa have themselves failed to fulfil in good faith their obligations under the Charter. By extending to Pretoria political and diplomatic support as well as economic and military collaboration, these States have in effect frustrated efforts to translate into reality the purposes and principles of the United Nations. By exercising their veto to shield Pretoria from enforcement measures, the Western permanent members of the Security Council are not only abusing their power but also encouraging the erosion of the authority and credibility of both the Charter and the Organization. Although action in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 of the Charter should have been taken against South Africa long ago, the friends and allies of Pretoria have also blocked any action by the Security Council, and, as a result, South Africa remains a Member of the United Nations, its persistent violation of the Charter notwithstanding.

322. In his report on the work of the Organization to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session,² the Secretary-General rightly pointed out:

“The Security Council, the primary organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, all too often finds itself unable to take decisive action to resolve international conflicts and its resolutions are increasingly defied or ignored by those that feel themselves strong enough to do so.”

He went on to say:

“Sterner measures for world peace were envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter, which was conceived as a key element of the United Nations system of collective security, but the prospect of realizing such measures is now deemed almost impossible in our divided international community. We are perilously near to a new international anarchy.”

323. I submit that the grave situation in southern Africa is a vivid example of that creeping anarchy. As a result of the failure of the Security Council to strengthen the arms embargo and to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, a course of action which would have facilitated a peaceful solution of the Namibian question, the colonized people of Namibia are left with no choice other than the intensification of the armed struggle. More bloodshed, more grief and more destruction will surely be the inevitable consequences of the armed struggle. However, we should recall that neither the immensity of the sacrifice to be made nor the overwhelming military superiority of a colonizer have at any time in history intimidated a people struggling for their independence, let alone compelled them to abandon their legitimate cause. It would be foolhardy to expect the gallant people of Namibia to be an exception in this regard.

324. We should also note that any intensification of the armed struggle will, in turn, increase not only internal repression within Namibia but also acts of aggression and subversion against the front-line States. Inasmuch as the front-line States, in particular, and peace- and freedom-loving forces elsewhere, in general, could not be expected to observe with folded arms Pretoria's lawlessness, the spiral of violence with the attendant loss of life and destruction of property is bound to plunge the sub-region of southern Africa—and indeed the entire African continent—into turmoil.

325. Given South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability, it is not difficult to depict a consequent grim and painful scenario. We in Africa shudder at this thought, and it is this unthinkable scenario that compels us to be bitter and indignant at the continuing nuclear collaboration of certain Western States with the racist régime of Pretoria, a fact which is succinctly reflected in a working paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:

“The development of South Africa's nuclear potential has been considerably enhanced and accelerated by the collaboration extended to the *apartheid* régime at various levels by certain Western countries through assistance in uranium extraction and processing, the supply of nuclear equipment, transfers of technology, the provision of training and exchanges of scientists.”²⁰

326. As is indicated in the same document—much to our utter indignation—that collaboration still continues. We are convinced that nuclear weapons in and of themselves are a threat to the survival of humanity, the false assertions of the ideologues of deterrence notwithstanding. It is therefore not difficult for us to visualize the gravity of that threat when a rabidly racist and totally lawless and irresponsible régime such as the one in Pretoria is in possession of such weapons.

327. Ethiopia sincerely hopes that those Western States which continue to collaborate with Pretoria in the nuclear field will soon realize the far-reaching and very grave consequences of their collaboration.

328. If we are to learn any lesson from history it is that no colonized people will give up their inalienable right to live in freedom and independence and instead submit to subjugation and colonization. That the Namibian people will never submit to the illegal occupation of their motherland by the racist régime should therefore be a historic truism. Indeed, the people of Namibia will struggle, and through that struggle they will win their independence.

