



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. LOULICHKI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): For several years now, the General Assembly's consideration of the question of Namibia has constituted something of a self-examination by the international community in the face of South Africa's continued, totally unpunished defiance of the peoples of the United Nations and its stubborn, implacable injustice against the suffering people of Namibia in contempt of international law and universal morality.

2. Neither the revocation by the Assembly of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*see resolution 2145 (XXI)*], nor the adoption of the United Nations plan for a peaceful determination of the fate of the Territory, nor the imposition by the Security Council of sanctions seem to have had any deterrent effect on the mindless, inhuman policy of the Pretoria régime. Indeed, South Africa has responded to the Assembly's call to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia and to the Security Council's appeals to implement its resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 532 (1983) by proclaiming new repressive, racist laws, assassinating Namibian leaders and patriots, building up its military and nuclear potential and carrying out acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

3. There is no question but that such acts constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and, therefore, call for the adoption of the enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and their immediate effective implementation by all States Members of the Organization. That is the only way in which the Pretoria régime can be compelled to abide by the unanimous will of the Assembly and that the United Nations can hasten the liberation of the fraternal Namibian people.

4. The United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), continues to be the proper framework for a peaceful and genuine settlement of this question. Its full implementation, therefore, cannot be delayed or diverted from its primary objective.

5. In this context, we welcome the encouraging results of the Secretary-General's consultations,¹ which resulted

in resolving virtually all the outstanding issues concerning UNTAG.

6. At the same time, we share the concerns he expressed in his complementary report,² with regard to the disastrous consequences that would result from delaying or obstructive tactics to prevent the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia.

7. However, we hope that one last decisive impetus can be given to the efforts of the United Nations and of the Western contact group in order to overcome the final obstacles and allow the Namibian people to join the community of independent nations.

8. In expressing this hope, Morocco renews its total support for the legitimate struggle of our Namibian brothers against all measures that would interfere with their identity, their right to self-determination, the integrity of their national Territory, including Walvis Bay, and their permanent sovereignty over their natural resources.

9. The Moroccan delegation welcomes the persevering and untiring action of the United Nations Council for Namibia, especially that of its eminent and dedicated President, Mr. Lusaka, in safeguarding the Namibian people's rights and interests until their independence, and we pledge our support for its programme of future action.

10. Mr. RUTIHINDA (United Republic of Tanzania): The Assembly ended its thirty-seventh session in deep disappointment at the blow to the high expectations that the world community had held concerning the independence of Namibia before that session.

11. Since then, a great deal of diplomatic activity has taken place in order to regain some momentum of progress towards a breakthrough. But, as members are aware, the situation is no better than it was at the end of the thirty-seventh session.

12. In the wake of a recent meeting of the Security Council, which was only the last in a series of meetings both within the United Nations and outside it, including a meeting of the Security Council in May, it is quite easy to yield to the temptation of those who may wish us to feel that a debate on Namibia at this time is of doubtful value.

13. Apart from the fact that a whole year has passed since the Assembly last considered this problem and that we decided last year to place the item on the agenda of the thirty-eighth session, the gravity of the situation in Namibia cannot escape the attention of the membership at this thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. For the prominence of the problem is so unique in the totality of the concerns of the Organization that we cannot afford to consider it as anything but urgent and critical.

14. The situation in Namibia represents a unique combination of problems of the world today. Today, Namibia is the embodiment of all evils. Namibia is a case of colonialism, institutionalized racism, occupation, Fascist oppression and economic plunder. Its freedom and the independence of its people are held hostage to the geopolitical and strategic preoccupations of a super-Power. The overall consequence of this coalition of evil against the people of Namibia and of southern Africa as a whole

has been the deterioration of the political situation and of security, with an attendant threat to international peace and security. Humanity as a whole has a stake in the security and stability of the world. The taking up of this question at this session is therefore a manifestation of these concerns.

15. Last year, we had just emerged from a brief spell of optimism generated by positive signals concerning a possible settlement. The South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], the Western contact group, the front-line States and Nigeria had then concluded the proximity talks, at which most of the key issues concerning the implementation of the independence plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had been resolved. Yet, as became evident, that sense of optimism was quickly shattered by the negative positions taken by some parties to the undertakings arising out of the proximity talks. As we noted then, it was regrettable that a party to these understandings had, largely on the basis of ill-conceived ideological preoccupations, decided to opt out of the consensus and hence turn its back on the independence of Namibia. The Assembly in its resolutions also regretted the fact that elements totally extraneous to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), such as the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, had been linked with and made a condition for the independence of that Territory. The thirty-seventh session therefore ended with expressions of frustration and indignation at seeing the freedom and independence of a people fall victim to some ideological obsessions of a super-Power.

16. In the course of this year, a number of important meetings took place at which the question of Namibia was discussed. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence was held in Paris from 25 to 29 April. Both meetings underlined the fact that the United Nations has to take energetic and concerted action in support of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence. The nineteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], which took place at Addis Ababa from 6 to 12 June this year, also echoed that call. Two series of Security Council meetings, one in May and another in October, were convened to assess the situation and take concrete action. The front-line States, meeting at Lusaka on 12 November, as well as the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held at New Delhi from 23 to 29 November, in its final communiqué [see A/38/707, annex] have all expressed serious concern at the present state of affairs and have underlined that failure to act now will only prolong the injustice and oppression under which the people of the Territory of Namibia have for so long laboured and will escalate the present conflict. But above all, those meetings spoke with one voice in identifying both the real issues involved in the conflict in Namibia and those responsible for the present stalemate. It is also worth mentioning that the Security Council, at its latest meeting on this question, was unanimous in rejecting the introduction of extraneous issues that have nothing to do with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

17. This year's activities have been significant. The work done by the Security Council, and by the Secretary-General in fulfilment of the responsibilities entrusted to him, has, among other things, vindicated our long-standing conviction that the Namibian problem is a United Nations problem and that it belongs here. Hence,

among the most significant aspects of Security Council resolutions 532 (1983) and 539 (1983) is their reaffirmation of the central role of the Organization in achieving independence for Namibia. The reversion to United Nations initiative and direction came about as a result of the realization that, in the final analysis, the international community as a whole has a stake in the developments in Namibia and in southern Africa as a whole. In this regard, my delegation has noted the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General in reasserting the leadership of the Organization on the question.

