



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Question of Namibia (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;
- (b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that the General Assembly has before it five draft resolutions recommended by the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report [A/37/24, para. 786].

2. Mr. de La BARRE DE NANTEUIL (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour today to speak on behalf of the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

3. As all members of the Assembly are aware, our five Governments have entered into negotiations to secure an internationally recognized settlement of the Namibian problem. A solution to this problem is long overdue. In the past few months, intensive efforts have been made to overcome the remaining obstacles.

4. During July and August, consultations were held in New York between the contact group and representatives of the front-line States, Nigeria and the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], and there were concurrent consultations with South Africa. These talks enabled us to reach agreement on important aspects of the settlement proposal that were outstanding. The results of these consultations were conveyed to the Secretary-General in September at a meeting in which the five countries of the contact group, the front-line States, Nigeria and SWAPO participated.

5. Our Foreign Ministers met in New York on 1 October and welcomed the acceptance by the parties of the constitutional principles which are to govern the Namibian Constituent Assembly. They also noted that substantial progress had been made on the question of the impartiality, and on the size, composition and arrangements for deployment of the military component of UNTAG. In this regard, we should like to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General and his staff for their valuable contribution. We should also like to pay a tribute to the Secretariat for its efforts to complete preparations for the UNTAG operation.

6. Even with this progress, however, some issues still have to be settled. The commitment of the five Western countries to a successful conclusion of this exercise remains firm, and the independence of Namibia remains our goal. We believe that it is in the interests of the international community, and more specifically the sovereign States of southern Africa, that this problem be resolved as soon as possible. Our Governments remain convinced that only through negotiations will it be possible to achieve a lasting settlement while ensuring Namibian independence, which is what we all seek.

7. Neither in form nor in substance do the draft resolutions before us today recognize either the seriousness of the present situation or the opportunity that now exists to find a peaceful solution. They will not bring the goal of Namibian independence any closer. Although the five Western countries have reservations on numerous aspects of these texts, we shall abstain so as not to jeopardize our role in the negotiations. Our abstentions are purely procedural and in no way imply any position on the intrinsic merits of these draft resolutions.

8. Intensive consultations are continuing on the remaining unsettled issues. The contact group wishes once again to emphasize the importance of the cooperation of all the parties concerned to ensure the success of our common efforts.

9. The opportunity now exists to bring about a settlement which would make it possible both to strengthen peace and security and to foster economic development in the region. We see no real alternative to these negotiations other than the continuation of the conflicts in the area, with the ever-increasing suffering that would result for the peoples of southern Africa. We denounce violence from whatever source either to promote or to prevent change. We call on the international community for its support in the effort to achieve our common goal of peaceful negotiated settlement.

10. Mr. KIBANDA (Central African Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Regarded as one of the most burning issues of the United Nations, the situation in Namibia, which is once again under consideration this year, has virtually filled the foreground of the world scene and has been a focus of international public opinion for more than 20 years now. As in a tale from "A Thousand and One Nights", in which the East abounded, Namibia is, all things considered, a victim of the wealth nature has lavished upon it. The overflowing riches within its confines excite greed and attract vultures of every kind.

11. O, Namibia, poor Namibia, its future in suspense, frozen, paralysed. O, people of Namibia, a people abandoned, denied their existence, denied their

national identity, a people whose fate, whose right to life, are the subject of sinister and deplorable machinations, clever compromises in Foreign Ministries, compromises totally unacceptable in conscience, ethics and political morality, a people immolated on a monument to the glory of a colonialism that was once all-powerful and is today on the wane, a people sacrificed on the altar of the notoriety of multinationals, those oracles who determine if the weather shall be fair or foul.

12. We had thought, perhaps too euphorically, that 1982 would be the year of decision, the historic year that would hear not the clash of weapons, the whistling of bombs or the buzzing of South African helicopters in the airspace of neighbouring States firing their deadly shells, but instead the sound of a hymn to peace and independence, a symphony of joy, gaiety and popular rejoicing.

13. We had hoped—perhaps with unduly naive optimism, wittingly or unwittingly forgetting the logic of politics and its vicissitudes—that a large part of the South African colonialist régime would fall this year, opening a breach in the edifice of *apartheid*.

14. The members of the contact group, with their peace plan approved by the Security Council, had given us grounds to feed these illusions and nurture this hope. But it was all in vain. Despite substantial concessions made by SWAPO, peace, which should have led Namibia to independence—the finest flower of rhetoric—and put an end once and for all to the sufferings of the Namibian people, was crushed under the weight of thousands of tons of bombs falling from the skies—bombs unleashed daily by the South African army—was crushed under the weight of all the acts of mass destruction committed against neighbouring States, and was indefinitely postponed. Fate decided otherwise; the will of the great Powers was not merciful. O, cruel fate!

15. A problem of decolonization, born after the Second World War in the clash of weapons and fighting, the question of Namibia can have no rational, just or lasting solution unless it is within the framework of the process which began 22 years ago in the United Nations with the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

16. In adopting that resolution, which is a milestone in the annals of the Organization, the United Nations took a stand for posterity, stealing a march on history and underwriting the struggles and wars that subjugated countries and peoples suffering under colonial domination were waging in their desire for freedom and independence and to affirm their national identities.

17. Resolution 1514 (XV), with its programme of action, based upon respect for moral values and fundamental freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is, with regard to the irreversibility of history, one of the major decisions ever taken by the United Nations. It strengthened the universality of the Organization's mission by restoring to it its very reason for existence at a time when peace, in its new conception, means not only the end of hostilities but also respect for and safeguarding of these moral values and fundamental freedoms, the constant violation of which is a source of friction and disruption

that in turn generate bloody conflicts. To our mind, that resolution alone is the appropriate framework in which to solve the thorny problems of decolonization and with them the matter of Namibia, on which the bulky file is being reopened at this session.

18. For 16 years, the United Nations has, with perseverance and determination and in its usual spirit of harmony and conciliation, been trying to find a way out of the imbroglia of the Namibian problem, which has become very complex in the face of South Africa's systematic refusal to abide by the Organization's decisions supporting the free expression of self-determination by the Namibian people. The praiseworthy efforts constantly made by the United Nations and the Secretary-General to reach a negotiated settlement of the problem are often beaten back and countered by the persistent arrogance of the racist Pretoria régime. The bitter failure of the Geneva talks of January 1981, dominated far more by a destructive and negative outlook than by a real spirit of dialogue and joint action, is still fresh in our memory. During those talks, as in other circumstances, South Africa gave proof of its bad faith, that it would not contribute effectively to the search for a final settlement of the Namibian issue, and made clear its marked taste for time-wasting manoeuvres and subtle procedures of prevarication which confirm its notorious Machiavellian turn of mind.

19. Placed under South African trusteeship, unfortunately, more than half a century ago, Namibia, which is still fundamentally a colonial situation, has constantly been a source of serious concern to the United Nations because of South Africa's illegal presence and its persistent acts of aggression against States that are its neighbours. Yet, Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations defines the primary mission of the Trusteeship System as:

“... to further international peace and security;

“to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned ...

“to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion ...”.

20. Thus, the final aim of the mandate given the trustee under the provisions of the above-mentioned Article could not be clearer. It can be summed up in one word—*independence*.

21. Instead of that and quite to the contrary, South Africa has sought to stifle the legitimate aspirations of the courageous people of Namibia to freedom, justice and independence, the very basis of human dignity, to break that people's desire for equity and its propensity for ethics and, finally, to entrench its illegal presence.

22. Instead of that, South Africa has made Namibia an impregnable fortress from which its murderous raids, its hoplites armed to the teeth, are launched to attack, invade and occupy States in the region; to burn entire villages and raze them; to kill men, women and children savagely. Horrifying spectacles emerge after each raid, poignant pictures which revolt the human

and moral conscience, an infernal spiral of violence and cruelty.

