



*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. SILWAL (Nepal): Seventeen years have elapsed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [see resolution 2145 (XXI)] and 12 years since the historical advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore a matter of great concern that South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia in disregard of the wishes of the international community expressed in various resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. My delegation reiterates its full support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and 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 [resolution 1514 (XV)], the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex] and other relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

2. By the terms of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) and 2248 (S-V), Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations. This unique responsibility is exercised through the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the sole legal Administering Authority for Namibia.

3. My delegation shares the deep concern of the international community at the rapid depletion of the natural resources of Namibia in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>2</sup> enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. This exploitation constitutes another obstacle to the immediate independence of Namibia and endangers its eventual economic independence.

4. The people of Namibia have been waging a heroic struggle for national independence under the leadership of their sole representative, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO]. This struggle is being waged in the face of massive and ruthless repressions by South Africa. The extension of the abhorrent system of *apartheid* to Namibia and the gross and systematic violations

by the racist régime of the human rights of the Namibian people have been rightly condemned by the Organization. Similarly, the United Nations has declared illegal and null and void attempts by South Africa to destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia.

5. In its blatant efforts to defy the will of the international community, South Africa has persisted with the policy of massive military build-up in Namibia. South Africa has resorted to compulsory military service for Namibians and recruitment and training of Namibians for tribal armies. Nepal strongly condemns the persistent acts of aggression launched from Namibian territory against neighbouring African States, and especially against Angola. Nepal supports the efforts of the southern African States to safeguard their national independence and territorial integrity and joins the demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola.

6. The international community has given full and firm support to Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) as the only basis for a peaceful solution of the Namibian question. It might be recalled that pursuant to the call made 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], and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June 1983 [see A/38/312, annex, resolution AHG/Res. 105 (XIX)], the Security Council met twice this year to consider further action to expedite the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. In paragraph 24 of his report submitted to the Security Council pursuant to resolution 532 (1983),<sup>3</sup> the Secretary-General observed that "we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)". He further stated, in paragraph 25:

"However, the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) . . . makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan."

7. Some three years ago, at the Geneva pre-implementation meeting, South Africa sabotaged the implementation of the United Nations plan by linking Namibia's independence to its charge of United Nations lack of impartiality in overseeing the implementation of the plan. Of late, South Africa has resorted to the tactics of linking the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence to an issue which is extraneous to the issues in the United Nations plan.

8. Many world leaders spoke before the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly about the imperative need to restore the prestige and authority of the United Nations. They warned that if the lawlessness and immorality of States such as South Africa are allowed to paralyse

the collective search for justice, equality and freedom there will be ominous consequences. The gross injustice inflicted on the Namibian people and the naked aggression perpetrated on the region by racist South Africa have deep implications for the peace and security not only of southern Africa but of the whole African continent and beyond.

9. My delegation therefore urges the Security Council to set a timeframe for South Africa to announce its readiness to implement the United Nations plan. Should South Africa once again fail to make its pronouncement within the timeframe set by the Security Council, then, in the light of the threat posed to international peace and security by South Africa, its continued repression of the Namibian people, its failure to comply with the scores of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council and its repeated refusal to implement Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) for the early independence of Namibia, the Security Council should respond positively to the demand of the international community by taking appropriate action as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

10. Mr. MARÍN BOSCH (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Namibia is a constant reminder of how difficult it is to achieve implementation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations when there exists a country which has both military power and the overt and covert support it needs to impose its will and interests upon others. It is also an indication of the determination of the vast majority of the international community to secure the implementation of the fundamental and unchanging principles upon which contemporary international society has been built.

11. It is paradoxical that in this instance, when the international community has taken such a unanimous position with regard to the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, such prolonged and tenacious efforts should still be required to overcome the obstacles that have been raised.

12. In 1978, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which is the only internationally recognized basis for attaining the decolonization of Namibia. My delegation has on many occasions stated that it is against any measure that would modify, qualify or impose conditions on the contents of United Nations decisions with regard to the Territory and that, indeed, it is in favour of the immediate implementation of those decisions.

13. The Secretary-General has informed the Security Council that we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978), but that South Africa has put forward still another prerequisite for the launching of the United Nations plan—namely, the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

14. This new condition by Pretoria goes hand in hand with acts of destabilization, interference, aggression and occupation, making it necessary for the States that are the victims of South Africa's policies to have recourse to all possible means to ensure their self-defence. What we are witnessing here is an escalation of the violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of other States in an attempt to delay the end of the illegal occupation and exploitation of a Territory. New conditions and approaches are put forward and demanded, with the aim, in the final analysis, of maintaining a disequilibrium in which one State dominates an entire region, described as "strategic".

15. Namibia is the victim of oppression and plunder, in violation of United Nations resolutions. But the international community's reaction has not been proportional

to these flagrant violations. The Security Council has not been able to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime, which is supported in powerful countries and completely disregards the embargoes unilaterally imposed by the majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

16. The prolongation of the illegal occupation of Namibia is one of the many characteristics of a régime which is based on racial domination and whose alleged legitimacy derives from colonial occupation and exploitation. Throughout the past 10 years it had seemed that South Africa would remain isolated, the last bastion of times gone by. But that has not occurred. From all appearances, South Africa is today a laboratory for policies and relations between States that will be applied in the future. We must therefore face this new dimension of the problem.

17. Mexico has had the honour of taking part in the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory. The analysis of the situation that it has put before us and the approaches to action that it advocates are the only means available at present for effective action by the Organization. I confirm my delegation's commitment to and co-operation with the United Nations bodies dealing with this issue.

18. The independence of Namibia is important for almost all the countries of the Organization. To delay implementation would mean continued violation of the most fundamental principles of international coexistence. If the processes set in motion by the United Nations should fail, new mechanisms of domination will emerge and they will subsequently be used in other regions of the third world.

19. Mr. NAWAZ (Pakistan): Throughout this year, the question of Namibia's independence has remained a principal concern of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular. The consideration of this question last May by the Security Council led to the adoption of resolution 532 (1983), in pursuance of which the Secretary-General paid a visit to the area, including South Africa and Namibia. The report of the Secretary-General became the subject of yet another series of Council meetings in October, during which the progress on the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence was thoroughly reviewed.

20. Since the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), a major responsibility of the United Nations has been to settle detailed procedures for its implementation. Despite the unco-operative attitude of South Africa, progress in this direction has been substantial. In paragraph 24 of his report to the Security Council,<sup>3</sup> the Secretary-General states: "In fact, we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)". As far as modalities are concerned, the two outstanding issues—namely, the choice of electoral system and certain aspects of UNTAG and its composition—are nearly settled. Accordingly, the United Nations appears to be ready to put into operation its plan for Namibia's independence.

21. In the same report to the Security Council, the Secretary-General also clearly identified the political obstacles in the path of Namibia's independence. He stated 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.

22. It was understandable, therefore, that the Council meetings on the Namibia question held in October were devoted mainly to the consideration of the question of South Africa's demand for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The General Assembly, as well as the non-aligned nations, have taken a clear stand on this extraneous issue, rejecting any linkage between it and Namibia's independence. The Secretary-General maintained the same position when he carried out negotiations with the South African authorities. The Security Council has now upheld this position, in its resolution 539 (1983), in which South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues is rejected as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

23. The most recent Security Council resolution on Namibia leaves no room for doubt that Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally agreed basis for the independence of Namibia and that it cannot be altered or modified by any extraneous factors or considerations outside the resolution itself.

24. The Security Council's authoritative judgement has, however, failed to change South Africa's intransigence, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information of that country, in a statement made on 29 October 1983,<sup>4</sup> once again stated defiantly that no settlement can be implemented unless a firm agreement is reached on Cuban withdrawal from Angola.

25. It is evident that South Africa's insistence on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a pretext to frustrate and delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Angola represents no threat to South Africa's security. The reality is just the reverse: it is South Africa, emboldened by the vast military machine it has been able to build, which poses a constant threat to its neighbours, the front-line States. It has attacked these States on several occasions, with impunity, the latest example being its wanton strike against Mozambique last month. It has arrogated to itself the right to undertake such aggressive actions at will, whenever and wherever it pleases. The argument that South Africa's insistence on linkage arises from its security concerns is belied by its own behaviour.

26. South Africa is seeking delay in the implementation of Namibia's independence on one pretext or another, with a view to strengthening its illegal hold on Namibia and bringing about a situation in that Territory which would make it permanently susceptible to its manipulations. It has now sought to increase the militarization of Namibia through the creation of tribal armies and the use of mercenaries, which have transformed the Territory into a virtual garrison with one soldier for every 10 Namibians. This excessive militarization of the Territory serves South Africa's objective to intimidate and suppress the Namibian people, as well as to help it launch aggressive raids from Namibian territory against neighbouring, independent African States which support the struggle of the Namibian and South African peoples against colonialism and *apartheid*.

27. The question may be asked whether South Africa's formidable military prowess alone accounts for its defiant and intransigent attitude. This is not so. South Africa has been able to act with impunity and in contemptuous disregard of the United Nations because it continues to enjoy political and material support from certain Western countries and has been shielded more than once against effective action by the Security Council. Those States and, especially, the transnational corporations based in those

States have important economic interests in South Africa. This explains why those States have been less than firm in opposing South Africa's lawless conduct. Their tolerance of South Africa's unacceptable policies and behaviour is depriving the people of Namibia of their cherished freedom and the region of its stability and peace. This situation must now change. The United Nations, particularly the five Western countries which once formed the Western contact group and drew up the plan for Namibia's independence, owe a moral responsibility to the people of Namibia to terminate their hundred-year-old colonial subjugation.