18. It is evident that although the United Nations has long been preoccupied with ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, no period has been so marked with corresponding diplomatic activity in this regard as the last seven years. During those years, beginning with the adoption of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) and the convening of the ill-fated Geneva pre-implementation meeting in January 1981, leading to the proximity talks in July 1982, the international community has seen its hopes wax and wane, false expectations raised and hopes frustrated. Braving the contempt, prevarication and duplicity of the racist régime, SWAPO and other parties to those undertakings in fact arrived at an agreed framework for the independence of Namibia. Indeed, at one time, many of us thought we were very close to finality. Being closely associated with all these diplomatic initiatives, my delegation had good reason to believe that we had indeed made commendable progress—an achievement which, of course, could be consolidated with the commitment of all the parties to those initiatives. Today that understanding stands in limbo as it awaits the judgment of some of the parties on the consensus it embodies.

19. Apart from the recalcitrance of *apartheid* South Africa and its well-known policy of opposition to the independence of Namibia, nothing has contributed more to the undoing of all the understandings reached so far than the so-called policy of constructive engagement, of which the notorious linkage is an integral part. This view has been expressed by every body in the Organization, the Secretary-General himself and the international community as a whole.

20. Constructive engagement is based on the erroneous assumption that the United States of America can exercise influence over South Africa through co-operation and close friendship with the *apartheid* régime: the assumption being, of course, that the white racist minority régime is a reasonable Government. Well, after three years of the engagement, nothing positive has come of it.

21. The policy of linkage is not only inimical to the independence of the Namibian people, it also undermines the future security of the region as a whole. We are concerned that in interpreting every event in southern Africa, even that of the struggle for independence by a colonized people, in the geopolitical and strategic context of the East-West conflict the United States has allowed itself to be drawn into an alliance with *apartheid* and has thus arrested the peaceful progress towards self-determination of the Namibian people.

22. Contrary to claims which have been made, South Africa would not today have the ability to demonstrate such impudence and contempt for the Organization had it not been for the support of its powerful friends. They have demonstrated unfaltering consistency in their support for the *apartheid* régime. Their steady political and economic support apart, these countries have remained faithful to the defence of *apartheid* on the diplomatic front. Indeed, the representative of the *apartheid* régime

himself boasted of this support before the Security Council in October last.³ I might add that the *apartheid* régime itself invoked that support when, in utter disregard of international opinion, it rejected with contempt Security Council resolution 539 (1983) in a statement it issued on 29 October 1983.⁴

23. To complement this political support for South Africa, measures to effect closer relations have been instituted. American investments in the *apartheid* economy today stand at the staggering figure of \$14 billion; a new consular treaty has been signed; exchange of military, intelligence and police personnel has been institutionalized. South Africa is the recipient of the most sophisticated armaments and delivery systems, including technology and personnel to assist in the development of the *apartheid* nuclear bomb.

24. At the same time, South Africa has escalated its acts of violence within Namibia and its acts of aggression and destabilization against the neighbouring independent African States. As a result, today the situation in southern Africa poses a grave threat to international peace and security and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by *apartheid* South Africa is one of the major contributors to this situation.

25. It is immoral to try to ascribe responsibility for the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978) to Angola, itself a constant victim of the continued occupation of Namibia. The demand to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola—a convenient excuse for South Africa—must therefore be understood as a further scheme to bolster *apartheid*. It is part of the diplomatic front being developed to buy time for South Africa. It is consistent with the same manoeuvres for the rehabilitation of South Africa that its supporters are now referring to the universally condemned constitutional dispensations as a positive development.

26. The United States and South Africa are primarily responsible, but some of the other members of the Western contact group are individually also responsible for the delay. Their benign silence is not coincidental. Rather, the silence is a sign of support for South Africa, for, instead of condemning South Africa's intransigence and rejecting measures aimed at buttressing that intransigence, those members of the contact group claim to understand the preoccupations of the United States and South Africa. This so-called understanding is, in effect, approval of the policy of linkage as it relates both to the denial to the Namibian people of their independence and to the continued aggression against Angola. For how can it be otherwise when some of these very countries, being party to the understanding on the framework for the independence of Namibia, demonstrate such apathy towards its implementation and show understanding to forces which undermine that very plan? We have, however, taken note and are encouraged by the action of those members of the contact group which have disassociated themselves from the position of linkage.

27. We understand linkage, being an aspect of the so-called constructive engagement, to represent an initial step in the attempt by South Africa, with the help and support of the United States, to reverse all the victories achieved by the people of southern Africa over the last two decades. Thus, the international community can ill afford to understand, let alone to accept, the premise and essence of the policy of linkage. To do so would, in fact, mean turning its back on the independence of Namibia and on the principles upon which the Organization was founded. It would have actually endorsed South Africa's racist, colonialist, militaristic and aggressive policies

against the people of Namibia, as well as of the region as a whole.

28. The problem of Namibia is an international problem from which the Assembly cannot extricate itself. The United Nations must therefore continue to play the central role in any effort aimed at the resolution of the problem. Resolution 435 (1978) remains the most viable framework within which the United Nations can play that role. The international community remains convinced that, despite the passage of time, that resolution retains its intrinsic validity and continues to be the most acceptable basis for a negotiated settlement of the independence of Namibia. It must therefore be implemented in its totality and without further delay.

29. The crucial time has come for the Organization to secure the peaceful independence of the Namibian people or brace itself for increased armed confrontation, with its attendant human and material destruction. Accordingly, the Assembly must reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia. The existing framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) must be maintained. Full respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), must be underlined. Similarly, the Assembly must reaffirm its categorical rejection of linkage and instead call upon the *apartheid* régime to facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). At the same time, the Assembly must condemn South Africa's policies of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring independent African States, including its continued occupation of Angola.

30. We await the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council resolution 539 (1983). That resolution was significant in that for the first time the Council was categorical in rejecting the linking of the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues, as incompatible with its resolution 435 (1978), other decisions and other resolutions of the General Assembly, including the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)].

31. In its resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council confirms that all the outstanding issues relevant to resolution 435 (1978) have been solved and declares that the independence of Namibia cannot be made contingent upon the solution of issues that are alien to resolution 435 (1978). The Council was also in agreement that in the event of the continued non-implementation of that resolution by South Africa, it will meet to consider appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations. The groundwork for further action has, therefore, been done.

32. The independence of Namibia cannot be denied forever. It can only be delayed, but it will have to be attained. The people of Namibia has the right to struggle by all the means necessary, including armed struggle, to regain its freedom and independence. Procrastination in the achieving of Namibia's independence, however, can only mean the prolongation of the suffering of the Namibian people and the aggravation of the threat to international peace and security in the region. The United Republic of Tanzania, for its part, will not relent in its support of the liberation struggle.

