

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**3rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 10 September 1981,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rüdiger von WECHMAR
(Federal Republic of Germany).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we take up the item before us, I should like to say a few words at this stage.

2. I am deeply honoured to be presiding over the eighth emergency special session, on the important question of Namibia. Events of recent days—with the armed incursion into Angola by South Africa, which I strongly condemn, and the danger of further internationalization of the conflict—serve as a grim reminder of the critical need for an early and peaceful solution of the Namibia problem.

3. Since the views of your President on this subject were elaborated at the recent meeting here of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I shall not repeat them today. The urgency of the issue dictates that we proceed immediately to the consideration of the item before us, and I am confident that the support and the co-operation which Member States extended to me during my presidency of the thirty-fifth session, and again this morning, will continue as we deliberate on this vital matter affecting international peace and security.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia

4. The PRESIDENT: I call on the first speaker in the debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, Mr. Robert J. Ouko, in his capacity as representative of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity [OAU].

5. Mr. OUKO (Kenya), Organization of African Unity: Mr. President, I should like first to congratulate you on your unanimous election to preside over this very important emergency special session of the General Assembly on Namibia. It is fitting that this session should be held under your presidency. Your country is an important member of the Western contact group. We recognize the important role your country played in the negotiations that culminated in the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the plan for implementation.

6. The emergency special session of the General Assembly is being convened at the request of the States members of OAU. The decision to call for

the convening of this session was taken during the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June under the chairmanship of my President, Mr. Daniel T. Arap Moi, President of the Republic of Kenya and current Chairman of OAU. I myself had the honour of being Chairman of the OAU Council of Ministers when that proposal was formulated.

7. We wish to record our gratitude to the members of the Non-Aligned Movement and also to other States, friends of Africa, for their support in this regard.

8. We have come here because we believe the situation in Namibia has reached a critical stage. We have been called upon by the people we represent to act with speed. Namibia is the legal responsibility of the United Nations. The challenge before the Organization is enormous. The status of the United Nations itself is at stake. South Africa has continued to challenge the decisions of the Organization and to defy, with impunity, repeated United Nations calls for its withdrawal from Namibia. The United Nations must decide whether after three decades the defiance by South Africa is to be allowed to continue. Meanwhile, Africa is compelled to ask: When is enough, enough?

9. All the debates on Namibia in both the General Assembly and the Security Council have traced the history of the struggle for Namibia's independence, and I need not go over it here. We have not called for this emergency special session to familiarize ourselves with the history of Namibia or to debate whether or not Namibia should be free. Both these matters have been dealt with and settled. What, then, are the facts? First, South Africa is in Namibia illegally; secondly, Namibia is the legal responsibility solely of the United Nations; thirdly, in exercise of that legal responsibility the United Nations in September 1978—that is, three years ago this month—decided, by Security Council Resolution 435 (1978), on a plan for Namibia's independence; and fourthly, South Africa has defied that resolution, as it has many others, and as a result no progress has been made towards Namibia's freedom.

10. All men are created equal and freedom is an indivisible right given to all men by God. We are not asking South Africa to grant independence to Namibia. It cannot do that, because the right to freedom was granted to Namibia by God from the beginning. South Africa is in Namibia illegally. We are asking it to get out, and it must get out to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination. The plan of how South Africa should withdraw from Namibia has been drawn up and agreed upon through the lengthy but peaceful process of negotiation.

11. But it must be stressed here in the United Nations that resolution 435 (1978) was a product of compromise. The South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] made many concessions to secure the agreement of others. OAU seeks the implementation of the resolution without prevarication, without modification and without qualification, and we expect the support of other Members of the United Nations in that regard.

12. When it terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia in October 1966 [resolution 2145 (XXI)], the United Nations was convinced that the barbaric and gross violation of human rights perpetrated by South Africa against the Namibian people, the sinister colonial designs of South Africa on Namibia and its plans to destabilize front-line States could no longer be tolerated.

13. The United Nations assumed direct responsibility for the Territory by placing it under the jurisdiction of the United Nations Council for Namibia. In June 1971, the judicial organ of the United Nations system stated clearly that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa was under obligation to withdraw its administration immediately.¹ South Africa has remained in Namibia to this day.