28. South Africa should be presented with a clear choice: either to abandon its colonialist stranglehold over Namibia or to face the consequences of sanctions against it under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, which in the present circumstances appears to be the only viable and effective course to be adopted by the Security Council in order to ensure the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978).

29. As a member of the Security Council and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Pakistan has been making every effort to expedite Namibia's accession to independence. The people of Pakistan have great admiration for the valiant people of Namibia, who with great perseverance and fortitude have been waging a courageous freedom struggle under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO. The world believes in the justness of their cause and is fully committed to its early realization.

30. Mr. AL-BOAININ (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Approximately 17 years have elapsed since the United Nations declared illegal the racist Pretoria régime's occupation of Namibia. Furthermore, approximately five years have elapsed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which was accepted by the South African Government and SWAPO as a basis for agreement on the independence of Namibia.

31. Despite the passing of those years and the fact that the Pretoria Government declared its acceptance of the United Nations plan,<sup>5</sup> not one practical step has been taken to implement that plan. On the contrary, those years have undoubtedly proved that the South African Government has no intention whatsoever of ending its occupation of Namibia.

32. For all these years, South Africa has been procrastinating and hampering the implementation of the United Nations plan in order to gain time to tighten its grip on the people of Namibia, on the one hand, and, on the other, to continue its plundering of Namibia's national resources, of which that people has been deprived while the Territory has been thrown wide open to transnational corporations.

33. Although South Africa has spared no effort during all that period to entrench its occupation and to continue its oppression of the Namibian people and repression of its real leaders, those leaders are actively attempting to regain that freedom and to liberate their land. More importantly, they are fighting to regain their humanity, which has been destroyed by the hateful racist régime. The South African Government has continued to insist on its idea of linking the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola.

34. The Pretoria régime, which has been creating false pretexts concerning the size of UNTAG, spreading lies about the control of SWAPO forces in Angola or Zambia, questioning the objectivity of the United Nations itself or insisting on adopting constitutional principles which are in contradiction of the United Nations plan,

would not have been able to do so unless the United States had made the proposal to establish a link between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Furthermore, the presence or withdrawal of those forces concerns Angola alone, since the presence or withdrawal of those forces comes within its sovereign rights, particularly since South Africa is the party that is occupying Namibia and continues to occupy parts of Angola itself.

35. It is clear that South Africa, by insisting on the principle of linkage, is only aiming at entrenching its control over Namibia. It intends to place the front-line States under its heel and to make those independent States, by means of terrorism, intimidation and open military aggression, regions where South Africa can violate their sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity any time it wishes, under the pretext of pursuing members of SWAPO or the leaders of the South African opposition to the racist régime, leaders who take refuge in those countries from the repression of the Pretoria régime.

36. An example of this is the South African military campaigns against the offices of the African National Congress of South Africa at Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, and the seige which has been imposed on Lesotho. There is no doubt that the military invasion of Angola, which took place more than two years ago, is still fresh in the memory of the international community.

37. The delegation of Qatar, stressing the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, to independence and to the regaining of the freedom of which it has been deprived, urges the Security Council to undertake its historic responsibility in response to the will of the international community, which is calling for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. Furthermore, we support the call, stressed in many resolutions of the United Nations and in the recommendations of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April of this year, to the States concerned, and particularly those States members of the Western contact group, to reject any attempt to link the question of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

38. While calling for sanctions against South Africa, we must spare no effort to implement previous important Security Council resolutions, including resolution 418 (1977) on the prohibition of arms sales to South Africa, and we must work to ensure that all States respect this resolution.

39. There is no doubt that South Africa, as in the past, will make no effort to implement United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council adopted the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. I say that it will not do this unless it has clear material proof that those States which have thus far chosen to support it politically, in defiance of the will of the international community, have finally decided to support that will, which seeks right and justice.

40. In conclusion, I must renew the support of Qatar for the Namibian people in its struggle to regain its inalienable rights, including its right to self-determination. We support the struggle of this people to liberate its land under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative.

41. Mr. VALLE (Brazil): In last year's debate on this item, the delegation of Brazil stated that, although fully aware of the difficulties still to be surmounted, we hoped to welcome Namibia as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations at the present session of the General Assembly.<sup>6</sup> Once more, as so often in the past, our hopes

have been frustrated by the refusal of South Africa to agree to set a date for a cease-fire that would inaugurate the interim period, leading to the holding of free and fair elections in Namibia under the supervision of the United Nations.

42. After five years of delaying tactics by the Government of the Republic of South Africa, the Security Council held a series of meetings in May of this year. Foreign Ministers of many African countries participated in the proceedings, and the Council concluded its deliberations by adopting resolution 532 (1983), in paragraph 4 of which the Secretary-General was mandated "to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire, with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978)". In the exercise of this mandate, the Secretary-General went to South Africa, Namibia and Angola in August and subsequently presented the Security Council with an extensive report<sup>3</sup> on the results of his consultations with South African officials and with the President of SWAPO. I would like at this stage to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for the clarity, thoroughness and objectivity of his report and to congratulate him for having so entirely justified the confidence placed in him by the Security Council.

43. As pointed out in the report, the intensive consultations carried out by the Secretary-General succeeded in resolving most of the outstanding issues relating to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, once the difficulties with regard to the military component of UNTAG and its status were settled, the only factor, as far as resolution 435 (1978) is concerned, that is still holding up an agreement on a date for a cease-fire is South Africa's failure to announce its choice of electoral system. SWAPO, for its part, reiterated its position that it was willing to accept either proportional representation or the single-member constituency system.

44. The Secretary-General, in paragraph 24 of his report, states quite conclusively: "In fact, we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978)."<sup>3</sup> But on the other hand, he also makes it clear that an agreement on all the aspects involved in the United Nations plan is still not enough for South Africa to agree to the establishment of a timeframe for implementation. He points out in paragraph 25:

"... the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan."<sup>3</sup>

45. Confronted with Pretoria's insistence upon connecting Namibia's independence to unrelated issues, the Security Council, after having considered the Secretary-General's report, adopted resolution 539 (1983) last month, with 14 votes in favour and 1 abstention. This resolution, *inter alia*, rejected the notion of linkage as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978); it called upon South Africa to communicate to the Secretary-General its choice of an electoral system; and it decided to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa.

46. Brazil considers it inadmissible at this late stage for the Government of South Africa to attempt to impede the implementation of the United Nations plan by making it conditional upon the settlement of an extraneous and unrelated issue which belongs to the sphere of competence of two sovereign States. Only last year the representative of Brazil stated:

“ . . . whatever one’s opinions may be on the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, the solution of the matter cannot be turned into a pre-condition of granting independence to Namibia in compliance with resolution 435 (1978).”

47. But this is not the first and may not be the last time we face Pretoria’s delaying tactics. After having devised unacceptable excuses for its presence in Namibia until 1980, South Africa, at the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva, in January 1981, alleged that the time was not yet ripe for setting a date for a cease-fire because, it argued, the people of Namibia were still to be convinced of the United Nations ability to act impartially in supervising free and fair elections in the territory. After having received the necessary assurances on this matter from the Secretary-General, the Government of South Africa attached new conditions to its agreement to implement the United Nations plan. And while Pretoria keeps on resorting to dilatory manoeuvres, it proceeds with the imposition upon the people of Namibia of its own internal settlement, in open defiance of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

48. We must not be discouraged in our efforts to bring Namibia to independence and sovereignty, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. In spite of the obstructionist policies of the *apartheid* régime, we are confident that those efforts, together with those of the struggling people of Namibia themselves, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, will soon be rewarded with the emergence to freedom of a united Namibia, dedicated to the peaceful task of national reconstruction.

49. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The situation in southern Africa and around Namibia has given rise to a feeling of deep concern and worry among the African countries and, indeed, the majority of States in this world. The liberation of Namibia from the colonial oppression of the racist régime of South Africa has now come to the forefront in the struggle to eliminate colonialism from the face of the earth. Speaking from this rostrum, many representatives of African countries and the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, Mr. Peter Mueshahange [*2nd meeting*], have spoken very convincingly of the determination of the peoples of Africa to lead the struggle for the freedom of Namibia to complete victory.

50. More than 17 years ago, the General Assembly adopted a decision ending South Africa’s Mandate over Namibia. The United Nations called on South Africa to free Namibia unconditionally and itself assumed direct responsibility for that country. The 17 years that have elapsed since the General Assembly took that decision have been a glorious epic in the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of its vanguard and sole, genuine representative, SWAPO, for freedom and independence.

51. At the same time, these years have seen growing international support for the just cause of the Namibian people and they have been years during which, within and outside the United Nations, there has been growing indignation at the aggressive racist policy of the Pretoria régime and the protection provided to that régime by its allies.

52. Throughout these years, South Africa, relying on the direct assistance of the United States of America and some other countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—but primarily the United States of America—has disregarded the numerous decisions of the

United Nations on the granting of independence to Namibia. Issuing a challenge to the majority of the States of the world, South Africa has continued its harsh oppression of the people of Namibia and has constantly carried out acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African States.