33. Allow me, before concluding, to pay once again a deserving tribute to SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, which, even in the face of the prevarications of the racist régime, has demonstrated a high sense of statesmanship and commitment to the cause of the Namibian people.

34. I wish, at the same time, to express my country's appreciation for the work done by the United Nations Council for Namibia and for the praiseworthy manner in which its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, has been guiding its work. Its global campaign, mobilizing moral, material and diplomatic support for the Namibian people, is worthy of commendation. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, for example, served to bring to the attention of the world the vivid realities of the suffering of the Namibian people.

35. Mr. CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Over 17 years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and making the Territory the direct responsibility of the Organization in order to make it possible for the people there to exercise its right to self-determination and independence. There has been more than 17 years of intensive debate in which everything that could be said has been said and repeated. Indeed, progress has been difficult to detect. At times, it has seemed that we have come close to a solution of the problem. But to be perfectly realistic, we must say that in concrete terms the independence of Namibia is as distant a goal today as it was 37 years ago when the United Nations took up this distressing problem for the first time. The problem may be even more complicated today because the policies of the post-war period have developed such dangerous notions as vital interests, strategic reserves and spheres of influence.

36. The disappointment and frustration of the Namibian people over the inability of the United Nations to produce a just and, particularly, timely solution to the question are fully justified. We must say this perfectly frankly: we are all responsible, some of us because of what we have done, others because of what we have failed to do. Now the very people who benefit from the *status quo* and who are advocating its maintenance are the ones who are appealing for patience, prudence and non-violence; yet they care little for the long history of bloodshed and brutal repression against the people of Namibia.

37. If we wish to stand by the people of Namibia and SWAPO in their struggle, we believe that we have a duty to lay the blame at the door of some Western Powers for their illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia and for exploiting the country's wealth. But we must point our finger firmly at the one who is truly responsible for the crimes of South Africa—the United States. That country is responsible for the frustration of the people of Namibia. It is responsible for the defiant and arrogant attitude of South Africa, which has been possible because of its determined support and profitable constructive engagement. It has created all the obstacles which the ruling minority has raised against the application of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It has invented for Pretoria the so-called "linkage", or "parallelism", tying the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Yet the presence of those troops in that fraternal country is due to the legitimate needs of its self-defence against South Africa's aggression and its launching pad in Namibia.

38. The Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), recently declared the impropriety and impertinence of the linkage, or parallelism, and reaffirmed the terms of resolution 435 (1978) as being the only path to the independence of Namibia. Yet South Africa, with the invariable support of the United States, has disregarded this resolution, as it has traditionally disregarded United Nations resolutions, both in the matter of linkage and with regard

to the choice of an electoral system. It has said that it cannot put into effect any plan for independence if there is no agreement on the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola; and it has said that it will not accept any timetable of any kind. Once again, we have to cope with the defiance, challenge and scorn of South Africa, and once again we have to deal with its insulting attitude. Once again, we are facing the overt or covert support of the United States on which South Africa is certain that it can continue to rely.

39. After these failures, and in view of the impossibility of dealing with South Africa, we have reached the conclusion that we have exhausted all alternatives and that the only solution now is to take action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Otherwise, future generations will continue the debate that we are involved in today. Indeed, the same debate began decades ago. Rhetoric will continue; good intentions will be announced; frustration will continue and no action will be taken. In the mean time, the people of Namibia, under the direction of SWAPO, its sole, genuine representative, will continue to fight heroically against ignominy, colonialism and extermination in support of a universal cause, that of freedom and independence.

40. The noble dimensions of the cause of the Namibian people are clear even to the most indifferent observer, nor can they be ignored on the pretext of some kind of neutrality. There can be no neutrality when the choice is between good and evil. The Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, Mr. Peter Mueshange, has described very clearly what has inspired his struggle:

"What we are demanding is the return of our land.

We demand freedom to determine our own destiny. We are anxious to put an end to the suffering of our people and to restore their dignity and sovereignty. We are working hard to put an end to the dependent status of the refugees and the Namibian exiles so that they can be more productive citizens in a free Namibia, whose energies and creative genius must be used for national reconstruction and development."

41. What is at stake is the cause of democracy, the self-determination of a people and the human rights of an entire nation. Why on this occasion must those who support freedom and human rights in the Western world be silent? Why does the United States, which has so ardently invoked the cause of democracy in its attempts to subjugate Central America and invade Grenada, joined with one of the most brutal, anti-democratic and inhuman régimes that mankind has ever known? Can it be that for the Reagan Administration the concept of democracy means imposition, repression and subjugation—in a word, lack of independence and self-determination?

42. This is not a question of political whims or perverse interpretations of facts. We are talking about a universal conviction which is worth restating; it is the United States which is maintaining the colonial status of Namibia and keeping its people in a state of slavery and oppression. The United Nations has affirmed this; so have the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, OAU and the front-line States; even the friends and allies of the United States admit as much.

43. At the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, which was held a few days ago at New Delhi, it was declared, as *The New York Times* reported on 28 November, that efforts to achieve the independence of Namibia are continually being obstructed by the United States, and it was felt that the presence of Cuban troops in Angola was in response to a request of a sovereign State and had nothing to do with the independence of Namibia. Those last comments about the true role of the United States in

the situation we are considering do not come from a group of countries with policies hostile to the United States; some of the Commonwealth countries are even close allies of the United States.

44. As we study the true dimensions of the situation in southern Africa, in terms of the threat there to international peace and security, we must reach the conclusion that it contains highly dangerous elements and, even though the people of the region are suffering the consequences most directly, the development and expansion of the racist and colonialist policies are resulting in even more serious events in the rest of the African continent. The occupation of Namibia, the brutal conduct of the *apartheid* régime, the pitiless repression, the complete contempt for the universally accepted principles of morality and equality and the acts of aggression against the front-line countries are all factors which can never lead to peace and stability. On the contrary, they ignite the wrath of the peoples, and give rise to justifiable violence which deserves the unanimous support of the international community.

45. Peace cannot be brought about in southern Africa by ignoring the rights of the Namibian people to independence and freedom, by ignoring the rights of the front-line countries to stability and the full exercise of sovereignty. Such an approach can never achieve any solid results. The only way we can make a contribution to peace and security in that part of the world and at the same time pay a tribute to the peoples who have suffered there is through concerted action, as we said a few days ago [70th meeting] when the General Assembly was dealing with the question of the policies of *apartheid* of South Africa. South Africa does not recognize decency or morality.