23. The invasion of the Kingdom of Lesotho—a small country, of legendary calm and by tradition peaceful—by the South African army a few days ago still burns in our minds. That barbarous attack by the Pretoria criminals, which contrasts strongly with South Africa's so-called "obvious willingness to achieve détente" that its supporters wish us to accept, proves yet again its monstrous determination to settle the question of Namibia by force.

24. Who in this body, which inspires détente and peace, would have the courage to sanction or approve this act of schizophrenia? Which State Member of the United Nations, whose Charter advocates dialogue, concerted action and the peaceful settlement of disputes among States, could allow such a thing? Furthermore, who would dare stand by as a silent accomplice or in approval?

25. Who? The Central African Republic, for its part, most categorically condemns this abominable attack. It expresses to the Kingdom of Lesotho its complete sympathy in this difficult time when its security and independence are threatened.

26. In these circumstances, the deadlock is total. This cripples the prospects of the Territory of Namibia and paralyzes it. It creates, both inside and outside, a dangerous situation, because of the political and military implications involved and the threat to international peace and security it represents. It seriously harms the prestige of the United Nations, which is accused of ineffectiveness; it considerably weakens its credibility and detracts from its image.

27. In view of the facts, which clearly demonstrate the total failure of South Africa to carry out its highly important mission, to achieve in due time the objectives set by the Charter of the United Nations and to satisfy justifiable hopes, and in view of the warlike attitude of the Pretoria Government and its obvious intention to make Namibia an integrated province of South Africa, the General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, declared illegal South Africa's presence in and occupation of Namibia and entrusted the administration of the Territory to the United Nations Council for Namibia, established pursuant to resolution 2248 (S-V). In this regard, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,<sup>1</sup> which confirmed that resolution, is significant in more than one way.

28. The establishment of the Council, whose primary responsibility is to ensure the advancement of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence with strict respect for its dignity, identity and national unity, is an eloquent expression of the United Nations mission of universal peace and its desire to ensure and guarantee, in accordance with its responsibilities, world peace and security. The assumption of responsibility for the administration of the Territory of Namibia by the Council, which implicitly terminated South Africa's Mandate, was to the credit of the United Nations, which sought to give proper expression to its determination to work for a peaceful, happy and balanced world in which social justice and the welfare and well-being of man would be

the only dogma, the only tenet. All else is vanity and illusion.

29. Having taken upon itself responsibility for the future of the people of Namibia, the United Nations must at all costs guarantee the security of that people against any acts of aggression which might alter the course of its history and prejudice its future. In other words, it must fulfil that responsibility.

30. In view of the systematic refusal of the South African Government to fulfil its trusteeship Mandate, and its persistent determination to dominate and enslave, what, finally, can the people of Namibia do, in its burning desire for freedom and its quest for justice and peace, in order to affirm its national identity? It can take up arms to gain its independence in a surge of vitality and national feeling and in a vast liberation movement, thereby following the comforting example of many countries represented here—and not the minority.

31. In doing this, SWAPO, which is in the vanguard of the liberation struggle and which has proved its remarkable capacity for organization, is persuaded in advance of the rightness of its struggle for independence. By entrusting the leadership of the struggle to SWAPO, by demonstrating complete confidence in its ability to conduct the future affairs of the Namibian people, that people has made a decisive, historic choice which demonstrates its desire to liberate itself from domination and enslavement, a choice between, on the one hand, courage and honour, which are ennobling, and, on the other, domination and alienation, which are humiliating and degrading. The over-equipped South African army, which is one of the strongest in the world and possesses sophisticated military and strategic equipment, with a horde of foul mercenaries, horrible creatures who come from all over the world, drawn by the promise of financial gain, is opposed by a few determined patriots, whose courage we can but admire, in a bitter, furious and disproportionate struggle. The intensity and fury of the response of the army of Pretoria, exasperated by the bold actions of the soldiers of the movement, demonstrate the determination of the South African Government to settle the question of Namibia by force—a determination which is translated into the incessant acts of aggression and mass destruction of which the States of the region are the victims. In this respect, the price paid by the Namibian people for its freedom and independence is a very heavy one and the sacrifices it has made are enormous and superhuman.

32. This is an appropriate time to pay homage to the memory of the heroes of freedom who have given their precious lives in a sacred cause, who have sacrificed themselves for the Namibian nation, who have been buried without tombs or epitaphs, their blackened ashes carried by the wind of freedom and their blood spilled so that the history of an independent and sovereign Namibia may inspire future generations.

33. We must rejoice in the fact that SWAPO, its hopes having been fulfilled by its recognition by the international community as the sole representative of the Namibian people, has proved its political maturity by showing willingness to co-operate in any search for a solution, fully subscribing to the settlement plan approved by the Security Council on the basis of reso-

lution 435 (1978), which, as will be recalled, envisages free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

34. Certainly, it is Pretoria's obstinate refusal to implement that resolution, to accept the verdict of history by recognizing the international status of Namibia, and also its repugnant arrogance in violating, with impunity, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States which is perpetuating the deadlock in a situation which is a latent threat to world peace and security. There is only one way to achieve peace and the independence of Namibia, and that is by the withdrawal of South Africa.

35. Need we recall that great empires crumbled under the strong pressure of the profound upheavals which shook the world and brought into being the many young sovereign States that today form the majority of the membership of the United Nations, which groups together former colonial Powers and new countries, all taking part with enthusiasm and conviction in a community of action and harmony of thought in the interest of the future of mankind?

36. Need we recall that, beyond the divergences which may appear in their overall view of the world, their perception and conception of life and society and their analyses of and approaches to the solution of the many problems confronting the world, the States Members of the United Nations show a sincere desire to contribute to the building of a better world—a world of justice and freedom in which the focus of interest is man himself, for his happiness and well-being?

37. That is how history—the great history which is to be found at the crossroads of civilizations, and in the great schools of thought which have deeply marked our contemporary world—is made. How therefore can the Pretoria régime remain insensitive to the positive development of events and not understand the meaning of the irreversibility of history?

38. Benjamin Constant, in *On Conquest and Usurpation*, said: "Woe to those who, believing themselves invincible, defy mankind and seek through it, because they have no other instrument, to bring about upheavals of which it disapproves and miracles it does not desire".

39. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): Sixteen years have elapsed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence. No one could have imagined at that historic moment in 1966 that to this day Namibia would still be illegally occupied by South Africa, and its people still denied their inalienable right to freedom and independence. Indeed, no one could have imagined that young Namibians born at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) and those born after that would today fill the ranks of the freedom fighters seeking the liberation of their country from illegal South African occupation.

40. It is not for lack of effort on the part of the United Nations that Namibia is still not free. Nor is the long-delayed independence of Namibia due to any lack of co-operation by the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, in regard to efforts to promote a peaceful settlement.

41. The General Assembly, directly and through the United Nations Council for Namibia, has for almost two decades actively sought the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia and the accession of that country to independence. The Security Council has also been active and made imaginative efforts in the search for a peaceful settlement to the problem of Namibia. The International Court of Justice, through its advisory opinion of 1971,<sup>1</sup> and the Secretary-General have also contributed meaningfully to this effort.

42. Thus, the United Nations, through its major organs, is committed to the cause of the Namibian people. The Organization has put its prestige and authority at the service of the just struggle of the Namibian people, and they in turn, have placed their faith in it. The leaders of SWAPO have proved to be great statesmen, who have done everything necessary and possible to facilitate various United Nations initiatives towards peaceful change in their country. I need not add that the cause of the Namibian people enjoys overwhelming support in the international community.