53. Recently, the racist régime of Pretoria, with support from the United States of America, has been carrying on a sweeping undeclared war against Angola from the territory of Namibia, has occupied part of Angola’s territory and has been expanding its military actions against Mozambique and other African countries. The Angolan and Mozambican peoples have been demonstrating their courage in defending the independence of their countries. The sympathy and support of all freedom-loving peoples go to them.

54. During the long period of sabotage of United Nations decisions on the liberation of Namibia, there has been a clear distribution of roles among the opponents of independence for that country. Pretoria has cynically been refusing to implement United Nations decisions and has been unleashing military action against its neighbours; meanwhile, its allies, the United States of America and some other Western Powers, have been protecting South Africa and shielding it from effective international sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, and have been trying to win time to continue their joint colonial exploitation of Namibia and of its human and natural resources. Here, the United States of America and other Western Powers have been claiming that they are trying to convince Pretoria to grant independence to Namibia in a peaceful way. They claim that the whole problem is that SWAPO and neighbouring African countries should make concessions to the South African régime. And what they are talking about are concessions that would in the final analysis mean a neo-colonialist solution to the problems of Namibia and of southern Africa as a whole.

55. Five years have passed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) on a settlement for the question of Namibia and approved the proposal for bringing the country to independence.<sup>8</sup> During these five years, we have heard constantly from the Western Powers endless optimistic statements that the goal is within sight now and that the Africans must just show a little more patience and make a few more concessions to the racist régime of Pretoria and to Washington. And yet, if at the beginning there were some naïve people who believed those statements by the Western Powers, it has now become clear to everyone that all those promises and all that false optimism were no more than a smokescreen—or, in fact, simply deceit—covering up the aspiration to maintain the colonial régime in Namibia and to postpone for decades the liberation of that country.

56. The policy of constructive engagement, as they call it—or, to be more accurate, the United States deal with the South African racist régime—is directed against the peoples of Namibia and other independent African countries; and it is not only continuing but is also being developed still further.

57. If in the recent past the Western Powers were playing the role of mediators, Washington has now thrown off that mask and is threatening to use the problem of Namibia to attain its own hegemonistic goals in Africa, primarily by demanding a linkage between a settlement in Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, who are there, as we all know, at the request of the Angolan Government and under an agreement between Angola and Cuba. The purpose of this imperialist connivance is quite clear—to block the granting of independence

to Namibia, to weaken the People's Republic of Angola under the conditions of military aggression from South Africa and to limit Angola's sovereign right to self-defence guaranteed it under Article 51 of the Charter.

58. The General Assembly, the non-aligned countries, the OAU, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, which met in Paris in April of this year, and recently the Security Council have all firmly rejected any attempt to link directly or indirectly within the context of a so-called parallelism the independence of Namibia with any other completely extraneous issues, particularly the presence of the Cuban internationalists in Angola.

59. Security Council resolution 539 (1983), adopted on 28 October this year, states that the Council

*“Rejects South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978), other decisions of the Security Council and the resolutions of the General Assembly on Namibia, including General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)”.*

It is characteristic that the United States of America should have refused to support this resolution in the Security Council, which condemned this “linkage”, and that the representative of South Africa, having confirmed Pretoria's previous position, should have rejected any decision establishing a timeframe for implementing a Namibian settlement. Such positions taken by Washington and Pretoria are nothing other than “constructive engagement” in action.

60. Here it would be appropriate to recall that the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March this year at New Delhi, condemned the policy of so-called “constructive engagement” pursued by Washington. The Conference emphasized, *inter alia*, that

*“The public proclamation of the racist Pretoria régime as friend and ally has encouraged it in its intensified repression of the South African people, its escalating aggression against its neighbours and its determined intransigence over Namibian independence” [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 57].*

61. Also noteworthy is the fact that the current United States Administration, which has used various kinds of sanctions by its favourite method of diplomacy and has threatened right and left to impose sanctions against countries large and small, including some in Africa that have recently been liberated from colonialism, should, along with other Western Powers, with great determination now oppose coercive measures and sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria, blocking implementation of United Nations decisions on granting independence to Namibia and pursuing a policy of destabilizing neighbouring African countries. Pretoria and Washington are trying to cover up this invidious policy by making a lot of propagandistic noise to the effect that the conflict in southern Africa, and in particular the problem of Namibia, reflect “East-West confrontation”. Advancing this false thesis has a certain goal: to give Pretoria and the United States a pretext for intervening in the internal affairs of independent African countries in the region and opposing the national liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa.

62. The representatives of African countries who have spoken here have quite rightly emphasized that the problem of Namibia is one of decolonization in which there are, on the one hand, the peoples of Namibia and other African States struggling for their freedom and

independence and, on the other hand, the united forces of imperialism, colonialism and racism.

63. The United Nations position on Namibia is well known. Decisions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies, including the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the United Nations Council for Namibia, have clearly established that Namibia is a Territory illegally occupied by South Africa. The presence of South African administrators and troops in Namibia is contrary to decisions of the United Nations, the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia is an act of aggression against the people of that Territory and constitutes a threat to international peace.

64. The path to a settlement of the problem of Namibia has also been clearly defined in United Nations decisions as a whole. Here I am referring, *inter alia*, to Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), in which a political basis for a just solution of the problem of Namibia and its achievement of independence was set forth.

65. In May this year, the Security Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), another step in the right direction. That resolution, and in particular the mandate it gave to the Secretary-General, created a certain machinery for making progress in solving the problem of Namibia. To strengthen this machinery we also have Security Council resolution 539 (1983), adopted more recently, in October, requesting the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the implementation of the resolution; in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, the Council expressed its intention to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations. These decisions by the Security Council strengthened the positive process of enhancing the role of the United Nations in the matter of the Namibian settlement by ensuring effective control by the Council over implementation of all aspects of the granting to Namibia of genuine independence.

66. However, if we look at things realistically, we cannot fail to recognize that it is only by constantly exerting pressure on South Africa and its defenders that they can be forced to heed the will of the people of Namibia and of the Security Council, as well as of the overwhelming majority of States of the world. The Soviet Union supports the demands of African countries with regard to the need to involve the Security Council and have it apply against the Pretoria régime comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. To that end, we have to overcome the opposition of those Western Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, which are preventing application of effective international sanctions against South Africa. It is important to ensure that all States respect the arms embargo imposed against South Africa by the Council and halt co-operation with South Africa in the political, economic and military fields, including the nuclear field. The Security Council must also adopt such measures as are necessary to prevent South Africa's acquisition of nuclear weapons.

67. The inalienable right of the people of Namibia to achieve freedom, independence and self-determination by using every means available to it, including armed struggle, has on many occasions been recognized by the United Nations. If the Pretoria régime and the colonialists do not set off on the path to a peaceful settlement and granting of independence to the people of Namibia, if they

continue to impose military occupation of the country, then the Namibians have no choice but to continue their heroic struggle with the support of other freedom-loving States until final victory. The Soviet Union advocates rapid exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, preserving the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, the immediate and total withdrawal from Namibia of the troops and administration of South Africa and the transfer of all power to the Namibian people through SWAPO.

68. Solidarity with a people struggling against the remnants of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* for the attainment of independence is one of the fundamental principles of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union, true to its international duty, has provided and will go on providing continuing support to the just struggle of the people of Namibia against colonial domination, a struggle that it is waging under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole genuine, legitimate representative, a struggle for freedom and independence and for an immediate and just settlement to the question of Namibia in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations.

69. Mr. IACONU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The colonialist occupation of Namibia, one of the most flagrant anachronisms of our time, has been the subject of growing concern this year on the part of the international community. At the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris last April, and at the last two series of meetings of the Security Council at which the question of Namibia was considered, there was reaffirmation of resolute support for the attainment of the legitimate rights of the Namibian people freely to determine their own future and to live in an independent, sovereign and united homeland; there was further emphasis on ensuring that decisive measures be taken by the United Nations to end South African occupation and to ensure the accession of Namibia to genuine independence. It was also firmly emphasized that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia remains the sole basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia. Support was also expressed for a continuation of the work of the Secretary-General in this connection and there was a call for implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

70. It was unanimously considered that settlement of the Namibian problem was a vital requirement, not only for the Namibian people themselves but for all the peoples of southern Africa, as well as an urgent need to avert serious tension in the area and to ensure international peace and stability.

71. The need to proceed now with forceful and radical measures to put an end to the colonialist domination of Namibia by South Africa has been emphasized time and again by the Romanian delegation. This derives from the responsibilities directly assumed by the United Nations in the most formal manner with regard to the Namibian people, 15 years ago, and also the obligations set forth in the Charter with regard to people still under colonial domination, and also in respect of situations of tension and conflict, in order to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security.

72. Despite the outstanding achievements of the United Nations in the area of decolonization, it has not yet been possible to liberate Namibia, the last African Territory that remains in a dependent state and subjected to colonial occupation. The situation is all the more serious in that Namibia is the only Territory with international

status under the direct responsibility of the United Nations and one whose independence the United Nations has undertaken to ensure.

