



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. BASHIR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Seventeen years have passed since, on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. The Security Council, in its resolution 264 (1969), confirmed that resolution by recognizing that the General Assembly had terminated the Mandate and calling upon the Pretoria régime to withdraw its administration immediately from the Territory. The racist régime ignored that General Assembly resolution and refused to comply with the Security Council resolution. It has continued to challenge the international community. Five years ago, the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. At that time, the majority of the countries of the world felt some optimism about Namibia's attaining its independence, on the basis of the fact that the United Nations plan was established by the Western contact group, made up of five States which had all maintained close and friendly relations with the South African racist régime. Consequently, they were supposed to be able to exert pressure on South Africa to ensure its compliance with the international community's will. But the experience of the past five years has dashed the hopes of the vast majority of the Members of the Organization, because, despite all the efforts exerted by the international community and despite the Secretary-General's initiatives, the racist régime in South Africa continues to cling to its illegal administration of Namibia and does everything to hamper the implementation of the United Nations plan.

2. What has clearly emerged from the strenuous negotiations of the past five years is that South Africa uses those negotiations only to gain time and conceal its vicious plans, since it has continually created fallacious justifications and pretexts for delaying the independence of Namibia. From the outset, it accused the United Nations of being biased. Then it proposed an unusual electoral system. Thereafter it asked for prior agreement on the constitutional principles. When it appeared to it that all these questions could be solved or agreed upon, it chose

to introduce a new point which had no relation whatsoever to the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia or to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This was the linkage of the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. This has been declared intervention in the internal affairs of Angola and has been rejected by the international community.

3. It is quite clear from these manoeuvres that the racist régime is trying to gain time in a desperate attempt to circumvent the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, and consolidate the internal settlement. Its recent creation of a so-called State Council in Namibia falls within this framework. It aims thereby to establish a puppet Government in Namibia which would serve its interests and the interests of the imperialist forces which have encouraged it in this policy and given it the assistance which has enabled it to continue to challenge the will of the international community and to occupy Namibia, and even to go beyond that and occupy part of the territory of Angola, while also continuing its attacks on the front-line States.

4. The majority of the countries of the world have long been aware of the objectives of the racist régime of South Africa and of the methods of procrastination and prevarication which are adopted by that régime with a view to prolonging its occupation of Namibia and imposing a puppet Government on the Namibian people. Nevertheless, some Western States consistently oppose any measure which the Security Council attempts to take under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations to force the racist régime to comply with United Nations resolutions and withdraw from Namibia.

5. It is evident that the Western contact group is not serious in its commitment to assist the United Nations in achieving a solution of the problem of Namibia. It has not so far put any significant pressure on South Africa and has not taken any action that would indicate concern for the independence of Namibia. On the contrary, its members continue to encourage their companies to increase their investments in Namibia and South Africa, in spite of the numerous resolutions of the United Nations calling for the cessation of all transactions with the *apartheid* régime.

6. As indicated in a report of the Secretary-General to the Commission on Transnational Corporations, there are 90 transnational corporations with interests in companies in Namibia, of which 35 are British, 26 South African, 19 American, 3 West German, 3 Canadian, 1 French and another Swedish.¹ The existence in Namibia of these companies is a clear encouragement of the racist régime, in its vicious policy and its occupation of Namibia. The Pretoria régime has been able, because of the assistance it has received from Western companies and financial institutions, to develop its military capabilities, maintain its authority in South Africa and its illegal occupation of Namibia and part of the territory of Angola, and even step up its attacks against neighbouring States. The State Department's recent authorization of the provision

of technical services and the maintenance of nuclear installations in South Africa by seven United States companies is clear evidence of the role of Western firms in supporting, with the encouragement of their Governments, the racist régime.

7. The natural resources of Namibia are still being plundered and drained with the full knowledge of the international community. Those riches are turned into profits and raw materials for the Western countries with the co-operation of the transnational corporations, which are monopolizing the mineral resources of Namibia. They continue to extract those riches for the benefit of the racist régime of South Africa, which has transformed Namibia into a raw materials storehouse for the Western countries and which is trying by all possible means to drain this storehouse dry before Namibia gains its independence. All this goes on in flagrant violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974.

8. The transnational corporations are not satisfied with draining Namibia of its natural resources; they also exploit its human resources. This is obvious from the substantial difference between the per capita income of whites and that of blacks in Namibia. According to a working paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples:³

“... white per capita income in 1980 was approximately R 2,000, while the corresponding figure for all blacks, including both wage earners and subsistence workers, was about R 125, a ratio of 24 to 1. For blacks living on reserves and in ‘homelands’, the per capita figure was estimated to be considerably less”.

Furthermore, the transnational corporations continue to expel black workers or discharge them from their jobs if they demand an improvement in wages.

9. The *apartheid* régime receives financial support from the banks and financial institutions of the Western countries. The loans they gave to this régime in the period from early 1979 to mid-1982 amounted to \$2,756 million, which covered the annual military expenditures of South Africa and Namibia.

10. In the military field, in spite of the great lapse of time since the adoption of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which placed an embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa, the embargo has not been strictly implemented and the racist régime has been able to acquire massive quantities of weapons, with the complicity of the Zionist entity and some Western countries. The racist régime, because of the assistance it has received from those countries, or some of them, has been able to develop its military industry and has become self-sufficient in most military equipment. Consequently, it has been able to continue its occupation of Namibia and to step up its barbaric acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, violating their sovereignty and attempting to destabilize them, using both its regular forces and bands of mercenaries recruited for the purpose.

11. Reliable reports indicate that South Africa maintains more than 100,000 soldiers in Namibia, distributed over 40 military bases. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24] states that 2,000 to 3,000 mercenaries, most of them from the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Chile and Israel, participate in the military actions undertaken by South Africa in the campaigns

aimed at crushing the struggle of the Namibian people for liberation.

12. The racist régime of South Africa is able to maintain its occupation of Namibia because it has the complete support of some Western States, foremost among them the United States, which considers it to be an ally and a guardian of its interests in southern Africa, and because it receives support also from another racist régime, the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, which is based on a similar racist theory and practises the same policy in the Arab area.

13. The attempt to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is only a dilatory manoeuvre designed by South Africa, in collaboration with the United States Administration, to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), make it possible to continue for as long as possible to plunder that country's resources and give more time to the racist régime to establish new puppet elements to which to entrust the Government of Namibia. These manoeuvres have been condemned many times in international forums as being extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Cuban forces went to Angola as the result of a legal request from the legal Government of Angola to repel the aggression and invasion by South Africa when Angola acceded to independence. The Cuban forces would not have remained there till this day had it not been for the repeated racist attacks against Angola, the continued violation of its sovereignty and the occupation of part of its territory, as well as the use by South Africa of the UNITA⁴ gang to undermine the unity of the country in a desperate attempt to overthrow the legitimate Government of Angola.

14. A neutral observer of events would understand the real intentions of Pretoria behind this insistence to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces. These evil intentions are clear. If there is no response by the entire international community to Pretoria's illogical and unacceptable conditions, it will have found an excuse for continuing to occupy Namibia and to impede its independence. If the international community complies with Pretoria's conditions, the racist régime will have also gained, since the way will then be clear for its forces to take off in the direction of the capital of Angola and to overthrow the Government.

15. If these are not the real intentions of the racist régime, then there is no justification whatsoever for its claims. When South Africa withdraws from Namibia, it will be hundreds of miles away from the Angolan borders and the presence of the Cuban forces in Angola will not constitute any source of frustration or threat to South Africa's security.

16. The international community is facing a flagrant challenge by the racist régime of Pretoria. The time has come for the Security Council to live up to the promise it made five years ago in adopting resolution 439 (1978), in which it warned the Pretoria régime that failure to co-operate in implementing Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) would:

“... compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions”.

17. The situation in Namibia is continuing to worsen. Oppression, suppression, detentions and assassinations continue to be a daily practice of the racist régime against

the black inhabitants of Namibia. This represents a serious threat to international peace and security. The international community must intensify its efforts in order to guarantee speedy independence for Namibia in accordance with United Nations resolutions, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My country believes that the independence of Namibia cannot be achieved other than on the following basis.

18. First, full and unconditional support must be given by all States for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General to implement the United Nations plan.

19. Secondly, it must be confirmed that the two principal parties to the dispute are SWAPO, as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, which is struggling for the independence of the Territory, and the racist régime of Pretoria, which illegally occupies the Territory.

20. Thirdly, there must be support for the armed struggle undertaken by SWAPO to pressure the racist régime into complying with the will of the international community and withdrawing from Namibia.

21. Fourthly, a specific time-limit must be set for the full and speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without any amendments whatsoever, which would guarantee the full independence of Namibia and the sovereignty of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, over all its Territory, including Walvis Bay and all the offshore islands.

22. Fifthly, mandatory sanctions must be imposed in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, which would compel the racist régime to withdraw its administration from Namibia and enhance respect for the United Nations.

23. In conclusion, I wish to confirm the unlimited support of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the people of Namibia in its just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, to achieve self-determination and independence. We will continue to provide all material and moral assistance to this heroic people and to the people of South Africa until they achieve independence and finally eradicate racism from South Africa. We confirm our solidarity with the front-line States which face acts of aggression by the racist régime. We condemn South Africa for those acts and for its continued occupation of Namibia and parts of Angolan territory.

24. May I express the appreciation of my delegation and our gratitude for the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, presided over by Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, and for the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations aimed at securing early independence for Namibia.

25. Mr. ERICSON (Sweden): A year has elapsed since the Assembly last debated the Namibian problem and the people of Namibia can hardly be said to have come closer to attaining freedom and independence. In the mean time, we have received reports on increased harassment and torture of civilians in Namibia, committed by the extraordinarily great number of South African police and military forces stationed there.

26. The situation is all the more frustrating as the Secretary-General, after his visit to the region this summer, reported to the Security Council⁵ that we have never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing the United Nations plan for Namibia's transition to independence, endorsed in Council resolution 435 (1978). His consultations with the parties to the conflict made him conclude that the last outstanding issues pertaining to the United Nations plan had found a solution. If it were a matter only of the tributes paid in all quarters to resolution 435 (1978), no outsider would understand

the present eerie state of affairs in which there seems to be total agreement about everything except implementation.

27. The explanation for the stalemate, however, is simple. It appears that one party has not been negotiating in good faith. It has become increasingly obvious that one party is using the framework of carefully arranged and balanced negotiations to protract endlessly Namibia's transition to independence, for which its people has for so long been waiting, placing its faith in the authority and prestige of the Organization.

28. At the most recent series of meetings of the Security Council on the question of Namibia, in October of this year, South Africa had an opportunity to express its willingness to assist in the implementation of the Council's resolutions without any further pre-conditions and to give concrete proof of its good intentions. Instead, the South African representative chose arrogantly to declare that South Africa was irrevocably committed to the linkage of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Moreover, he claimed that his Government's position "is acknowledged and has support within the international community".⁶

29. The South African Government is thus referring to the United States support of the concept of linkage. Like an overwhelming number of countries, however, Sweden has characterized the link as an alien issue, which should not be used as an excuse to block Namibia's independence in accordance with resolution 435 (1978). The hollowness of the South African argument is demonstrated by the fact that South Africa did not raise the presence of Cuban troops in Angola as an issue related to the situation in Namibia when the United Nations plan was first agreed upon by all parties five years ago.

30. When it comes to a withdrawal of foreign forces from independent States in southern Africa, it is obvious to us that the primary question concerns the withdrawal of South African troops illegally occupying southern Angola. This would lead to a general reduction of tension in the area and reduce the risk of making it an area of East-West competition.

31. What we have learned from the long-drawn-out negotiating process regarding the question of Namibia is that the link between resolution 435 (1978) and its implementation cannot be found in Angola, but must be looked for in South Africa itself. South African intransigence is a challenge not only to the people of Namibia, to SWAPO as a leading force in its struggle for independence, and to the neighbouring countries in southern Africa, but also to the Organization, underscored by the special responsibility the United Nations has legally assumed for the Territory of Namibia and its people.

32. The true nature of the South African challenge was made unmistakably clear in the statement on Security Council resolution 539 (1983) on Namibia that was made by the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information on 29 October 1983 and transmitted to the Secretary-General.⁷

33. To deal with this challenge to Namibia's independence, my Government would suggest once more that the Security Council consider, without further delay, taking effective measures, including sanctions, against South Africa as a means to bring the long-drawn-out implementation negotiations to an end.

34. At the same time, the Security Council should also consider, in order to weaken the South African war efforts in Namibia and the neighbouring States, measures to make the existing mandatory arms embargo against South Africa more effective, and to widen its scope to include,

for example, the transfer of military and nuclear technology to South Africa. In this context, my Government would also like to stress the importance of halting the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources, as well as the need to give moral support and humanitarian assistance to SWAPO and the oppressed population of Namibia.

35. The people of Namibia must, at last, be given the freedom and independence for which it has been fighting for so long.

36. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Debating the question of Namibia during the second half of the General Assembly sessions has become an annual ritual, albeit one which we from Africa in general and southern Africa in particular neither welcome nor enjoy performing—for it is a ritual which reminds us that the people of Namibia have yet to be delivered from the shackles of colonialism and racial tyranny; indeed, a painful reminder that yet another frustrating year of unsuccessful initiatives, wasted opportunities and missed chances in the search for a solution to the Namibian question has come and gone.

37. Too much has been said and written about Namibia since the Territory's future became an object of contention and controversy in the United Nations. Unfortunately, we are doomed to continue to say and write a great deal more about the Territory so long as South Africa remains adamant in its defiant refusal to co-operate in its decolonization.

38. A little more than six weeks ago, the Security Council had a debate on the question of Namibia which culminated in the adoption of a resolution that was supposed to contribute in no small measure to the clearing of remaining impediments to Namibia's progress to independence and majority rule. The debate achieved its purpose. By Security Council resolution 539 (1983), the major impediment to Namibia's progress to independence—the linkage—was laid to rest, being overwhelmingly rejected by the Security Council.

39. Also rejected by virtue of their intimate, organic association with the linkage were such concepts as "parallelism" and/or "reciprocity". In other words, in normal circumstances, the way should now be clear for us to proceed without further delay with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

40. The front-line States and SWAPO have never been found wanting in their readiness to co-operate in the implementation of all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on Namibia. We are more than ready—even at this late hour—to give peace a chance in Namibia by co-operating with our friends in the Western contact group in the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). However, the ball is not in our court. We have done everything humanly possible to delay the exhaustion of the patience of the people of Namibia, who have waited for close to two thirds of a century to rid themselves of the yoke of South African colonialism.

41. The five members of the Western contact group and the front-line States, throughout their co-operative endeavours in the search for a solution to the Namibian question, have understood each other's responsibilities. The front-line States have always taken upon themselves the responsibility of ensuring that their friends in SWAPO are not in any way whatsoever found to be difficult and unreasonable in their approach to the negotiations for the independence of Namibia. Our friends in the Western contact group, on the other hand, have always accepted as their unfortunate and regrettable lot the responsibility to ensure that their friend, South Africa, will not be found

wanting in the negotiations. We, the front-line States, have steadfastly carried out our responsibilities. They, on the other hand, have not thus far succeeded in carrying out theirs—for reasons which only they can explain.

42. It is certainly not pleasant for us to admit, and to state here and now, that we, the front-line States and SWAPO, have every reason to feel cheated. In return for our co-operation with the Western contact group on the Namibian question, we have been subjected to three years of arguing against flying saucers and mirages such as "linkage", "parallelism" and "reciprocity". Instead of pressure being brought to bear on South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, in which both the front-line States and the Western contact group have invested so much political capital, the illegal occupier of Namibia has been handed a golden excuse—linkage—to remain ensconced in the Territory, in defiance of the United Nations.

43. South Africa's reaction to the recent Security Council debate on Namibia shows in no uncertain terms that, even if the Western contact group may have truly come to the conclusion that the linkage should be forgotten once and for all, Pretoria will hang on tenaciously to the issue, because it gives it a convenient cover by which it seeks to conceal its stubborn determination to stay put in Namibia. It shows how tragic the raising of the issue by the United States was in the first place, and how difficult it will be to get the South Africans to drop it, even if the five Western States were to decide to do so.

44. Nevertheless, it is our contention that getting South Africa to co-operate is the sole, real responsibility of the Western five. They have nothing to ask of us and SWAPO, short of suggesting that we should simply concede everything to South Africa and participate in the destabilization of Angola by putting pressure on that embattled front-line State to repatriate Cuban troops—that is, to strip itself naked in the face of the escalating threats to its stability and its very survival posed by the activities of the South African troops and the marauding South-African-supported dissidents of UNITA,⁴ and the continued occupation of part of its territory by South African troops.