14. Our hopes in the past for an early, peaceful settlement have been rudely dashed. Here at the United Nations, countries of the world are all aware of the tenacious patience and reasonableness demonstrated by African States on the issue of Namibia. In spite of Africa's patience and of its continued pursuit of a solution by peaceful means, the people of Namibia have continued to suffer indignities of unequalled proportions. The racist minority régime of South Africa continues to commit atrocities against the people of Namibia, as it does in South Africa itself. That oppressive régime carries out at will and with impunity frequent attacks against Angola, Zambia, Botswana and Mozambique. Last week, or rather, 10 days ago, it committed naked aggression against Angola. Can this august body really look back with pride on its inability last week even to agree on a condemnation of such naked aggression? We are preoccupied with granting rights to the minority in a situation in which the majority itself does not enjoy any rights of any description.

15. Africa's patience is running out. We have been subjected over these past years to endless frustration while awaiting the outcome of the initiatives of the five Western countries. During the tortuous negotiations which produced Security Council resolution 435 (1978), we were led to believe that South Africa was ready to vacate Namibia. This has not materialized. Instead, the régime has constantly brought up new and unacceptable demands to be fulfilled as a prerequisite for progress towards Namibia's independence. Everyone knows that the sole purpose of these demands is to block progress on the issue. It is not difficult to see the cause of our frustration and the reasons for our impatience. Indeed, in all these negotiations, SWAPO has shown a great degree of moderation, flexibility and co-operation.

16. The belief in a peaceful solution of a political nature and in the negotiating process no doubt inspired the Western contact group to embark on well-intended

negotiations with South Africa. African States, together with SWAPO, had serious doubts regarding South Africa's sincerity with regard to these negotiations. Throughout the negotiations, SWAPO made significant concessions in order to accommodate South Africa. These negotiations, as we know, produced what is now known as the United Nations plan of action for Namibia.² The plan provides for a ceasefire, for the establishment of a demilitarized zone, for the deployment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group, and for the holding of a free and fair election under the control and supervision of the United Nations. This was the plan of action which was eventually endorsed by the Security Council on 29 September 1978 in its resolution 435 (1978).

17. It was our belief that the five Western countries had succeeded in persuading South Africa to accept the plan. But in Geneva early this year, South Africa demonstrated beyond any doubt that it was not ready to accept the Western plan, after misleading everybody, including the five Western countries themselves, that it had agreed to the terms of the plan. The refusal by South Africa to implement resolution 435 (1978) was a setback not only for OAU and SWAPO, but also for the five Western countries themselves. By its action in Geneva, the régime clearly set its face against negotiations, against reason, against every suggestion that has been made in the long history of Namibia.

18. In the light of this defiance, what is the international community expected to do? Is it now the intention to grant, by our apparent indifference, official licence to South Africa to continue its oppressive presence in Namibia, which presence the United Nations itself has declared illegal?

19. Has not the time come for the United Nations to act decisively? We say "yes"—and now. In our negotiations for the liberation of Namibia, we have been patient. We have been flexible. We have been reasonable. South Africa, however, has taken advantage of our patience and of our moderation by escalating the conflict. It has converted Namibia into a springboard from which it has carried out unprovoked, incessant armed attacks and repeated aggression against neighbouring States. Defiantly, South Africa committed naked aggression against Angola on a very large scale on the eve of this emergency special session. In short, such is South Africa's response to our demand for Namibia's independence. Why did the racist régime decide to raid Angola at a time when the Organization was preparing to hold an emergency special session to seek the end of its illegal occupation of Namibia? South Africa did that to demonstrate its contempt for the Organization. It has no respect for the concern of the international community. That is why, on behalf of the current Chairman of OAU, we urge the international community to take effective steps, individually and collectively, against South Africa for its consistent defiance of the Organization, for its blatant refusal to withdraw from Namibia, and for its repeated, unprovoked attacks on front-line States, and also for its archaic and abominable policy of *apartheid*, among other sins.

20. It is for all those reasons that African States asked for an urgent Security Council meeting in April this year. We were convinced at that time, as we are

now, that South Africa's total defiance of the Organization had gone too far. We went to the Security Council to urge it to exercise its responsibility seriously and to ensure the implementation of its own decisions. In the Security Council, many delegations from every region of the world urged the three permanent members of the Council who are among the authors of the plan of action to agree to take steps against South Africa for not complying with their own plan. We did not think that it would be necessary for us to have to urge the three Powers to see to it that their own plan was implemented. We do so now.