46. The Organization has a sacred and inescapable responsibility: to achieve independence for Namibia. All the means at our disposal have already been tried. Neither diplomacy nor persuasion has worked, and patience is now exhausted. We cannot wait another 30 years only to hear that the United Nations is discussing the question of the independence of Namibia and that the United States is pleased with the progress made as a result of the constructive and flexible attitude of the racists of Pretoria. The Charter of the United Nations gives us the final recourse available: the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII thereof. Let the people of Namibia indicate their will. Nicaragua, standing by them to the end, will not deny them its determined support.

47. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The problem of Namibia is again on the agenda of the General Assembly. The agony of the people of South Africa under the *apartheid* régime is still torturing the consciences of all lovers of freedom, but the colonial domination of a racist régime continues none the less and this international body has made no progress in its efforts to bring the victimization of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to an end. This tragic situation, as the Assembly knows very well, is the inevitable outcome of the network of global imperialism, which contains within it the malicious evil of Zionism and racism, as well as colonialism, and the sad reality is that this monster is still at work even within the United Nations.

48. The mother base of the Zionist-racist entity has taken the United States of America as its own safe and permanent settlement, and from there it is spreading in deadly metastasis to the rest of the world, directly and through its satellite bases, South Africa and occupied Palestine.

49. The people of the United States, who are themselves victims of the same monster, may not be aware of how they and their beloved country have been, and are being, manipulated by the racist and Zionist elements which control the major economic and industrial units of the United States, the Government of the United States and, through the mass media of that country, the people of the United States. Therefore, we fully sympathize with the people of the United States, who do not know what is being done to them and, through them, to others.

50. To speak of Namibia without immediately pinpointing the role of the United States' transnational corporations is overly to condone the fact that the United Nations' sincere efforts to save the people of Namibia and South Africa remain futile, simply because the United States' military, economic, diplomatic and intelligence ties with South Africa have been increasing throughout the time the United Nations has been making those efforts. The direct and indirect support given by the United States to the UNITA⁵ movement in Namibia and Angola has obstructed every important possible solution in South Africa. Based on the policy of "constructive engagement", the United States is only nurturing and strengthening the racist, Zionist régime of South Africa. That same "constructive engagement" policy led to the sinister agreements on technical co-operation and on joint military manoeuvres recently concluded between the United States and its other satellite, racist base, which is situated in the Middle East.

51. The United States' linkage policy is another conspiracy to strengthen South Africa's control over Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia informs us, in a report⁶ to the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, that 75 of the 232 transnational corporations in Namibia—that is, about one third of all the transnational corporations there—belong to the United States; this is, in fact, telling us the basis of the South African and Namibian tragedy. It is on the same basis that the United States representative votes in the International Monetary Fund [IMF] in favour of a \$1.1 billion loan to South Africa. Therefore, in spite of its humanitarian outlook, IMF is often a device under the control of imperialist Powers to do to the oppressed people, through the IMF, whatever they wish to do.

52. The entire network of global arrogance, with its colonial, racist, Zionist ambitions, threatens the oppressed at all times, wherever they are. There is no need to reiterate that on the basis of our Islamic principles our commitment to support the oppressed and to combat the "*istikbar*"—which means "oppression"—and the "*istikbari*" nature—which means the "oppressive" nature—of global arrogance and its satellites remains resolute. We shall spare no effort to make the united front of the oppressed people and the third world countries stronger and stronger. We appeal to all Member States that advocate freedom and sympathize with the deprived and oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia to join this united front and to refrain from approaching various elements of the enemy in isolation. The enemy is one; the enemy in South Africa, in occupied Palestine and in Latin America—everywhere—is the same. Let us not face it in isolation. Please do not be deceived or misled by the enemy's slogans of support for human rights. It pretends to be furious when it can claim that its human rights are violated in some parts of the world, but it does not hesitate to invade any country under the guise of protecting human rights. Representatives know all the examples.

53. The General Assembly can rest assured that whatever serious action the international body wishes to take in

favour of Namibia, the Western contact group will most likely vote against it. However, this neither embarrasses nor disappoints the lovers of freedom and the supporters of the oppressed.

54. Therefore, we need a united front to challenge the enemy everywhere. This united front must become stronger and stronger, and its coverage must go beyond the framework of the United Nations, simply because the United Nations itself is dominated constitutionally by the same forces that constitute neo-colonialism outside the United Nations. We dealt fully with this handicap of the United Nations in the Security Council on 26 October 1983.⁷ However, what I have just said does not mean that we should curtail our support for the sincere efforts of the Secretary-General. We must and will support whatever anyone, anywhere, does in order to liberate Namibia.

55. While supporting all the United Nations measures to suppress imperialism and its colonial role in South Africa and elsewhere, the Islamic Republic of Iran looks forward to further co-operation between the third world countries *vis-à-vis* the common enemy.

56. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ-MEDINA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Colombia has been a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia since it was established. For 17 years we have lived like front-line protagonists through this difficult process engaged in by the international community to bring independence and self-determination to the Namibian people. We have occupied this honourable position as the representative of Latin America, inspired by our deep-rooted faith in democracy and our constant and stubborn struggle in the interest of decolonization.

57. As we have shared this noble struggle, in solidarity, in a cause which is close to our hearts as a sovereign nation that cherishes civil and political liberties, we have seen the greatness and heroism of the African people in the face of adversity.

58. Listening to this general debate, it might be thought that there were grounds for discouragement and pessimism. However, although the world seems to have exhausted its patience in the face of the stubborn, rebellious position of South Africa regarding United Nations resolutions, we believe that common sense and cool judgement will prevail in the long run, to the benefit of the cause of justice and equity. We trust that the energetic rejection by the international community of the excuses and pretexts used to prolong the agony of an entire people will eventually lead to a definitive and satisfactory solution.

59. Only then shall we be able to speak of lasting peace in southern Africa and only when Namibia becomes independent will the United Nations have achieved its most ambitious objective—the total eradication of colonialism.

60. The Secretary-General has shown ample proof of his great negotiating ability and his skill as a mediator in the Namibian problem. We must give him our full support and assist him in his efforts. He must complete the task which he undertook as soon as he assumed office. He alone is capable of carrying out the plan for the independence of Namibia and is the sole guarantor that the process will be accomplished along the lines set down by the United Nations.

61. The plunder of the natural resources and stifling of the political aspirations of the Namibian people must be ended, as must any economic or military assistance which will help the oppressors maintain their illegal rule. The moral conscience of the people of the world must be mobilized to accelerate the process and counter any attempt to dilute or divert it. Colombia, as a non-aligned

country which has made the Namibian cause a prime commitment of its foreign policy, now addresses the Assembly with the profound, optimistic conviction that there will be, in the not-too-distant future, a peaceful settlement of a conflict which is a threat to the very existence of the United Nations.