73. It seems to us evident that the United Nations must endeavour to eliminate the causes of such a situation. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24], introduced by the President of the Council, Mr. Paul Lusaka, deals with the occupation of Namibia and the dangerous actions of the South African régime, which brutally obstructs the rights of the Namibian people to freedom and independence and to the norms of international conduct and still refuses to recognize the right of the Namibian people freely to determine its own future in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Pretoria authorities, adopting an obstructionist approach, have once again this year, as they have throughout the long process of negotiations initiated by the Secretary-General to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978), continued to set up new obstacles to the implementation of that resolution; they have blocked the ceasefire and the organization of free elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations. South Africa imposed conditions during the negotiations which link the process of decolonization of Namibia to other matters, as is emphasized in the report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council,<sup>3</sup> thus making implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia impossible. At the same time, the South African régime has taken measures to consolidate its dominion over Namibia. Such measures include the establishment of a so-called State Council, designed to set conditions for an internal neo-colonialist-type solution in Namibia, which is in flagrant contradiction of the provisions of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions that reject any unilateral measure affecting the future of Namibia.

74. Such actions once again confirm that Pretoria is using the negotiations as a smoke-screen to gain time so as to ensure by other means its domination over this Territory which is so rich in natural resources. Attempts to perpetuate the colonialist order in Namibia and diversionary tactics by South Africa have resulted and still result in vehement protests on the part of the Namibian people and of international public opinion as a whole.

75. The expansionist policy followed by the South African racists is reflected not only in their occupation of Namibia but also in their continuing acts of aggression against independent African States which have set out on the path to free and independent development. South Africa is waging an undeclared war against Angola and is taking military action against Mozambique and other African States. Such actions constitute serious violations of international peace and security. Such acts of aggression, taken together with the so-called participation in the negotiating process for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), once again reveal the hypocrisy of the South African régime. This arrogant stance, which has been condemned by the entire international community, would not be possible if, as has been emphasized throughout this debate, the racist régime did not enjoy the support of certain Western Powers, particularly in the economic and military fields.

76. Recent developments in southern Africa, however, show quite clearly that the only way to solve the Namibian question is to recognize and ensure the implementation of the inalienable right of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to independence and to ensure that the United Nations shoulders its responsibility to the Territory and to the people of Namibia.

77. Romania's position on the elimination of the last remnant of colonialism and the implementation of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, and its support for United Nations efforts to end South African occupation of Namibia and ensure the accession of Namibia to independence, have been described on many occasions in the General Assembly, the Security Council and in other international forums.

78. Romania, which long suffered under foreign domination and which gained its independence only after a long and difficult struggle, has lent and will continue to lend multifaceted assistance to the national liberation struggle. We have always supported and continue to support all peoples who are struggling to eliminate colonialist and neo-colonialist domination, to put an end to all forms and practices of imperialist domination, and to affirm their own independent development.

79. President Nicolae Ceausescu, who recently made official visits of friendship to the African continent, expressed his deep concern over the manifestations of imperialist, colonialist and neo-colonialist policy, a policy of domination and intervention in the internal affairs of independent and sovereign African States that are facing attempts to hinder the process of the total liberation of Africa as well as their own economic and social progress. On that occasion, Romania's militant solidarity with and support of the front-line African States and the peoples of southern Africa were strongly reaffirmed, as was the need to ensure Namibia's immediate accession to independence and the right of the Namibian people themselves to choose the path of their own future development in accordance with their legitimate aspirations and interests. At the same time, emphasis was put on the need for the international community to exert all its efforts to ensure the adoption of effective measures, with the participation of the United Nations, to ensure Namibia's swift accession to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

80. The visits of the Romanian Head of State to the African continent were made at a time when an attempt was being made to perpetuate and to strengthen colonialist domination over Namibia, at a time when the Pretoria régime was attempting to destabilize young independent African States and when the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination was becoming increasingly virulent. Those visits represented a strong reaffirmation of Romania's full solidarity with the struggle against the policy of *apartheid*, with the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for freedom and national dignity and with the struggle for independence of the Namibian people, and Romania's respect for the independence, sovereignty and integrity of the front-line States and of all African States.

81. Romania has always given active support to the Namibian people who, under the leadership of SWAPO, their legitimate representative, are struggling against the illegal South African occupation of Namibia and for their right to independence and free development. Strongly condemning the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination and the obstructionist policy of South Africa with regard to Namibian independence, we have at the same time firmly called for an end to the aggressive acts of the South African racists against independent African countries.

82. The position of support and militant solidarity of socialist Romania and the Romanian people with regard to the just cause of the Namibian people in their heroic and arduous struggle to achieve without any further delay

their right to live freely in their own land, and our determination to continue granting them political, diplomatic, moral and material support in their efforts to cast off foreign domination and to realize their aspirations to independent development, progress and well-being were stated once again at the Bucharest meeting on 14 October 1983 between President Ceausescu and the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, a meeting that brought a new dimension to the solidarity and friendship between the peoples of Romania and Namibia.

83. Romania feels that, in view of the continuing occupation and domination of Namibia and of the urgent need to ensure Namibian independence, the Namibian people are entitled to use all the means of struggle available to them to liberate their country and to combine political and diplomatic means, including negotiations, with their armed struggle in order to gain their national independence and to build a united country under the leadership of their national liberation movement, SWAPO.

84. At the same time, we consider that at the current session we must increase international support for the cause of Namibian independence and promote united efforts by all States and all democratic and progressive forces to strengthen United Nations action in the discharge of its responsibilities to the Namibian people so that that people may achieve their legitimate aspirations to freedom and independence.

85. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Once again we are debating the problem of Namibia in the General Assembly. Seventeen years have elapsed since this body terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and proclaimed its people's inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and independence [see resolution 2145 (XXI)]. The situation today is unchanged. The Assembly has remained faithful to the position it took in 1966, Namibia is still occupied by South Africa, and self-determination, freedom and independence remain a dream to the suffering and struggling people of Namibia.

86. Seventeen years of efforts by the international community—or by the greatest part of the international community—to achieve freedom for Namibia have not produced any results. Other colonial territories have long since won their independence. Colonial Powers much more powerful than South Africa have long ago recognized the inevitability of change, and freedom has been achieved by the peoples they had previously controlled. The role of the United Nations in the process of decolonization marks the brightest chapter in the history of the Organization. Yet it remains unsuccessful so far in respect of Namibia.

87. What is it then that makes the case of Namibia so different from other colonial problems and so much more difficult to solve?

88. One part of the answer lies in the mentality of the racist régime in South Africa. It is the same mentality that is at the core of the shameful system of *apartheid*, maintaining that system for decades as a historical anachronism and a unique phenomenon in the international community today, turning a deaf ear both to the plight of the South African people and to the protests of the outside world. It is a mentality that prides itself on its stubborn resistance to change and cultivates the use of force and "Sharpevilles" and "Sowetos" as the only answers to the mounting opposition to it. It is the same mentality that maintains its own society in a state of racial segregation and keeps Namibia in colonial bondage, immune to appeals and protests.

89. Yet no such régime could have survived entirely on its own, and that is where the second part of the answer



lies. The racist régime has few, but powerful, supporters. The reason for their support is partly economic, for the South African régime controls rich lands and abundant cheap labour from which some Western companies happily reap profits.

90. There are political reasons too. The South African racist régime has seized the opportunity presented by the East-West confrontation and has carved its niche in it. It presents itself as an important pillar in the system of Western defence, and with the world as polarized as it is today it secures for itself a sympathetic eye and a mere slap on the wrist for deeds that cause an outcry by the rest of the international community. Had it not been for the ever-greater global rivalry and confrontation, régimes like the one in South Africa would have soon shown their true worth, in their right perspective. But the extreme expression of this sympathetic eye is the nuclear and military collaboration with the racist régime, which leads to extremely dangerous consequences. The outside support thus helps the racist régime to maintain the existing mentality and the existing policy, which, in turn, secure the continuation of the benevolence of its supporters.

91. It had seemed last year that almost all of the practical problems in respect of the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia had finally been settled, but then came a sudden insistence on linking the implementation of the plan to the presence of foreign troops in Angola. That marked the beginning of the latest stalemate in the efforts to solve the Namibian problem.

92. In an attempt to break that stalemate, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which represent the broadest and the firmest stronghold of the struggle for the independence of the people of Namibia, called on the Security Council to meet as soon as possible to discuss further action to bring about the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49].

93. The Security Council held a series of meetings in May attended by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of a number of non-aligned countries, who expressed in the Council the positions jointly taken by the non-aligned countries at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government.

94. In its resolution 532 (1983), the Council, in an attempt finally to set the plan in motion, called upon South Africa to make a firm commitment as to its readiness to comply with resolution 435 (1978). It also mandated the Secretary-General to resolve, in direct consultations with the parties to the conflict, the outstanding questions relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and to report to the Council within a prescribed timeframe.

95. The Secretary-General, acting in a dedicated manner in fulfilment of his mandate, reported that all the outstanding issues relevant to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved. The choice of the electoral system had been left to South Africa, and the sole undetermined issue was thus resolved.

96. The report of the Secretary-General<sup>3</sup> showed, however, that South Africa was continuing to insist on a linkage between the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the irrelevant and extraneous issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. It was thus continuing to obstruct the independence of Namibia, imposing a condition on it that had never even been contemplated by the Security Council when it adopted resolution 435 (1978). The African and other non-aligned countries then

considered it indispensable to call on the Security Council to meet and reject linkage once and for all as a condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

97. The Security Council justified the hopes placed in its action and, by its resolution 539 (1983), adopted at the end of the series of meetings held in October this year, in addition to condemning South Africa, rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues as incompatible with resolution 435 (1978). It also declared that the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are alien to resolution 435 (1978) and called on South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to communicate to him its choice of the electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Furthermore, by resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to report to it not later than 31 December 1983 and decided to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa.