45. But despite the derailment of the negotiations on Namibian independence by the disruptive and provocative introduction of extraneous issues, we in the front-line States and in Africa as a whole remain convinced, as reiterated in the joint communiqué issued after the meeting of the heads of State or Government of the front-line States, the Foreign Minister of Botswana and the President of SWAPO, held at Lusaka on 12 November 1983, that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides the only valid basis—that is, the only basis at present—for achieving a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. We reiterate this fact because it has always been our cherished desire to solve the problems of southern Africa by peaceful means. Hence, our dogged commitment to resolution 435 (1978).

46. It may not be possible, however, to keep the people of Namibia in a permanent state of anticipation. Their patience is not inexhaustible. We have to accept the fact that a war of liberation by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, has been going on in the Territory for 17 years. The war will go on with increasing intensity if the Western five and South Africa choose to abandon the path of peace represented by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We therefore insist that the Western five prevail on South Africa to co-operate, or else face the ignominy of allowing themselves to be remembered by present and future generations of

Namibians as having laboured so tirelessly for more than five years simply to buy more time for South Africa's illegal occupation of their country.

47. The front-line States and SWAPO are ready to move forward, I must repeat, but first things first. We fully share the insistence of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola that South African troops at present encamped in the southern part of Angola be withdrawn immediately and unconditionally, and, indeed, the Assembly should so demand. Surely Namibia cannot proceed to genuine independence and freedom with South African troops ensconced in southern Angola. It is also crucial that there be a cessation of attacks against Angola by South African troops using Namibia and their bases inside Angola as launching pads. Surely, we cannot expect Angola to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) while it is being subjected to persistent acts of terrorism perpetrated by South Africa. There must also be a cessation of South African support for the murderous activities of the marauding thugs of UNITA, who, in the service of imperialism, are causing havoc in rural Angola at this very moment. Then there must be an irrevocable commitment by South Africa to the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

48. These are reasonable demands by a country, Angola, which shares no border with South Africa and has never in any way whatsoever threatened the security of South Africa; Angola, a country which nevertheless has become a perpetual victim of South Africa's acts of aggression. Angola, more than any other independent country in the region, desires peace more than anything else so that its war-weary people can begin to reconstruct their lives and for the first time taste the fruits of independence. Angola is in no way whatsoever responsible for the non-implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

49. South Africa is solely responsible for the stalemate, and South Africa, we repeat, is the responsibility of the Western five. We challenge the Western five to break the stalemate by ensuring South Africa's co-operation in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They should make it clear to South Africa, first, that the linkage has been found to be totally unworkable and a waste of time and must therefore be abandoned once and for all; secondly, that the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is not only in the best interest of the front-line States and everybody else in southern Africa but also in the interest of South Africa itself; thirdly, that the continuation of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is a threat to peace and stability in southern Africa, since it can serve only to provide a convenient pretext for external interference in the affairs of the region; fourthly, that South Africa would be deluding itself if it were to see its future in southern Africa through the prism of military invincibility—the facts are that SWAPO will not be defeated, nor will the people of Namibia ever stop yearning for the restoration of their God-given right to live as free men and women in their own land; and, finally, that the alternative to the path of peaceful change in Namibia represented by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is a continuation and intensification in the Territory of a war the consequences of which will be too ghastly even for South Africa itself.

50. These are the facts which must be put to South Africa by the five Western States themselves if they are to avoid losing the initiative to the dogs of war.

51. I said earlier that too much has been said and written about the Namibian question. By the end of this debate, sufficient to fill more volumes will have been uttered on the subject, but one reality will continue to haunt us: if

nothing is done to persuade South Africa to co-operate, Namibia will continue to be an occupied country crying for deliverance, and until South Africa and its friends realize that there is too much at stake in southern Africa, we shall continue to engage in sterile debates about linkages, parallelisms, reciprocities, mirages and "flying saucers", as I call them, to the detriment of the prospects of peace and stability in southern Africa.

52. Mrs. MAIRIE (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Five years have already elapsed since the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978) defining the modalities for Namibia's peaceful accession to independence. Despite the laborious efforts made in the course of that period, the situation today remains stalemated and there seems to be no sign of the positive change that the international community has so long desired.

53. Several times in the course of this year, the Security Council has convened to consider this question, and it entrusted the Secretary-General with a mandate to undertake consultations with the parties involved with a view to securing the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. From those consultations it is clear, as emphasized in the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council,⁵ that, although all questions regarding the ways and means of implementing resolution 435 (1978) have already been settled, it is still impossible to implement the United Nations plan owing to the adamant position of the Pretoria régime, which continues to make Namibia's independence contingent upon the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

54. Taking advantage of the deadlock that it endeavours to maintain, the South African racist régime continues to practise in Namibia a policy of pitiless oppression and brutal repression in the form of arbitrary arrests, endless detention, inhuman torture and the murder of many Namibians, in particular the leaders and supporters of SWAPO. South Africa also continues its attempts to bolster and win international recognition for the puppets and institutions it has installed in Namibia for the purpose of perpetuating its policy of domination and exploitation. Front-line independent African States are almost daily the victims of acts of aggression designed to weaken their economies and destabilize their Governments, because of their solidarity with the freedom fighters.

55. It is unnecessary to remind the Assembly that the illegal occupation of Namibia, the growing militarization of this Territory, which has been placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and the repeated acts of aggression by the Pretoria régime against neighbouring African States, in particular, Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho, directly threaten international peace and security.

56. As we have frequently repeated, this intolerable conduct of the South African régime is unfortunately being intensified, drawing its strength from the friendly co-operation and protection provided by certain Powers, some of which, as permanent members of the Security Council, bear special responsibilities regarding the maintenance of international peace and security.

57. What can be done in the light of this extremely disturbing situation? We are convinced that in view of the delaying and obstructionist tactics of Pretoria the international community must remain vigilant and step up its efforts to enable the Namibian people to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

58. In this connection, the General Assembly should reaffirm the direct responsibility which the United Nations

bears regarding the problem of Namibia and denounce all attempts to maintain the *status quo*, the sinister purpose of which is to plunder Namibia's natural resources. In this connection, the action of the United Nations Council for Namibia is decisive and the results secured by that Council under the dynamic guidance of Mr. Paul Lusaka, which are described in the report submitted to the Assembly [A/38/24], deserve our praise and entire support. Moreover, we would like to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, who, despite his heavy burden of duties, went to southern Africa recently to try to break the deadlock. Finally, we commend the laudable efforts of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, as well as the action undertaken by many specialized agencies. All of these efforts attest to their unequivocal commitment to finding a speedy solution to the question of Namibia and we encourage them to continue to work in that direction.

59. The Security Council should reaffirm all the decisions adopted so far to compel South Africa to co-operate in implementing resolution 435 (1978). Moreover, in view of the adamant attitude and bad faith of the Pretoria régime, my delegation considers that the Security Council has no alternative but to have recourse to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is encouraging to note in this connection that, in its resolution 539 (1983) on Namibia, the Security Council decided that it would meet as soon as possible following the Secretary-General's report on progress made in the implementation of that resolution to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter to compel South Africa to implement resolution 435 (1978). It is also gratifying to note that in the same resolution the Security Council finally declared that the question of the independence of Namibia is not linked in any way with any extraneous question, which includes the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola.

60. In the present situation, international pressure exerted on South Africa should be increased by all possible means. The countries that are still co-operating in political, economic and even military spheres with South Africa, despite numerous United Nations resolutions, should not try to ignore the extent of their responsibility regarding the Namibian people, which is the victim of the denial of its legitimate aspirations to self-determination and true independence. We should also like to emphasize the particular responsibility borne by the members of the Western contact group. Those that have taken the initiative and pressed for the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, despite doubts concerning the good faith of the Pretoria régime, must appreciate the heavy responsibility they bear in the implementation of this plan. That is why we appeal urgently to them to exert influence on their partner and induce it to co-operate with the United Nations in ensuring the peaceful and speedy accession of Namibia to independence. We express the hope that the member States of the contact group will not expose their credibility or that of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, to the scepticism of international public opinion.

61. We invite all Member States to co-operate with the United Nations in the process of the decolonization of Namibia, in particular by ensuring that all the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council concerning Namibia are strictly implemented, especially resolution 435 (1978). At the same time, the international community should give full support and assistance to the front-line States, which, because of their support for the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, are exposed

to repeated attacks by South Africa against their territorial integrity, security and economic structures and are sustaining considerable human and material losses.

62. For its part, the United Republic of Cameroon will continue to support as in the past all action undertaken by the United Nations to bring about the independence of Namibia. A long time ago, my country adopted a series of legislative and administrative measures, which we have already described to the Assembly, in keeping with the various United Nations resolutions on this question.

63. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the United Republic of Cameroon will continue to support the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the guidance of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative.

64. The United Republic of Cameroon, its people and its Government stand resolutely in brotherly solidarity with the people of Namibia. We shall continue actively to seek ways and means to put an end to the colonial occupation of this international Territory and we shall work tirelessly for the achievement of its true independence, safeguarding its unity and territorial integrity, within the framework of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

65. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): More than 17 years ago, in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, the General Assembly decided to terminate South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia. It declared South Africa's continued occupation of the Territory illegal and placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. The following year, by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V), the administration of the Territory until independence was entrusted to the United Nations Council for South West Africa, which was subsequently renamed the United Nations Council for Namibia.

66. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa has since then refused to recognize the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and has turned a deaf ear to the repeated appeals of the international community for the granting of independence to the Territory. Instead, it has, on the one hand, been intensifying its repressive policies while, on the other, it has been resorting to acts of aggression against neighbouring African States. Angola and Lesotho are victims of the most recent South African aggressive acts. Moreover, the Pretoria régime is increasing the exploitation and plundering of Namibia's natural resources despite the enactment by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974 of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.²

67. Thus, once again the members of the international community are addressing the General Assembly in support of the inalienable rights of the people of the Territory to self-determination and independence, and to condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa. Once again we are speaking to express our full support of the much-tormented people of Namibia who, under the leadership of their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, are struggling for freedom and in defence of dignity and lofty ideals.

68. The continuation of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa, contrary to repeated General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, represents an affront to humanity and cannot but weigh heavily on our conscience, because the Namibian people are not simply denied their inalienable right to self-determination and independence; they are at the same time being subjected to a most abhorrent form of discrimination, that of institutionalized racism.

69. The policy of *apartheid* practised by the South African régime, both in South Africa and in Namibia, represents an ugly and utterly unacceptable anachronism in contemporary society. It actually represents an arrogant denial of humanity and its values. Institutionalized racism, the official dogma and practice of the Pretoria régime, and indeed racism of any form, has been rejected by civilized society and condemned in all international forums.

70. The persistence of the South African régime's racism, its utter disregard of the moral values of our civilization and its refusal to comply with the decisions of the international community as expressed in the relevant United Nations resolutions must be attributed as much to its arrogance as to our own failure to cope with this problem of the continuing aggression against the Namibian people. As we noted at the eighth emergency special session, in 1981:

“The forces of aggression and injustice are allowed to prevail over the principles of freedom, peace and justice because of the inability of the United Nations to ensure the implementation of its resolutions, a fact which hinders its effective functioning and erodes the very concept and even the *raison d'être* of this Organization.”⁸

71. The frequent meetings of the Security Council and of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia are indicative of international concern over developments in the region and a realization of the threat they pose to regional and world peace and security.

72. Only recently, on 28 October 1983, the Security Council adopted resolution 539 (1983), in which it called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the solution of the problem of Namibia endorsed by the Council in its resolution 435 (1978).

73. Moreover, at the end of May 1983, the Security Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), which mandated the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of the same resolution.

74. Despite the intensive and much-appreciated efforts of the Secretary-General, no peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia is in sight, since such a solution is dependent on the co-operation of the South African régime, a prospect that leaves little room for optimism. We all recall that since 1978, when Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, South Africa has raised a number of obstacles which have hampered efforts for a just solution of the problem, and for the past two years it has shielded itself behind the linkage argument. In his report to the Security Council of 29 August 1983,⁵ the Secretary-General notes 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”.

It is obvious that South Africa is using the linkage issue as one more pretext for delaying the independence of Namibia.

75. The position of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is that the issue of linkage is foreign and irrelevant to the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978). As the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, stated in his address to the General Assembly on 3 October 1983 [*15th meeting*]:

“The question of Namibia is a clear case of decolonization, and as such it should not in any way be linked to other extraneous issues in the region. The attempt of South Africa to link the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with the efforts to find a settlement in Namibia is untenable and only serves to prolong the conditions of injustice being inflicted on the Namibian people.”

76. The South African *apartheid* régime is fully responsible for the stalemate over the question of Namibia. The Western contact group has therefore been unable to make any substantial headway towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and the repeated resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia remain unimplemented and unrealized because the occupying Power, in the absence of a United Nations system of international security, is unwilling to comply with them.

77. The inability of the Organization to give effect to the resolutions of its principal organs poses serious questions as to the very usefulness and credibility of the United Nations. The fact that a considerable number of Security Council decisions and resolutions remain unimplemented is the underlying cause of the perpetuation of various international problems, such as those of Namibia, of Palestine and of Cyprus, to name only a few.

78. The people of Namibia, the people of Palestine, the people of Cyprus, and others, are suffering and their most fundamental rights and freedoms are being denied. The duty of the Organization is to ensure that these situations are brought to an end as soon as possible, for the crimes committed against these peoples are in reality crimes committed against humanity as a whole, because freedom is universal and indivisible. The people of Namibia must be allowed to realize their legitimate aspirations; they must be allowed to exercise their inalienable rights; they must be freed as soon as possible from colonialism, oppression and racism.

79. The position of Cyprus on the question of Namibia is both consistent and principled. We fully support the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia for self-determination and for national independence in a united Namibia, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and other adjacent offshore islands, in accordance with resolutions of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and declarations of the non-aligned countries.

80. Cyprus is proud to be one of the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and in that context, as well as in the context of the United Nations and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we shall exert every possible effort to enable the heroic people of Namibia to realize their principles and rightful aspirations.

81. In this connection, we wish to express our deep appreciation to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, for his most able leadership and his dedication to and untiring efforts for the just cause of the people of Namibia.

82. In conclusion, we again call on the Assembly to exercise its responsibility for Namibia in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It is high time that the Security Council exercised its full authority in implementing its resolutions, especially resolution 435 (1978), for an independent and united Namibia.

83. Mr. CARR (Jamaica): The history of United Nations involvement with the question of Namibia is a saga of the determined and dedicated efforts of the States Members of the world body to bring to a speedy end South Africa's illegal occupation of that richly endowed land, to end the racist régime's brutal and inhuman oppression of the Namibian people, to frustrate South Africa's

repeated attempts to impose unilaterally a client régime on the Territory and, above all, to ensure the exercise of the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

84. I shall refrain from delving into the past history of South Africa's intransigence and defiance of United Nations resolutions on Namibia. Many representatives who have preceded me in speaking here have done that with clarity and vision.

85. It is pertinent, however, to recall that five years ago, in April 1978, the Security Council approved a plan of action designed to achieve a peaceful negotiated political settlement that could lead Namibia to self-determination and independence. The fact that in the intervening years this plan has gained universal recognition and acceptance is testimony to its continuing relevance and viability. The signing of a cease-fire agreement, the establishment of a demilitarized zone, the development of UNTAG, the holding of free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations and the rejection of any internal settlement that would foist South Africa's hand-picked puppets on the Namibian people are the principal elements of this plan.

86. The Secretary-General's latest report to the Security Council⁵ remains an ominous reminder, were any to be needed, of the perils which confront southern Africa and the international community if the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people continue to be denied.

87. It is equally clear from that report that the only outstanding issues among the modalities for implementing resolution 435 (1978)—namely, the choice of the electoral system and the composition of UNTAG—should not constitute a serious impediment to the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan.

88. In his report, the Secretary-General confirmed what had been realized for some time—the fact that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola has been made a pre-condition for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. My delegation, in this context, must unreservedly register our Government's consistent rejection of the spurious contention that there can or should be any linkage between the presence of Cuban forces in Angola and the speedy accession of Namibia to independence. Such a concern could, in our view, more appropriately be linked to the general question of a comprehensive effort to reduce tension and discord in the entire southern African region—and, even so, could be pursued only after the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

89. There has undoubtedly emerged a clear and unmistakably international consensus, which Jamaica fully supports, that the presence of Cuban forces in Angola and the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are distinct and unrelated issues, which must be regarded as such and not as another convenient pretext to postpone independence for Namibia indefinitely.

90. It was inevitable, as it was justifiable, that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, its callous betrayal of the sacred trust to promote the political and socio-economic well-being of the Namibian people, its introduction to the Territory of the universally despised *apartheid* system and the calculated denial of the Namibian people's right to self-determination would incite the legitimate political and military response of that people and lead to the creation of an authentic national liberation movement—SWAPO.