62. We are sure that no valid reason could possibly exist, of either a political or an economic, much less of an ethical, nature, for the further continuance of this intolerable situation. My country trusts that when the definitive agreement is finally reached it will be under the auspices of the United Nations. No good purpose will be served with regard to either the international community or the future of the United Nations by attempting to relegate it to the sidelines in this cause with which it has been so closely involved all these years. That is why we have such profound faith in the work of the Secretary-General and in the immense possibilities open to him as the architect of a new, definitive dialogue in the quest for final agreement.

63. Miss JACOB (Guyana): As many delegations before mine have pointed out, this is the thirty-seventh year in succession that this question has occupied the attention of the Assembly. In terms of years, we can say that this encompasses the whole period in which the Organization has been in existence.

64. It is not for want of the necessary will and commitment that a solution to the question of Namibia has continued to elude the Organization. Ever since 1966, the efforts expended in order to secure freedom and independence for the Namibians have been immeasurable. Indeed, the question of Namibia is unique in the history of the Organization since this is the first and only Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility—a responsibility which it assumed in response to the unusual challenge placed before it by South Africa when it refused to place the former League of Nations Mandated Territory under the United Nations Trusteeship System or to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the United Nations as the successor of the League.

65. Today, the nature of this question is such that when we speak of the question of Namibia we must take into consideration several interrelated issues. Pre-eminent among these are South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and its systematic denial to the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence; the plunder of the Territory's resources; the calculated acts of aggression launched against the neighbouring States by South Africa; and the serious challenge posed to the credibility and authority of the Organization by South Africa's refusal to comply with its resolutions and decisions.

66. From General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted on 27 October 1966, when Namibia and its people were placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, to Security Council resolution 435 (1978), when it accepted the proposals of the Western contact group of five States, the Organization has demonstrated its determination to seek a peaceful solution to the Namibian question. South Africa's attitude, however, throughout this period has been one of consistent prevarication, temporization and intransigence. The support and encouragement given to South Africa during this period by those States which possess extensive trade and other links with the *apartheid* régime have contributed to fortifying the belief of the Pretoria régime that it can continue to trample with impunity upon the rights of the Namibian people. Its machinations and manoeuvres further to entrench itself in the Territory and to deny to Namibians their rights have therefore continued unabated. These

acts have now extended well beyond the borders of Namibia and within recent times have taken the form of acts of massive armed aggression against the States of the region, particularly the People's Republic of Angola, where damage to infrastructure alone already runs into billions of dollars.

67. The situation in and around Namibia has deteriorated to such an extent as to pose a serious threat to international peace and security. The international community needs to make a positive response to that state of affairs. South Africa's friends and supporters, in particular those with special obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, need to take a close look at the extremely dangerous situation they are helping to create and perpetuate through their collaboration with South Africa.

68. The wide participation in the current debate shows that concern about Namibia is pervasive and deep-rooted. Guyana now joins its voice to those of others to speak out against the injustice meted out to the Namibian people and against the outrages going on in South Africa. To do less would be to fail to live up to our collective commitment under the Charter to establish conditions in which mankind can live in dignity, with freedom for all.

69. What is most disturbing to my delegation, as it is to all who share a genuine concern for the early liberation of Namibia, is the fact that South Africa is now being given yet another pretext for non-co-operation, through the insistence on linking its withdrawal from Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, an extraneous element for which no provision was made in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

70. My delegation views the attempts to make independence for Namibia contingent on the withdrawal of the Cuban forces from Angola as a further step to distract the international community from the real issue and to camouflage South Africa's designs in the region. The Cuban forces are in Angola at the direct invitation of the sovereign Government of that country. Their presence has nothing to do with South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia. This insistence on linkage is designed further to delay the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable rights, and it constitutes an interference in the internal affairs of Angola. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) clearly defines the stages designed to lead Namibia to independence, and in the face of the callous methods now being used to undermine the authority of the Security Council, the Organization has a responsibility and a duty to take practical measures to ensure implementation of its resolutions without further delay. It is Guyana's firm view that those who promote and defend this new and deliberate frustration of the liberation process contribute directly to the continued suffering of the Namibian people and of the peoples of the region as a whole.

71. Not unexpectedly, the Pretoria régime, bolstered by the insistence on Cuban withdrawal as a pre-condition for Namibia's independence, has become even more intransigent, indicating quite clearly, in response to Security Council resolution 539 (1983), that it will not comply with the provisions of that resolution. That attitude stands in marked contrast to that displayed by SWAPO throughout the period of negotiations, and my delegation would here like to pay a tribute once again to the maturity and statesmanship which have characterized SWAPO's actions throughout the process, and to reaffirm our support for SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia.

72. My delegation would like also to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia and to its President, Mr. Lusaka, of Zambia, for the single-mindedness

and imagination with which he pursues its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory of Namibia. We should like also to express praise for the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Mishra, of India, for the dedicated and excellent manner in which he has been discharging his duties on behalf of the people of Namibia.

73. The involvement of the United Nations with the question of Namibia has been long and frustrating. Be that as it may, my delegation will not fall prey to cynicism and regard the question of Namibia as one which is destined to be with us forever. Namibia must be free. It is a Territory for which the United Nations has assumed direct responsibility. It is therefore incumbent on all Members of the Organization, in particular those with special responsibilities under the Charter and those with influence over South Africa because of their relations with it, to ensure that Namibia proceeds to independence without further delay. We must exert maximum pressure on South Africa to ensure its compliance with the relevant decisions of the Security Council.

74. My delegation addresses a solemn appeal to the friends and supporters of South Africa to place in the forefront of their consideration the rights and interests of the people of Namibia, who are the ones made to suffer most directly from any accommodation made with the Pretoria régime. My delegation nourishes the hope that out of the Assembly's consideration of the question of Namibia at this session will come a fresh commitment by all States, in particular South Africa's powerful Western friends, to ensure the achievement of the goal of the liberation of Namibia, to which the Organization has so resolutely committed itself.

75. In conclusion, I wish to express my delegation's wholehearted support for all the draft resolutions now before the Assembly on this question.

76. Mr. S. E. CHARLES (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): Once again, the Assembly has been called upon to state its position on the thorny question of Namibia, which continues to be one of the most disturbing problems before mankind.