21. In the 36 years of United Nations history, voluminous records of continued aggression by South Africa against the people of Namibia and against neighbouring independent States have been compiled. In view of that, we solemnly called upon the Security Council in April of this year to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We called upon the Security Council to rise to the sacred responsibility conferred upon it by all Members of the United Nations. The call for such action had overwhelming support. It was a global call. The international community was ready to act; it was ready to take concrete steps against a State that has defied the world body for so long.

22. Yet, in spite of support for such action against South Africa, we witnessed triple vetoes from those who had themselves taken the initiative for negotiations for the independence of Namibia. Those vetoes were cast, not to facilitate the independence of the Namibian people, but to strengthen the hand of the illegal occupying Power, thus further increasing the agony of the Namibian people. Those negative votes in the Security Council only gave comfort to the forces that have flouted every resolution of the Organization on Namibia.

23. The decision to call for the convening of this emergency special session was made in Nairobi last June at the eighteenth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU. That decision was made against the background of what had happened here in the Security Council debate in April of this year.³ We had taken our case to the Security Council and obtained the support of the international community, with the exception of the three Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council. The international community was prepared then, as we believe it is prepared now, to take steps against South Africa. The action of the three Powers paralyzed the international community.

24. We asked for this emergency special session not just because we wanted a session. We are fully aware that we have held many debates and adopted several resolutions on the question of Namibia. As I have said before, those resolutions have all been ignored by South Africa. Can we escape the obvious conclusion that South Africa is simply not interested in peaceful negotiations? South Africa has defied all the decisions of the Organization on that and other subjects for the last 30 years. South Africa gives us no signals at all that it is willing to accept the decisions of the Organization. We have come here, in the interest of international peace and security, to urge our friends not to block action against South

Africa. It is now three years since Security Council resolution 435 (1978) endorsing the plan of action was adopted. The fact is that the plan was not implemented because of the evasive and negative attitude of South Africa.

25. We remain committed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), unmodified, unqualified, and without prevarication, because it was a product of compromise and because it is clear in its purpose. It needs no strengthening.

26. We have heard that part of the scheme to "strengthen" resolution 435 (1978) includes a proposal that would give South Africa power to write a constitution for independent Namibia before the implementation of the United Nations plan. The right to draw up Namibia's constitution belongs to the people of Namibia, as represented by SWAPO, and to no one else. It is a right no one can take away from the people of Namibia. As the current Chairman of OAU Mr. Daniel T. Arap Moi has said, the struggle for Namibia's independence will continue until Namibia is free, by peaceful means, if this is possible, or by continued and intensified armed struggle should the peace option fail. Africa's patience is running out, but our faith in the option of peace has not died.

27. In our view, there are only three parties to the problem. One is the party representing oppression, racism and illegal occupation, that is, South Africa; another is the party representing the oppressed people of Namibia, that is, SWAPO; and the third party is the United Nations. Of course, we know that South Africa has many puppets in Namibia. We do not recognize these puppets.

28. Let us not confuse issues in this debate. The Namibians are fighting for self-determination. The Angolans are fighting to preserve their territorial integrity against brutal aggression by South Africa and must be conceded the right to seek help when they feel they need it. When Namibia becomes free and when the threat to Angola's sovereignty is removed, a new situation will have arisen. It is to that situation that we must look, to avoid confusing cause and effect. We should like to make it abundantly clear that the problem over Namibia's independence is created by South Africa and South Africa alone. Therefore it is to South Africa that the attention of the United Nations must be turned for a solution to the problem.

29. Let me say that Africa views the situation with grave concern. We called for an emergency special session to highlight once again the plight of the people of Namibia, who have suffered for so long from the naked racism of South Africa. We have to take the bull by the horns. We have little choice. Anything else will lead us to further delay and further frustration. The friends of South Africa, we know, have great influence over South Africa and can, if they wish, exert the necessary pressure on the South African Government. South Africa must be made to understand that the world community is now ready to act, and to act decisively. The support of the Western countries is important in that respect. We ask them to help us to face the challenge posed by South Africa.

30. In conclusion, let me say this. Let this be the session which will record for posterity the determi-

nation of the United Nations to implement its own decisions and thus to discharge its legal obligation to the people of Namibia, whose only desire at this moment, as it was the desire of the people of the United States of America some 200 years ago, is to be free. History will record our courage—or lack of it.

31. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to request representatives who wish to participate in the debate to inscribe their names on the list of speakers. I propose that the list be closed today at 5 p.m. I take it that there is no objection to that proposal.

It was so decided.

32. The PRESIDENT: I call on the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

33. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia), President of the United Nations Council for Namibia: The present emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened in response to a request made by an overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations which have felt increasingly frustrated by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and by the obstacles created to the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations in relation to Namibia. In fact, as early as February this year, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 to 13 February, called for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa and also decided that, in the event of the Security Council's failing to act decisively, an emergency special session of the General Assembly should be convened to consider collective action.

34. After assessing the developments during the course of the intervening period, in particular after the three vetoes in the Security Council cast on draft resolutions seeking mandatory sanctions against South Africa, OAU reiterated at the summit meeting held at Nairobi that the time had come for the General Assembly to meet in an emergency special session to consider the question of Namibia.

35. The failure of the Security Council to take punitive measures against the racist régime of South Africa following its virtual rejection of the United Nations plan for Namibia at Geneva came as a great disappointment to the international community. We had expected that by then all Member States would be aware of the grave consequences of the continued defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations by South Africa and therefore there should have been no doubt as to what measures should be taken against the recalcitrant régime of Pretoria. The offences of that régime are too many to enumerate; suffice it for me to mention only a few.

36. The racist régime of South Africa, after having accepted the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the negotiations for which took a long time and painstaking efforts, has now refused to co-operate with the United Nations in implementing that resolution. After playing a game of hide-and-seek, the racist régime of Pretoria has finally revealed its true intentions, namely, to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to impose fraudulent entities on that Territory.

37. In its pursuit of those objectives, the South African régime has persisted in oppressing the Namibian people through a massive militarization of the Territory and the massacre, torture and arrest of Namibian patriots and the enforcement of conscription into the so-called SWA/Namibia Territory Force, which has become an umbrella for the recruitment of mercenaries and has also sown the seeds of a civil war in Namibia.

38. The situation in Namibia has forced the population in the Territory to flee to neighbouring independent African countries. Even there they are hunted and attacked by South African forces, which do not hesitate to commit aggression against independent African States on the pretext of hot pursuit.

39. It was only a few days ago that South Africa launched a premeditated, unprovoked and massive armed aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, causing destruction of life and property. The invasion was mounted with a massive force of two South African motorized columns, using 32 tanks and 82 armoured vehicles and 8 jet bombers, which penetrated deep into Angolan territory in flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. Here at the United Nations we witnessed the sad spectacle of the Security Council's being incapacitated by the veto of the United States, which failed even to utter a word of condemnation of the dastardly act of aggression against Angola, not to speak of the Council's failure to take action commensurate with its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

40. While the international community was seeking to resolve the question of Namibia peacefully, the white racist and illegal occupation régime of South Africa in Namibia continued to assemble bogus governmental structures with a view to giving a semblance of legitimacy to its presence in Namibia. It has continued to strengthen the apparatus of its so-called National Assembly, Council of Ministers and bantustan homelands, all of which are subservient to South Africa, by increasing their repressive legislative and executive measures in an effort to stem the growing tide of support for SWAPO in the Territory. The so-called Representative Authorities Proclamation No. AG. 8 of 24 April 1980 has illegally divided the Territory into 12 mutually exclusive entities based on ethnic groupings, with the largest and most economically viable portion of the land reserved for the whites. Throughout 1980 and part of 1981, the illegal South African régime in Namibia continued its process of fragmenting the Namibian people into some 12 political and administrative entities with powers to arrest, torture and detain SWAPO supporters.

41. All those negative developments in the Territory have had the effect of boosting the arrogant intransigence of the racist régime of South Africa in rejecting the United Nations independence plan for Namibia. It has since raised further demands and introduced extraneous and unacceptable elements into the United Nations plan. It appears that whatever concessions are made, South Africa will proceed to demand even more.

42. In contrast to South Africa's defiance, SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian

people, which has been leading the indomitable struggle for the liberation of the Namibian people, has exhibited unique statesmanship and political maturity by agreeing to the immediate implementation of the United Nations resolutions and to the signing of a cease-fire agreement with South Africa.