91. We have always believed that, being confronted with the obdurate position and the illegal actions of South

Africa, the Namibian people are fully entitled, under SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, to have recourse to all political, diplomatic and other means of struggle, including armed struggle, in order to realize their legitimate aspirations to freedom and national independence. No mechanism or formula for achieving independence for Namibia can be successful without the full participation and the decisive role of SWAPO, particularly when it is acknowledged that it was the intensity of the freedom struggle waged by the Namibian people under SWAPO that forced South Africa to acquiesce in the United Nations plan, albeit only for tactical purposes, as has now become apparent.

92. The unavoidable question to which the Assembly must find a credible response is this: what more must now be done to compel South Africa to co-operate fully in the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and particularly the United Nations plan for the settlement of the Namibian question?

93. Jamaica believes that it is imperative that no initiative that can be used to intensify and exert pressure on the racist Pretoria régime should be neglected. In this regard, we believe that the international community, through the United Nations and its specialized agencies and governmental and non-governmental organizations, must remain mobilized to isolate further the racist Pretoria régime as long as it pursues its criminal *apartheid* policies and remains defiant of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the norms of international conduct.

94. We must, in this context, also recognize the fundamental role and responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council, particularly the five members of the Western contact group, in bringing the requisite pressure to bear to compel South Africa to live up to its international obligations.

95. Continuing efforts must be made to reinforce the arms embargo already imposed by the Security Council, as well as to intensify the oil embargo against South Africa.

96. Equally, the international community should continue to provide the necessary financial and material support to SWAPO in its legitimate struggle for national liberation.

97. The international community should also strive to strengthen the hand of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative in their continuing endeavours to achieve the speedy decolonization of Namibia.

98. The prolonged and tragic agony of the Namibian people has touched the conscience of mankind everywhere. Their sense of frustration and outrage is also acutely felt in my own country, which closely followed their struggles even before the granting of our own independence in 1962. In addressing ourselves to the Namibian question, we are thus able to do so from a deep sense of national commitment and identification with their legitimate aspirations for freedom and independence.

99. I wish, in conclusion, to reaffirm Jamaica's support for SWAPO and to commend the statesmanship and dedication it has displayed in the difficult struggle to achieve the national aspirations of its people. We equally reaffirm our support for the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the capable and dynamic leadership of Mr. Lusaka, has fulfilled with distinction the mandate entrusted to it.

100. Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): Over 17 years have elapsed since South Africa's Mandate over Namibia was terminated [*see resolution 2145 (XXI)*], but, unfortunately, we are still facing the same serious problems

as the racist Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation of that Territory in violation of all United Nations decisions. Five years after the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978), which raised great hopes for the Namibian people, the United Nations plan remains unimplemented and the people of Namibia continue to suffer the most inhuman degradation and brutal repression under a racist régime.

101. The problem of Namibia continues to trouble the international conscience more and more and is a problem requiring a solution most urgently, for it is that of the liberation of the Namibian people. It is also becoming more and more evident which forces are obstructing the attainment of the objective that the Namibian people will at last enjoy the inalienable right of every nation, the right to freedom. The trend of world opinion has been confirmed this year by important international conferences, such as the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March, and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April, as well as by the decisions of the Security Council this year, the last of which was adopted a few weeks ago.

102. At the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, many heads of State referred in their statements to the situation in Namibia. The President of the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, Mr. Jabłoński [13th meeting], pointed to the extremely serious international situation and to the necessity of eliminating international conflicts and tensions and the remnants of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racism. Let me quote from his statement on the problem of Namibia:

"The arrogance of the South African régime and the political manoeuvres of certain North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] States are being allowed to postpone the proclamation of the independence of Namibia, which should have become a sovereign State of free and independent Africa years ago".

103. The Government and people of Poland follow with deep concern the situation in and around Namibia. We consider that South Africa's military build-up and the brutal acts of armed aggression against neighbouring countries, particularly against Angola, pose a grave threat to peace and security in that region. Unfortunately, the more repressive the policies of the racist Pretoria régime become, the stronger is the support given to South Africa by its foreign protectors. Losing ground all over Africa as a result of the historic process of decolonization, they need a colonial Namibia in order to achieve their political, strategic and economic ends; they need it to blackmail the independent African nations, to destabilize their internal order and to hamper progressive transformation in many African countries.

104. Enjoying, as it does, the support of imperialist forces, the South African racist régime has made use of the opportunity to consolidate its illegal presence in Namibia and to drain the Territory of its precious wealth. It is now quite clear that the continuation of these policies would not have been possible had there not been co-operation by major NATO countries, and first of all by the United States, with Pretoria. The creation of the so-called contact group of five Western countries has now proved to be only a pretext to play for time and to defer *ad infinitum* the independence of Namibia. In fact, their negotiations have not brought the day of Namibia's liberation any closer and the only result has been to leave the problem of Namibia in deadlock.

105. As a member of the Security Council and as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Poland

has consistently endeavoured to make a constructive contribution towards the interests of Namibia. In doing so it has always observed the following fundamental guidelines: first, the people of illegally occupied Namibia have the inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia; secondly, Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until genuine self-determination and national independence are achieved in the Territory; thirdly, the genuine independence of Namibia can be achieved only with the direct and full participation of SWAPO in all efforts to implement United Nations resolutions relating to Namibia, the only parties to the conflict in Namibia being, on the one hand, South Africa, as the illegal occupying Power, and, on the other, the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative; fourthly, Walvis Bay and the offshore islands of Namibia are an integral part of the Territory and all attempts by South Africa to annex them are therefore illegal, null and void; fifthly, Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 385 (1976) are the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, to be implemented unconditionally, without modification or qualification. The crux of the matter, therefore, is not formal independence under a *de facto* perpetuation of Namibia's colonial exploitation, but complete decolonization of the Territory, in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

106. Having that in mind, and in view of the recent developments in the region, we cannot but join other delegations in their concern about the prospects for Namibia's independence. That concern has also been voiced in the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I], in the Paris Declaration on Namibia adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence⁹ and by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June 1983 [see A/38/312, annex, resolution AHG/Res.105 (XIX)]. One may also find confirmation of such awareness in the report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council⁵ after his recent visit to the region:

"The people of Namibia . . . are suffering not only denial of their legitimate aspirations for genuine self-determination and independence, but from the effects of procrastination and the uncertainty of their future."

107. Let me state here that the mandate given to the Secretary-General to act for the implementation of United Nations resolutions concerning the independence of Namibia creates favourable conditions for an acceleration of the process of liberation of Namibia. It is with confidence that we consider the measures already taken within that framework by the Secretary-General. We are likewise positively assessing the report he submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 532 (1983) of last May.

108. The debate in the Security Council a few weeks ago and resolution 539 (1983) which it then adopted are a further rejection of any attempt to solve the Namibian problem outside the United Nations. The resolution itself revealed the real nature of the insistence of South Africa on linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces stationed in an independent African State, at the invitation of that State, namely, Angola, which is a victim of frequent South African aggression. We firmly believe that this is a matter of exclusive concern to the two sovereign States involved and should by no means be allowed to impede Namibia's independence. The resolution itself leaves no room for doubt. It states that the Security 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 . . .”.

It therefore restores to the United Nations and to the Security Council full responsibility for the solution of the Namibian problem. By the same resolution, the Council also decided, “in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations”.

109. That is the long-standing position of the Government of the Polish People’s Republic. That is why Poland voted in the Security Council in favour of the said resolution concerning Namibia.

110. The Polish delegation would like to assure the Assembly that, as it has in the past, in full solidarity with the Namibian people and with their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, it will actively work for the speedy granting of independence to Namibia. We are prepared to continue our assistance to SWAPO, in particular in the area of education and training. We shall also continue to play an active part in the valuable efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia in promoting the cause of the Namibian people.

111. In concluding, I should like to express our deep conviction that the greater the efforts we make together within the framework of the Organization, the sooner we shall succeed in achieving liberty for the oppressed Namibian people.

112. Mr. OULD HAMODY (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Nobody can reproach Africa in general, and still less our brothers from southern Africa, for saddling the General Assembly with the aspects of long standing and those of more immediate relevance regarding *apartheid* and other practices of the minority South African régime.

113. That régime, which openly practises racism, which we have just been dealing with in its latest manifestation—the so-called constitutional changes—is permanently occupying part of Angola, has regularly been committing acts of aggression against other front-line countries and is defying the international community by nothing less than the confiscation of Namibia.

114. With regard to the question of Namibia, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania would remind the Assembly of its constant position. For our country, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only basis for restoring international legality to Namibia as well as the authority and exclusive responsibility of the United Nations in order to put an end to the illegal usurpation of the Territory, and to bring the united people of that country to mastery, in the full exercise of its sovereignty, of the country’s future.

115. Mauritania reaffirms its solidarity with the Namibian people and its authentic representative, SWAPO, which, in our view, remains the only negotiating partner for the settlement of this question.

116. We remain firmly opposed to any delaying tactics liable to delay the fulfilment of the aspirations of the Namibian people to national self-determination and independence.

117. The Islamic Republic of Mauritania in particular rejects the unjustified link which some people have attempted to create between the restoration of Namibia to its people by South Africa, and a question relating to the sovereign will of Angola, which is confronted with efforts to destabilize it.

118. Our delegation reaffirms, also, its full confidence in the group of African countries charged with the task of continuing frank and open dialogue with the Western countries to speed up the process of the liberation of the Territory of Namibia. We regret, however, that the reaffirmation in 1982 by the Western contact group, as it is known, of its commitment to the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to enable the Namibian people to exercise their right to self-determination, has not led to any signs of progress.

119. It is clear that this lack of progress is the result of the obstinacy of South Africa, which is creating every possible obstruction to delay the independence of Namibia and to intensify the exploitation of its riches.

120. We also note that South Africa has received encouragement in its obstinacy in the form of bilateral investments, multilateral assistance and growing co-operation with the Western countries and Israel, in both the cultural and the economic fields and in terms of political support and substantial and constant supplies of military material and other strategic products.

121. We continue to maintain that South Africa will only return to international legality if the Organization uses pressure to compel it to comply with the universal consensus on the question of Namibia. Thus, the Programme of Action on Namibia,⁹ adopted at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held last April in Paris, remains for our country the minimum basis for concerted, wide-scale action to force the minority South African régime to give way.

122. The co-operation of the major Western Powers is vital for the success of the Programme of Action on Namibia because of the volume of the co-operation of this group of countries with South Africa.

123. I should like to stress our delegation’s appreciation of the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka. The report of the Council [A/38/24] is an exhaustive document which, in our view, deserves the careful attention of the Assembly.

124. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): The debate on the question of Namibia, as in previous years, has once again shown the growing concern and frustration felt by the Assembly, as well as the international community, over the considerable delay and lack of progress in bringing that Territory to independence. The dismay and frustration extends far beyond Namibia and SWAPO. Nor is it confined to the OAU and Africa. For nearly a decade, the General Assembly has pronounced itself very clearly in support of the unconditional withdrawal from Namibia of the racist régime of South Africa and the Territory’s transition to independence. But, in characteristic fashion, the racist South African régime has simply ignored the various resolutions of the Assembly, as well as those of the Security Council.

125. Last May, the Security Council adopted resolution 532 (1983), which required South Africa to make a firm commitment regarding its readiness to comply with resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia’s independence. As a result of resolution 532 (1983), the Secretary-General went to South Africa for talks with the authorities there. It was a most courageous mission for which we are extremely grateful to him. But it soon became clear that the racist authorities were not really interested in a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question.

126. As the Secretary-General reported after his mission,⁵ he was not able to secure from South Africa the necessary assurances regarding its commitment to Namibia’s independence through negotiations. Though

agreement was apparently reached on other, secondary, issues, there was absolutely no progress on the basic issue of South Africa's compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Instead of addressing itself to this fundamental problem, the racist régime not only resorted to all kinds of prevarications, but gratuitously attempted to link its own withdrawal from Namibia with the parallel withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. It is not necessary to dwell any longer on this so-called linkage, which has been firmly rejected by both the Assembly and the Security Council.

127. Over the years, it has become quite apparent that, unless it is compelled to do so, South Africa has no intention of withdrawing from the Territory, even though its Mandate has been withdrawn and its presence there declared illegal. It has found one pretext after another for obstructing all efforts towards a negotiated settlement, including the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Its record on Namibia is one of broken promises. The hopes of the Namibian people have been repeatedly raised, only to be dashed. Not content with all the concessions it has managed to wring from SWAPO, the racist régime of South Africa has simply asked for more.

128. We are now faced with an impasse on the Namibian question owing to South Africa's intransigence. Yet it is imperative that something be done to break out of the impasse. South Africa's continued intransigence in this matter has simply become intolerable and completely unacceptable. Its defiance of the international community is severely damaging to the moral authority of the United Nations. It undermines the foundations of international law and order. It raises questions that transcend even the all-important issue of Namibia's independence.

129. The contact group of five Western nations has played a key role in the efforts to move towards a negotiated settlement. Over the years, the five have enjoyed the support and co-operation not only of the front-line States, but of all of Africa. We believed then that they were negotiating in good faith and that as friends of the racist régime they were well placed to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), by which, it may be recalled, the Council endorsed their own plan for Namibia's independence. Today, it is clear that they have failed completely to bring pressure to bear on South Africa in order to secure that independence. That failure stems from their own lack of political will and their regrettable disposition to underrate South Africa's capacity for duplicity and apparent determination to remain in Namibia at all costs.

130. Whatever their economic interests in southern Africa—and no one doubts that they are enormous—those interests will undoubtedly be jeopardized in the long run by the callous indifference they have shown to the terrible sufferings of the Namibian people under the colonial yoke of the racist régime. In the case of the United States, which has now strengthened its close ties with the racist régime in its constructive engagement policy, we have warned repeatedly that that policy will only serve to encourage the racist régime in its refusal to accept a negotiated settlement in Namibia. It is incredible that anyone would seriously believe in the efficacy and utility of such a policy in persuading the racist régime to co-operate on the question of Namibia.

131. In the intervening years, events in southern Africa have shown quite clearly that the policy of constructive engagement has proved to be an abject failure. It has done nothing to restrain South Africa. In fact, South Africa's persistent military attacks and other acts of destabilization against the front-line States are all a direct consequence

of the United States policy of constructive engagement, which implicitly allows the racist régime of South Africa a free hand to undertake military forays into the front-line States. At the United Nations, the racist régime is assured of diplomatic cover under the United States policy of constructive engagement. What incentive is there under this policy for the racist régime to co-operate if, as is obviously the case, it has been assured of United States support regardless of its irresponsible conduct? How can a régime such as South Africa's, which has demonstrated its inflexibility and intransigence beyond any doubt, be induced to co-operate when it is told in advance that its failure to do so will incur no penalties?

132. The struggle to bring about the independence of Namibia has been long, tedious, and frustrating. But this frustration should not obscure the greater danger involved in the persistent refusal of the racist régime of South Africa to accept international accountability, since South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes an act of aggression not only against the Namibian people, but against the United Nations. In the present circumstances, it is incumbent on the international community to take definite action to eliminate the dangerous threat to international peace and security presented by South Africa. The Namibian question represents the most serious challenge to international law. Failure to resolve the problem will be a serious blow to the survival of the United Nations as a force for world peace.

133. Despite the set-backs in resolving this question, we are convinced that Namibia is destined to achieve independence, either through a negotiated settlement or by armed struggle. We still hope for a negotiated settlement, as a bloody conflict over Namibia's independence is in the interest of no one, least of all of those who proclaim their adherence to democratic values and to the principle of self-determination. The Western Powers, particularly the United States, must abandon their policy of friendship for the racist régime in favour of a policy which, even at this late hour, may still help to eliminate the danger of a major conflagration in southern Africa.

Mr. Dorji (Bhutan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

134. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For some time now there has been a strong international demand that the Government of South Africa take energetic steps to implement the Security Council resolutions on the independence of Namibia, in particular resolution 435 (1978).

135. I must once again express the concern of the Bolivian Government over the delay in implementing that resolution, which provides the basis for a negotiated, peaceful solution of the question of Namibia's independence, thus putting an end to the painful and outrageous illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa.

136. These concerns were eloquently expressed by the international community at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, the International Conference in Solidarity with the Front-line States, held at Lisbon from 25 to 27 March 1983, and, most recently, by the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April. At all these conferences attempts were made to find ways to make real progress, in keeping with the efforts made by the United Nations.

137. We have read carefully the report of the Paris Conference,⁹ at which SWAPO and the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the able guidance of Mr. Lusaka, played an important role. The Conference analysed not only the problems involved in South Africa's

refusal to abide by the international community's appeal, but also matters relating to the violation of the right to life, the treatment of political prisoners, the disparity between the salaries of black and white workers, the forced mass displacement of populations, acts of aggression against the territory of neighbouring States, the plundering of natural resources and the refusal to return Walvis Bay, which is an integral and inseparable part of Namibia.