77. I hardly need to go once again into the history of this subject, as its every detail is well known to the members of the Assembly. I shall merely recall that for nearly four decades this question has been considered regularly by the principal organs of the United Nations, which have been shown clearly to be incapable of putting an end to the subjugation by the racist régime of South Africa of the brave and peace-loving Namibian people. That régime, in fact, in high-handed disregard for the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, stubbornly continues its illegal occupation in defiance of the United Nations and of the international community. Worse still, South Africa is working single-mindedly to consolidate and perpetuate its domination of the Territory of Namibia, into which it has introduced *apartheid*, the most hateful and degrading system mankind has ever known.

78. Moreover, thanks to its military superiority and assured of the impunity which—we must recognize the fact—it gains from its alliance with certain Western interests, South Africa is intensifying its violence against the defenceless civilian population, while neighbouring African States, particularly the People's Republic of Angola, are the target of numerous acts of aggression in violation of their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

79. It goes without saying that the South African régime's aggressive policy, which runs counter to the basic principles underlying international relations, is a source

of permanent tension in southern Africa and a grave threat to international peace and security.

80. Seven years have elapsed since the Security Council, realizing the seriousness of the situation—the solution of which must involve the effective exercise by the Namibian people of its inalienable rights to self-determination, freedom and national independence—adopted resolution 385 (1976), which was intended, *inter alia*, to secure South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia and the organization of free elections under United Nations supervision and control. Unfortunately, it achieved neither of these things.

81. Two years later, on the initiative of Western Powers, a plan for the settlement of the Namibian question—which, moreover, had the approval of South Africa—was endorsed by the Council in its resolution 435 (1978).

82. My country, which has always rejected any role whatsoever for South Africa in the settlement of the question of Namibia, with the sole exception of its withdrawal from the Territory, had endorsed the fundamental elements of that resolution in the hope that it might lead to a peaceful settlement of this problem, which had already caused so much needless suffering to the peoples of southern Africa.

83. But, once again, the Organization's efforts to implement the resolution were foiled by the duplicity of the South African régime in raising totally extraneous issues.

84. In this connection, we agree with the Secretary-General that the question of Namibia must be considered as a substantive issue in itself and not as an accessory to other questions. He stated most pertinently, in paragraph 16 of his excellent report on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978):¹

“It is evident 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.”

85. The defiance of the Pretoria régime must be broken. Chapter VII of the Charter provides for effective enforcement measures which the Security Council should take against South Africa as a matter of the utmost urgency. Faced with the increasing intransigence of the Pretoria régime, the use of such measures remains the final option.

86. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reiterate the total support of the Government and the people of Haiti for the heroic struggle of the Namibian people for national liberation under the guidance of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, and it cherishes the hope that the international community will continue to provide them with all necessary support for the triumph of their just cause.

87. My delegation also wishes to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia for their steadfast efforts to ensure the prompt implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

88. Mr. HOUFFANE (Djibouti) (*interpretation from French*): Once again, the General Assembly is considering the question of Namibia, a very important and disturbing question, which remains essentially and fundamentally a problem of decolonization for which the United Nations is solely responsible, in accordance with the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

89. In addition, it is more than 17 years since the General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI), recognized the international status of Namibia and terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory.

90. The Security Council has also reaffirmed this direct responsibility of the Organization and has encouraged the struggle of the Namibian people.

91. I shall refrain from narrating the history of Namibia, which is so dear to us. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia [A/38/24] describes the development of the situation clearly and at some length.

92. We recognize that the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the competent and experienced leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, has diligently carried out the mandate given it by the General Assembly and its responsibilities in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions. We are very pleased at this stage to congratulate the Council on its tireless efforts to mobilize concerted international support for ending the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa.

93. Year after year, the international community sets its heart on the hope of seeing a free, independent and sovereign Namibia. That is why, for the last five years, we have been impatiently waiting for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains the basis for a peaceful negotiated settlement to the question of Namibia.

94. But the racist régime of South Africa continues to use every possible strategy to gain time for its manoeuvres and dilatory tactics designed to increase its domination over the Namibian people and its exploitation and plunder of the natural resources of the Territory, in violation of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

95. At the initiative of the non-aligned countries, the Security Council, in its resolution 532 (1983), requested the Secretary-General, to submit a further report on the subject. I should like to praise the efforts of the Secretary-General, who has demonstrated his dedication and the impartiality of the Organization.

96. In paragraph 26 of his report,² the Secretary-General stressed:

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

He went on to say, in paragraph 27: “A peaceful solution of the Namibian problem is also the key to a peaceful and co-operative future for all countries of the region.”

97. This question has arisen year after year and needs no special comment; it is truly a question of decolonization, as other speakers have said.

98. It is noteworthy that the Security Council has rejected South Africa's so-called linkage as far as the question of Namibia's independence is concerned. In resolution 539 (1983), the Security Council condemned South Africa for its unlawful occupation of Namibia in flagrant violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Council itself. It also condemned South Africa for having obstructed implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and for insisting on conditions contrary to the provisions of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

99. This we take as encouragement for the efforts of the international community, and the racist régime must

not be given any opportunity to engage in stalling tactics or to find alibis. The Security Council must, in the near future or by a date to be decided on, take appropriate action under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We are convinced that it is only by implementing such sanctions that the South African régime can be induced to abide by the relevant resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia.

100. In conclusion, I wish to pay a special tribute to the courageous people of Namibia who, under the leadership of SWAPO, are fighting valiantly against South Africa. The front-line countries—Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and others—also deserve a tribute because they too have provided support to those peoples struggling against South Africa.

101. We also pay tribute to the efforts made by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia, Mr. Mishra, in support of the people of that country and for his attempts to find a just and lasting solution to the problem.

102. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that the Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia, which appear in the report of the Council [A/38/24]. I call on the representative of Nigeria, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A, entitled "Situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa".

103. Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria): This is the thirty-sixth year that the question of Namibia has been in the forefront of the concerns of this world today. No other question has for so long been a dominant issue with the international community. The cause of Namibia's independence has been supported by the overwhelming majority of States since the early years of the Organization. Since then, the momentum has increased by the termination of the Mandate 17 years ago by the Assembly [*see resolution 2145 (XXI)*], by the historic advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,⁸ by Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and by many other resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

104. However, over these long years, the international community has been frustrated in its efforts to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia by the intransigence of the Pretoria régime, with the support of its Western allies which have created impasse after impasse. All of this is familiar to the Assembly. The racist régime has tried all kinds of manoeuvres to hoodwink the international community. I refer here to the attempts by South Africa and the United States to link the question of Namibia's independence to irrelevant and extraneous issues such as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

105. The Security Council, in its resolution 539 (1983), recently rejected:

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

The Council also decided that, in the event of continued obstruction by South Africa, it would consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

106. South Africa's intransigence remains the only hurdle in the way of Namibian independence. It is in this context that my delegation is introducing draft resolution A. It is a draft resolution that has been recommended

by consensus to this Assembly by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

107. The draft resolution reaffirms once more the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia, while reaffirming the mandate given to the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for that Territory until independence. The draft resolution further reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people by all means, including armed struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

108. After laying down these basic principles, reiterated year after year by the Assembly, the draft resolution proceeds strongly to condemn South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and for obstructing the implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which remain the only basis for an internationally recognized peaceful settlement on the question of Namibia.