98. Now, what was the reaction of South Africa to all these diplomatic actions undertaken by the international community?

99. The answer came first in the brazen statement of the South African representative in the Security Council.<sup>9</sup> He left no doubt about the continued opposition of South Africa to all the decisions of the United Nations. And then, at the end of October, came a letter to the Secretary-General from the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information<sup>4</sup> which confirmed that South Africa continued to insist on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for the implementation of the United Nations plan, and defiantly proclaimed that the Security Council need not wait until 31 December to learn of South Africa's reaction.

100. Bearing all that in mind, we think that it is high time to undertake a meaningful, concentrated and intense effort to break the vicious circle of intransigence of the racist régime and the support it receives.

101. The first logical action in this regard should be the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Attempts to do that have been made in the Security Council, the last time being in 1981, and have failed. Another attempt should be made, but the likelihood of its being frustrated by the supporters of the South African régime remains considerable.

102. In that event, it would be extremely helpful if every individual country that supported sanctions against South Africa imposed them on its own and stopped all contacts with the racist régime. That would still leave contacts between South Africa and its main supporters uninterrupted, but it would remove those occasional, unpublicized "deals" between South Africa and certain other countries, which those countries feel free to make in the absence of mandatory sanctions.

103. Furthermore, the United Nations should do everything in its power to persuade those countries that support South Africa in its intransigence to stop doing so. We feel that what must be done is to strengthen the programmes of activity of the United Nations Council for Namibia which are designed to increase the awareness of the societies in those countries of the plight of the Namibian people and the immorality of co-operation with the occupying régime.

104. So long as the racist régime defies the will of the international community, it is our duty to support the struggle of the Namibian people, led by its sole authentic

representative, the liberation movement, SWAPO. This struggle is the expression of the determination of the people of Namibia to achieve its freedom and independence. SWAPO, which has demonstrated full co-operation with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan, must be supported in its attempts to win freedom for Namibia when the racist régime blocks all the avenues leading to an agreed political solution. All States Members of the United Nations should extend effective material, financial, political and diplomatic assistance to SWAPO.

105. At the same time, the international community should lend support and assistance to the front-line States, which, owing to their support for the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, are exposed to attacks on their territorial integrity, on their security and on their economic structures, and suffer vast human and material losses.

106. It is the duty of all Member States also to lend their support to all other activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, so ably presided over and led by Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia. It has been the initiator of most of the actions aimed at assisting the struggle of the people of Namibia and at attaining independence for Namibia. In the present situation, when we are faced with continuing attempts by South Africa to block the attainment of Namibian freedom and independence in accordance with the United Nations plan, the activities of the Council acquire added importance. My delegation will continue, as a member of that Council, to make a full contribution to its work and will do its utmost to help the Council achieve progress in the struggle for the independence of Namibia. We support all the resolutions recommended by the Council for adoption by the General Assembly and shall vote in favour of all of them.

107. Yugoslavia will also continue to support the struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for as long as that struggle is necessary and until the people of Namibia is able to decide its own future and, as was pointed out at the 72nd meeting by Peter Muesihange, the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, "to usher in a new order based on justice, equality and co-operation". In spite of all the obstacles, we believe that that moment will come soon. The peoples of Yugoslavia consider support for that struggle an obligation emanating from our own history and our own struggle for independence, and from the ideals and principles we have evolved during our own struggle for freedom and in the period afterwards.

108. Once again, I wish to stress that it is of the utmost importance that all countries should act in accordance with the resolutions that will soon be adopted in this Assembly. Only by doing so will they contribute to bringing the suffering of the people of Namibia to an end and to achieving the independence of Namibia.

109. Mr. BWAKIRA (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): Since its invasion by South Africa during the First World War, in 1915, Namibia has never been able to enjoy freedom. It will soon be 70 years since the people of Namibia was subjugated by a régime characterized by the most heinous oppression in the history of colonization. That people is a martyr to *apartheid*, with everything that implies in humiliation, the denial of human dignity and the total negation of the fundamental rights of man.

110. Despite the sustained efforts of the United Nations, the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa is far from over. On the contrary, the Namibian issue is becoming more and more complicated. Without going into the historical details, it is necessary

to study the problem in the light of a few essential facts which demonstrate the arrogant contempt of the racist régime of Pretoria for international law and for the United Nations.

111. In December 1920, the League of Nations established a Mandate which authorized South Africa to administer Namibia. Among other duties, Pretoria was by every possible means to enhance the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the Namibian people. Far from carrying out the commitments it had entered into in that regard, South Africa annexed the Territory of Namibia, exploited its resources and its inhabitants, and extended its racist policy of *apartheid* into Namibia. In 1946, the United Nations rejected Pretoria's desire to integrate Namibia into the Union of South Africa.

112. On 27 October 1966, the General Assembly, convinced that the manner in which the racist régime of Pretoria had administered Namibia was contrary to its Mandate, to the Charter of the United Nations and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in resolution 1514 (XV), adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), revoking South Africa's Mandate over Namibia.

113. In 1967, by its resolution 2248 (S-V), the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia and entrusted it with the administration of the Territory until its independence. It gave the Council the power to enact the necessary laws and decrees for the administration of Namibia. It also decided to make the Council responsible for defending the rights and interests of the people of Namibia. The Security Council, in its resolution 264 (1969) of 20 March 1969, recognized that South Africa's Mandate had been terminated and called upon the Pretoria régime to withdraw its administration immediately from Namibia.

114. The racist régime of South Africa, which had ignored the General Assembly resolutions on this subject, refused to comply with the Security Council's call. The Council, in its resolution 276 (1970), stated that the continued presence of South African authority in Namibia was illegal and that consequently "all acts taken by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate are illegal and invalid".

115. That same year, in July, the Security Council asked the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on the legal consequences of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia. The Court, in its advisory opinion, stated:

"(1) that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory; . . .

"(2) that States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration;

"(3) that it is incumbent upon States which are not Members of the United Nations to give assistance, within the scope of subparagraph (2) above, in the action which has been taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia."<sup>1</sup>

116. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice was not heeded. The racist régime and its Western partners have increased their investments in the shameless exploitation of the mineral and marine resources of Namibia. They are plundering all the resources of Namibia before its accession to independence.

117. In the light of this situation, the United Nations Council for Namibia, on 27 September 1974, promulgated Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.<sup>2</sup> The Decree prohibits the exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia without the authorization of the Council, and stipulates that any person, entity or corporation which contravenes these provisions could be served with a demand for damages by the future Government of an independent Namibia.

118. In view of the persistent refusal of the Pretoria régime to abide by the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations on Namibia and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the Security Council, in its resolution 385 (1976), called upon South Africa to withdraw its illegal administration from the Territory and to transfer power to the people of Namibia, and declared that free elections should be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations for all of Namibia as a single political entity.

119. SWAPO and South Africa agreed to the proposal for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, based on resolution 385 (1976), submitted by the five-Power Western contact group.

120. In resolution 435 (1978), the Security Council set forth an approach acceptable for the implementation of an appropriate settlement plan for Namibia's accession to independence.

121. With total disregard for this resolution, South Africa drew up its own plan, designed to impose upon the people of Namibia an internal arrangement to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia and to maintain its wrongful claims to Walvis Bay and to the offshore islands. The racist régime persisted in its attempts to undermine SWAPO and has continued systematically to exploit the people and resources of the Territory.

122. The United Nations has spared no effort to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has constantly been obstructed by the time-wasting manoeuvres of the racist régime of Pretoria. It has held many consultations with that régime's representatives, but unfortunately without success. The contact group has not managed to exhaust South Africa's demands. That régime, in its actions, has almost destroyed United Nations efforts to solve the problem of Namibia through negotiations.

123. The United Nations, after holding talks with SWAPO, South Africa, the front-line States and the contact group, suggested to the Security Council that there should be a meeting prior to the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, the idea being to set a date for the cease-fire and the setting up of UNTAG, so that Namibia could be steered towards independence before the end of 1981.

124. The pre-implementation meeting was held at Geneva in January 1981, but it was a failure. Despite the goodwill of SWAPO, South Africa refused to contemplate a date for the implementation of the settlement plan, thus causing the talks to fail.

125. After three years of negotiations and diplomatic initiatives, which proved insufficient to obtain from the racist régime of Pretoria a firm commitment to begin implementing the United Nations plan, the General Assembly called upon the Security Council to impose

comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa [resolution 35 /227 A], so as to ensure its compliance with resolution 435 (1978).

126. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the OAU and other regional bodies echoed that appeal. Furthermore, the Security Council considered the situation in Namibia from 21 to 30 April 1981. Three permanent members of the Security Council refused to vote in favour of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. In its resolution 36/121 A of 10 December 1981, the General Assembly expressed its disapproval of this attitude.

127. Availing itself of Western military, economic, political and financial support, South Africa has stepped up its systematic exploitation of the wealth of Namibia, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, the "bantustanization" of Namibia, brutal political repression of the Namibian people, and the flagrant violation of human rights.

128. South Africa has increased the number of its acts of aggression against Angola, which have caused many losses and much destruction. It has continued its raids on all the front-line States.

129. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and its repression against the Namibians have caused a constant flow of Namibian refugees into neighbouring States, among them Angola, Botswana and Zambia. This situation has forced SWAPO, which is the only genuine representative of the people of Namibia, to continue its struggle against repression, of which its people are victims. SWAPO is waging a legitimate struggle to obtain freedom and self-determination for the people of Namibia. However, SWAPO has always been willing to co-operate in negotiations on the independence of Namibia. It has shown that its movement is based essentially on the principle of peace, while South Africa strengthens its militarization of the Territory.

130. It is precisely the contrary attitude that we find with South Africa. We are constrained to note that resolution 435 (1978), which was agreed to by the parties concerned as the basis for a settlement of the problem, is far from being implemented because one of the parties, South Africa, is avoiding it and distorts it, and, consequently, refuses to leave Namibia and, indeed, continues its illegal occupation, which is a denial of the independence of the people of Namibia and a violation of General Assembly resolutions, and an infringement of the Charter of the United Nations.

131. Once again it is the question of linkage which is the cause of the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The independence of Namibia is, according to South Africa and its protectors, linked to another question, which is completely foreign to it: the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

132. This linkage is not only an obstacle to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), but also to the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. However, the question of the independence of Namibia is a question of decolonization which falls within the competence of the United Nations.

133. The presence of Cuban troops in Angola comes within the purview of the sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola. The withdrawal of those troops falls within the sovereignty of Angola alone, and of the other party, the Republic of Cuba. It is in conformity with the Charter and with international law that a country should call upon another for assistance if its security is threatened.

134. Angola would not have called upon Cuban troops unless its security had been threatened by the raids of the

racist régime of South Africa, which is illegally occupying part of Angolan territory. Because of a policy of double standard, those who are concerned with the presence of Cuban troops, which have come to Angola at the request of the legitimate Government of the country, do not invoke, nor indeed do they condemn, ever, the illegal occupation of the territory of Angola by the forces of South Africa.

135. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the arrival of Cuban troops in Angola preceded the adoption of resolution 435 (1978); that resolution makes no mention of it. The withdrawal of Cuban troops—do we have to say it again?—is totally separate from resolution 435 (1978), and there is no linkage, no parallel which can be drawn, between independence for Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops.

136. The General Assembly includes in its agenda every year the question of Namibia. Special sessions, international conferences, talks, symposia and seminars have regularly been devoted to this subject. My country is happy that it has been able to make its modest contribution, particularly during the missions of the United Nations Council for Namibia to increase international awareness of this problem. At New Delhi, from 7 to 12 March 1983, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries once again discussed the question of Namibia very thoroughly.

137. From 25 to 29 April of this year, in Paris, there was an International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence. All countries which wish to see the question of Namibia solved politically should give their support to the Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia,<sup>10</sup> which were the result of that Conference.

*Mr. Silwal (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

138. After the Paris Conference, the Security Council met in May and adopted resolution 532 (1983) calling for the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations settlement plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978).

139. In order to break the deadlock, the Secretary-General made more contacts and took more steps in accordance with the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council. He even went to southern Africa for consultations with the parties concerned. Once again he made clear the role that the United Nations must play in the decolonization of Namibia in the context of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My delegation wishes to pay tribute to him for his courage and determination in defending the cause of Namibia.

140. It emerges from the Secretary-General's report after his visit to southern Africa that the Pretoria régime agreed to Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 532 (1983) as a basis for negotiation.

141. An agreement in principle was reached with regard to the electoral system in which the only things that remained to be defined were the type and modalities involved and the composition and status of UNTAG. But once again the Pretoria régime persists in linking the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola; worse still, it makes that a pre-condition for any settlement of the problem of Namibia.

142. The situation that prevails in southern Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

143. My delegation still firmly hopes that the Security Council, which adopted resolution 539 (1983) on 28 October last, will see that United Nations decisions are respected and will strengthen further the role of the

United Nations in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on the settlement of the question of Namibia. To that end, it is important that the measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations should be applied to end South Africa's intransigence and hasten Namibia's accession to independence.

144. Before finishing, I should like to reiterate the solidarity of my country with the people of Namibia in their struggle for their country and with the front-line States which are victims of repeated acts of aggression by the Pretoria racists.

145. Mr. JANKU (Albania): The question of Namibia is, undoubtedly, one of the problems that for many years now continue to be of the utmost concern to the United Nations.

146. As at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, convened in Paris last April, during the deliberations of this session of the General Assembly the representatives of various democratic and peace-loving countries, while debating the grave and disturbing situation prevailing in Namibia, rightly continue to condemn the racist policy of *apartheid* practised by the Fascists of South Africa.

By expressing their support for the struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, they are bringing fresh evidence of the intensification of the barbarous repression of the Pretoria régime and the efforts it is making to destroy Namibia's national unity and territorial integrity.

148. Thus, the just and final solution of the Namibian question has concerned not only the Namibian people and the African peoples in general but also all peoples throughout the world which cherish peace, freedom and justice.

149. Seventeen years have elapsed since the General Assembly put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, during which too much has been said about this problem here in the General Assembly, in the Security Council and other international forums. But, besides the demagoguery and fuss raised over this question, not a single effective step has been taken to put an end to the illegal occupation and colonial domination of Namibia by the Fascist régime of South Africa. The events that have taken place so far, especially those of the current year, are clear testimony to the efforts being made by the racists of South Africa to perpetuate their colonial domination over Namibia.

150. By arrogantly and stubbornly disregarding world public opinion and openly ignoring the decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the racists of Pretoria continue to maintain their colonial occupation of Namibia. In so doing, they deny the most elementary rights of the Namibian people, who have been fighting for years to be free, independent and sovereign. At the same time, the South African régime is making ever clearer its genuine character and role as a gendarme of American imperialism in southern Africa and a defender of the interests of neo-colonialism, imperialism and multinationals.

151. The *apartheid* policy practised against the Namibian and Azanian peoples, the crimes, acts of terror and mass extermination by Pretoria in order to repress the revolts and armed struggle of those peoples, are incontrovertible proof of the fact that the South African régime has never intended, nor does it now intend, to give up of its own will its colonial domination of Namibia. Now, more than ever before, it has become crystal clear that the racist régime of South Africa, its abominable policy of *apartheid* and its reactionary and warmongering activities

in the region in general would not have lasted for so long if they had not served the political, economic and military interests of American imperialism and world reaction. The imperialist Powers are doing their utmost to perpetuate their neo-colonial occupation of Namibia. A genuine free and independent Namibia is not to their liking.

152. The barbarous methods that the South African racists are using in order to suppress the Namibian and Azanian peoples, the acts of aggression that they launch and the massacres that they commit against the population of other neighbouring African countries are similar to those of the Israeli Zionists, who continue to deny the inalienable human and national rights of the Palestinians. Their acts of aggression, cynicism and cruelty have been instigated and encouraged by the same imperialist Powers, primarily by American imperialism. Like the Israeli Zionists, the racists of Pretoria could not have behaved so arrogantly but for the economic, political, military and diplomatic support of several imperialist Powers, in particular the United States.

153. The Albanian delegation holds the view that, in carrying out their policy of oppression against the Namibian people, the Fascists of South Africa are also being helped by the expansionist and hegemonistic policy of Soviet socialist imperialism and the intensification of its fierce rivalry with American imperialism. Their bargains and plots hatched against peoples the world over and their struggle for military bases and spheres of influence find their expression in southern Africa as well. While imperialist Powers, particularly the United States, try to justify their political, economic and military support by allegedly halting the increasing influence of the Soviet Union in that region, the Soviet socialist imperialists, for their part, are doing their utmost to present their influence as support that they are providing to the African peoples.

154. But, despite the demagogical fuss being raised over the alleged defence of the rights of the Namibian and other African peoples, the Soviet socialist imperialists are, in fact, their false friends. As in other areas of the world, in Africa, too, their real intention is to profit as much as possible from the struggles being waged by the peoples and to translate into reality their expansionist goals.

155. Despite the support provided by the imperialists and world reactionaries, in particular by their American masters, the racists of South Africa are not finding it so easy to preserve their position in Namibia. Every passing year provides testimony to the continued increase of resistance and armed struggle by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO. It is testimony to the support which the African peoples and other peoples throughout the world have been providing for that struggle.

156. With the aim of compelling the Namibian people to give up its struggle for national independence and perpetuating by all possible means their colonial domination over Namibia, the racists of South Africa and those who support them have for many years been making a great fuss over the solution of the question of Namibia by using fraudulent tactics. The United States and other imperialist Powers continue to pretend that they are working towards finding a so-called political settlement of this question through dialogue and peaceful means, a settlement that would allegedly be acceptable to everyone. But the facts have shown quite the opposite. They are interested only in a settlement acceptable to themselves and compatible with the system of *apartheid*.

157. Placing their own economic, political and strategic interests far above the expressed will of the Namibian people to be free and independent, and trying to perpetuate their neo-colonialist plunder and exploitation of

Namibia, the imperialist Powers continue to encourage Pretoria to pursue a policy that guarantees their domination over Namibia and constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

158. But in spite of all their efforts the racists of Pretoria and their imperialist masters will not be able to repress the will of the Namibian people. Regardless of the sacrifices it has to make, the Namibian people is determined to carry to the end its struggle for social and national freedom. In their long and just struggle, the African peoples, in particular the Namibian people, have had and continue to have the support and solidarity of all revolutionary, progressive and peace-loving peoples of the world. They also have the full support of the Albanian people, which has always had a high regard for their efforts and their struggle for freedom, independence, progress and social justice.