138. Despite all these efforts, we are again meeting here to debate the situation. The Namibians are still fighting to achieve self-determination, and the Government of South Africa is still finding new reasons to persist in delaying implementation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, as well as the advisory opinion delivered by the International Court of Justice.¹⁰ However, we should not come here merely to reaffirm our support for and solidarity with a people fighting fiercely to bring about better days of freedom and justice; we should go beyond this by giving the Secretary-General a broader mandate which will make possible the speedy implementation of the plan for Namibia's independence. We should also call for more decisive action on the part of the five countries of the contact group, which have the power to persuade South Africa, and induce them to make timely and effective use of that power.

139. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): Every year at this time, the General Assembly takes up an issue which is its most direct responsibility—the achievement of independence by Namibia. In the course of the debates on the issue, the detailed reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia are considered; the reports of the Secretary-General are examined; statements are made by Member States; and, at the end of every debate, half a dozen resolutions are adopted.

140. The story keeps repeating itself year after year, with the addition of a few reports of the regional and international solidarity meetings and conferences which are held between sessions of the Assembly. Yet no real, tangible steps can be taken to bring closer the Namibians' attainment of independence.

141. The colonial administration and the armed forces of the *apartheid* régime still remain in Namibia; extensive political, economic and military assistance from imperialist countries continues to be rendered to the *apartheid* régime; oppression and suppression of the Namibian people continue unabated; and depletion of Namibia's natural resources by capitalist multinational monopolies continues to drain Namibia of whatever is still left in that unfortunate land. What causes great concern is that the international community seems to have no foreseeable chance of putting an end to the shameful and deplorable situation in Namibia.

142. This year's exercise in the Assembly does not seem much different from last year's, and the result might very well be the adoption of a few more resolutions along the lines of those adopted before, which will most probably suffer the same fate. But one may wonder when the time will come for real and effective action to eliminate one of the last and most embarrassing vestiges of colonialism on the African continent.

143. Obviously, the key party responsible for the continuation of the present situation in Namibia is the abhorrent régime of South Africa, which, relying on the use of force and repression within Namibia and criminal armed aggression and acts of intimidation against the front-line States, is out to perpetuate its colonial hold on Namibia. However, that could not mislead the international community into ignoring some detrimental factors

at work which exist not in Namibia or South Africa but in the United States and some other Western countries.

144. The arrogant defiance of international public opinion by the racist Pretoria régime thus has its roots not only in the criminal and horrendous nature of the *apartheid* system but also in the policy of those quarters which have practically identified themselves with the perpetrators of that system, namely, the United States and some of its imperialist allies.

145. In circumstances where every effort is needed to isolate South Africa and to force it to abide by United Nations resolutions, the decision by the International Monetary Fund in November 1982 to grant special drawing rights of over \$1 billion to the *apartheid* régime can only be condemned in the strongest possible terms. That decision, which was adopted under open United States pressure, is particularly deplorable when the requests of a large number of developing countries for much smaller loans have been rejected by the same institution.

146. In the mean time, the plundering by the capitalist monopolies of Namibia's rich natural resources continues, in complete defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

147. Faced with the stubborn refusal of the *apartheid* régime to abide by United Nations resolutions, the Security Council adopted resolutions 418 (1977) on 4 November 1977 and 473 (1980) on 13 June 1980 on military sanctions against South Africa. Thanks to the continued covert military collaboration with the *apartheid* régime by the United States, some of its imperialist allies and the Zionist régime of Israel, those resolutions have lost virtually all their effectiveness in forcing the Pretoria régime to heed the calls of the international community.

148. Ever-increasing information is surfacing in the international media that reveals close military and intelligence links between the South African racist régime, on the one hand, and some Western countries, in particular the United States and the Zionist entity, on the other. What is of the greatest concern, not only for the African nations but also for all peace-loving nations in the world, is the collaboration with the South African racists in the nuclear field. Acquisition by South Africa of a nuclear capability will undoubtedly give rise to consequences that will seriously jeopardize peace and security throughout the world.

149. Throughout the years, the South African régime and its imperialist supporters, particularly the United States, have been trying to explain the colonial issue of Namibia within the context of East-West confrontation, and have therefore attempted to tie the solution of the Namibian question to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The international community has given a strong rebuff to that pretext. It is our belief that the question of Namibia is one of decolonization and self-determination, the final solution of which should not and cannot be tied to any other extraneous issues.

150. The verdict of the international community has been unequivocal. By resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. By the same resolutions, the General Assembly entrusted the United Nations Council for Namibia with the administration of the Territory.

151. To engage the United Nations in an exhaustive and perpetual diplomatic process, the racist régime of South Africa has repeatedly resorted to delaying tactics. The

activities of the so-called Western contact group have been instrumental in the carrying out of those manoeuvres. That so-called Western contact group, through which imperialist quarters would like to pacify the outrage of the international community, has failed to produce any tangible results.

152. Together with the continued suppression of the Namibian people, the brutal repression within South Africa and acts of aggression and intimidation against the front-line countries have been escalating. A large part of Angolan territory is still under occupation by South African armed forces; repeated criminal raids are conducted against towns and cities of Mozambique and Lesotho; and other acts of terrorism, sabotage, destabilization and pressure are perpetrated against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

153. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan reaffirms its strong support of and solidarity with the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO, in their struggle to achieve the independence of their Territory.

154. We also express our firm support for the struggle of the South African people and their liberation movement, the African National Congress of South Africa, against the abhorrent *apartheid* system, and our solidarity with the front-line States.

155. The question of Namibia can be solved only through the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), adopted on 29 September 1978. The people of Namibia, through their sole and legitimate representative, SWAPO, have given their full support to that and other relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and have co-operated fully with the United Nations in efforts to implement its plan on Namibia.

156. The people of Namibia, like any other people, are entitled to political independence, national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of their country, which, of course, includes Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in conformity with Security Council resolution 432 (1978) and the Declaration on Namibia and Programme of Action in Support of Self-Determination and National Independence for Namibia [see resolution S-9/2].

157. The international community should no longer tolerate the heavy burden of the Namibian question on its conscience, and should adopt more effective, practical measures to enable the people of Namibia freely to exercise its right to self-determination and independence.

158. Mr. BEAUGE (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly once again is considering the question of Namibia, one of the most important and high-priority items in the still unfinished process of decolonization which affects the development of peace and security throughout southern Africa.

159. The vast majority of the international community has expressed itself clearly and repeatedly in the United Nations, in the OAU and in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries—and indeed in all world forums—to the effect that the Namibian people must be allowed to exercise, freely and authentically, its right to self-determination and national independence, with full respect for its territorial integrity, thus enabling Namibia, once and for all, to embark on an independent life as a national State in the full exercise of its sovereignty.

160. There can be no doubt that the maintenance of the present *status quo* in Namibia is due to the arbitrary and illegal continuation of South Africa's colonial occupation in flagrant violation of the relevant resolutions of the

General Assembly and the Security Council. The international community, particularly the front-line States and also SWAPO, has given repeated demonstrations of its goodwill and patience in order to find a just and peaceful solution to the question of Namibia.

161. This year, the situation I have described, which has been perpetuated by the defiant and illegal conduct of South Africa, was dealt with in Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983). It has been clearly established that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the sole basis for a peaceful solution of the Namibian problem; that the independence of this Territory cannot be contingent on the fulfilment of conditions which have not been provided for in the independence plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and which affect the sovereignty of independent States. The Pretoria Government must accept the facts of justice and history. It must cease its actions and policies that obstruct the independence of Namibia. It must abstain from intimidation, aggression and illegal occupation against neighbouring countries, particularly against Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho.

162. The Argentine Republic, which emerged as a sovereign State as a result of its people's struggle for self-determination and independence, and which is still suffering from colonial domination over part of its territory, whole-heartedly shares the sentiments of the Namibian people in favour of freedom and development. The Government and people of Argentina are fully convinced, as is the overwhelming majority of the international community, that the emergence of Namibia as an independent State will only be possible if there is a faithful and immediate compliance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 432 (1978) guaranteeing the full territorial integrity of Namibia.

163. Accordingly, my delegation believes that, if the delaying tactics of South Africa continue in flagrant violation and disregard of the decisions of the Organization, particularly of Security Council resolution 539 (1983), this body should take all necessary measures, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to see to it that the process of decolonization of Namibia becomes a reality as soon as possible.

164. The elimination of colonialism in all its forms and of the *apartheid* régime is the basic objective of the international community. Therefore, the Argentine Republic repeats its support for all the efforts of the Organization, particularly those of the front-line States, to ensure that the Namibian people can enjoy its well-deserved freedom and justice.

165. Finally, I would like to express our particular appreciation for the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the distinguished and efficient presidency of Mr. Paul Lusaka, and to reaffirm our commitment in support of the efforts made for the just cause of the independence of Namibia.

166. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In October of this year, after considering the report of the Secretary-General on the question of Namibia submitted after his visit to southern Africa,⁵ the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 539 (1983) in which it, *inter alia*, called upon South Africa to co-operate, without delay, with the Secretary-General with a view to facilitating the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Unfortunately, South Africa's reply to the Council once again prevented the achievement of that just aim.

167. The reports of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24] and of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [A/38/23] gave explicit descriptions of the characteristics and the dimensions of the resources in the Namibian subsoil, as well as the extent of foreign interests which, by profiting from those resources, become factors impeding the decolonization process. Whatever arguments might be adduced to justify that exploitation on the grounds of Namibian development, the sad truth is that in the present circumstances the majority of the Namibian people suffers from poverty and discrimination.

168. It is the sovereign right of all countries to establish the rules regulating the presence of foreign interests in its territory. This is the only way to protect national interests. Thus, it should be the people of Namibia which administers and controls the exploitation of its resources, in particular its non-renewable resources. The unfortunate reality for this people is quite different, and that is why my delegation would like to call again for the speedy withdrawal of the forces that are illegally occupying the Territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

169. The Peruvian Constitution provides absolute guarantees of the rights and freedoms of the individual and opposes any form of discrimination, whether on the basis of race, religion or political creed. The institutionalization of racial discrimination in Namibia and South Africa must thus be condemned by my country. There is no valid reason for the minorities in those countries to continue to oppress the majority, to which the Territory has belonged from time immemorial.

170. There is no reason to prolong the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. This is why we are pleased to note the position adopted by the States members of the Western contact group in dissociating themselves from any South African demands not specified in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This attitude is entirely supported by my delegation and we hope that this position will also be adopted by other Western countries, so that real pressure will be exerted that will lead to the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

171. Similarly, my delegation reiterates its appreciation of the objectivity and diligence shown by the Secretary-General in dealing with the question before us.

172. This year we are commemorating the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great American liberator, Simón Bolívar. He lived and fought for the cause of freedom and to restore the dignity and value of the human being. A Peruvian writer said of him, *inter alia*, that "With the passage of the centuries his glory will grow, as grow the shadows after the sun sets".

173. We hope that the light of the liberating spirit of the life and work of Bolívar will inspire the international community as it seeks justice for the people of Namibia.

174. Mr. DESKER (Singapore): Year after year, numerous resolutions, declarations and programmes of action relating to the question of Namibia have been adopted by the General Assembly with support from the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations. However, the people of Namibia remain under the illegal occupation of South Africa. The question may therefore be asked, "What is the purpose of yet another debate on Namibia?"

175. The answer is that no State, whether big or small, powerful or weak, isolated or internationally accepted,

can be unaffected by international opinion or be indifferent to the will of the international community. Thus the views and arguments propounded by the Assembly will have an impact over time and to varying degrees on the behaviour of the Governments to which they are addressed. However, in order that these views may be respected and regarded as the considered opinion of responsible members of the international community, it is essential that certain norms guide our deliberations.

176. Our statements should be rational and based on solid information. The assessments we make should be based on facts. Our proposals should be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Our views should be couched in the language of reason and logic, not inflated or abusive rhetoric. If we do not observe these norms, those who are the object of our appeals, our entreaties and our demands will simply ignore our point of view. The General Assembly will be reduced to a debating society, with little influence on the course of events or issues of international concern.

177. It is in this frame of mind that my delegation has approached our current discussion on the question of Namibia.

178. My delegation regrets the continued placing of obstacles in the path of the people of Namibia in their efforts to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as recognized in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and in Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), as well as in subsequent resolutions of the Assembly relating to Namibia. My delegation regrets that, despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971 delivered in response to the request addressed to it by the Security Council in its resolution 284 (1970) of 29 July 1970,¹⁰ the people of Namibia have still not attained their independence. We regard South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia as illegal and lacking in legal or moral justification.

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

180. My delegation supports the struggle of the people of Namibia to liberate themselves from South African colonialism and racism. We welcome the leading role played by SWAPO as the authentic representative of the Namibian people in their efforts to secure freedom and independence for their country. We recognize the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Namibia by all the means at their disposal to end the illegal occupation of their Territory by South Africa. We call upon the international community to continue its support for the people of Namibia, and urge the redoubling of efforts aimed at ensuring that, on the attainment of its independence, Namibia has a pool of highly qualified, trained and educated Namibians.

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

182. The delegation of Singapore deeply regrets the continued lack of co-operation by South Africa, which has prevented the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We believe that this resolution,

together with Security Council resolution 385 (1976), is the only realistic basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. My delegation therefore calls for its immediate and unconditional implementation. We support the Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted by the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence,⁹ held in April 1983. We call upon the Government of South Africa to implement in good faith the United Nations plan which it accepted five years ago. We urge South Africa to cooperate forthwith and fully with the Secretary-General in order to expedite implementation of resolution 435 (1978) for the immediate independence of Namibia. We cannot but condemn the various obstacles and excuses which the Government of South Africa has put forward during the past five years in order to avoid the implementation of the United Nations plan.

183. As for the current position of the Government of South Africa that the implementation of the plan is linked to the withdrawal of the foreign troops present in Angola, we wish simply to point out that South Africa did not make this a condition of its acceptance of the United Nations plan in 1978, and that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence should be dealt with on its own merits and not linked to other, extraneous, issues.

184. If South Africa continues to obstruct the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations will have to be considered.

185. Mr. SOGLO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly is once again dealing with the question of Namibia, and doing so 37 years after the item first appeared on its agenda and 17 years after the Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated the Mandate of South Africa over that Territory.

186. In spite of certain hypocritical statements and professions of good faith, the outcome of this debate cannot be subject to any doubt—an unambiguous debate, in which once again a unanimous General Assembly will endorse the concerns expressed by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the Secretary-General—both, in their respective reports, attempted to reflect the feelings of frustration and indignation of the international community in the face of the persistence and intolerable defiance of the Pretoria racists.

187. The Assembly will unanimously condemn South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibian territory; it will solemnly proclaim its unreserved support for the fight of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative.

188. It will unanimously condemn the stepping-up of barbaric repression, the policy of “bantustanization” and efforts to disrupt the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

189. It will unanimously condemn the ruthless exploitation of the Namibian people, the shameless plundering of its resources, the militarization of its territory and its use as a base for committing acts of aggression against the front-line States, particularly Angola and Zambia.

190. It will unanimously reaffirm its loyalty to and support for the United Nations plan laid down in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as a universally accepted basis for a settlement of the Namibian problem, a settlement which is to guarantee the Namibian people the exercise of its most inalienable rights to independence and international sovereignty.

191. Will we, after such a fine example of unanimity, have any guarantee, even then, that the laggards of Pretoria will finally come to understand that they are striving in vain to halt the irreversible tide of history?

192. Will we have any guarantee, after all that, that there will be an end to all the machinations, hypocrisies and cold-blooded calculations on the part of those who hitherto have encouraged and continue to encourage Pretoria to continue its outrageous defiance of the international community?

193. Will we have any guarantee, after all that, that the members of the contact group, those who on their own initiative set themselves the task of working for the rapid implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, resolution 435 (1978) in particular, will finally make up their minds to exert the necessary pressure on Pretoria?

194. We have been frustrated for too long not to be prey to serious doubts today. Today, like yesterday, unfortunately, we can be sure of the political blindness and bad faith of the racist clique of Pretoria. Today, like yesterday, we shall have to reckon with the sordid machinations of certain imperialist quarters.

195. If Security Council resolution 435 (1978) gave rise to much hope, it was not so much because of the relevance of certain of its provisions but rather because it was conceived by those very people who have constantly maintained with the racist régime of Pretoria relations which are, to say the least, blameworthy and because it was negotiated by all parties concerned. South Africa, having been consulted, gave its assent at all the stages of the negotiations. Resolution 435 (1978) can be seen as a compromise, designed to win the agreement of all parties. Unfortunately, five years after its adoption by the Security Council, South Africa, far from respecting the commitments which it entered into voluntarily, is striving to strengthen its grip on the Territory, to suppress, exploit and plunder the Namibian people.

196. We shall not repeat here the long list of the abhorrent crimes of the South African régime.

197. This obstinacy of South Africa in its flouting of the unanimous decisions of the Organization can only be explained by the complicity—I would almost say the treachery—of certain imperialist Powers which, conniving with it, have been shamelessly exploiting the Namibian people, ruthlessly plundering their resources, in spite of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974. There is every ground for believing that the idea is first of all to exhaust the sizeable natural resources of Namibia before allowing it to become independent.