43. Yet, South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia. It persists in its exploitation and plunder of Namibia's natural resources. It maintains a stranglehold over the Territory through brutal oppression and repression of the Namibian people. Many Namibian patriots have been arrested, detained, imprisoned, tortured, maimed or killed in cold blood by the illegal South African occupation régime.

44. In the series of United Nations initiatives aimed at resolving the problem of Namibia, the most current and topical is Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution, which was adopted four years ago, once again offered an opportunity to South Africa for an honourable exit from Namibia, as did Security Council resolution 385 (1976) and several other initiatives before it. On the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), Namibia would have been independent three years ago and would today be occupying its rightful place in the United Nations.

45. Resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented because South Africa refuses to co-operate. While pretending to be interested at last in yielding to international opinion and withdrawing from Namibia on the basis of this resolution, South Africa has at every turn procrastinated and prevaricated precisely in order to block the implementation process of resolution 435 (1978). Time and again it has injected frivolous and extraneous elements to undermine and prevent the implementation of the resolution which would bring about its withdrawal from Namibia and the independence of the Territory. South Africa, therefore, has shown that it is neither ready nor willing to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia.

46. There is no question but that the South African régime is intransigent. It is a régime that is the very epitome of all that is evil in southern Africa. It represents a clique of diehard white racists with an avowed commitment, through the ill-conceived and false doctrine of *apartheid*, to the exploitation of the black majority of South Africa and Namibia and to the plundering of the rich natural resources of the region.

47. South Africa refuses to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) because it is afraid of an inevitable SWAPO victory in free and fair elections



in Namibia. It is afraid of a democratic process in Namibia and is therefore seeking to stifle the right of the people of Namibia freely to elect a government of their choice. South Africa wishes to impose a puppet régime on the Namibian people, even given the disarray in the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance. It is determined to cling to Namibia, directly or through a puppet régime, for it considers Namibia important in its so-called strategic calculations in defence of the obnoxious system of *apartheid*.

48. The Pretoria régime still deludes itself into believing that it can win international legitimacy and recognition for a puppet régime in Namibia. As evidenced by the recent so-called elections in Walvis Bay, the Pretoria régime is also stubbornly intent on usurping Namibia's vital seaport and violating its territorial integrity.

49. The international community, through the Assembly, must once again make it abundantly clear that it will in no circumstances accept or tolerate any South-African-imposed puppet régime in Namibia. Similarly, South Africa must be told in no uncertain terms that Walvis Bay is and shall remain an integral part of Namibian territory, in accordance with Security Council resolution 432 (1978).

50. The new pretext for South Africa's refusal to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. The issue in Namibia is the illegal South African occupation of the Territory and the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence. Yet, South Africa and the United States want to hold the Namibian people hostage to their own ideological perceptions and preoccupations. Their insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the obviously extraneous issue of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola would, in effect, perpetuate the denial to the Namibian people of their freedom and independence.

51. Zambia is therefore strongly and categorically opposed to the linkage being made between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Our duty is to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which deals exclusively with the question of Namibia. The question of Namibia must be solved on its own merits in accordance with the letter and spirit of that resolution. It is morally reprehensible and politically unacceptable to us to sacrifice the freedom and independence of the Namibian people on the altar of ideological expedience. The other members of the Western contact group should have the courage of their convictions and tell the United States that its insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is wrong and contrary to resolution 435 (1978). They should speak out and bring pressure to bear on the United States to drop its insistence on the linkage, lest they be perceived to be part and parcel of the United States position. I must say that the statement we just heard from the representative of France, who spoke on behalf of the Western contact group, did not address the heart of the problem, namely, South Africa's intransigence, encouraged by the position of the United States. To be an honest broker, one must have a clear vision of the issues and not assist those who seek to distort them.

52. Angola is an independent and sovereign State. It has borne the brunt of repeated acts of aggression by South Africa. It therefore has legitimate security concerns and a sovereign right to enter into bilateral arrangements with its friends as it sees fit. Besides, it stands to reason that the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia, the termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory and the achievement of independence by the people of Namibia are necessary for Angola to enjoy peace and security on its borders.

53. I must, in this regard, reiterate Zambia's strong condemnation of the repeated South African acts of aggression against Angola. Zambia also strongly condemns the continued South African occupation of Angolan territory and once again demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African military forces from Angola.

54. We, in Zambia, have time and again pointed out that *apartheid* is not only a crime against humanity but also a serious threat to international peace and security. In defence of *apartheid*, South Africa persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia and uses the Territory as a launching pad for its acts of aggression against front-line States. Indeed, South Africa has, through its actions, demonstrated that it will stop at nothing to protect its criminal policies and practices of *apartheid*.

55. No words would adequately express the revulsion and indignation that we in Zambia feel at the barbaric act of aggression by South Africa against Lesotho last week. Nothing could speak more eloquently about the threat to international peace and security that South Africa represents than its decision to attack Lesotho. No pretext whatsoever can justify the vicious, callous and dastardly attack by South Africa, a big country with colossal military power, against Lesotho, a small, defenceless and peace-loving neighbour. Zambia strongly condemns the South African act of aggression against Lesotho. Zambia also strongly condemns South Africa's aggression against Mozambique committed almost simultaneously with that against Lesotho.

56. It is clear that, for southern Africa to enjoy peace and security, there is an urgent need to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, to put a stop to its acts of aggression against independent African States and to eliminate the scourge of *apartheid*. The international community as a whole must re-dedicate itself to this end. Certainly, we in Africa are concerned about the policies of some powerful Members of the United Nations which seem to give succour and solace to South Africa and unquestionably encourage it in its recalcitrance and defiance of the decisions of the Organization. We are, in particular, concerned about the United States policy of so-called constructive engagement, and we would urge a new policy of constructive disengagement from the racist régime of South Africa.

57. The statement made in this debate by Mr. Mueshange, Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO [102nd meeting], was important and eloquent testimony of the determination of the Namibian patriots to struggle for the freedom and independence of their country. While making clear the indomitable will and steadfast determination of the Namibian

people to struggle by all means at their disposal and to make sacrifices in pursuit of their just cause until victory, the statement once again expressed the faith of the Namibian people in the United Nations and their continued willingness to co-operate in the search for a negotiated settlement if possible.

58. Let us not disappoint these peace-loving people, who have always pursued their just cause with dignity and great statesmanship. With genuine political will on the part of all Member States, there is no doubt that the United Nations can, with pride, fulfil its historic responsibility towards the freedom and independence of Namibia.

59. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Once again, the General Assembly has returned to the discussion of the question of Namibia, which has now become a familiar subject in all its historical, political and legal aspects. The General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia 16 years ago in its resolution 2145 (XXI) and has declared, time and again since then, that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal. The administration of the Territory has been entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia until the withdrawal of South Africa. At the level of the Security Council, more than four years have elapsed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), which approved the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

60. In spite of all this, the Namibian people continue to languish under colonialism, to suffer from the policy of *apartheid* and to be denied the exercise of their right to self-determination.

61. The majority of the States Members of the United Nations have been aware for some years of the objectives of the racist régime of South Africa and of its methods of prevaricating and sowing confusion, which are undertaken for the purpose of prolonging its occupation of Namibia and imposing a puppet régime on its people. Unfortunately, some Western countries, led by the United States, do not wish to recognize this fact. They consistently block any measure which the Security Council attempts to take to compel the racist régime to comply with United Nations resolutions and to withdraw from Namibia.

62. At the core of the question is the fact that these countries wish to perpetuate their enjoyment of the enormous profits and the strategic and military privileges which they have obtained through the existence of the racist régime in Namibia. The support received by the racist régime from Western banks and companies has contributed to the entrenchment of the *apartheid* policy in South Africa and the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia. It is regrettable that, in spite of the resolutions that have been adopted by the United Nations calling for the boycotting of the racist *apartheid* régime of South Africa, the Western countries nevertheless continue to encourage their companies to invest in South Africa.