159. The Albanian people and its Government have condemned and continue strongly to condemn the *apartheid* policy of the racists of Pretoria against the Namibian people, as well as their acts of aggression and subversion against other African countries. The Albanian delegation is convinced that the Namibian people, through its determined struggle, will overcome all the attacks, plots and intrigues of the racists of South Africa, the imperialists and world reactionaries and achieve full freedom, independence and sovereignty.

160. Mr. ALI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure to participate in the general debate on the question of Namibia. Since this is the first time that I have spoken, I should like to congratulate Mr. Illueca on the skill and wisdom with which he is presiding over the deliberations of the General Assembly. At the same time, I congratulate the other members of the General Committee on their worthy efforts, which will surely contribute to the success of the Assembly's work at the present session.

161. Today, the people of Democratic Yemen celebrate their national independence day. On 30 November 1976, our people acceded to independence after 130 years of British colonialism.

162. Today, I raise my voice here to declare the continued solidarity of the people of Democratic Yemen with the people of Namibia in their struggle for self-determination and national independence, free of the illegal occupation of the racist South African régime. The struggle of the people of Namibia is also the struggle of the people of Democratic Yemen and of all other peoples for progress, freedom, independence and peace.

163. More than 20 years have passed since the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. During the historic period following that adoption, many of the peoples of the three continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America have rightfully attained national independence, thanks to their persistent struggle and to the important role played by the United Nations and the forces opposed to imperialism and colonialism and dedicated to independence, peace and progress.

164. The Namibian people began at an early stage its national struggle against the racist, colonialist régime of South Africa to secure its right to self-determination and its national independence. This people is still suffering under colonialist domination, despite a series of resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly from the 1960s to the present day.

165. The racist régime of South Africa has persistently defied the international will by its illegal occupation of Namibia ever since the United Nations ended its Mandate

over that Territory in 1966. The colonialist régime persists in its defiance and its refusal to implement Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council set out its plan for the rightful national independence of the Territory.

166. The racist Pretoria régime resorts to all sorts of delaying tactics and to misleading the international community with regard to the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions in order to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia. It insists on linking the independence of the Territory to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Furthermore, it is making serious efforts to impose an internal settlement on the Namibian people in an attempt to crush the struggle of the Namibian people and wipe out its important military and political achievements under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. It is trying to establish a false process of independence under a puppet régime through its agents in the region.

167. The *apartheid* régime would not have been able to persist in its defiance of the international will without the continuous aid provided to it by the United States of America and some other Western States in the conventional military, nuclear and economic fields. This economic, political, nuclear and military support has given the Pretoria régime the moral, economic and military force which has allowed it to continue to disregard the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the immediate granting of genuine independence to Namibia. At the same time that support has allowed it to continue its occupation of the Territory since the United Nations ended its Mandate. It has also enabled it to undertake repeated acts of military aggression against the African front-line States, particularly Angola, which has suffered massive losses through this aggression and part of whose territory is now occupied by forces of the racist régime.

168. The use of the veto in the Security Council by the United States and other Western States, the obstruction of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence by those States in order to block resolutions on comprehensive economic sanctions against the South African régime and the continuing trade exchanges with South Africa reveal the ongoing alliance between them and constitute a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and the Charter. They also demonstrate a position inimical to the liberation and independence of peoples.

169. The people of Namibia has fallen victim to the racist, colonialist policy of the South African régime and the imperialist Powers which provide it with economic and military means, just as the Arab Palestinian people fell victim to Zionist and imperialist forces.

170. Thus the ongoing nuclear co-operation between the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel symbolizes the joint interest of those two racist régimes in eliminating the Namibian and Palestinian peoples, which they continue to oppress and deprive of their lawful right to self-determination and independence.

171. The policy of the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel, which is based on aggression, expansionism and the occupation of the land of others by force, constitutes a real danger to the African and Arab peoples, increases international tension and threatens international peace and security.

172. The report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978)<sup>3</sup> clearly shows the policy

of repression, oppression and terrorism practised by the South African régime. The report states, in paragraph 26:

“My visit to the region brought home to me vividly both the human tragedy of the present situation and the necessity for urgent progress towards implementation. The people of Namibia, on whose behalf this long-standing international effort has been mounted and maintained, are suffering not only denial of their legitimate aspirations to self-determination and independence, but from the effects of procrastination and the uncertainty of their future.”

173. We appreciate the efforts of the Secretary-General, the United Nations Council for Namibia and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

174. These efforts are constantly hampered by the obstinacy of the racist régime of South Africa, which places obstacles and difficulties in the way of the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). It is therefore necessary to adopt appropriate measures of deterrence against the racist régime of South Africa to force it to comply with the international will as expressed in Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

175. The racist, colonialist régime of South Africa has confronted the United Nations with a grave issue. It has confronted it with a serious challenge which threatens the achievement of the noble purposes for which the United Nations was created and the principles on which it is based. The United Nations will either give way before this challenge by the South African régime, supported by imperialist forces led by the United States of America, or it will shoulder its direct, legal responsibility for Namibia until the people of Namibia is enabled to exercise its right of self-determination and the Territory achieves its national independence. The territorial integrity of Namibia must be ensured; it must not be fragmented, as is the aim of the policy of aggression and expansionism practised by South Africa, which wants to separate Walvis Bay and some of the offshore islands from Namibia. Any such act by South Africa would be illegal, null and void and would constitute a threat to the Territory of Namibia. It must therefore be opposed and prevented.

176. Democratic Yemen, in demanding the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the right to independence of Namibia, reiterates its support for the struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and true national independence under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO. We condemn racist, imperialist attempts to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

177. Democratic Yemen stresses anew its support for the struggle of the people of South Africa against the illegitimate racist régime. We also stress our support for the African front-line States against continuous acts of aggression and the economic blockade by the racist régime of Pretoria.

178. Democratic Yemen, like other States that cherish freedom and peace, calls on the international community to impose comprehensive economic sanctions against the South African régime, particularly since the international community has decided that *apartheid* is an abominable crime against humanity.

179. Democratic Yemen condemns the continuing nuclear co-operation between some Western States, particularly the United States of America, and South Africa,

as well as the military and nuclear co-operation between the racist régimes of South Africa and Israel. This military nuclear co-operation constitutes a threat to the Arab and African peoples and to international peace and security. It is also a flagrant breach of Security Council resolutions, particularly resolution 418 (1977), and of General Assembly resolution ES-8/2 of 14 September 1981, which stressed the need to impose sanctions on the racist régime and strongly urged all States to cease forthwith, individually and collectively, all dealings with South Africa in order totally to isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally.

180. The questions of Namibia and Palestine remain vividly in the minds of African and Arab peoples. Our peoples will continue their struggle to end once and for all the occupation, repression, oppression and barbaric genocide to which the struggling Namibian and Palestinian peoples are being subjected by the racist régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

181. History teaches us lessons and gives us confidence. It tells us that the struggle of the peoples cannot be defeated and that the struggles of the Namibian people and the Palestinian people will end in victory.

182. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia): The very fact that the question of Namibia has this year been considered twice by the Security Council and once by the world community at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence is vivid evidence of the gravity and acuteness of the problem in and around Namibia. At its current session, the General Assembly is again seized of the question of Namibia as an important problem demanding an immediate solution.

183. The solution of this problem at the earliest possible time is a matter not only of liberating the people of Namibia, who have suffered for so long, from colonial and racist oppression, but also of alleviating tension and removing the threat to international peace and security.

184. As is well known, the world community, in particular the United Nations, has spared no effort to bring freedom and independence to the sorely tried people of Namibia. If all the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council had been strictly observed and implemented by all States Members of the United Nations, Namibia would long ago have joined the family of sovereign nations. The reason why the people of Namibia remain subjected to cruel colonial and racial oppression lies in the double-standard policies of some Western Powers, first and foremost the United States, which in their words are against *apartheid* and racial discrimination but in their deeds and in every other way encourage and support the racist régime of South Africa for their own narrow political, strategic and economic purposes.

185. The so-called contact group, consisting of five Western Powers—Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States of America—which was supposed to help ensure the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, has, on the contrary, enabled the Pretoria régime to gain time in order to adopt a series of unilateral, illegal measures aimed at the perpetuation of its colonial and racial domination of Namibia.

186. Western Powers permanent members of the Security Council which are also members of the so-called contact group have blocked the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, which are the only effective means of compelling South Africa

to implement United Nations decisions and in this way bring about a peaceful settlement of the problem.

187. It was the United States that, in continuation of its delaying tactics, came out with the idea of the linkage of the issue with extraneous matters, namely, with the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola, a manoeuvre which South Africa wholeheartedly welcomed, and has been resorting to ever since. However, this linkage has been categorically condemned and rejected by the world community.

188. As a result of the all-round collaboration and partnership between the United States, its major allies and South Africa, the latter has become intransigent and stubborn in pursuing its criminal policies of *apartheid*, aggression and occupation. South Africa, in absolute disregard of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the demands of the world community, continues its illegal occupation of Namibia and is intensively engaged in extending its inhuman policy of *apartheid* and “bantustanization” to this international Territory and in imposing a neo-colonial, so-called internal settlement designed to perpetuate its colonial and racial domination. The racist authorities not only wage a cruel colonial war of repression against the people of Namibia and its vanguard, SWAPO, they use the Territory as a springboard for acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring African States. The Pretoria régime continues to occupy a considerable part of the territory of Angola and to wage an undeclared war against that country.