198. In the face of these facts, we are entitled to wonder what has been the use, so far, of the contact group of five Western Powers. Ever since it announced its intention, in 1977, of working towards the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Organization in order to bring its South African partner to listen to reason, we cannot but note that the contact group has been unable to do its job—a job which it set itself. Entangled in its contradictions and divided within itself, the contact group has become, rather, a brake on the process of independence. It is not surprising, therefore, that SWAPO should have come to the conclusion that:

“... the five Western Powers were no longer honest brokers in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and that these Powers must be persuaded to give up their attempt to divert and abuse the process of negotiations on Namibia for their own selfish ends”.

While sharing this view, we should like none the less to pay a tribute to those members of the group which, like France, have publicly dissociated themselves from certain manoeuvres.

199. One such manoeuvre is the linking of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola with the independence of Namibia. This not only constitutes interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign States of Angola and Cuba, but is, above all, an attempt to facilitate and compound the crimes committed every day by South African soldiers against Angola and the other States of the area.

200. The Secretary-General, in his report to the Security Council,⁵ notes that the question of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition of Namibian independence now constitutes the only obstacle to implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The entire international community has rejected this pre-condition with such firmness that its sponsors should at last decide to withdraw it.

201. In the face of the obstinacy and arrogance of South Africa, the Organization has no choice but to adopt measures under Chapter VII of the Charter, namely, to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa that will end all military and nuclear co-operation with it, impose an effective oil embargo, break off all economic and trade relations, in particular, discontinuing the purchase of gold and other minerals, and deny it access to technology.

202. Only this isolation of South Africa, whose economy is largely dependent upon Western countries, and will be seriously affected by comprehensive sanctions, is likely to persuade it to see reason.

203. In the face of the intransigence of South Africa and in view of the ineffectiveness of the Organization, particularly the Security Council, the valiant people of Namibia have no option but to take up arms under the leadership of SWAPO. This is a difficult course, but it has always led peoples which have fought for the just cause of their independence to final victory.

204. This debate once again provides an opportunity not only to show South Africa how determined the international community is to oppose its foreign policy by all possible means, but also to remind the members of the contact group of the spirit and letter of the settlement plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in the drafting of which they played an important part.

205. My delegation therefore reaffirms its whole-hearted support for the just struggle of the Namibian people and congratulates the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the leadership of its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, has spared no effort to fulfil the responsibilities entrusted to it as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence. We wish also to express to the Secretary-General our satisfaction and gratitude for his devotion to the cause of Namibia. The relevance and rightness of the conclusions reached by both the Council and the Secretary-General should, if they are accepted by all and faithfully implemented, finally allow the Namibian people to live in freedom in the land of their fathers.

206. The People's Republic of Benin, its people, its progressive People's Revolutionary Party and its Government will continue to give the Namibian people and its sole authentic representative, SWAPO, its militant and unswerving support until the final victory. Ready for the revolution—the struggle continues!

207. Mr. BIGOMBE (Uganda): I wish at the outset, on behalf of my delegation, to thank the United Nations

Council for Namibia, which is the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, for the report before us [A/38/24], which covers a broad spectrum of the activities of the Council and its assessment of developments relating to the question of Namibia. Our special gratitude goes to the members of the Council, in particular to Mr. Paul Lusaka, its President, for their vigilance in furthering the just cause of the Namibian people. I also wish to congratulate Mr. Mohamed Sahnoun, of Algeria, acting President of the Council, on his presentation of the Council's report at the beginning of the consideration of this item [72nd meeting].

208. We also pay a tribute to the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Namibia for the valuable work being done by them to hasten the independence of Namibia.

209. I wish to commend the members 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, in particular its Chairman, Mr. Koroma, of Sierra Leone, for their report [A/38/23] and their sustained effort to bring to an end colonialism in Namibia.

210. The General Assembly is once again considering the perennial question of Namibia, a question with regard to which the Organization has for the past 17 years continued to experience open defiance of its decisions by the racist régime of South Africa. As we continue to discuss this item we are gravely concerned by the plight of the people of Namibia, who continue to suffer under the oppressive and exploitative rule of the colonial, racist régime of South Africa. This is all the more true in that, while the racist régime of South Africa continues to frustrate the implementation of the United Nations plan, it has also continued to commit atrocities in that Territory and has stepped up such action, with the sole purpose of thwarting the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to independence.

211. The situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa remains grave. As stated in a working paper prepared by the Secretariat for the Special Committee:

“South Africa has enacted a great number of repressive laws aimed at intimidating and terrorizing black Namibians. These laws give the South African colonial police and occupation forces absolute power to ban organizations and publications opposed to Pretoria's illegal occupation of Namibia, and to detain or deport Namibians without trial. They also provide for preventive detention, the banning of meetings, the imposition of martial law and the establishment of ‘security districts’ to stifle the political struggle of the Namibian people.”¹¹

Under these laws, acts of terrorism, oppression, imprisonment, torture and intimidation of the Namibian people have continued to be committed by the South African occupation forces.

212. In its desperate attempt to prevent an internationally recognized settlement, South Africa has continued to design fraudulent schemes aimed at perpetuating its control over Namibia. The latest ploy, of establishing a so-called “Council of State”, which has failed to gain ground in the Territory, is another such attempt. The collapse in January this year of the puppet administration, which Pretoria imposed on the Namibian people in 1978, and the resumption of direct administration of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa, illustrate that no fraudulent schemes in disregard of the United

Nations plan can result in a just and lasting solution of the Namibian question.

213. The other issue of grave concern regarding the Territory of Namibia is the militarization of that Territory by the racist régime of South Africa. In seeking to perpetuate its illegal control of Namibia, the Pretoria régime has moved large numbers of heavily armed troops into Namibia, recruited mercenaries from Western countries to serve in the South African Defence Force deployed in Namibia, and has, as a result, turned Namibia into a garrison State. The military build-up has reached a point where today there is one soldier of the racist régime to every 12 Namibians.

214. These forces are subjecting the Namibian masses daily to untold sufferings in the form of cold-blooded murder, abduction, torture, detention, massacres of innocent villagers, forcible removal of communities for political or military purposes, destruction of property and other acts of intimidation and manipulation. As a result, a large part of the Territory has been transformed into a permanent war zone, serving as buffer zone between Namibia and the front-line States.

215. Another dangerous aspect of the militarization of Namibia has been the systematic campaign for the destabilization of the neighbouring independent States. Using the international Territory of Namibia as a launching pad, South Africa has repeatedly committed blatant acts of aggression against the front-line States, in particular against Angola, and has in the process caused extensive damage and destruction to life and property. Women and children and other innocent civilians have been its constant victims. Today, the racist forces still occupy the southern part of Angolan territory.

216. It is regrettable to note that transnational corporations from certain Western countries have continued to be major supporters of South Africa's military establishment in Namibia. These corporations, in collaboration with racist South Africa, have continued not only to plunder the natural resources in utter disregard of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and of resolutions and decisions of the Organization, but also to supply the racist régime with dual-purpose equipment and large financial support. As stated in the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24], these corporations:

“... purchase South African defence bonds, service the part of the economy concerned with the production of military equipment, finance arms purchases by South Africa, provide loans which augment South Africa's military expenditures, [and] provide facilities for South African military personnel . . .”

The collaboration of these countries with the racist régime continues to strengthen South Africa's military capability and to consolidate the illegal military occupation of Namibia.

217. The political and military implications of these developments are grave and constitute a threat to international peace and security. There is, therefore, an urgent need, today more than ever, for the Organization and the international community to take united and firm action against the racist régime of South Africa aimed at ending its illegal occupation of Namibia.

218. The international community has continued to mobilize support for an end to the illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist régime. The adoption of the Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia by the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence in April this year⁹ further enhances our

determination in support of the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

219. It is unfortunate that, because of the friendship it enjoys with certain Western countries, the racist régime of South Africa has continued to flout the decisions of the Organization.

220. The Secretary-General, in his report submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 532 (1983),⁵ stated that, although virtually all issues contemplated under the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia have been resolved, 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 implement the plan.

221. The continued insistence by the racist régime of South Africa on an issue internationally rejected and totally unrelated to the decolonization of Namibia demonstrates the bad faith which is the true characteristic of that régime, designed to undercut all peaceful efforts for a just and lasting settlement of the Namibian question.

222. We in Uganda have continued to reject any attempts to cast the question of the decolonization of Namibia in the mould of East-West rivalry and strategic considerations. We continue to reject any idea that the Namibian settlement is contingent upon the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We maintain that resolution 435 (1978) remains the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question.

223. We welcomed the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 539 (1983) in October this year, in which the Council, the responsible body for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues incompatible with resolution 435 (1978). The Council also called upon South Africa to co-operate with the Secretary-General and to communicate to him its choice of electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed by the Council in its resolution 435 (1978). In accordance with those resolutions, my delegation remains ready to support the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, against the racist régime in the event of its continued obstruction of the independence of Namibia.

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

225. Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like on behalf of my delegation to address our sincere congratulations and deep appreciation to the United Nations Council for Namibia, in particular to its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, for their tireless efforts for the independence of Namibia and in the discharge of the Council's mandate.

226. Once again we find before us the question of Namibia, which has been dealt with in countless resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. We are considering this question again today with feelings of disappointment, frustration

and indignation. Indeed, 17 years after the Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate in Namibia [see resolution 2145 (XXI)] and five years after the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, we are forced to note that Namibia is still under South Africa's illegal occupation. The authorities of Pretoria have sought one pretext after another or raised one obstacle after another, always in an effort to prolong their occupation of Namibia.

227. In order to crush the resistance of the Namibian people, the South African authorities have maintained in Namibia an army estimated to number 100,000 men. In addition to that, there are mercenary forces recruited by South Africa to serve in the so-called South African Defence Force. In 1981, the authorities occupying Namibia also established conscription for the black Namibian population, and as a result several hundred young Namibians have fled their land to seek refuge in neighbouring countries in order to escape this forced enlistment.

228. The continuing illegal occupation of Namibia means that the authorities in Pretoria are continuing to plunder the natural resources of Namibia. That continuing illegal occupation means above all that the Namibian people are continuing to suffer the same tragic fate as the black people of South Africa because of the inhuman policy of *apartheid* practised by the Pretoria régime. The Namibian patriots continue to be the victims of intimidation, arrest, imprisonment and other brutal forms of coercion.

229. In the face of this intransigent stand by South Africa, which refuses to implement the United Nations plan, and in the face of such repression of the Namibian people, we welcome the fact that those people have stepped up their struggle and the international community its efforts to bring about the liberation of Namibia.

230. The Namibian people, like any other people under colonial domination or under alien domination or occupation, have no alternative other than to intensify their just struggle in all forms, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative, to attain the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a united Namibia. It is encouraging to note that the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people has made considerable progress during the past 12 months. We are pleased to note that, as was made clear once again by Mr. Peter Mueshihange, the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, in his statement to the Assembly on 28 November [72nd meeting], SWAPO is prepared to co-operate in negotiations in order to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. I should also like to take this opportunity to reiterate the fraternal solidarity of the Government and people of Democratic Kampuchea with the just struggle of the people of Namibia.

231. Since we considered the question of Namibia at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the international community has on three occasions spoken out unequivocally on this issue. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence was held in Paris last April and adopted the Paris Declaration and the Programme of Action on Namibia; the Security Council met and on 31 May of this year unanimously adopted resolution 532 (1983); it met again in October on the same subject, at which time it adopted resolution 539 (1983). On each of those three occasions, once again the international community, first, condemned South Africa's persistent illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council; secondly, condemned South Africa for the obstacles it has raised

to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); and, thirdly, reiterated, according to paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 539 (1983), that Security Council resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, was the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem.

Mr. Malinga (Swaziland), Vice-President, took the Chair.

232. The General Assembly must at the end of this debate give a clear and firm signal to South Africa that its illegal occupation of Namibia cannot be prolonged with impunity. The United Nations, in particular the Security Council, must do everything in its power to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia without modification or reservations so that the Namibian people, who have suffered all too much, can attain their noble and legitimate aspirations and see their land, Namibia, free, independent and sovereign throughout the whole of its territory, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands.

233. In conclusion, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, who, through his steadfast commitment to the cause of Namibian independence, has kept this question at the heart of the activities of the Organization and has done so much to discharge the mandate entrusted to him by the Security Council to implement resolution 435 (1978).

234. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): There is a truism which states that those who forget the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. How much harder will be our fate if we continue in the Organization to ignore the lessons of yesteryear, and yesterday: the Sabra and Shatila massacres, Grenada and Cyprus to name just a few.

235. What are the facts in the inexorable tide of events which now characterizes the question of Namibia? Despite the adoption by the Assembly in 1966 of its resolution 2145 (XXI), which placed Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations as the best means for it to achieve independence, despite the adoption by the Security Council of its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), and despite constant reaffirmation since then of those resolutions, how close to independence can we honestly say that Namibia is in 1983?

236. Even more of an indictment of the Organization's handling of the question of Namibia is the fact that since the Assembly adopted resolution 2248 (S-V) in 1967, which established the United Nations Council for Namibia with the objective, *inter alia*, of obtaining the withdrawal of the illegal South African régime from Namibia and taking over the administration of the Territory, South Africa, in its continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, not only has consolidated its control over the Territory in political, civil, economic, social and military matters, but has intensified it so that Namibians are under attack not only as residents in their own country, but also as refugees in sympathetic neighbouring front-line States.

237. In addition, because of South Africa's ever-increasing capabilities in the nuclear field, it holds as potential hostages not only the people of Namibia but the entire African continent and even—if we wanted to indulge in writing "worst-case" scenarios—every one of us sitting here today.

238. It is not the intention of my delegation to assume the role of a prophet of doom for the sake of pure effect. If it were, I could add another dimension to what I have depicted so far by detailing the human rights atrocities, summarized in some of the reports before us, which the minority South African régime is perpetrating, up to this

very moment as we gather here, against the people of Namibia. However, while it may seem to be a disservice to the suffering people of Namibia, I shall not do so, because the intention of this statement is to provoke us all—particularly the main protagonists in this sad situation—to take stock and honestly, even coldly, to assess what course of action in respect of this question is in the best interest of all of us, from the immediate as well as from the long-term perspective.

239. My delegation's summary of the primary facts of the question of Namibia—indispensable for a comprehensive, objective stock-taking in furtherance of a just and lasting solution to the question—would not be complete without the observation that perhaps the only truly positive development in the failure to date of the United Nations to implement its resolutions on Namibian independence is the fact that time has, at least, unequivocally exposed the true intentions and degree of commitment to the attainment of this goal of all the protagonists.

240. What are we now to do in the face of the continued non-implementation of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 532 (1983)? Is the immediate independence of Namibia truly not in the best interests of us all?

241. We now have before us the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia [see A/38/24] and of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [see A/38/23]. These recommendations, while laudable in addressing all the multiple facets of the problem presented by the question of Namibia, are none the less excessively lengthy and introduce no qualitative changes—which, we can say in the light of experience, does not augur well for immediate, definitive solutions, of which the most important would be the independence of Namibia before the thirty-ninth session of the Assembly. It must also be observed that the question of Namibia, like that of disarmament, illustrates the limits of public consciousness-raising when decision makers—particularly when they are acting as protagonists—give priority to national interests over international obligations.

242. Thus, obviously, the question still remains: What is to be done, in this state of affairs of the potential continued non-implementation of resolutions of the Assembly and of the Security Council?

243. In the face of the continued intransigence of the South African Government, which is one of the root causes of the non-implementation of the resolutions of the Assembly and of the Council, we in the General Assembly—especially the major protagonists—must all, in the view of the Bahamas delegation, undertake a serious cost-benefit analysis of the degree of our individual and collective contribution to South Africa's intransigence.

244. For my delegation, such an analysis must not neglect to include at the very least, first, an assessment of the financial costs of continued management by the Organization of South Africa's intransigence, especially when—irony of all ironies—that country contributes not one Krugerrand to defray them. In this context, we must not forget the financial costs of the Sisyphean task of providing economic and other assistance to the front-line States, only to have South Africa's military arsenal periodically undo it.

245. Secondly, it must include an assessment of the social costs to fellow human beings in Namibia and the front-line States. Is continuing verbal solidarity in the face of such suffering and dislocation worthy of the Organization?

246. Thirdly, it must evaluate the political costs. Can we afford, regionally and internationally, to continue ignoring the fact that there is strength in unity?

247. Finally, it must tally up the international costs, which are the greatest potential costs, quantitatively and qualitatively, in so far as they have the potential to escalate the financial costs and spread the social costs to the territories of us all. I refer in particular to such international costs as armed conflict, which fuels international instability, especially when there is the distinct possibility of the use of nuclear weaponry.