329. Our task in this regard is to lessen the human sacrifice that has to be made before that inevitable objective is attained. That is why we in Ethiopia advocate consistently and persistently the need for the imposition of economic sanctions. There is no doubt in our minds that only such an enforcement measure will facilitate a more peaceful and a speedier settlement of the problem. To all those who profess to advocate a peaceful settlement of the problem, we reaffirm that, short of the escalation of the armed struggle, only a comprehensive programme of mandatory economic sanctions will bring the racists to their senses.

330. I wish to conclude by expressing Ethiopia's fervent hope that—sooner rather than later—the friends and allies of South Africa will find it possible to join us in the worthy cause of the freedom of the Namibian people in a united, independent and sovereign motherland.

331. Mr. ADAMCHIK (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The General

Assembly is again considering the question of Namibia, 17 years after it revoked South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia and demanded an end to the occupation of that country. This problem has repeatedly been discussed at various international forums. This year alone, the question of Namibia was considered at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March, at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April, and at the nineteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June. It was also discussed at specific meetings of the Security Council.

332. It is no accident that the international community has drawn attention to this question, because, among the problems of decolonization, the gaining of genuine independence for Namibia, being occupied illegally by the racist régime of South Africa, is now at the top of the list. The overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, including the Byelorussian SSR, favours a rapid exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence on the basis of maintaining the unity and territorial integrity of their country, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We further advocate the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of the forces and administration of South Africa. We also favour the transfer of full power to the people of Namibia through SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and by OAU as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

333. The opinion of the overwhelming majority of Member States is expressed in numerous decisions of the United Nations. However, 23 years after the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] and 17 years after the termination of South Africa's Mandate to administer Namibia [*see resolution 2145 (XXI)*], the Namibian people remain under the yoke of the South African racists.

334. The question is rightly asked: why is this happening? The answer is clear to the whole international community. The guilty ones are the Pretoria régime and its imperialist protectors. The facts confirm that there is now in South Africa an ominous alliance between the South African racists, the imperialist States and the transnational corporations.

335. The position of the United Nations on Namibia is well known. Decisions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies clearly indicate that Namibia is a Territory illegally occupied by South Africa. The presence of a South African Administration and thousands of South African troops in Namibia is contrary to the standards of international law and the norms of the Charter of the United Nations, because South Africa's occupation of Namibia constitutes aggression against the people of that Territory. The policy of racism, terror and aggression pursued by the South African régime is a serious threat to the free and independent development of African countries and to international peace and security. This policy represents an integral part of the crusade of American imperialism to suppress progressive, democratic forces and national liberation movements and further to exacerbate international tension, the threat of war and the arms race.

336. The racist South African régime continues to use the Territory of Namibia to carry out systematic acts of aggression against neighbouring sovereign States. Armed

to the teeth, the South African aggressors, who include many mercenaries from a number of Western countries, invaded the territory of Angola to a significant extent to destabilize the internal political situation in that sovereign African State. That was also an attempt to frighten the Angolan people and to force it to refuse solidarity with the struggling people of Namibia.

337. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Angola told the Security Council in May this year that the criminal acts of aggression carried out by the racist Pretoria régime since 1975 had caused the deaths of more than 10,000 Angolan citizens and property damage in Angola amounting to \$10 billion.²¹

338. The whole world knows that the United States and the other participants in the so-called Western contact group are primarily concerned with maintaining their political, strategic and economic interests in southern Africa, and so they use all possible means to support the racist Pretoria régime. At the United Nations, they protect South Africa by opposing the imposition against it of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. They violate the Security Council's arms embargo against South Africa, and the transnational corporations of those countries shamelessly plunder the natural wealth of Namibia and profit from the sweat and tears of the Namibian people. According to a working paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,³ there are in Namibia 90 transnational corporations, the majority of which belong to the United States, the United Kingdom and South Africa. South African and Western transnational corporations dominate the key sector of the Namibian economy, the mining industry, which yields almost two thirds of all Namibia's exports and about half of the State income. According to the most conservative figures, the net income of foreign monopolies constitutes 45 per cent of the gross national product (GNP) of Namibia, while 36 per cent of the GNP is exported in the form of profits, dividends and taxes. The native inhabitants of Namibia, who make up more than 90 per cent of the population, receive less than 10 per cent of the GNP.