189. In order to keep alive and strengthen the oppressive system of *apartheid* at home, and commit acts of aggression against the front-line States and suppress the national liberation movements, the racist régime of South Africa is strengthening its military capability. Military expenditure has been increasing every year. Thus, for example, the defence budget for 1982/83 is estimated at 3 billion rand, representing a 7 per cent increase over the preceding year. The strength of the South African force in Namibia alone is estimated at 100,000, approximately one soldier to every 12 members of the Namibian population. This intensive military build-up of South Africa has become possible through the extensive military support of some Western countries which supply the racist régime with combat equipment in disregard of the arms embargo. Furthermore, the United States has already lifted existing restrictions on the supply of equipment from the United States to South Africa, thus freeing its hand for collaboration with South Africa in the military field.

190. Moreover, the Pretoria régime, again with the assistance of some Western Powers, in particular the United States and Israel, is making every effort to develop its nuclear technology with a view to acquiring nuclear-weapon capability. In view of the aggressive policy and sinister designs of the *apartheid* régime, the world community must not allow this to happen.

191. Along with the cruel repression and military operations against the people of Namibia, who, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, are waging an armed liberation struggle, the racist authorities subject the indigenous people of the Territory to ruthless exploitation and plunder their natural resources. Suffice it to mention that, according to a report of the United Nations Council for Namibia entitled “Activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia”,<sup>11</sup> South Africa has appropriated 60 per cent of the total land area and some 90 per cent of the best arable farmland for the exclusive occupation and utilization of the white minority; and approximately 80 per cent of the Territory’s total mining assets are held by just three foreign corporations.

192. It is the 88 transnational corporations belonging to the Western countries and North America that not only ruthlessly plunder and exploit the natural and human resources of that Territory but support the colonial authorities in every way and exert an adverse influence on the policies of their own States.

193. Faced with the continued illegal occupation of Namibia, the increased repression of the indigenous people by the racist authorities of the white minority régime, and the intrigues and manoeuvres designed to perpetuate the colonial and racial domination in Namibia, the world community and the United Nations have enhanced their vigilance and adopted a series of measures directed at the speedy implementation of the relevant decisions. The most notable evidence of this was the convening of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, which was attended by delegations representing 136 Governments. The Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia<sup>10</sup> were adopted at that representative forum.

194. In this connection, the delegation of Mongolia wishes to pay a special tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, for their tireless efforts to fulfil the mandate entrusted to the Council. The Council has done much to expose the dangers inherent in the policies of South Africa against the Namibian people and to mobilize international support for the efforts of the United Nations.

195. The Mongolian delegation fully supports all the recommendations contained in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the most recent resolution of the Security Council, resolution 539 (1983), directed at the implementation of its earlier decisions. The Mongolian People's Republic continues to believe that, under the present circumstances, the only effective measure to make South Africa respect international law and listen to the demands of the world community is the imposition of the comprehensive mandatory sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

196. The people and Government of Mongolia, who have always stood at the side of peoples struggling for their freedom and national independence, express once again their sympathy and solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Namibian people and SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, against imperialism, *apartheid* and neo-colonialism. We likewise express our solidarity with, and admiration for, the firm and principled stand of the front-line States against the aggression and intrigues of the Pretoria régime.

197. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the United Nations has constantly been trying to have that Territory accede to independence, in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*].

198. Those efforts led to the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in which the Council endorsed a plan for Namibian independence, a plan designed by the Western contact group and accepted by the two parties to the Namibian conflict, namely, the South African Government and SWAPO. That plan, which was considered very positive by the international community, immediately brought a ray of hope into the process of decolonization for Namibia. However, one was not at the

time expecting the bad faith of the racist régime of Pretoria and the duplicity of one of the members of the contact group, namely, the United States.

199. Five years have passed since then and no real progress has been made along the lines desired by the international community. On the contrary, the Pretoria racist régime has tightened its grip on Namibia, completely flouting the injunctions, and indeed the condemnation, of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 532 (1983) which, *inter alia*, called upon it forthwith and fully to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

200. The Pretoria racist régime was not content simply with continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia and introducing there its inhuman policy of *apartheid*, with brutal oppression of the Namibian people. It also tried to attack Namibia's territorial integrity by seeking to annex Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the offshore islands.

201. South Africa was bold enough to act in this way and to continue arrogantly to ignore the international community because it enjoyed the more or less open support of certain Western countries which, through their financial resources and their multinational corporations, all had interests in Namibia. The United States Government has even openly supported the Pretoria régime's pursuit of its policy of so-called "constructive engagement". Pretoria, strengthened by this support, has shown itself increasingly intransigent on the subject of the independence of Namibia. It has now even made the granting of this independence subject to withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola even though these two questions are completely unrelated. All African States and the international community as a whole, at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, at New Delhi, and at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, in Paris earlier this year, rejected such linkage.

202. One might wonder if the linkage had not been suggested to the racist régime by the American Government, because it is part of the political mores of that Government always to try to present national liberation struggles as East-West ideological conflicts and to interfere in the internal affairs of other States, particularly those whose policy it finds displeasing.

203. We are now far from the days when the former British colonies of the New World struggled against the Crown for their independence and won only thanks to the assistance from a Power from another continent; and now those former colonies have become a great Power themselves, but they are consumed by the imperialist disease and the lust for power and they forget what their situation was in the past and are now bitterly opposing those people who, just like themselves 200 years ago, are struggling for liberation and national independence. They oppose them by allying themselves now with the oppressive tyrannical régimes. The obstacles created to the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the repression of the revolutionary movements in Central America and the invasion of Grenada to crush the revolution of its people are excellent examples of this kind of conduct.

204. One reason which is delaying the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the use made of the negotiating process by the five members of the Western contact group, dragging it out in order to promote their economic and strategic interests. According to



the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, 53 of the 88 transnational corporations directly involved in plundering the natural resources of Namibia have their headquarters in the capitals of those five countries. This frantic exploitation of those resources by foreign interests is a violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,<sup>2</sup> enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia. In addition, these activities of foreign interests, as well as being an obstacle to the immediate independence of Namibia, jeopardize its future economic independence.

205. Another indication of the Pretoria régime's intention not to abandon Namibia is the strengthening of its military potential and presence in Namibia. The South African troops stationed there, without counting the young Namibians who have been drafted by force, have been estimated at over 100,000. The object of this reinforcement is to strengthen Pretoria's hold on Namibia and prevent SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, from acceding to power by the democratic methods advocated in the United Nations plan.

206. In this connection, it is ironic to see the American Government, which is so loudly in favour of free elections for other countries in other places, standing side by side with the Pretoria racists and refusing free elections for the Namibian people.

207. The racist régime of Pretoria, through its militarization of Namibia, has used it as a bridgehead for launching acts of aggression against neighbouring States, particularly Angola, part of the territory of which it is still occupying. In its armed attacks against these countries as in its repression against the Namibian people and the SWAPO fighters, the racist régime also uses mercenaries from various other countries. This brutal repression has led to Namibian refugees fleeing to neighbouring countries, thus creating additional burdens for those countries.

208. This situation in Namibia, whose people have been refused the right to self-determination, causes us to remember the situation in the Middle East, where the Arab Palestinian people have been refused the exercise of their inalienable rights, including the right to establish an independent Arab State in Palestine. In both cases, the occupier and oppressor benefits from the support of that same imperialist Power, the former through a policy of so-called "constructive engagement" and the latter through "strategic co-operation" which in the last few days has been strengthened further. Also, both enjoy immunity because they are protected by the right of veto of their great protector.

209. The question of Namibia is a question of decolonization and, as such, a direct responsibility of the United Nations and must be solved within the context of the United Nations, in accordance with its relevant resolutions. In this spirit, my delegation would like to pay

tribute to the efforts of the Secretary-General to find a solution. My delegation would also like to pay tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and its President, to the Commissioner for Namibia, to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and to the Special Committee against *Apartheid* for their devotion and their work towards putting an end to racism, *apartheid* and colonial occupation in southern Africa so as to enable the peoples of Namibia and South Africa to enjoy freedom and equal rights.

210. South Africa has taunted the Organization long enough. It is high time for the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities fully, imposing if necessary comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter so as to compel it to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

211. SWAPO has already demonstrated its good will by its support, from the outset, for this peaceful process provided for in resolution 435 (1978), but it has also stated its determination to continue armed struggle in order to obtain independence for its country and its willingness to pay the price. The international community, for its part, has on several occasions reaffirmed its support for the just struggle, including armed struggle, of the Namibian people for independence in a united Namibia. Whether it be through negotiations or through armed struggle, the Namibian people and their representative, SWAPO, can always rely on the support of the people and Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24 (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II.*

<sup>3</sup> *See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983, document S/15943.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1983, document S/16106.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid., Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978, document S/12678.*

<sup>6</sup> *See Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Plenary Meetings, 106th meeting, para. 285.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid., para. 290.*

<sup>8</sup> *See Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1978, document S/12636.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid., Thirty-eighth Year, 2481st meeting.*

<sup>10</sup> *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.*

<sup>11</sup> A/CONF.120/4-A/AC.131/92.