248. By way of additional illustration, I return to the observation I made at the beginning of my statement: history is unequivocal in demonstrating that strategic and profit-making interests, when pursued in the context of a dulled or uncaring social conscience, provide their own antidote, which is far from pleasant, all the more so when hindsight and jolted social conscience are forced to agree that it was all avoidable.

249. A foreign policy which is, in essence, founded on pragmatism must, if it is to be considered enlightened, take into account long-term, as well as short-term and medium-term, interests. In this context, it therefore bears observing that, whatever one's global view or aspirations with respect to international society, the dynamics of interdependence ultimately nullify the national interests which ignore it.

250. I wish to leave the Assembly with the following fact: South Africa's actions not only inflict terror and suffering on Namibia and other southern African States, but also constitute open defiance of the United Nations itself. Shall we continue to allow South Africa to make a mockery of the very Organization in which we all place our hopes for the future stability of our peoples?

251. In conclusion, I wish to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its continuous hard work and dedication, under the leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, and to the heroic people of Namibia for their unwavering struggle for freedom, under their legitimate representative, SWAPO.

252. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea): The General Assembly is once again called upon to deliberate on this long-standing issue of Namibian independence. It is a well-known fact that the *apartheid* régime of South Africa has time and again, and with impunity, refused to comply with all the relevant United Nations resolutions calling for the unconditional cessation of its illegal occupation of Namibia and for the exercise by the oppressed Namibian people of its right to self-determination and independence.

253. My delegation has followed very closely the events that have taken place over the past year and notes with deep regret that no positive progress has been made since this body last dealt with this issue. This is due, as we all know, to the persistent arrogance of the racist régime of Pretoria and its contempt for the Charter of the United Nations and the fundamental principles of human rights.

254. The international community has been told bluntly that independence for Namibia is not possible because of the so-called issue of linkage. My delegation would like to point out that this is just another delaying tactic being used by the illegal régime and its supporters to prolong Namibia's wait for independence. We would therefore call upon the international community to press for independence at an early date, as provided for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and to bring about the genuine realization of that ultimate dream of the people of Namibia.

255. The notion of linkage was never an issue when talks began in the first instance between the contact group of Western allies and South Africa. It became an issue only very recently, when one of the leading members of the contact group suddenly decided that the issue of independence for Namibia should be linked to the withdrawal of foreign forces from Angola. However, the Government of Papua New Guinea is pleased to note, and at the same time gives full support to, Security Council resolution 539 (1983) of 28 October 1983, which rejects any extraneous or irrelevant issues such as the linkage of Cuban troops to Namibian independence.

256. The *apartheid* régime of South Africa continues to exploit the people and the mineral resources of the Territory of Namibia with the compliance and co-operation of some members of the Assembly. South Africa's military build-up and operations in Namibia pose a serious threat not only to the oppressed Namibian people and their aspirations but also to the States neighbouring South Africa.

257. My delegation reiterates its call upon the international community, and more particularly the Western Powers, to cease forthwith all political, social, economic, military and other links with the illegal régime of Pretoria, as a genuine and practical demonstration of support for the struggling people of Namibia, who are ably led by SWAPO, and for the United Nations.

258. I should like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the Government of Papua New Guinea our sincere thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his reports and his relentless efforts to find a final solution to the Namibian problem. My Government also commends the United Nations Council for Namibia for its report [A/38/24] and supports the recommendations contained therein.

259. In conclusion, my delegation reiterates its firm belief that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides the best basis upon which a peaceful solution can be brought about in Namibia. The world body must not entertain any more delaying tactics by the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria. The international community and, more importantly, the people of Namibia have been waiting for far too long for the freedom that is rightfully theirs. We in Papua New Guinea reiterate our support for and sympathy with the struggle of the Namibian people, under the legitimate leadership of SWAPO.

260. Mr. MUHAMMED (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Many years have passed and the General Assembly goes on discussing the question of Namibia, either at its regular sessions or at its special sessions. Despite the widespread international interest in this question—which is, indeed, one of the most serious facing the Organization—the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria continues to defy the international community and to obstruct, with every means at its disposal, the achievement of independence by Namibia.

261. The record of the racist régime speaks for itself. The countries of the world have unanimously agreed to place squarely on the shoulders of that régime direct responsibility for the continued suffering of the Namibian people and the denial of their just and inalienable right to self-determination and political freedom. Stubbornness, intransigence and contempt for the will of the international community are the hallmarks of the action of the racist régime in South Africa.

262. No one can deny that today the South African authorities are even more intransigent and aggressive. Their record is replete with broken promises. The racist Pretoria régime wants to impose extraneous issues on us

in order to evade the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) concerning Namibia's independence. On the basis of a request made by the Security Council in its resolution 532 (1983), the Secretary-General visited South Africa. Before he left, the Pretoria régime assured him that it accepted Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 532 (1983) as the basis for further discussions, and that it was prepared, without prejudice to its position on other regional issues, to discuss the two remaining outstanding issues relating to the electoral system and the few remaining points pertaining to UNTAG and its composition.

263. In his report to the Council,⁵ the Secretary-General explained that during his consultations it was possible to achieve agreement with the South African Government on those two issues. However, the Pretoria régime has returned to its deceitful and delaying tactics and it made it clear in the Security Council in October that, with regard to solution of the outstanding problems relating to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), it was impossible to make further progress towards implementation of the plan for Namibian independence on the basis of that resolution without prior withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. We feel that it is indeed strange that South Africa should impose an extraneous pre-condition of its Government's co-operation with the United Nations in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

264. The racist régime of South Africa, after obtaining one concession after another from all the parties concerned, now demands new concessions. It used the pretext of United Nations partiality and then sought to involve so-called internal parties. It then raised difficulties concerning the composition of UNTAG and the electoral system, after agreement had been reached on all these matters. It calls for more concessions when it knows very clearly that its demands are outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978).

265. The continued obstruction by the racist régime of all efforts aimed at the peaceful achievement of Namibia's independence and the violation with impunity by that régime of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions have dealt a serious blow to the United Nations. We must point out that the repeated use by some of the permanent members of the Security Council of tactics which hinder the Council's efforts and prevent it from taking a decisive stand against the racist régime of South Africa is what drives that régime and encourages it in its recalcitrance and its refusal to co-operate with the United Nations on Namibia. Some member countries of the contact group have defended South Africa's delaying tactics and objected to the imposition of sanctions against the Pretoria régime under the pretext that there is a possibility of overcoming South Africa's objections during discussions.

266. The United Nations has a moral and political commitment to support the people of Namibia in the achievement of true and effective independence. Therefore the United Nations Council for Namibia should receive continued support. It is the sole legitimate Administering Authority for the Territory until Namibia is able to accede to independence. Support for SWAPO, the sole representative of the people of Namibia, should be redoubled; it should be able to depend on continued backing and increase its legitimate struggle against the racist régime of Pretoria until the Namibian people's aspirations to freedom, sovereignty and independence are fulfilled. The international community wishes to see a unified, independent Namibian State, without any surrender of its right to Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. Any attempt

by South Africa to separate those islands from the Territory and to prevent the exercise of sovereignty over those areas is illegitimate, unacceptable and null and void.

267. The activities of transnational corporations and other foreign economic interests in Namibia, aimed at plundering the Territory's wealth and obstructing its independence, violate the provisions of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,² enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974, in the most explicit way. Foreign monopolies continue to mine the uranium, diamonds and other minerals in Namibia, to an extent that constitutes plunder and brutal exploitation of the riches of the Namibian people. Selfish, strategic military and political interests are the motives of the Western companies in Namibia and they hinder the achievement of a settlement of the question of Namibia.

268. The Pretoria régime continues to build up its military capabilities, massively increase its armaments and establish military industries and foreign bases with the aim of tightening its grip on Namibia and using its territory as a springboard for aggression against front-line sovereign States, especially Angola. The racist régime continues to wage an undeclared war against the people of Namibia and neighbouring African countries, making use of all types of destructive and aggressive weapons. The flow of arms to the South African régime does not come from Western sources alone. Israel plays a cardinal role in supporting Pretoria's build-up of military hardware and armaments. Israel co-operates closely with the racist entity of South Africa. This co-operation is rooted in their similar philosophies and practices, based on racism and aggression. The value of military equipment and armaments exported by the Zionist authorities to South Africa during the period 1982 to 1985 will reach almost \$2 billion. This includes warships, rockets, Gabriel missiles and patrol boats. Furthermore, Israeli aid has allowed the Pretoria régime to establish an enormous, repressive military machine and to acquire the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. There is no doubt that South Africa's attempts to develop its technology and nuclear installations in order to acquire the capacity to produce nuclear weapons constitute a threat to international peace and security. That threat stems from the co-operation at many levels between the racist régime and Israel and a number of Western countries. The support given to South Africa's nuclear programme encourages the Pretoria régime to continue its defiance of the international community and impedes United Nations efforts to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

269. The racists of the South African régime, whose military might is now supreme, will continue to depend on military adventures and brutal repression inside Namibia. Furthermore, they will intensify their aggressive acts against the front-line States. They will continue to implement the so-called internal constitutional reforms, which are merely an attempt to sow discord among the people of Namibia and perpetuate *apartheid*, which excludes the vast majority of the population of Namibia.

270. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence and the two documents, the Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia,⁹ adopted by that Conference in solidarity with the people of Namibia constitute in our view a step forward in the struggle of the Namibian people to attain independence. The Paris Declaration reaffirms the illegality of South Africa's occupation of the Territory and declares that the continuing occupation is an act of aggression against the Namibian people in terms of the Definition of Aggression

contained in the annex to Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. Furthermore, it reaffirms the right of the Namibian people to avail themselves of all means at their disposal, including armed struggle, to repel this aggression and to achieve their national aspirations for freedom, independence and unity.

271. The international community, at the International Conference, once again, in the most severe terms, condemned the Pretoria régime for its illegal occupation of Namibia and its flouting of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibian territory and for Namibia's independence. The Iraqi delegation fully supports the Programme of Action on Namibia adopted by that Conference, in which, as we all know, the Security Council is called upon to impose economic sanctions on the racist régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations because the policy of that régime constitutes a direct threat to peace and stability in the African continent and because of its many acts of repression and oppression of the Namibian people and its actions to prevent them from achieving their national aspirations. The Conference called upon the Security Council to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of its resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), so as to bring about the independence of Namibia and to prevent any attempts to distort the thrust of those resolutions. The Programme of Action on Namibia affirmed the need to ensure strict compliance with Security Council resolution 418 (1977) with regard to the arms embargo against the racist régime, and it called upon all countries to apply unilateral sanctions against South Africa pending the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions by the Security Council.

272. We fully concur with the aims of the United Nations and its agencies and organs concerning the implementation of all measures that serve the cause of the people of Namibia. This includes giving support to the front-line States and the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference; in addition States are urged to make every effort to bring about the strict and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to reject any attempt to link Namibian independence with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

273. The Iraqi delegation strongly supports the exercise by the Namibian people of its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence on the basis of the preservation of Namibia's territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, as well as the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of South African troops and South Africa's administration and the transfer of all authority to the people of Namibia as represented by SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations and the OAU as the sole representative of the Namibian people.

274. Mr. PAVANARIT (Thailand): The question of Namibia has been included in the agenda of every regular session of the General Assembly for more than three decades without interruption. Today, Namibia remains under the illegal occupation and control of South Africa. Like the peoples of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, the Namibian people still find themselves under the yoke of alien domination and foreign occupation and are being denied their rights, especially the right to self-determination. The struggle of the Namibians for the exercise of their legitimate rights in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions continues to deserve the whole-hearted support of the international community.

275. Throughout the past year, several meetings have been held and a number of resolutions adopted for a just and peaceful solution of the Namibian question. The Secretary-General and various United Nations agencies continue untiringly to perform their important roles in order to achieve the goal envisaged in the resolutions. These worthy efforts, however, have achieved only limited progress because of the intransigence of the racist Pretoria régime. One can only wonder how long the Government of South Africa will continue to disregard the will of the international community. The unlawful occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be terminated forthwith in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

276. My delegation joins with the others in denouncing South Africa's insistence on the linkage of the question of Namibia to the irrelevant and extraneous issue of foreign troops in a third country. We once again reaffirm our unqualified support for the legitimate cause of the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO and its struggle to secure its sovereign rights over its own territory and resources in a united and independent Namibia. My delegation strongly urges the Western contact group to exert every possible effort to bring about the prompt implementation by all parties concerned of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

277. For its part, my delegation wishes to join with the international community in reiterating its serious concern at the lack of genuine progress. In this connection, my Government is prepared to welcome the extraordinary plenary meetings to be held by the United Nations Council for Namibia at Bangkok in 1984. We hope that its programme of work will be focused on the dedicated efforts of the Council in promoting the necessary mobilization in all quarters in support of self-determination, freedom and national independence for the Namibian people, and on plans of action which will receive the endorsement of the General Assembly.

278. Finally, the Thai delegation will support all draft resolutions submitted under this agenda item, in conformity with my Government's position on this issue, which has been stated often and consistently before. Nevertheless, we have reservations on some parts of certain draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [A/38/24], particularly draft resolutions A and B, which make specific references to some countries with which my country enjoys diplomatic relations. By not naming countries on such a selective basis, the draft resolutions would have enjoyed the broadest consensus, which they fully deserve. However, my delegation will be able to vote for all the draft resolutions which have been submitted to the Assembly.

279. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): This is the thirty-seventh year that the General Assembly has been seized of the question of Namibia. In all these years, the issue has been one and the same, namely, that South Africa must get out of Namibia so that Namibians may exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

280. It is not because of lack of effort on the part of the international community, the United Nations in particular, or the Namibians themselves that Namibians continue to languish under alien *apartheid* domination to this day. The international community, through the General Assembly, the Security Council and, indeed, the International Court of Justice, has explored all possible avenues available under international law in order to get South Africa peacefully out of Namibia.

281. Many speakers before me have outlined in detail the many steps that have been taken by way of resolutions

adopted in support of the heroic struggle of the Namibians, under the leadership of SWAPO, against South Africa. Significant amongst these was General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the Mandate granted to South Africa by the League of Nations was terminated.

282. It is sad to have to admit from this rostrum that despite these numerous United Nations efforts, South Africa, in its usual intransigence, has defied them and continues illegally to occupy Namibia. What is unfortunate about this state of affairs is that it seems that the international community is powerless to take effective action against South Africa.

283. My delegation has read with great care and interest the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24] and the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [A/38/23], as well as the report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence⁹ and the reports of the Secretary-General [A/38/183 and Add.1 and 2 and A/38/525]. We join those who have paid tribute to the Secretary-General, the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and others for their commendable efforts in producing the reports.

284. These documents show a recurrent theme: South Africa's lack of meaningful co-operation in the settlement of the question of Namibia. An overwhelming majority of States Members of the Organization have repeatedly tried to assert the authority of the United Nations over Namibia and, frustrated by South Africa's arrogant defiance of such assertions, they have even tried to persuade the Security Council to adopt strong punitive measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. We all know that some Western countries have consistently rallied behind the *apartheid* régime to defeat the imposition of sanctions on South Africa by the Security Council.

285. With the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, deadlocked and rendered impotent to take any effective action against South Africa, intensified armed struggle was the only alternative left for the Namibians under SWAPO to attain their freedom and independence from the alien racist and illegal occupation of South Africa. The cost of this struggle has been heavy in loss of life, and neighbouring countries have not been spared the anguish.

286. It was within this tragic context that the initiatives of the contact group of the Western five were welcomed in 1977 as a means of negotiating a peaceful settlement of the violent struggle between the freedom fighters and the occupying forces of oppression. Even though the emergence of this contact group may be said to have given legitimacy to the South African occupation of Namibia, many of us saw it as a responsible and constructive step, whereby the West would provide a break in the stalemate and prevent further escalation in the violent conflict over Namibia.

287. We must give credit to the contact group for its contributions to the formulation and eventual adoption by the Security Council of resolution 435 (1978) as a basis for a peaceful solution to the question of Namibian independence. We should not forget, however, that the resolution represented a compromise, which was accepted by Africans because we believed it was going to bring about the independence of Namibia. We believed that it provided South Africa with a chance for an honourable retreat. However, we all know that, even as South Africa

was accepting the resolution, it was busy taking action that undermined the very essence of that resolution. In fact, some members of the contact group were frustrated by South Africa's repeated display of a lack of readiness to reciprocate, to co-operate or to live up to the letter and spirit of the resolution.