63. In this connection, a report prepared by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, dated September 1981, refers to the fact that the number of companies with investments in South Africa increased from 1,888 in 1978 to 3,035 in 1981. It is to be noted that the highest rate of growth has been achieved by the companies of the Western countries members of the so-called contact group on Namibia. The number

of American companies has jumped from 539 to 894; of British companies from 699 to 874; of West German companies from 135 to 296; of French companies from 116 to 202; and of Canadian companies from 39 to 86. The well-known investments of the United States and certain countries of the European Economic Community in South Africa reached, in 1977, the sum of \$11 billion. Doubtless this figure has doubled by now. For example, *The New York Times* on 3 November 1982 said the following in an article about investment in South Africa: "The value of American investments in this country rose by 13.3 per cent in 1981, to \$2.63 billion, according to the United States Department of Commerce".

64. In the field of bank loans, a report dated 13 October 1982, prepared by the Centre against *Apartheid* states that Western banks and financial institutions based in Western countries, and especially in the United States and the United Kingdom, extended loans to South Africa exceeding \$2.756 billion in the period from the beginning of 1977 to mid-1982.

65. These figures are clear proof of the fact that the basic objective of the Western countries is not the attainment of independence by Namibia but the continued exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia. South Africa has continued to take measures which encourage foreign companies to work in Namibia and to drain its wealth, in violation of numerous international resolutions and of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted on 27 September 1974<sup>2</sup> by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The following appears in a document of the Special Committee:

"South Africa has attracted foreign investment in Namibia by various means. Among other things, foreign-based companies are allowed to write off capital expenditure from current gross profits, to mine minerals with no restrictions as to volume of output and to export raw materials for processing abroad at considerable savings for the companies, but to the detriment of the Territory's economy, which suffers from a loss of jobs that would have been created by the local processing of raw materials. Furthermore, there is no requirement that any percentage of the profits be reinvested in the Territory for development purposes. Consequently, the bulk of the profits generated by foreign investment are regularly repatriated to foreign shareholders."<sup>3</sup>

66. It is to be noted that the *apartheid* system is now intent on oil-prospecting in Namibia. The document I have just cited also says that "South Africa's reluctance to withdraw from Namibia might be motivated by its hope that the Territory could become a major oil producer".<sup>4</sup>

67. The racist régime of South Africa is able to cling to its occupation of Namibia because of the total support it receives from the Western countries, which consider it to be a protector of their interests in southern Africa. It obtains assistance also from another racist régime: the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine. The many points of similarity between the two régimes and their identical nature and aggressiveness are obvious to everyone. The racist régime in South Africa is denying the black majority its basic rights and is denying the Namibian people its right to self-determination and independence. The racist Zionist entity is

denying the Palestinian people its right to self-determination and to establish an independent State. The racist régime of South Africa is occupying Namibia and part of Angola, and the racist Zionist entity is occupying the territories of a number of neighbouring Arab countries.

68. The racist régime of South Africa has linked its withdrawal from Namibia with the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban troops, whose presence is legitimate and is the concern of the Governments of Angola and Cuba exclusively. The racist Zionist entity has linked its withdrawal from Lebanon with the withdrawal of Arab forces, whose presence is legitimate and is the sole concern of the Lebanese Government and the principal Arab parties concerned.

69. Both régimes launch repeated attacks on neighbouring countries, allegedly in pursuit of members of national liberation movements, whom they call "terrorists".

70. The attempt to link the independence of Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola is simply a delaying tactic concocted by South Africa, in collaboration with the United States Administration, in order to delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia and to buy time for the racist régime in its bid to consolidate the foundations of the puppet régime which has been set up in the Territory.

71. Recently, 31 African countries, during their meeting at Tripoli, stated, in a declaration on Namibia, that they:

"Condemn the United States of America and the South African racist régime for their attempts to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, that being a contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter...

"... and emphasize unequivocally that the persistence of such attempts would... constitute not only hegemonic manipulation of the situation in and around Namibia in order to prolong the illegal occupation of Namibia and the oppression of Namibians, but also a blatant interference in the internal affairs of Angola."

72. In spite of the long time that has elapsed since the adoption of Security Council resolution 418 (1977), concerning the arms embargo against South Africa, that embargo has yet to be strictly applied. Thanks to the connivance of the Zionist entity and Western countries, the racist régime has been able to obtain large quantities of weapons. A bulletin of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, in London, states that South African naval bases now house seven Israeli-built high-speed attack ships equipped with Israeli-made missiles, and seven further craft are under construction. Last May, the *Sunday Times* of London reported that, according to a book soon to be published in Israel, Israel and South Africa together are developing a ballistic missile with a range of 1,500 miles, as well as a neutron bomb and various nuclear delivery systems.

73. The assistance received by the racist régime of South Africa from some Western countries and the Zionist entity, the direct investments by transnational corporations and the technical assistance lavished on

that régime have permitted it to obtain the technology needed to develop its armaments industry to the point of achieving near self-sufficiency in military equipment. It has managed to consolidate its military capabilities, to perpetuate its occupation of Namibia and to intensify its barbaric attacks on neighbouring countries and violate their sovereignty. The most recent examples of such aggression are the attacks launched against Mozambique on 6 and 9 December of this year, and against the Kingdom of Lesotho on 8 December, which took a high toll in dead and wounded and caused heavy damage to property, responsibility for which is borne by the racist régime alone.

74. The situation in Namibia is deteriorating from day to day. Oppression, repression, incarceration and assassination have become the daily practice of the racist régime against the black citizens of Namibia. The sinister manoeuvres of that régime in Namibia have been revealed in its desperate bid to destroy SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. The racist régime is stepping up its harassment of SWAPO members and trying, by every means, to perpetuate its puppet régime in the region.

75. Because of the deteriorating conditions in Namibia, the situation in southern Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security. The international community should redouble its efforts to secure the speedy accession to independence of Namibia, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, especially Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Namibian independence can come about only through adherence to the following principles. First, it must be reaffirmed that the principal parties to the conflict are SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, which is striving for the independence of that Territory, and the racist Pretoria régime, which is occupying the Territory illegitimately. Secondly, SWAPO's armed struggle must be supported and pressure on the racist régime increased so that that régime will bow to the will of the international community and withdraw from Namibia. Thirdly, resolution 435 (1978) must be implemented speedily, without any modification, in order to guarantee full independence for Namibia and the sovereignty of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, over its entire territory, including Walvis Bay and the various offshore islands. Fourthly, mandatory sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, must be imposed so as to force the racist régime to withdraw its administration from Namibia.

76. My delegation sincerely hopes that the efforts of the United Nations will be crowned with success and that the Namibian people will win the right to self-determination and independence. My delegation would like to warn against the manoeuvres of colonialist countries under the slogan of a "peaceful solution", carried out in a desperate bid to overcome the authentic liberation movements and to impose questionable solutions that would ultimately result in puppet régimes whose purpose would be submissively to serve the interests of the imperialist countries.

77. Finally, I wish to reaffirm the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's unlimited support for the Namibian people in its just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, for self-determination and independence. We shall con-

tinue to extend all forms of material and moral assistance to that heroic people and to the South African people until they accede to independence and until racism is stamped out in southern Africa.

78. We reaffirm our solidarity with the front-line States in the face of the repeated attacks unleashed by the racist régime. We condemn South Africa's occupation of a part of Angola and fully stand by and support the people of that country. We condemn the aggression against Mozambique and stand by the people of Mozambique. My people wishes to reaffirm its support for the struggle of the people of Lesotho, and condemns the attacks by South Africa against that people.

79. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The erosion of the authority of the United Nations and the weakening of its role in acting for the maintenance of international peace and security has been one of the central themes of this session of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General has emphasized this issue in his report on the work of the Organization [A/37/1]. In response to his appeal, the General Assembly has adopted by consensus a resolution designed to provide a basis for dealing with the question.

80. For more than 30 years, Namibia has been a challenge to the will of the international community and a supreme test of the authority of the United Nations, which has assumed responsibility for the Territory. Sixteen years have passed since the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia. Eleven years have passed since the International Court of Justice, on the initiative of the Government of Finland, gave an advisory opinion<sup>1</sup> which determined that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia is illegal. Six years have elapsed in painstaking negotiations since the adoption of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Four years have gone by since the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia, in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is well to remember that the Government of South Africa has committed itself to that plan.

81. Yet, Namibia is still not free. The illegal occupation of that country continues. Not only is the people of Namibia denied its right of self-determination but under the present administration it is also denied the exercise of fundamental human rights.

82. The extended process of negotiations on Namibia on the basis of resolution 435 (1978) has taxed the patience of the international community in general and of the African States in particular. Their disappointment is understandable, and we for our part wish to pay a tribute to the African front-line States and SWAPO for the statesmanship and restraint they have demonstrated. In spite of their frustration, they have left no avenue unsearched for reaching a peaceful settlement. The Finnish Government shares the conviction that negotiations, however painstaking and complicated, are not simply the only peaceful but also the only realistic way to achieve the goals of the United Nations in Namibia. That is why my Government, in close concert with other Nordic countries, has given its full support to the United Nations plan since the very beginning of the negotiations. We trust that all those engaged in the process of negotiations will continue to

be aware of their responsibility in this respect and will act accordingly.

*Mr. Gökçe (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

83. The main obstacle to a peaceful settlement in Namibia has been and continues to be the Government of South Africa. All along, its intentions have been ambivalent, to say the least. The prospect of a truly independent Namibia obviously would require a profound change in the attitude of South Africa. In that context, it is often hard to measure long-term benefits with the yardstick of immediate gain. However, a peaceful settlement after years of bloodshed and violence would, in our view, be a solution that would benefit all. If it lays aside pre-conceived fears and suspicions, this should be true for South Africa in its future relations with an independent Namibia and with other African States in the region.

84. While South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, tension has escalated in the region because of South Africa's repeated attacks against Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and, most recently, Lesotho. By committing acts of aggression against its neighbours, South Africa violates basic principles of international behaviour. Its actions show that policies of internal repression breed external aggression. This violence is further proof of the structural tension that is endemic in the region. Conversely, the settlement of the question of Namibia through an early, internationally acceptable settlement would alleviate the tension and should go a long way towards allaying the security concerns of all nations in southern Africa. It would also remove a serious obstacle to their economic development.

85. The position of the Government of Finland on the question of Namibia is well known and remains unchanged. The illegal occupation of Namibia must be brought to an end. The people of Namibia must be given the right to self-determination. This should be achieved through free and fair elections designed to create a democratic society with justice for all, on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). My country will continue to give humanitarian assistance to SWAPO and to all Namibians, both bilaterally and through the United Nations, as long as this process continues. We have also declared that Namibia, once independent, will become a major recipient of Finnish technical and economic assistance.

86. We believe that the possibility for a negotiated, peaceful settlement is still there. Yet, who can say for how long? If South Africa fails to grasp this opportunity, then the United Nations must take full responsibility in the ensuing situation, in order to fulfil its obligations. If the present efforts do not succeed—if South Africa refuses to co-operate in reaching an ultimate solution—then sooner or later, we will be forced into a situation where the United Nations collectively, as well as its Member States individually, will have to review the situation and take the measures which, in accordance with the Charter, depend on decisions of the Security Council, in order to protect the basic principles on which the Organization was founded.

87. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Some four months ago, many of us here entertained the hope that, by the close of the current session, the question of Namibia would be deleted from the agendas of sub-



sequent sessions of the Assembly. We expected and hoped for the beginning of a new and happier chapter in the history of that unhappy and severely distressed country, Namibia.

88. Regrettably, however, it is clear that the question of Namibia will be with us for some time yet. This is because Namibia continues to be under the illegal occupation of the racist régime in Pretoria, and the people of Namibia are still suffering from the oppression and the repressive and exploitative rule of that colonial régime.

89. In spite of the efforts of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, prospects for an early and peaceful resolution of the question of Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations plan, as adopted in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), remain frightfully bleak. The international community, especially those members that are directly involved in the search for Namibia's genuine self-determination, are naturally concerned at this lack of progress in our efforts and the lack of reward for them.

90. Equally worrying are the manoeuvres and machinations being concocted by the *apartheid* régime, and those willing to collaborate with it, in its efforts to maintain an illegal, colonial and criminal *status quo* in Namibia. The strategy and tactics of the Pretoria régime are geared towards the hijacking of the Namibian revolution and the promotion, in its place, of a puppet internal settlement group under a stooge yet to be identified.

91. The Assembly must be concerned, because in its efforts to change or halt the march of history in Namibia, the Pretoria Government is prepared to sacrifice thousands of lives within its own borders and in the independent neighbouring countries of Angola, Mozambique, Lesotho, Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and even as far away as Seychelles. The recent cold-blooded massacre of refugees and innocent women and children, citizens of the Kingdom of Lesotho, by the régime's army is a painful reminder that the irrational and immoral white minority gang in Pretoria will, and can, adopt any conceivable criminal method in the pursuit of its iniquitous objectives and interests.

92. Another source of worry is the fact that the desperate Pretoria Government is prepared to sacrifice peace and security in the southern African region in its determination to frustrate and obstruct progress towards Namibia's independence. Thus, the régime is currently executing a campaign of political destabilization and economic blackmail, bullying and sabotage in the region. Pretoria thinks—it is wishful thinking—that such acts of aggression and intimidation will weaken the resolve and determination of the Governments and peoples of the affected countries to support the legitimate struggle for self-determination in Namibia, and for social and political justice in *apartheid* South Africa itself. In this, however, the régime is terribly, terribly wrong.

93. If the Pretoria Government has committed gross miscalculations in judging and assessing the responses of independent neighbouring States to its destabilization policy in our region, it seems confident that certain Member States of the General Assembly

share its views on developments in southern Africa. We sincerely hope, however, that Pretoria will be proved equally wrong in its calculations here. We must observe, however, that as long as mixed and confusing signals regarding the régime's illegal occupation of Namibia continue to be flashed from the capitals of certain Western countries, the régime feels greatly encouraged in its belief that it is not alone in its determination to defy the decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

94. In the wake of the abortive pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva in January 1981, we of the front-line States, together with Nigeria and SWAPO, agreed to co-operate with the Western contact group in a common effort to uncover and address whatever factors made the Pretoria Government afraid to co-operate in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence. In very good faith, too, our Heads of State, Foreign Ministers and senior government officials considered every issue which they thought relevant to the Namibian question. In doing this, the leaders of the front-line States, SWAPO and Nigeria believed that the Western contact group shared their desire to end South African colonialism in Namibia and to facilitate the democratic process in that country.

95. Now, however, it appears that the other side, or at least some members of it, have all along been trying to find ways and means of assisting the South African Government to destroy the Namibian liberation movement and to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. We came to this conclusion because, when it was clear that every conceivable question relevant to the speedy implementation of the United Nations plan had been satisfactorily clarified and when at long last the road seemed clear, the United States and South Africa jointly hatched extraneous issues to frustrate and obstruct progress towards the implementation of the plan. Washington and Pretoria have now, to all intents and purposes, abandoned efforts towards achieving Namibia's independence. Instead, they are now poking their long noses into affairs which fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of two sovereign Member States of this Organization. They are arguing that there is a link between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

96. Consequently, instead of focusing its influence and efforts upon getting Pretoria to leave Namibia and thereby make possible implementation of the United Nations independence plan, Washington is now pressuring Angola on the question of the presence of Cuban troops. The implication, of course, is that if the Cuban troops do not leave Angola, both Washington and Pretoria will not co-operate with the rest of the international community in its endeavour to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Angola, the United States Government believes, will be regarded by the international community as intransigent and therefore held morally responsible for the impasse on the Namibian question.