339. Especially ominous is the nuclear co-operation of Western countries and Israel with South Africa. As the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24] emphasizes, the development of South Africa's nuclear potential has been considerably enhanced and accelerated by collaboration extended to the *apartheid* régime by such countries as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland. This collaboration has taken various forms, including assistance in the extraction and processing of Namibian uranium, the supply of nuclear equipment, transfers of technology and so on.

340. The direct interest of the imperialist circles of the Western Powers—precisely those Powers which make up the Western contact group—in the further exploitation of natural and human resources of Namibia, and the military, political and strategic interests of the member countries of NATO, are the main obstacles to the achievement of self-determination and independence by the Namibian people. This is the explanation for the manoeuvres of the Western group of five in this matter of a political settlement in Namibia. Those manoeuvres are aimed at imposing on Namibia a neo-colonialist future. It is precisely to achieve those purposes that the so-called linkage of a settlement in Namibia with the question of the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola was dreamed

up. Those forces are there at the request of the Angolan Government and by agreement between Angola and Cuba. The insistent attempts by the United States and the racist régime of South Africa to establish such a linkage are not only dragging out the process of decolonizing Namibia but are also an unjustified and crude interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola. This was clearly and unambiguously stated at the nineteenth ordinary session of the Heads of State and Government of OAU, by the participants in the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.

341. The same stand was taken by the overwhelming majority of delegations in the general political debate at the current session of the General Assembly and in the discussions in the Security Council last month. Their statements rightly emphasized that the United States had made the Namibian people a hostage to its own imperialist ambitions on the African continent, and condemned and rejected the attempts of South Africa and the United States to link the independence of Namibia with any other unrelated questions—in particular, the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. In this connection, the representative of SWAPO told the Security Council on 20 October this year:

“It is quite obvious to us that if the unholy alliance of Washington and Pretoria is going to be allowed to get away with this despicable chicanery, Namibia's hopes for independence will once again have been dashed for many more years to come.”²²

342. The Byelorussian SSR decisively condemns the continued occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and confirms its full support for SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR advocates the immediate granting of independence to Namibia, on the basis of implementation of all the United Nations decisions on this question, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Byelorussian SSR supports the demands of the African countries that the Security Council impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We vigorously reject the attempts to link the problem of Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, or to any other matter. We regard such attempts as being based on a desire to maintain colonialism in southern Africa.

343. The Byelorussian SSR advocates the strengthening of the United Nations role in a Namibian settlement, by ensuring effective control by the Security Council—yes, by the Security Council, not by any other group of States—over all aspects of Namibia's achievement of genuine independence.

344. In conclusion, my delegation notes the great and useful work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia in defending the interests of the Namibian people. We express our gratitude to the representative of Zambia, Mr. Lusaka, for his skilful guidance of the work of the Council.

345. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR will support the draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report because the measures proposed therein are geared to the rapid achievement of freedom and independence by the people of Namibia.

346. Mr. Bassy CAMARA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The independence of Namibia has again

been delayed by the Pretoria racist régime. But this time there is a difference: the *apartheid* authorities are con-ning, in a sort of mutual manipulation, with certain members of the Western contact group.

347. In 1966, the Mandate over Namibia originally given to South Africa by the League of Nations was terminated. But South Africa has continued its illegal occupation of Namibia, in defiance of the United Nations.

348. Having wrested some concessions from all the parties concerned, including the United Nations, and faithful to its strategy of using diversionary tactics to gain time, the racist régime continues—unfortunately with the compliance of its partners—to ask for further concessions. After demanding so-called impartiality on the part of the United Nations, South Africa demanded the participation of what it called the “internal parties”. Then it raised difficulties with regard to the composition of UNTAG and the electoral system. Realizing that an agreement was possible and achievable on all those questions, the racist authorities, to gain more time, went beyond the context of the decolonization of Namibia and raised new difficulties having absolutely nothing to do with resolution 435 (1978).