288. A series of procedural queries and demands followed one after another from Pretoria. There was a demand for an increased number of inspection posts in the proposed demilitarized zone as a guarantee against the alleged SWAPO infiltration from the neighbouring front-line States; and there was a demand for the inclusion of the so-called internal parties to offset the alleged partiality of the United Nations, to mention but two. At the same time, South Africa intensified its military presence in the Territory and mounted periodic armed attacks against neighbouring States. Indeed, today South Africa is occupying southern Angola. In other words, the South African rule of terror and *apartheid* has now been extended beyond the boundaries of Namibia. Internally, through its Administrator-General, South Africa is taking steps towards its own style of settlement, which is far from removing South Africa from the scene. More recently, South Africa, aided by the current United States Administration, has come up with what is popularly known as the "Cuban linkage". Under this new ploy, South Africa and the United States have made the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola a pre-condition for the independence of Namibia.

289. On this latest delaying tactic for Namibian independence, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Tourism of Lesotho, Mr. M. V. Molapo, had this to say when he addressed the Assembly on 7 October 1983 [24th meeting]:

"We condemn in the strongest terms these delaying tactics, which can only result in the intensification of the armed struggle and, with it, continued loss of life on both sides . . . we find totally unacceptable attempts to establish linkages between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola".

290. It is absurd to talk about what is happening in the independent sovereign State of Angola, when the issue before us is South Africa's presence in Namibia. The Cuban troops are in Angola at the invitation of the Government of Angola, ironically enough to defend that country against aggression by South Africa. The question of how long those forces will stay in Angola is a matter exclusively between the sovereign States of Angola and Cuba. Cuban troops are not in Angola illegally. But the presence of South Africa in Namibia, and now in southern Angola, is not only illegitimate and aggressive, but also indefensible by any stretch of legal, political or moral imagination.

291. Many speakers have attempted to rationalize the irrational behaviour of South Africa. But then we have to accept that this task is rendered even more difficult by the fact that society in South Africa is abnormal. One thing is clear: the white man in South Africa, having independent Mozambique and independent Zimbabwe on his doorstep, is not prepared to have an independent Namibia under SWAPO, because this would hem South Africa in on all sides. It is clear to South Africa that the independence of Namibia will intensify the struggle within South Africa itself. Namibia serves as a good buffer against the movement of freedom southward. It provides South Africa with time to prepare for the anticipated onslaught on itself and thus South Africa must of necessity wage its war against freedom in Namibia now rather than in South Africa later. Indeed, its adventurous attacks against neighbouring countries are very much part of this

strategy because, by destabilizing those Governments, South Africa hopes to install puppet régimes that will not be committed to the eradication of racism and *apartheid* in South Africa.

292. We have repeatedly stated that it is neither the front-line States, nor the refugees, nor the rest of South Africa's neighbours that threaten peace and security in southern Africa. It is Pretoria's intransigence on both *apartheid* and Namibia, coupled with its arrogant defiance of United Nations resolutions, that constitute the real danger to peace and security in the subregion.

293. That is why we consider it extremely important that South Africa should not be allowed to hinder the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We commend the Secretary-General for his efforts and encourage him to continue. In this regard, we commend those members of the contact group who have rejected the Cuban linkage issue and express the hope that the United States will reconsider and reject this linkage too. We noted with interest and surprise that the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, in his statement of 29 October which was circulated as a Security Council document,⁷ insisted that "no settlement plan can be implemented unless a firm agreement is reached on Cuban withdrawal from Angola".

294. It was even more interesting when he singled out the United States and undertook to take up with the United States Administration the matter of the United States' seemingly wavering position on linkage. One wonders who dictates to whom between those two. To us, the ball is in the court of the United States, a great Western democracy which should be in the forefront of those who yearn for the freedom and independence of Namibia. To act otherwise is to encourage the pillaging and terrorist intimidation of the subregion by Pretoria.

295. South Africa should not be allowed to go on invading its neighbours on the flimsy excuse that their granting of asylum to victims of *apartheid* amounts, according to the Minister's statement,⁷ to harbouring "terrorist organizations which openly boast that they practise acts of terror and subversion in South Africa". South Africa's iniquitous occupation of southern Angola and Namibia should be brought to its long overdue end.

296. Mr. KAMARA (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Since 1946—in other words, for 37 years—the question of Namibia has been considered by the General Assembly at its regular sessions. It was also discussed during the fifth and ninth special sessions and at the eighth emergency special session. It has been dealt with at various international meetings and conferences: *inter alia*, the International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights, held at Dakar from 5 to 8 January 1976, the International Conference in Solidarity with the Struggle of the People of Namibia, held in Paris from 11 to 13 September 1980, the Nordic Conference on Namibia, held at Helsinki from 9 to 11 March 1981, and, recently, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, to mention only a few.

297. This year once again the Assembly is considering this most distressing question, which reflects the particular interest that the international community has in this problem. This interest and concern is equalled only by the stubbornness of the Pretoria régime, which, despite the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, of the OAU and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,¹⁰ and despite repeated appeals and efforts by the

international community, continues to occupy Namibian territory illegally and thus to defy the United Nations. 298. South Africa, not content with occupying Namibian territory illegally, despite resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by which the General Assembly terminated its Mandate over Namibia, continues to endeavour to perpetuate its racist and military domination and to institutionalize in that Territory the shameful system of *apartheid*, using an incredible arsenal of repressive and oppressive laws. The tense situation there is tragically eloquent proof of this.

Mr. Illueca (Panama) resumed the Chair.

299. As the Assembly knows, South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia is accompanied by repeated attacks against independent neighbouring States, which threaten stability in the region and constitute a serious danger to international peace and security.

300. In conducting itself in this manner, the racist régime of Pretoria violates and tramples under foot the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [resolution 217 A (III)], the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)] and the most elementary principles of international morality and the peaceful coexistence of peoples.

301. Ten years have elapsed since the Assembly decided to assume direct responsibility for the management and administration of the Territory of Namibia until its accession to independence. As we all recall, the General Assembly, in its resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, established the United Nations Council for South West Africa, which subsequently became the United Nations Council for Namibia, and that resolution provided for the attainment of independence "by June 1968" at the latest.

302. Ever since that date, which marked a historic point in the decolonization of Namibia, the Namibian people have been waiting to take their place, in accordance with their legitimate aspirations, in the community of free and independent nations.

303. Seven years ago, the Security Council adopted resolution 385 (1976) calling for South African withdrawal from Namibia and the organization of free and fair elections under United Nations control and supervision. But the situation has not changed; far from it. The Assembly was fully aware of this when, in its resolution 37/233 C, it decided to convene the International Conference held earlier this year in Paris to draw the attention of the international community once again to the serious situation in that Territory, which is such an anachronism in the world of today.

304. During that important Conference, over which my country, Senegal, had the signal honour of presiding, two documents were adopted, which in our view constitute a major stage in the struggle of the Namibian people to regain their independence. They were the Paris Declaration on Namibia and the Programme of Action on Namibia.⁹

305. In addition to unambiguously reaffirming the internationally accepted principles embodied in those two documents, the Conference solemnly reiterated the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, in accordance with its legitimate aspirations and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

306. The international community also condemned the Pretoria régime once again and in the most forceful manner for its illegal occupation of Namibia, despite the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council calling on South Africa to withdraw

from Namibian territory and to promote, within the context of the settlement plan endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the accession to independence of the people of Namibia. My delegation reiterates that total condemnation.

307. Pursuant to an explicit recommendation of that Conference, the Security Council met in May, when it adopted resolution 532 (1983), mandating the Secretary-General "to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire, with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978)".

308. We know what has happened since. The Secretary-General went to South Africa, where he met the highest Pretoria authorities, and to Angola, where he had in-depth discussions with President Sam Nujoma of SWAPO. The report that he submitted to the Security Council in October⁵ shows that all the technical and operational aspects involved in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) were considered and were generally agreed upon.

309. However, South Africa persists in its unacceptable position of linking the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—and thus the independence of Namibia—to a completely extraneous question: the departure of Cuban troops from Angola, a matter which comes under the sovereignty of other States. Moreover, the Pretoria régime is making this matter a pre-condition for any settlement of the Namibian problem.

310. As everyone knows, this linkage has been condemned by the international community—during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held last March at New Delhi, and at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April. In its special resolution on Namibia, resolution AHG/Res.105 (XIX), the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June this year, categorically rejected this linkage, which it regards as a serious obstacle to efforts to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

311. It is hardly necessary to recall that the essence, the basis, of the question of Namibia is a problem of decolonization alone. It must be settled peacefully, in the spirit of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is above all an international problem, for which the United Nations has a special, direct responsibility. Senegal continues to believe that it is within this context that, in accordance with the wishes of the international community and SWAPO itself, we must find a proper solution without further delay.

312. Accordingly, Senegal, the rest of Africa and the whole international community followed with special interest the meetings of the Security Council on the question of Namibia held in October. Although we are aware that there are still pitfalls that must be dealt with as soon as possible, my delegation believes that resolution 539 (1983), adopted at the end of those meetings, represents a positive result and an encouraging step forward.

313. After reaffirming the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence, the resolution condemned South Africa for its illegal occupation of Namibia, in flagrant violation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It also stated unambiguously that "the independence of Namibia cannot be held hostage to the resolution of issues that are alien to resolution 435

(1978)". My delegation therefore still hopes that a successful solution will quickly be found to this tragic question of Namibia, within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

314. In this connection, my delegation repeats the appeal made by Mr. Moustapha Niasse, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, in his statement to the Assembly [22nd meeting], and calls on all countries—particularly the members of the contact group—to demonstrate more co-operation with the international community by putting more effective pressure on the Pretoria régime to persuade it to reconsider its policy in Namibia. Their co-operation is essential if we wish to avert the intensification of an armed conflict in southern Africa which is already threatening stability in the region and which could constitute a serious danger to international peace and security.

315. In conclusion, I wish on behalf of my delegation to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his willingness and his constant work in support of the Namibian people. I also wish to express our appreciation of the devotion to the Namibian cause of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka, and the other members of the Council. All of Africa is grateful to them for their tireless, constant efforts to bring about the independence of Namibia by peaceful means.

316. Senegal will continue to co-operate fully with the Council to achieve the speedy, complete attainment of this lofty goal—the independence of Namibia, under the leadership of its legitimate, authentic representative, SWAPO, to whose heroic struggle and great political maturity we pay tribute.

317. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Seventeen years ago, in 1966, the Assembly decided to terminate *apartheid* South Africa's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia. By that decision, contained in resolution 2145 (XXI), Namibia became the direct responsibility of the international community—until such time as the Namibian people were able to attain self-determination and political sovereignty. Seven months later, in May 1967, the Assembly demonstrated its acceptance of this responsibility by adopting yet another resolution, resolution 2248 (S-V), establishing the United Nations Council for South West Africa, later to be renamed the United Nations Council for Namibia, through which the United Nations assumed, as it continues to exercise, legal administrative authority for Namibia until the attainment of independence by the Namibian people.

318. Yet, in November 1983, the United Nations is still battling to assume effective control of the Territory of Namibia, which continues to be firmly under South Africa's military occupation. The *apartheid* Pretoria régime's illegal occupation of the Territory has continued, in defiance of those resolutions and numerous subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

319. By its characteristically arrogant defiance of international consensus, demands and decisions, the Pretoria régime has been deliberately frustrating and obstructing a peaceful political solution to the Namibian question. The racist régime has thus opted for a military and violent, rather than a peaceful, path. The oppressed and suffering Namibians understood that immediately and very clearly. They therefore took to arms and declared their national liberation struggle, under SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. As the Assembly knows, that liberation struggle has been escalating and will continue until Namibia's inalienable right to self-determination is upheld.

320. However, in opting for armed struggle as the most appropriate response to Pretoria's military occupation and their exploitation and oppression by the illegal occupation régime, the people of Namibia have not slammed shut the door to a peaceful settlement. Thus, SWAPO threw its maximum support behind the United Nations search for a formula for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and a political framework within which it could be worked out. Indeed, when in 1978 the Security Council adopted what is now widely known and accepted as the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed in its resolution 435 (1978), SWAPO and the Namibian masses expressed their support for the plan despite its obvious flaws.

321. The catalogue of events subsequent to the adoption of the United Nations plan is too well known to all of us here and its repetition is therefore unnecessary. Suffice it to say, however, that since 1978 the South African régime has been prolific in its creation of one demand and pretext after another to frustrate and obstruct United Nations efforts to implement the plan.

322. First, we were told in 1980, for instance, that the régime did not have confidence in the United Nations and that it also harboured certain reservations about the composition of UNTAG as envisaged in the plan. The régime's preoccupations were addressed—apparently to its satisfaction. Thus the régime agreed to the convening of the pre-implementation meeting, which began at Geneva on 7 January 1981. The main objective of that meeting, as we all know, was to reach an agreement to set in train the process of implementing the United Nations plan by March 1981, so as to achieve Namibia's independence before the end of 1981.

323. Specifically, the two parties—SWAPO and the Pretoria régime—were required to declare their readiness to sign a cease-fire as envisaged in the plan and to agree to the immediate implementation of the United Nations plan endorsed in resolution 435 (1978). At the outset, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, declared his organization's readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa and for the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978). However, as we all know, the meeting broke up on 14 January without achieving its objective. The South African delegation had announced on the previous day that South Africa was not prepared to co-operate with the United Nations in implementing the plan for Namibia.

324. The international community's condemnation of the *apartheid* régime's indefensible behaviour was as unanimous as it was clear. Thus, the failure of the Geneva meeting of January 1981 was correctly blamed entirely on the Pretoria régime.

325. It was also clear, to the people of Africa in particular and the rest of the world community in general, that, in its defiant and arrogant behaviour, South Africa counted upon the protection of some Western Powers against any punitive measures that the Security Council might contemplate taking against it. Secondly, the Pretoria régime was also hoping that the new Administration soon to assume control in Washington might be more sympathetic to its position. Pretoria was proved right on both counts.

326. As we all know, many ambiguous and mixed signals began to come from some Western capitals, including those whose Governments are not only among the authors of the United Nations plan but also permanent members of the Security Council. For instance, two months after the abortive Geneva meeting there was more talk by spokesmen of those Governments about the need to "strengthen" resolution 435 (1978). Of course, that

implied revising the plan—something totally unacceptable to the front-line States, to Nigeria and to SWAPO. Our voices were later endorsed by the United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which demanded implementation of the plan without further delay, prevarication, qualification or modification.

327. The Pretoria Government had given as one of the reasons for non-co-operation with efforts to implement the United Nations plan its lack of confidence in the ability of the United Nations to supervise elections in Namibia in an impartial manner. Ridiculous as that doubt was, however, it was addressed by the international community in the hope that the régime would be encouraged to co-operate with the United Nations peace efforts. But as soon as that hurdle had been cleared South Africa came up with yet another pretext from its inexhaustible bag of criminal tricks and devious strategies. Thus, by August of last year, the *apartheid* régime's stratagem was then being articulated in terms of what has been called linkage. Pretoria was insisting, as it still continues to do, on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a pre-condition for its co-operation in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

328. "Linkage", "parallelism" or "reciprocity", as it is now called by Pretoria and its allies, was condemned and rejected early in 1982 by the front-line States and, subsequently, by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at New Delhi in March 1983, by the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April of this year, by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its nineteenth ordinary session, held at Addis Ababa in June of this year, and, more recently, on 28 October by the Security Council in its resolution 539 (1983).

329. The international community has also condemned and rejected linkage because it is a blatant interference in the internal and external affairs of Angola and Cuba, sovereign States Members of this Organization. The international community has demanded, and must continue to demand, instead, that South Africa co-operate immediately with the Secretary-General in his efforts to launch the United Nations plan, in accordance with resolution 532 (1983).

330. The international community must also call upon South Africa's allies, especially those countries with influence on the occupation régime, to warn the Pretoria rulers that they cannot continue to defy and flout the decisions of the Assembly, the Security Council and other international bodies, with impunity. The Fascists in Pretoria must be told in very clear language that the Charter of the United Nations prescribes methods, measures and remedies to be taken by the international community whenever international peace and security are threatened or breached. Soon the international community will have no other choice but to invoke such measures as are provided under Chapter VII of the Charter.

331. We have pointed out elsewhere that the international community cannot accept, or even tolerate, the cheek and arrogance of the illegal Pretoria régime which seeks to shift the responsibility for the delaying of Namibia's freedom on to Angola, a country which has been a victim of that régime's own continuous naked aggression since 1975. In fact, it was in response to that régime's acts of brutal aggression that Angola requested Cuban assistance in defending its territorial integrity. We condemn in the strongest terms that régime's aggression against Angola, part of whose territory its forces have been occupying continuously since August 1981. We also

condemn Pretoria's policies of repression and exploitation in Namibia and in South Africa, as strongly as we also denounce its campaigns of terror, blackmail and destabilization in our region, which are bringing untold suffering and misery to the peoples of neighbouring independent countries.