97. The Government of Zimbabwe has already rejected the linkage of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops. We have rejected it as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other States. Zimbabwe, which cherishes so dearly

its own ability to pursue its own foreign policy free from any external interference, will not accept any interference in the bilateral relations between the two friendly States of Angola and Cuba, which are also peace-loving Members of the United Nations and members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

98. Zimbabwe also rejects as mischievous, immoral and wicked any attempts to blame Angola for the stalemate in the international community's efforts to have resolution 435 (1978) implemented. In our view, it is the Pretoria régime and those who collaborate with it that must bear full responsibility for what is going on in Namibia and southern Africa. It is the Pretoria régime that has been intransigent; it is that régime that is the terrorist, the delinquent and the international deviant; and it is that régime that must be punished.

99. Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Until that country has attained its independence, the United Nations, and it alone, must ensure that its resolutions and decisions regarding Namibia's decolonization are implemented. Accordingly, we call upon the Assembly to exercise its responsibility for Namibia in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. We feel very strongly that it is time the Security Council exercised its full authority in implementing its own resolutions, especially resolution 435 (1978), so as to bring about Namibian independence.

100. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me, first of all, to tell the members of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic that we share their distress and suffering following the terrible earthquake that has just afflicted their whole country. In Algeria, we have ourselves at various times experienced the sufferings entailed in such a calamity, the most recent of which struck my own home town, Al-Asnam. We are therefore particularly aware of the sufferings that this tragedy has brought to the fraternal people of Yemen.

101. It will soon be 16 years since the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia and, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, for completion of its process of liberation. Since then, there has developed an international consensus confirming the illegality of the South African occupation, the inalienable right of the Namibian people to independence, the legitimacy of its national liberation struggle and the exclusive representativity of SWAPO.

102. There was, therefore, every reason to believe that this problem—which in fact amounts to depriving a people of its right to national independence and self-determination, as well as the occupation of a territory by military force—would, thanks to the United Nations, finally find a solution in authentic independence. However, in defiance of the international consensus, the Pretoria régime has maintained its illegal presence in Namibia and has been mobilizing its political and military machine to impose a neo-colonialist solution on Namibia.

103. Although the intransigence and manoeuvres of South Africa were foreseeable because they fall squarely within the logic of the *apartheid* system, the international community nevertheless expected from those who had solemnly undertaken, in return for

acceptance of their settlement plan, to exert on South Africa the pressure necessary for implementation of this plan, a new approach and more determination to impose respect for law. However, the five Western Powers have, we cannot but note, refused to demonstrate firmness and are thus encouraging South Africa to persist in its intransigence.

104. Though the impression is created of perseverance in efforts to bring about a peaceful negotiated settlement, this situation actually reflects the traditional attitude of certain countries which, in order to preserve their immediate interests, are helping make even more burdensome the problems of the oppressed peoples. This ambiguity in fact reflects the duplicity which, in spite of verbal condemnation of the South African policies and their manifestations, actually makes it possible to maintain and strengthen a very dense network of relationships which in the final analysis is a comfort to South Africa in its defiance and directly or indirectly strengthens its potential aggression and domination, thus inevitably dooming to deadlock the various attempts at settlement.

105. South Africa, universally condemned for its system of *apartheid*, for its illegal occupation of Namibia and for being a constant source of aggression against the sovereign States of southern Africa, is in effect, with the complicity of certain Western Powers, attempting to break out of its isolation. Within this context, we have for some time now noted with concern statements by Western leaders who represent South Africa as a "special partner". This recognition of the particular nature of the links established with the Pretoria régime has been accompanied by increased assistance to that régime. Thus recently, thanks to its allies, South Africa was able to obtain from IMF a loan of more than \$1 billion, which will essentially be used to finance the strengthening of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the repression of its people and the murderous operations conducted against the independent African countries of the region.

106. The international community, which sanctioned the initiative of the five Western Powers in the hope of seeing a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, is thus today entitled to wonder whether they really intend to honour the commitment they freely entered into with the United Nations.

107. If, four years after its adoption by the Security Council, resolution 435 (1978) has not even begun to be put into effect, the reason is undeniably that those same Powers are politically not ready to exert the necessary pressure on South Africa.

108. Furthermore, today we are seeing a reversal of roles. South Africa, which is running out of pretexts, has been offered another argument as fallacious as those that preceded it, aimed at strengthening its illegal presence in Namibia. Thus, out of apparent concern for a negotiated peaceful solution, an attempt is being made to link the process of decolonization of Namibia with other questions that are exclusively within the province of the sovereignty of independent countries, Members of the United Nations. That state of affairs only strengthens the temptation of the racist régime of Pretoria to bring about an "internal" solution in Namibia.

109. At this decisive stage in the process of bringing about a settlement of the question, of Namibia, it is imperative vigorously to reaffirm both the unity and legitimacy of SWAPO, as the representative of the Namibian people, and the total responsibility of the United Nations in conducting the process of bringing Namibia to independence with strict respect for its territorial integrity.

110. In the face of South Africa's procrastinations and the stepping up of its policy of oppression and aggression, the important thing is for the United Nations to express its solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa by taking concrete action and measures.

111. Because the United Nations is entrusted with exclusive responsibility for conducting the process of Namibia's decolonization, because it alone possesses the legal authority over that Territory until it becomes independent, and because the United Nations is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United Nations must clearly honour its commitments and take the decisions called for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

112. Africa, which has always appealed for the faithful application of the United Nations plan in its totality, condemns and rejects firmly the most recent attempts to link the independence of Namibia with other questions which fall within the exclusive sovereignty of independent countries. Such attempts can only delay the process of decolonization in Namibia, prolong the illegal occupation of that country and strengthen the oppression of its people.

113. Today, Africa expects that the United Nations, which has undertaken to guarantee the Namibian people the exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, will from now on take a more active part in achieving this goal and, consequently, in discharging the primary responsibility which it has never legally surrendered.

114. In this context, permit me to conclude by paying a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its outstanding efforts tirelessly made to promote the cause of the Namibian people, thus preserving the image of the United Nations before world public opinion which is our judge.

115. Mr. SUBRAMANIAM (Malaysia): For almost two decades, much of the attention of the United Nations has focused on the question of Namibia, and we do not need to be reminded as to why we are still confronted with this unresolved problem today. The recent promise of a breakthrough in the negotiations for the independence of Namibia remains, sadly, an empty one. This is not due to inaction on the part of the United Nations, which has exerted concentrated and painstaking efforts to resolve the problem and implement the granting of the fundamental rights of self-determination and independence to the Namibian people. It is due to the complete defiance and deceptive tactics of South Africa, which, with the aid of certain friends, has been able to continue to act in contempt of resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and various related organizations in the United Nations system. Malaysia is convinced that today South Africa continues to demonstrate that it has no

intention of complying with the decisions of the international community.

116. Representatives may recall that it was in October 1966 that the United Nations terminated South Africa's League of Nations Mandate and declared that South Africa no longer had any right to administer Namibia and that henceforth the Territory was the direct responsibility of the United Nations. South Africa has chosen simply to ignore this declaration. Since then, the General Assembly and the Security Council have adopted numerous resolutions declaring, *inter alia*, that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal. Year after year, South Africa has not only ignored those resolutions but has also intensified its brutal repression based on the inhuman policy of *apartheid*, increased its military buildup, and attempted to develop political organizations to strengthen its hold on the Territory. South Africa has also used tactics of terrorism and intimidation and has ruthlessly exploited both the people and the natural resources of Namibia. The people of Namibia have been subjected to unjust imprisonment under inhuman conditions, torture and continual degradation of their fundamental human dignity.