349. South Africa is being encouraged to continue its defiance of the authority of the United Nations by the very ones who have made themselves into a contact group; and the paradox here is that, on the one hand, they claim to be impartial intermediaries and, on the other, they continue to finance the militarization of the *apartheid* régime for its colonization of Namibia.

350. We know that in 1974 the draft resolution calling for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations because of its repeated violations of the Charter was stopped in its tracks by the triple veto cast by some members of the Security Council—all of them members of the contact group on Namibia. Also, in 1975 they blocked the draft resolution calling for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa. In 1976, these very same members, among others, prevented the adoption of the draft resolution on comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. That is the reason for the obstinate refusal of the Pretoria authorities to co-operate with the United Nations in order to decolonize Namibia. The constant obstruction by these very members of the Security Council of the imposition against South Africa of the sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter enables the racist régime to consolidate, with impunity, its stubborn defiance of the international community.

351. It remains quite clear that the process of the decolonization of Namibia has nothing to do with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. In that regard, we should remind those who act as though they are unaware of it that Cuban troops arrived in Angola not to counter an imaginary threat, but to stop the invasion of Angola by the South African racist soldiery, which was already threatening Luanda, the capital. We know that this adventure of the South African racists was indeed carried out jointly with certain members of the contact group. The very ones who in the past did not hesitate to support the last yoke of Portuguese colonization against the will of the peoples in the Portuguese colonies of Africa to be free are today allied with the *apartheid* régime against the African peoples' will for independence, peace and co-operation.

352. So long as the Western Governments, in particular those that are members of the contact group, continue to view African problems out of context, they will not be able to understand, and still less to judge objectively, any possible contribution by them to the solution of these problems. In other words, viewing African problems only

in the context of propaganda and East-West rivalry will merely complicate the search for solutions to these problems—which, by the way, do not have as many ramifications as people would have us believe most of the time in the West.

353. It goes without saying that those who today continue to support the illegal racist occupation of Namibia by South Africa, against the freedom of the Namibian people, can hardly expect the free people of the future Namibia to show any understanding for them. The same is true of the oppressed African people of South Africa.

354. That is why we call on the Western Governments that are members of the contact group to take the doctor's advice that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. That will be possible only if there is an objective and realistic readjustment of their present foreign policy, which is racist in content and discriminatory in practice and is essentially geared to supporting the institutionalized system of racism in South Africa.

355. We hope that independent Namibia will soon take its rightful place here in the concert of nations.

356. Mr. OYOUE (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, 17 years after the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2145 (XXI), by which South Africa's Mandate over the Territory was terminated, is today a major challenge to the Organization and to the entire international community.

357. The survival of so typical a colonial situation as that in Namibia 23 years after the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV), in which it recognized that all peoples have the inalienable right to freedom and sovereignty, is a flagrant violation of the principles and ideals of the Organization and an attack on international morality.

358. Colonialism in a continent which has freed itself almost entirely from this odious phenomenon constitutes today an unfortunate political aberration, because it threatens peace, security and stability in the region.

359. Despite the efforts that have been exerted by the United Nations Council for Namibia to persuade South Africa to recognize United Nations authority over the international Territory of Namibia, the Government of Pretoria has refused to withdraw from that Territory, thereby making impossible a process leading to self-determination for the people of that Territory.

360. Despite the adoption by both the Security Council and the General Assembly of a succession of resolutions relating to the independence of Namibia, South Africa, encouraged by the endless arguments adduced by some Powers which still believe that the colonial régime will continue to exist, continues to adopt and step up illegal military and administrative measures designed to strengthen its presence in Namibia.