332. Finally, we beg to differ with, and even warn, those who would have the international community believe that appeasement will eventually make a favourable impression on the pariah régime in *apartheid* Pretoria. That régime, like its Nazi and Fascist predecessors some four and a half decades ago, is an enemy of mankind and a deadly threat to international peace and security. No amount of appeasement or "constructive engagement", as some circles euphemistically choose to call the policy of appeasement, will therefore alter the Pretoria régime's brutal nature. Moreover, the Assembly needs no reminding of the contribution of the policies of appeasement to the events leading to the Second World War, 44 years ago. We shall, therefore, refuse to appease or in any way hobnob with the *apartheid* régime. We shall, instead, continue to denounce, oppose and reject it with all the means at our disposal.

333. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): Once again, the General Assembly is forced to include in its deliberations the perennial question of Namibia because of the persistent refusal by South Africa to assist in the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, spelt out in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Events following the adoption of that resolution clearly attest to the notion that the racist Pretoria régime, backed by its friends, is bent on maintaining its colonial and neo-colonial domination over Namibia, in total disregard of the aspirations of the Namibian people and in flagrant violation of the international community's decisions on the matter.

334. Seventeen years have elapsed since the Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), by which it unconditionally terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and simultaneously transferred responsibility for that Territory to the United Nations. Yet, South Africa persists in its illegal, repressive occupation of Namibia. The numerous decisions adopted by the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly and other international bodies, calling on South Africa to relinquish its hold on Namibia, have all been treated with disdain and arrogance by the Pretoria régime. Thus, the serious problem of Namibia's independence has been reduced to such a level that the great majority of members of the Assembly would appear to be capable only of treating the subject with expressions of mere verbal condemnation, without any tangible achievements leading to the liberation of the Namibian people from its colonial yoke.

335. This unfortunate state of affairs has persisted because of the lack of political will on the part of the major Western Member States of the Organization whose intensified collaboration with the racist Pretoria régime in the nuclear, military, economic, financial, technological, cultural and political fields, in total disregard of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, has strengthened South Africa's intransigence and frustrated global efforts aimed at liquidating South Africa's obnoxious *apartheid* policy, as well as securing the removal of South Africa's illegal occupation from Namibia.

336. Following the adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 435 (1978), my delegation shared the high hopes entertained by the international community that Namibia's independence was within easy reach and that the working out of the details regarding the modalities for

the implementation of the independence plan endorsed in the resolution was going to be achieved within a relatively short period of time. Our hopes, however, were short-lived: five years later, we still find ourselves bogged down over negotiations on procedure because the efforts of the international community have been severely undermined by the introduction of the so-called linkage theory which seeks to make Namibia's independence contingent upon the simultaneous withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

337. The Ghana delegation views this linkage or parallelism between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as another devious attempt by South Africa and its friends to delay the decolonization process in Namibia. While the presence of Cuban troops in Angola remains completely irrelevant and extraneous to the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence, my delegation sees in its linkage to the Namibian question another ploy to satisfy South Africa's plan to prevent a free, fair and democratic election in Namibia. In the mean time, South Africa is seriously engaged in a plan to promote and install a puppet régime in Namibia which it hopes will disguise the perpetuation of its colonial stranglehold on the Territory and thus provide a very convenient means for South Africa and its Western allies to maintain an uninterrupted and deplorable exploitation of Namibia's natural resources.

338. The thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly closed last year in the hope that the Territory of Namibia would be brought closer to independence from South African domination by the end of this year. It was a hope born in many Member States, instilled by Western countries, which argued persuasively for the opportunity to engage South Africa in quiet diplomacy. At the time, my delegation was unconvinced of the capacity of any Member State, however militarily significant, to deflect the racist Pretoria régime from its nefarious hold on Namibia. However, we were prevailed upon, as indeed many other colleagues were persuaded, to go along with the open and sometimes not-so-open undertakings that some Western countries gave to the front-line States and other African States. Today, time has unfortunately proved us right because the Territory of Namibia continues to be in South African chains with no prospect of South Africa yielding to the seductive pleas of the so-called Western contact group.

339. We allude to the failure of the contact group not in any strident criticism of them nor in recrimination but to remind them once again that the racist Pretoria régime is never likely to succumb to the doubtful bait of constructive engagement. The racist régime's reasoning on the question of Namibia is so vitiated by illegality and exploitation that it would hardly find itself in agreement with any persuasive argument in favour of yielding territory. In other words, the racist régime itself is so steeped in crime and illegality that mere words will not be enough to effect a change in its ways. And yet, at this same time last year, our friends of the West were convinced of the efficacy of the policy of constructive engagement.

340. It was with reluctance that we agreed to give them a chance. We did so because we belong to a peaceful organization that should, in principle, always explore pacific methods of settling disputes. We gave them the opportunity because we trusted and respected their capabilities and leverage in international affairs, even though we continued to be very doubtful of the good faith of the racist régime. Today we hope that the members of the contact group will themselves agree with us that our worst fears have been confirmed: the racist régime is unabashedly prevaricative and cannot be depended on,

and we have to turn now to other measures to achieve the objective of early independence for Namibia.

341. It is now clear to all that it was because of the overwhelming insistence of a leading member of the Assembly on the policy of "constructive engagement", and therefore dialogue with South Africa, that we agreed to bide our time. Now that the racist régime has defied all of us, my delegation would like to request the United States delegation, which visibly assumed leadership responsibility for negotiating with South Africa, to elaborate for us all what its next course of action will be in the matter. It is to the detriment of the Namibians that the whole issue is enveloped in a deafening silence. We pose the question because we still believe that the United States has a dominant role to play in the matter, even though it chooses to adopt a position contrary to that of the rest of the international community.

342. In asking to be informed, the Ghana delegation must at the same time point out that it would find it extremely difficult to go along with the policy of constructive engagement merely because one country alone insists on it. The amount of support that both that policy and the "linkage" theory enjoy among Member States, especially among African States, is well known and I will refrain from any lengthy comments. Suffice it to say that these theories violate the Charter of the United Nations and the human rights principles that have always guided us in such matters. They are not likely to be efficacious or viable merely because a major Power is attached to them. They should be discarded. The very fact that these policies lack broad international support make them vulnerable as far as the racist régime is concerned. In our view this is sufficient reason not to press them.

343. My delegation totally rejects any further attempt deliberately to place obstacles in the path of the implementation plan. Negotiations leading to the granting of independence to Namibia have become unduly protracted, and we call on the members of the contact group to use their leverage over South Africa to induce that régime to accept Namibia's independence in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

344. The Secretary-General, in his report to the Security Council in May 1983,¹² could not have been more eloquent on the dangers posed to international peace and security by South Africa's intransigence. He stated, in paragraph 16 of that report, that:

"the delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) is having a destructive impact not only on Namibia itself but also on the prospect of a peaceful and prosperous future for the region as a whole. The delay also has an adverse effect on international relations in a wider sphere, adding to the prevailing sense of frustration and mistrust, with all that that implies for peace and security in the region".

345. This observation should warn the international community about the explosive situation prevailing in the southern African region caused by the Pretoria régime's racist and colonial policies. South Africa, in addition to its illegal occupation of Namibia, continues to defy the most elementary rules of international law by committing acts of armed aggression and political and economic destabilization against Angola and other front-line States. Must the international community remain silent, and put up with South Africa's crimes and arrogance until there is a conflagration, before we crank ourselves into action?

346. The United Nations' primary responsibility towards the Namibian people ought to be translated into specific action now. No longer must the Organization allow its

prestige to be toyed with by the prevarication and deception of the South African Government and its allies.

347. In the view of my delegation, it is critically important for the international community, in the face of South African intransigence and in view of its infant nuclear-weapon capability, to return to the original plans agreed upon by all parties. It is equally important at this time to reaffirm certain basic facts about Namibia and the struggle to bring the Territory to independence.

348. In the first instance, it is important that we remember the basic fact that South Africa, after all, is still occupying the Territory of Namibia illegally. We have often proceeded in the search for a solution, especially in the last two years, as if our call for the independence of Namibia were an aberration in itself which required the blessings of South Africa to make it legal. Nothing can be further from the truth. South Africa's occupation of Namibia is as illegal as was the Nazi occupation of Poland or France almost 50 years ago, and we ought to negotiate or fight for Namibian independence from the position of our combined moral and physical strength. History has never documented the eradication of brutal and intransigent occupation forces like that of the racist régime through the policy of constructive engagement. A firm opposition in principle and actions has always been necessary to restore normalcy.

349. Secondly, we must remember that our insistence on South Africa bringing the Territory to independence now is supported by advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice as well as numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. These legal norms are therefore the real basis for our principles of freedom, independence and equity for Namibia and not the plea for the racist régime's unilateral show of mercy towards Namibians. Some of the methods being sold to us completely overshadow the legality of the Namibian cause and we should be careful to what extent we pursue them.

350. Thirdly, it is important that we remember that every action that South Africa has taken with respect to Namibia has been designed to assert sovereignty illegally over the Territory rather than to yield it. The racist régime has in the past 40 years proposed Namibia's incorporation into South Africa; it has argued that the Mandate of the League of Nations had expired; it has disagreed with the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice; it has sought to divorce Walvis Bay from the rest of the Territory; and it has attacked Angola militarily to assert its claim over Namibia. It should be clear even to the politically naïve, therefore, that the racist Pretoria régime will not relinquish Namibia and its natural resources voluntarily.

351. Fourthly, we should never lose sight of the fact that Namibia and Namibians are an international responsibility which we should not shirk. Our negotiations should be within the framework of discharging that obligation and not of humouring a régime that has been adjudged the perpetrator of crimes against humanity.

352. These basic facts have been recounted by the Ghana delegation to remind us all that we are straying too far from what is legitimate and promising for the decolonization of Namibia. It is precisely because of the pursuit of these innovative options, all of which are calculated to placate the politically delinquent member of the international community, that we fail to register progress. We bear a responsibility towards the Territory because we are Members of an international Organization whose Charter forbids subjugation, exploitation and aggression. Our resources for fighting such political and social injustice

will therefore have to be the Charter provisions, the decolonization process as the United Nations has delineated it and the courageous but prudent implementation of Security Council resolutions, especially resolution 435 (1978). Those that drag their feet must remember that the Charter provides for pressure on a defaulting Member and even for the use, in special circumstances, of our collective strength against that Member State.

353. We therefore urge that the Security Council, as a matter of urgency, stipulate a definite timetable for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), since in our view that resolution offers the only basis for a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. South Africa's continued defiance of the Council's decisions regarding the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia should be met by the Council with the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

354. Of our partners in the West, especially the contact group, we ask in all earnestness when they will be satisfied that South Africa does not wish to relinquish Namibia voluntarily. What other signs do they wish to see in the heavens before they are convinced, or are they for ethnic reasons just leading us all on? The dogged adherence to dialogue is beginning to arouse our suspicions and we need reasonable and unambiguous reassurance. That reassurance would be best given through their acceptance of the overwhelming evidence of South African bad faith and by their rejoining the overwhelming majority of the international community in imposing long-overdue sanctions against the racist régime. To continue to refuse to do so would be to use unfairly their economic and military might to block the will of the majority in more or less the same way as the South African whites themselves are blocking the will of the black majority in South Africa.

355. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the unflinching support of the Government and people of Ghana for the Namibian people's just struggle for the attainment of its God-given right to freedom and independence. In this connection, the delegation of Ghana is deeply appreciative of the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Representative, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, the members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, especially its President, and the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia to bring about a speedy solution to the Namibian problem.

356. The moment of truth for Namibia has finally arrived and all of us—Africans, Asians, Latin Americans and Europeans—must make sacrifices and display a singleness of purpose in order to triumph. Such a determination is a light burden compared with the armed struggle to which the Namibians, under the leadership of SWAPO, have been forced to resort. Those of us who are affected most will continue to give SWAPO our moral and material assistance until victory is won. The rest should uphold the provisions of the Charter in order to hasten that victory. My delegation does not believe that this is an unreasonable request. The international community should, in the absence of any viable alternative, demand the immediate implementation of resolution 435 (1978), because it is the only weapon we have. Anything else is a fabrication and a clear waste of time.

357. Mr. MAMBA (Swaziland): Speaking for the first time in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly, may I, on behalf of my delegation, humbly congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. The way you conduct our deliberations here bears testimony to your diplomatic skills.

358. The Assembly is once again discussing the question of Namibia. The details of the question of Namibia are familiar to almost everyone and my delegation does not intend to dwell on them today. For more than 37 years, indeed, this question has been inscribed on the agenda of the regular sessions of the Assembly. It has also been dealt with in several special sessions, international conferences, seminars and interminable negotiations. The Security Council, the United Nations organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, has devoted many a series of meetings to it. My delegation finds no need, therefore, to go into the historical background of a problem which is still topical.

359. In spite of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice regarding Namibia delivered in 1971,¹⁰ the Government of South Africa has deliberately frustrated all peaceful moves by the United Nations to lead the people of Namibia to genuine independence based on the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This arrogant defiance of the international community must no longer be allowed to continue.

360. Over the years, the United Nations has adopted the position that the people of Namibia should be given their freedom. Over the years, the people of Namibia have determined that they want to decide their own future. Over the years, the United Nations has demanded that Namibia become independent as a unitary State. It has demanded of South Africa that Namibia become independent under international supervision. The people of Namibia want this to be done as rapidly as possible.

361. My delegation looks forward to independence for Namibia that will be genuine and unbiased, independence that will benefit all the people of Namibia, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

362. SWAPO is ready to sign a cease-fire with South Africa. It is, in principle, prepared to accept an electoral system based either on proportional representation or on the single member constituency system and has assured the Secretary-General that it would support his recommendations regarding the composition of the military component of UNTAG. This gesture of co-operation, goodwill and accommodation on the part of SWAPO is commendable indeed. The ball is now in the court of the South African Government, which has confirmed to the Security Council that all outstanding issues relevant to resolution 435 (1978) have been resolved.

363. South Africa should realize by now that the use of force and destabilization of its neighbours are not a basis for a lasting settlement. Furthermore, the use of force in an attempt to stifle the principle of self-determination as set forth in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*] has never succeeded in the past, and therefore there is no way in which it can succeed in the case of Namibia. It is unfortunate that South Africa's use of force in the region is resulting in unnecessary loss of life in Namibia, in Angola and in South Africa itself. As if that were not enough, the protracted fighting in question also deals a fatal blow to the economies of the countries concerned.

364. Swaziland's position on the question of linkage is clear and unequivocal. It can be stated as follows: Namibia's accession to independence should not be impeded by irrelevant and external considerations. Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) stand on their own merits. They must be fully implemented as adopted, without any pre-conditions or prerequisites whatsoever. Swaziland unswervingly upholds this cardinal principle. There is no justification whatsoever for linking Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from

Angola, for the two issues are different in pattern and nature. The Cuban troops are in Angola at the invitation of the Government of Angola.

365. The so-called linkage is indeed outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978). My delegation concurs with the view expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 25 of his report to the Security Council,⁵ where he states:

“This difficulty can only be dealt with in its own context by those directly concerned acting within their sovereign rights, and, above all, by a determined effort by all concerned to reduce the tensions and contentious issues and to put an end to conflict in the area as a whole.”

366. As recently as 28 October 1983, the Security Council rejected the so-called linkage by adopting resolution 539 (1983). Swaziland therefore categorically rejects this attempt to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

367. My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General for his courageous efforts undertaken in compliance with Security Council resolutions 435 (1978), 439 (1978) and 532 (1983) and to pay a special tribute to him for his report. In this report, my delegation notes the following particular points. First, the Secretary-General has affirmed that it has been possible to resolve some outstanding problems, such as selection of the electoral system and the question of UNTAG and its composition. Secondly, my delegation is extremely concerned at South Africa's attempt to continue to set pre-conditions for the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Thirdly, my delegation deeply regrets that it was not possible to obtain a cease-fire commitment from the South African Government, in spite of the willingness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement with South Africa, as a necessary requirement for holding elections in Namibia in order to establish the constituent Assembly in an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity.

368. I should be remiss if I did not refer to the front-line States and Nigeria. The work done by these African States deserves our praise. The negotiations on the question of Namibia are difficult and time-consuming. The progress made so far would not have been possible if it had not been for the time and money spent by the front-line States and Nigeria. These African States have not failed to go wherever meetings on Namibia were held, and this they have done in spite of their meagre economic resources and the time that must be taken from their own domestic affairs. There is still a lot to be done before Namibia attains its independence. Hence my delegation would like to encourage these States to carry their good work to its logical conclusion.

369. In conclusion, I should like to extend the thanks of my delegation to Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, and to the United Nations Council for Namibia for the report we have before us [*A/38/24*], which is brilliant, and for the good work done so far.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹See E/C.10/1983/10/Add.1.

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

³See A/AC.109/744, para. 10.

⁴União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

⁵*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15943.

⁶*Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year*, 2481st meeting.

⁷*Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16106.

⁸See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 6th meeting, para. 147.

⁹See *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).

¹⁰*Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

¹¹See A/AC.109/748, para. 9.

¹²*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1983*, document S/15776.