117. In addition, South Africa has continued its ceaseless efforts to destroy SWAPO, the sole and internationally recognized representative of the Namibian people, and their struggle to liberate their country. SWAPO is facing overwhelming odds against the might and war machine of the South African armed forces. With the aid of certain friends, South Africa is able to develop additional military capacity for the production of armaments, as well as nuclear weapons, thus posing a serious danger to the peace and security of not only the southern African region but also of the entire world. This is the tragedy confronting SWAPO and the international community. One nation has been able for decades, with the help of its friends, to reject with contempt the will and resolution of the international community and has instead vastly increased its destructive capabilities, engaged in glaring acts of brutal aggression, and yet remains seemingly immune from international sanction and censure.

118. South Africa has also indulged with increasing frequency in open acts of aggression, as well as intimidation against, and subversion of, neighbouring sovereign States. Its aim is clearly to intimidate those States from assisting the just struggles of SWAPO and the Namibian people and to create chaos and instability in the area to divert world attention from its criminal and illegal activities in Namibia.

119. Malaysia is firmly convinced, having followed the question of Namibia closely, that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, which is the result of years of determined effort by the United Nations and was endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978), remains the only basis for the peaceful settlement of the question. In every forum in which the question of Namibia has been discussed, the validity of this resolution has been consistently and strongly reaffirmed. It is a matter of regret that, instead of continuing to pressure South Africa into faithfully implementing the provisions of this resolution, some countries have found it necessary to seek modifications of the plan. We fear that such attempts may well result in further encouraging the intransigent attitude of

South Africa. There is no cause to modify this plan. We should continue to urge its implementation.

120. It is evident that South Africa is able to continue its illegal and dangerous activities in Namibia and to defy the collective will of the international community because of the support and collaboration it receives from certain countries, particularly in the military and economic fields. For this reason, the oil and arms embargo, which the international community has pledged, has been rendered ineffective and the political, economic and social isolation of South Africa, which the international community has repeatedly urged, has not been realized. South Africa, therefore, has become more emboldened in its policy and action.

121. Recent as well as past negotiations on the independence of Namibia have time and again floundered, because of lack of good faith on the part of South Africa. We have painfully witnessed Pretoria's endless attempts to stall any prospect of settlement of the problem. South Africa's policy of linking Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, for instance, is a case in point. As long as South Africa continues its procrastinating tactics and its policy of increased suppression, terrorism, military buildup, intimidation and subversion in Namibia and neighbouring States, the resolution of this long-outstanding problem will continue to be elusive.

122. Malaysia wishes, once again, to place on record its appreciation of the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia to develop world opinion against South Africa in the light of South Africa's intransigence and continued defiance of United Nations resolutions. There is need for even greater efforts to mobilize public opinion concerning the illegality of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa and concerning the true nature of the independence movement and obstacles faced by the Namibian people and their sole and recognized representative, SWAPO. Malaysia wishes to commend the efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia and other bodies within the United Nations system in bringing about a greater public awareness of the situation in Namibia and an end to South Africa's illegal control over the Territory.

123. Malaysia wishes to reaffirm, once again, its strong support for the people of Namibia and for SWAPO in their just struggle to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence and to restore peace and stability to that brutally oppressed Territory and to the region. We also wish to reiterate our firm conviction that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) should remain the basis for the peaceful implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We call upon South Africa and others involved once again to heed the will of the international community, expressed through the United Nations and other international forums, to seek a just and lasting solution to the problem.

124. Mr. KOR Bun Heng (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to associate myself with previous speakers in expressing the deep sympathy of my delegation to the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic and I wish to ask it to convey our heartfelt condolences to the families of the victims of the earthquake.

125. Turning to the question of Namibia, I should like first of all, on behalf of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea, to address to the courageous people of Namibia and to its sole, genuine representative, SWAPO, our brotherly greetings and to express our complete solidarity with its just struggle for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

126. I wish also to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations Council for Namibia, under the competent and efficient leadership of Mr. Paul Lusaka, of Zambia, for its untiring efforts to carry out its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until the achievement of its independence. My delegation particularly welcomes the holding of the extraordinary plenary meetings of the Council in May 1982 at Arusha and the adoption of the Arusha Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia.<sup>5</sup>

127. At this year-end, when the people and particularly the children of the world are preparing for a joyous celebration of the New Year, there are people and particularly children who continue to suffer the anguish caused by foreign domination and occupation, whether in Kampuchea and Afghanistan in Asia, in the Middle East or in Africa. As far as Africa is concerned, the question of Namibia is still being discussed by the General Assembly, as it has been for many years.

128. The General Assembly had had the question of Namibia before it for almost 36 years, and in 1966—some 16 years ago—by resolution 2145 (XXVI), it terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, in order to enable the people of Namibia fully to exercise its right to self-determination and to achieve genuine national independence. Since that time, the United Nations has adopted many resolutions, in particular Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which established the framework for the independence of Namibia, better known as the United Nations plan for Namibia.

129. However, the racist régime of Pretoria, with total disregard for the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people and for the unanimous will of the international community, as repeatedly expressed, has refused to co-operate in implementing that plan and has thus prolonged the sufferings and subjugation of the Namibian people.

130. The past year has once again seen the obstinate refusal of South Africa to listen to reason. This means that a year has gone by without a resolution of the question of Namibia, which is under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and without bringing closer the hope of a settlement. This means that the people of Namibia has for one more year been the victim of domination and oppression and is going to suffer the same tragic fate in the years to come, as long as the authorities of South Africa continue to occupy Namibia illegally. Born of the policy of *apartheid* and colonial expansionism of the Pretoria régime, this situation continues to rob a whole race and a whole continent, Africa, of honour and dignity and to outrage the human conscience. It is therefore essential to put an end to this state of affairs, both for the dignity of Africa and for the United Nations itself. In this instance, the Organization, through the United Nations Council for Na-



mibia as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia, has the historic responsibility of leading the Territory to genuine self-determination and independence. The Organization cannot allow its authority to be continually flouted by the Pretoria authorities.

131. In the face of the illegal occupation of their country, in the face of colonial domination and oppression, the people of Namibia have the sacred right to engage in a struggle in any form for self-determination, freedom and national independence in a united Namibia.

132. The people of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, which are at present victims of a foreign war of invasion and occupation, fully understand the feelings and aspirations of the people of Namibia and their sole authentic representative, SWAPO, living as they are in the extremely difficult conditions imposed by the racist régime of Pretoria. The people of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea reiterate their brotherly solidarity with and firm support for the people of Namibia in their just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, until they have totally regained their national independence.

133. We demand an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. All the troops of the racist régime must be withdrawn from Namibian territory. The South African authorities must end their policies of *apartheid*, bantustanization in Namibia and barbarous repression against the population and the patriots of Namibia and, at the same time, stop their attempts to impose a puppet administration on the Namibian people by force or trickery. They must also stop plundering the natural resources of Namibia.

134. My delegation still feels that resolution 435 (1978), which is the result of a general consensus of the international community, is a solid, reasonable foundation for the peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia. It is encouraging that SWAPO and the front-line States have shown flexibility and constructive co-operation in negotiations on the implementation of this resolution.

135. While the illegal occupation of Namibia is in itself a source of tension which threatens international peace and security, the acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization carried out by South Africa against the African front-line States serve only to aggravate further the existing tension and show the world the true nature of the racist Pretoria régime, which represents a constant threat to the peace and security of the entire African continent and of the world.