361. While noting with satisfaction the praiseworthy efforts of the Secretary-General to promote a speedy and final settlement of this situation, my delegation still has some doubts regarding the genuine desire of Pretoria to leave Namibia.

362. In truth, the feeling is growing, because of the delaying tactics of South Africa and its allies, that the negotiations which are taking place are becoming more bogged down day by day and year by year. The Government of South Africa is creating, on the flimsiest pretexts, all sorts of obstacles to protect its own interests and, above all, to prevent the negotiations from being successful, thus indicating its refusal to withdraw from Namibian territory. The interference of some Powers and their attempts to establish solutions in keeping with their own

strategic interests are further complicating the process towards independence for Namibia.

363. In order to gain time, Pretoria imposes unacceptable and legally unjustifiable pre-conditions. One such, which is in fact a challenge to the international community, is the attempt to make the independence of Namibia contingent upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

364. The position of the delegation of Gabon concerning this concept is unequivocal. We categorically reject any link between Namibian independence and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Those troops are there because of bilateral agreements concluded in full sovereignty. They cannot constitute a threat to South Africa or to any neighbouring State of Angola. They are there simply to help Angola defend its territory within its own borders. They have not, to the knowledge of my delegation, carried out any military, political or other action concerning neighbour States of Angola or South Africa. Rather, it is Pretoria, on flimsy pretexts which could not deceive even the most naïve, that is sending its troops beyond its borders to sow death and terror in neighbouring countries and even to occupy a part of Angolan territory. Let us state quite clearly that South Africa, by its policy of *apartheid*, is the best advertisement for the ideas it is opposing in Angola.

365. The independence of Namibia is not something to be taken lightly and cannot be subordinated to any kind of subterfuge. When the Member States of the Organization adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) unanimously, it was not just a gratuitous, hypocritical gesture. On the contrary, the Member States wished to give the Namibian people the assurance of speedy liberation in accordance with the spirit of the Charter, one of the fundamental purposes of which is to put an end to colonialism in all its forms as a source of inequality and conflict among peoples.

366. We support SWAPO and the brother people of Namibia, who are struggling to achieve their freedom. We believe that the solution of the problem of Namibia must be based upon strict implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) concerning the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. That plan has laid down the modalities for a peaceful settlement of that problem and, in particular, calls for the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia, the liberation of all political prisoners, the abolition of all unilateral measures adopted by the illegal régime of Pretoria relating to the electoral process, and the organization of free elections under United Nations supervision.

367. The United Nations plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was adopted and accepted by all Member States, including the five members of the contact group, remains the only valid basis for a just settlement of the Namibian problem.

368. This is why my delegation believes that some members of the Security Council and of the contact group,

instead of introducing into our debate considerations which are not related to the decolonization process, which falls purely within the purview of the United Nations, should take a more resolute stand concerning the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

369. The United Nations and all peoples that cherish peace and justice must refuse to accept the South African occupation of Namibia as a *fait accompli*. The Security Council, whose role it is to maintain peace and security, should oppose the racist, colonialist, terrorist and aggressive policy of South Africa and compel that country to end it by bringing to bear strong, joint measures, including comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, since the situation created in southern Africa by South Africa's *apartheid* policy constitutes a clear breach of international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15943.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1*.

³ A/AC.109/744.

⁴ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

⁵ Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde.

⁶ Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.

⁷ Frente de Libertação de Moçambique.

⁸ See *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.

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, 2440th meeting*.

¹⁰ *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.

¹¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, 2482nd meeting*.

¹² A/AC.131/91.

¹³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16106.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year*, 2439th meeting.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1983*, document S/15776.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978*, document S/12636.

¹⁷ See A/AC.131/114, para. 101.

¹⁸ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, 2451st meeting*.

¹⁹ A/AC.109/743, 744 and 748.

²⁰ A/AC.109/743, para. 50.

²¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, 2441st meeting*.

²² *Ibid.*, 2481st meeting.