109. The draft resolution firmly rejects the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any "linkage" or "parallelism" between the independence of Namibia and, in particular, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, and emphasizes unequivocally that any such attempts are designed to delay the decolonization process in Namibia and constitute interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

110. In view of recent South African threats to proceed with yet another so-called internal solution in Namibia, such as the establishment of yet another puppet institution in the form of a so-called State Council, the draft resolution strongly condemns this latest direct violation of Security Council resolution 439 (1978), which is aimed at perpetuating South Africa's domination of the Territory.

111. The draft resolution condemns the increased assistance rendered by the major Western countries and Israel to South Africa in the political, economic, financial and, particularly, military fields. In this regard, the draft resolution declares that the resolution on the need for development aid for Namibia, adopted by the European Parliament on 13 January 1983⁹ calling upon the European Economic Community to extend aid to occupied Namibia as well as to so-called "refugees from southern Angola" in Namibia, if implemented, would flout international law by implying recognition of South Africa's presence in Namibia and would subsidize Pretoria's illegal administration of the Territory, while encouraging its acts of aggression against Angola and the occupation of a part of Angolan territory.

112. The draft resolution notes, in this connection, the letter of 15 November 1983 from the President of the European Parliament addressed to the Secretary-General underlining that the European Parliament and the European Community support and respect the framework established by the United Nations in respect of Namibia [*see A/38/24, annex III*].

113. The draft resolution condemns South Africa's military build-up in Namibia and its use of Namibian territory to launch armed attacks against the independent African States of the region, and particularly its continued unprovoked attacks against and occupation of Angola.

114. Furthermore, it expresses grave concern about the acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability by the Pretoria régime as constituting a further attempt on its part to terrorize the independent States of the region, while also posing a danger to all mankind. In this regard, the draft resolution condemns the continuing military and nuclear

collaboration of certain Western countries and Israel with the racist régime, which is in violation of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa under Security Council resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977.

115. The draft resolution also deals with South Africa's attempts to thwart the work of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference [SADCC] and calls upon all States and United Nations agencies to render all possible assistance to SADCC in its efforts to promote regional economic co-operation.

116. The draft resolution declares that all activities of foreign economic interests in Namibia are illegal under international law and that South African and all other foreign economic interests operating in Namibia are liable for damages to the future lawful Government of an independent Namibia, and calls upon the Governments concerned to take appropriate action in the context of the implementation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,¹⁰ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974.

117. The draft resolution reiterates its request to all States, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, to take legislative, administrative and other measures, unilaterally and collectively, to isolate South Africa, and requests the United Nations Council for Namibia to continue to monitor the boycott of South Africa.

118. Finally, it calls upon the Security Council to adopt the necessary measures to tighten the arms embargo against South Africa and ensure strict compliance with it by all States, and, in the light of the serious threat to international peace and security posed by South Africa, it urges the Security Council immediately to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that country, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

119. The draft resolution that I am submitting for the consideration and approval of the Assembly is an accurate summation of the issues pertaining to the independence of Namibia. I hope that it will receive the broadest possible support.

120. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of India, who wishes to introduce draft resolution B, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

121. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Few resolutions of this body have earned so vast a measure of international endorsement and support as Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Indeed, today the world considers this resolution, embodying the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, to be the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. It is therefore a tragic paradox that five years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) the plan still remains unimplemented.

122. The obstacles which have been strewn in the path of the implementation of this resolution by South Africa are only too well known to the international community and scarcely need reiteration. Given South Africa's enormous intransigence, it follows that the international community must intensify pressure on that régime to submit to the universal will and co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which remains central to the peaceful attainment of independence by Namibia.

123. The draft resolution that I have the honour to introduce to the Assembly on behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia underscores the importance of resolution 435 (1978) and the need for its implementation without further delay.

124. The draft resolution speaks for itself and I need not dwell separately on its various preambular and operative paragraphs. In a nutshell, it strongly condemns South Africa's obstructionism with regard to the implementation of relevant resolutions of the Security Council, reaffirms the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia, reiterates that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question and demands the immediate and unconditional implementation of that resolution, without modification, qualification or amendment and without the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues of linkage, parallelism or reciprocity. The draft resolution firmly rejects and condemns such attempts to establish "linkage" or "parallelism" between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous and irrelevant issues, in particular the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, and emphasizes unequivocally that such attempts are designed to delay the decolonization process in Namibia and that they constitute interference in the internal affairs of Angola. It further calls upon all States to reject linkage. Finally, it calls upon the Security Council to exercise its authority with regard to the implementation of relevant resolutions and urges it to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

125. The long debate in the Assembly on the question of Namibia that has just concluded, in which an unprecedented 95 delegations participated, has only served to demonstrate the intensity of the feelings of the international community with regard to the continued bondage of the people of Namibia. That debate has also manifested near unanimity in the categorical rejection of linkage and in the desire of the nation States represented here to see Security Council resolution 435 (1978) implemented without further pretexts being adduced and without further delay. The draft resolution is an echo of what we have heard in this Hall for the past four days, an unmistakable reflection of the will of the General Assembly. It is therefore to be hoped that it will receive the overwhelming support of the Assembly.

126. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Yugoslavia, who will introduce draft resolution C, entitled "Programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia".

127. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution C, recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Council, established by General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 as the legitimate Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, has drawn up a programme of its work for the coming year which we feel will enable it to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by that and by subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly.

128. According to that programme of work, the United Nations Council for Namibia has and will continue to represent Namibia in conferences and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and to participate in meetings of specialized agencies in order to protect the interests of the Namibian people, to consult Governments in order to further the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia and to contact Governments and foreign corporations operating in Namibia regarding the illegal basis on which they are operating in the Territory. In addition, the Council will conduct hearings, seminars and workshops in order to obtain relevant information on the exploitation of Namibia by South Africa and other foreign interests and to expose such activities; it will also organize regional symposia and publish reports on the situation in Namibia with a view to galvanizing active support for the Namibian cause.