136. The barbarous aggression recently committed by South Africa against the Kingdom of Lesotho aroused indignation and unanimous condemnation on the part of the international community. This fresh aggression against a sovereign, independent, non-aligned, front-line State can only strengthen the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia and foster the unswerving solidarity of all peoples and States of Africa, as well as of the international community, with them in their just struggle.

137. On 10 December, the people of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea condemned this unprovoked act of aggression as follows:

“The people of Kampuchea... are enraged at this act of aggression by the South African authorities against Lesotho, which also constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

“On behalf of the people of Kampuchea as a whole, the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea wishes to reiterate its support for the just struggle of the people of South Africa for freedom, democracy and the eradication of *apartheid*. At the same time, we affirm our staunch solidarity with the people and Government of Lesotho in defence of their national sovereignty and territorial integrity, which are sacrosanct.”

138. My delegation also wishes to affirm its staunch solidarity with the other front-line peoples and States of Africa, which are confronting the last bastion of colonialism and racism in Africa, the Pretoria régime.

139. Every hour, every day, every month and every year that passes represents for the people of Namibia, as for any other people under foreign domination and occupation, one more hour, one more day, one more month and one more year of suffering and bereavement.

140. The United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, must fulfil its responsibilities and take all the measures necessary to end the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and ensure that the Namibian people can, without further delay, enjoy their sacred rights to self-determination, freedom and national independence, like other peoples of the world. Only a settlement in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) will make it possible to achieve this objective and remove a hotbed of tension from Africa and the world.

141. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization. I call on him in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3237 (XXIX), of 22 November 1974.

142. Mr. HUSSAINI (Palestine Liberation Organization): Freedom is a sacred human right. All human beings are born free. No human being is born a slave. And nations have fought bitterly to preserve their freedom.

143. In the words of a just Arab caliph: “Since when have you enslaved human beings born free by their mothers?”

144. Yet, today, millions of human beings are still enslaved, shackled by the chains of racism, segregation and oppressive military rule. The black people of Namibia and the Arab people of Palestine suffer today from the oppressive chains of *apartheid*, racism, zionism and military occupation and domination. They stand today proud but bleeding peoples, their men tortured and massacred, their children starved and wounded, their women widowed and destitute.

145. The peoples of occupied Namibia and occupied Palestine are united in a just struggle for freedom. Their freedom fighters have died, giving their lives to this sacred cause of freedom. But their women remain, widowed, bloodied and dispossessed, in Namibia and in Palestine, surrounded by thousands of hungry children.

146. In the words of Abraham Lincoln: “The soldier has gone to rest and now, crippled, blinded and broken,

his widow comes to you and to me, gentlemen of the jury, to right her wrong”.

147. That black woman in Namibia who saw her children torn to pieces by South African bombs and whose husband was taken prisoner and killed is one with the Palestinian woman in southern Lebanon who saw her children torn to pieces by Israeli bombs and whose husband was taken prisoner, never to return.

148. That black Palestinian woman cries out to all of us, saying, “In the name of humanity, in the name of decency and justice, stop the bombing, stop the genocide, give me my freedom, give me my life and let my people be free at last”.

149. The women of tortured and brutalized Namibia and Palestine scream for justice. Their bloodied hands reach out to all of us here in this United Nations hall.

150. Will more United Nations resolutions help them? Are we going to vote for more resolutions and then turn off the lights and go home, while the resolutions we have adopted gather dust in the archives of the United Nations?

151. How can we truly reach out to that suffering, screaming woman? How can we reassure her, how can we bring warmth to her malnourished children, how can we truly turn the United Nations into a shining beacon, a statue of liberty for the oppressed, wretched and poor of this earth?

152. Those who justify and support *apartheid*, racism and zionism still sit with us in this Hall. The representative of the United States shamelessly pushed the red button and voted against freedom for suffering Namibians and Palestinians. He turned his back on the great legacy of freedom for which so many honourable Americans have given their lives. His Government stands against its own Declaration of Independence, which 206 years ago stated: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

153. Do the people of Namibia and Palestine today enjoy these rights to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness? That is why the words spoken by the black American ex-slave Frederick Douglass in 1852 still hold true today. He said:

“America is false to the past, false to the present and solemnly binds herself to be false to the future. I will—in the name of outraged humanity, in the name of liberty, which is fettered; in the name of the Constitution and the Bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon—dare to call into question and to denounce everything that serves to perpetuate slavery, the great sin and shame of America.”

154. The United States Government today has lost its soul. It does not feel for this black or Palestinian woman. It is busy building nuclear warheads; it has no time for the poor, the meek and the hungry.

155. One black American, Martin Luther King, spoke for that human soul of America. Despite racism, bigotry and hatred, he stood up to say:

“When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up the day

when all God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing the words of that old Negro spiritual, ‘Free at last, Free at last, God Almighty, we are free at last.’”

We have to fulfil Martin Luther King’s dream. We must do so, so that “on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of slaves and the sons of former slave-owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood,” so that in the fields of Namibia the sons of the oppressed and the sons of the oppressors will be able to sit together at the table of freedom, and so that on the hills of Jerusalem, the sons of the occupiers and the sons of the occupied will be able to coexist together at the table of equality.

156. We have come a long way in this human march towards freedom. Yet, we still have to rededicate ourselves to the words of the ancient prophets. We have to implement what Isaiah said to the oppressors and the unjust:

“Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil;

“Learn to do well; seek judgement, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.” [Isaiah, 1:16 and 17.]

157. In a few days, some will celebrate the birth of the fisherman from Galilee, Jesus of Nazareth. If he were alive today, he would shed tears for the suffering people of Namibia and Palestine. He would reach out to their bleeding children and comfort their widowed women, and he would say:

“Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

“Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

“Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

“Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

“Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

“Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.” [Matthew, V: 4 to 9.]

158. The people of Namibia and Palestine are today the meek. They mourn, hunger and thirst. They are crucified on the American imperialist cross of bigotry and racism. But they fight back for freedom and life because they have the strong and deep will to be free. They are like the great Mahatma Gandhi, who was an unarmed, frail man who defied British might, militarism and oppression. His strength was his strong determination, his belief in freedom and his great love for his suffering people. A people’s determination and strong belief changes history. As the great Tunisian poet Aboul el-Qasim Chabbi said: “If a people seek life, destiny will answer. Night will be vanquished. The chain will be broken.”

159. No one will give the oppressed people of Namibia and Palestine their freedom or help them off their cross. They shall regain their freedom through their own sacrifices. They shall be reborn into freedom. They will break the chains and be free at last.

160. Our duty is to carry on the struggle with them. In the words of Abraham Lincoln: “We here highly re-

solve that the dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.”

161. As for the representatives of the oppressors, the United States imperialists and Zionists that sit here in this Hall without shame pushing the red button for continued racism, slavery and bigotry, they who have destroyed our cities and towns, they who have bombed our children in Japan, Viet Nam, Palestine and Namibia, they who defile our victims while our people still bear on their bodies the scars of their nuclear, phosphorous and cluster bombs, to them we say: the people of Namibia and Palestine yearn for freedom as the earth yearns for rain. They seek equality as the trees seek the rays of the sun. They love peace as the peasant loves his land, for freedom, equality and peace are dear to us as life itself.

162. Our heroic people in Namibia and Palestine will defy death and will struggle to live. They do not carry hatred, bigotry or vengeance in their hearts. They, like that Palestinian fisherman from Nazareth, will repeat:

“... Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

“That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.” [*Matthew, V: 44 and 45.*]

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*

---

NOTES

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

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24, vol. 1, annex II.*

<sup>3</sup> See A/AC.109/702, para. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 19.

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 24, para. 767.*