129. We in the United Nations Council for Namibia believe that the United Nations should do everything in its power to persuade those countries that support South Africa in its intransigence to stop doing so. We feel that we have to strengthen the programmes of activity of the Council, particularly those which are intended to increase the awareness of the societies in those countries of the plight of the Namibian people and to increase the awareness of the immorality of their co-operation with the occupying South African régime in Namibia.

130. I wish to stress that in the present situation, characterized by the outright rejection by South Africa of all steps taken by the United Nations towards the implementation of the United Nations plan, the programme of work of the United Nations Council for Namibia acquires an added significance. I therefore submit this draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly with the earnest hope that the activities carried out by the Council will contribute significantly to bringing about the independence of Namibia as soon as possible.

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Bulgaria, who will introduce draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information and mobilization of international public opinion in support of Namibia".

132. Mr. DENICHIN (Bulgaria): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution D recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

133. Over the years it has become increasingly clear that the mere recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence, the repeated condemnations of racist South Africa's brutal colonialist policy of *apartheid*, repression and aggression, the appeals by the world Organization for the immediate cessation of that policy and for the granting of independence to Namibia, although being of utmost significance, cannot by themselves bring about the withdrawal of Pretoria from the illegally occupied Territory. On the contrary, in blatant defiance of numerous United Nations resolutions, the racists have continued and expanded their aggressive colonial war against the people of Namibia which, under the leadership of its sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, is waging an heroic and just struggle for independence. The aggression of Pretoria has long ago crossed the borders of South Africa and Namibia. Now all the independent African States of the region are under direct assault by the racist régime. Indeed, as has been declared more than once by the General Assembly, the policy of racist South Africa has become a threat to international peace and security.

134. It is more than obvious, therefore, that a concerted and sustained effort by the whole international community is necessary in order to help the Namibian people achieve its independence. The United Nations Council for Namibia and, indeed, the United Nations as a whole have long recognized that the active and continuous dissemination of information on all aspects of the question of Namibia is one of the most important and effective vehicles for attaining this goal. It is essential for the building up of broad solidarity with and support for the cause of Namibia and for the mobilization of public opinion against the policies of Pretoria and against the all-round assistance which the *apartheid* régime is receiving from the United States, some other Western States and Israel. It is even more important in view of the fact that a wide-scale campaign to misrepresent the Namibian question and distort its real decolonization nature is being undertaken in those same States, a campaign which is fully consistent with their policy of support for South Africa.

135. In compliance with its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence, the

United Nations Council for Namibia has become the rallying point of the world-wide mobilization of support for the struggle of the Namibian people. In recognition of this fact, the General Assembly, in the draft resolution before us, would request the Council to continue to consider ways and means of increasing the dissemination of information on Namibia. It would, further, request the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, in all its activities of dissemination of information on Namibia, follows the policy guidelines laid down by the Council and assists the Council, as a matter of priority, in the implementation of its programme of dissemination of information. It would also decide to intensify its international campaign in support of the Namibian cause and to expose and denounce the collusion with the South African racists of the United States of America, certain other Western countries and Israel. To this end, it would request the Council to include a wide range of activities in its programme of dissemination of information for 1984, including the organization of a symposium to mark the 100 years of heroic struggle waged by the Namibian people against the colonial occupation and plunder of the natural resources of their country, and for self-determination, freedom and independence.

136. In recognition of the very important role which the non-governmental organizations have to play in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, the draft resolution would request those organizations to strengthen their co-operation with the United Nations Council for Namibia and would urge them to intensify their efforts for the mobilization of public support for and solidarity with this struggle.

137. The dissemination of information on the question of Namibia cannot be regarded as an activity of a technical character. Its character is highly political. It is a most important means for bringing pressure to bear on Pretoria and its allies to comply with the will of the Namibian people and with United Nations resolutions for the granting of independence to Namibia without further delay.

138. I therefore have the pleasure of recommending for adoption by the General Assembly draft resolution D.

139. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution E, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia".

140. Mrs. CORONEL DE RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a great honour for Venezuela, and for me in particular, to introduce draft resolution E.

141. The United Nations Fund for Namibia was established in 1970, pursuant to Assembly resolution 2679 (XXV). South Africa's Mandate to administer the Territory had been terminated and the United Nations had assumed direct responsibility over Namibia until its independence. The Organization had thus contracted a solemn obligation to help the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence and therefore had the duty to give them broad assistance.

142. Initially, the United Nations Fund for Namibia covered activities related to the granting of educational and social assistance and relief. During the second part of 1976, however, two separate accounts were established: that of the United Nations Institute for Namibia and that of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia. Thus, the magnitude and the objectives of the assistance granted by the Fund have continued to expand.

143. Since the Fund was established, the General Assembly has each year authorized, as an interim measure, an allocation to the Fund from the regular United Nations

budget. For 1983, the sum of \$1 million was authorized under resolution 37/233 E. For 1984, the same allocation is envisaged.

144. The majority of the activities of the United Nations Fund for Namibia, however, are financed by voluntary contributions from Governments, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and individuals. I emphasize that the need for financial assistance to the people of Namibia exceeds the funds available. Various proposals for projects have not yet been implemented because of a lack of funds. There is therefore an urgent need to increase contributions to the Fund so that the United Nations Council for Namibia is able to increase the humanitarian aid and development assistance provided to the Namibians.

145. In this respect, I stress the importance of the request to the organizations within the United Nations system to waive administrative costs of projects financed by the United Nations Fund for Namibia; or, if those costs cannot be waived, to treat contributions from the Fund as Government cash counterpart contributions, for which the agencies cover only 3.5 per cent of the administrative costs instead of the usual 13 per cent.

146. It is also extremely important that these assistance activities be co-ordinated so that the resources available to the Namibians may be used to the fullest. For that reason, I draw attention to the request that the specialized agencies and the other organizations and institutions of the United Nations system plan and initiate new measures of assistance to Namibians within the context of the

Nationhood Programme for Namibia and the United Nations Institute for Namibia.

147. All those measures will increase assistance to the Namibians and ensure the effective use of the sums allocated by the United Nations for such assistance, thereby giving the Namibian people effective help in its just struggle for freedom and independence.

148. For all those reasons, I recommend to the General Assembly that it adopt draft resolution E by consensus.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1983*, document S/15776.

² *Ibid.*, Supplement for July, August and September 1983, document S/15943.

³ *Ibid.*, Thirty-eighth Year, 2481st meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983, document S/16106.

⁵ União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

⁶ A/CONF.120/8.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year*, 2488th meeting.

⁸ *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.

⁹ Official Journal of the European Communities, No. C 42/53.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24 (A/35/24)*, vol. I, annex II.