43. As we have so often stated, the obduracy and intransigence of the racist illegal occupation régime of South Africa has caused justifiable frustration and impatience within the international community. The overwhelming sentiment of the international community is that Namibia must accede to independence without further delay. We in the United Nations Council for Namibia believe that the illegal racist régime of South Africa must be compelled to withdraw from Namibia by the mounting of greater pressure on that régime by all concerned and, in particular, by the major Western allies of South Africa. The five Western countries which initiated the process resulting in the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council have the obligation and must bear the responsibility of seeing to it that South Africa complies with the decision of the United Nations to implement that resolution without any dilution, modification or, indeed, qualification.

44. The United Nations Council for Namibia is becoming increasingly disturbed by what appears to be a deliberate intention of certain Western countries to tie the solution of the question of Namibia to some unrelated issues not germane to the letter and spirit of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. This idea is reflected in the efforts made to amend Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in the name of "strengthening" it. This trend of thinking has resulted in encouraging the illegal occupation régime of South Africa to delay implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still further, on the one hand, and to consolidate its illegal presence in Namibia, on the other. In addition to the vague suggestion to modify the United Nations plan for Namibia, we hear also declarations of neutrality by certain countries which, in actual fact, amount to open support of South Africa in its persistent intransigence.

45. The policy of the United States, which is to treat the question of Namibia in terms of an ideological confrontation, can only give solace and succour to South Africa. By placing its own economic and strategic interests far above the expressed will of the international community, the United States has encouraged South Africa to pursue a perilous course which threatens international peace and security. The United States must begin to see the writing on the wall, since ultimately the forces of justice are bound to triumph in southern Africa. The victory of the patriotic forces against British and Portuguese colonialism in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe after a long period of struggle is sufficient testimony.

46. This emergency special session must raise a clarion call that the time has come for Member States not only to discharge their moral responsibility over the question of Namibia but also to rededicate themselves to the cause espoused in 1966 when they took the decision to make Namibia the direct responsibility of the United Nations. That historic undertaking is being put to the test by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa. Indeed, the present

situation has placed the prestige and honour of the Organization in jeopardy. It is the responsibility of all Member States to protect the honour and prestige of the United Nations from being eroded by the racist régime of South Africa, by taking a resolute and decisive position and demanding the immediate commencement of the unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) by the régime of South Africa, to be completed by a specified date.

47. The General Assembly should be able to adopt such measures as necessary to isolate South Africa politically, economically, militarily and culturally with a view to compelling it to implement the decisions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The memorandum of the United Nations Council for Namibia, submitted in document A/ES-8/3 of 2 September 1981, and the draft resolution have set out certain proposals which, if adopted, will have a decisive impact on South Africa.

48. We in the United Nations Council for Namibia earnestly hope that the decisions taken at the present session will result in the liberation of Namibia. We also hope that the present session will speed up the process of the destruction of the *apartheid* system in South Africa itself, thereby achieving the goal which the United Nations set itself in the 1960 Declaration to free colonial countries and peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*].

49. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Chairman 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, Mr. Frank Owen Abdulah of Trinidad and Tobago.

50. Mr. ABDULAH (Trinidad and Tobago), Chairman 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: For the second time in six months, the General Assembly is meeting specifically to consider the question of Namibia. This emergency special session, however, comes at a moment of deep crisis. This is so not only because the efforts of the international community to bring about genuine independence for Namibia by peaceful means have been brought to a standstill by the intransigence of the minority régime in Pretoria but also because the continuation of this situation has resulted in a serious escalation of violence, culminating in the most recent massive invasion of neighbouring Angola, a fact which gravely menaces the peace and stability of the region and has the potential for much broader repercussions.

51. This emergency special session has been called because the Security Council was unable to fulfil its responsibilities with regard to Namibia. Four months ago, when faced with the repeated refusals of South Africa to comply with its decisions, the Council found itself prevented from taking remedial action in the form of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter because of the negative votes of three Western permanent members. Only a few days ago the Council once more found itself unable even to condemn an overt act of aggression, unprecedented in its massiveness, committed by South Africa against Angola because one permanent member voted against such

action. These recent failures by the Security Council are all intensely frustrating to the overwhelming majority of the international community, because they appear to lend substance to South Africa's erroneous belief that it can defy the world with impunity. South Africa's confidence in this respect is, of course, based on its expectation that vested financial and other interests in the major Western industrialized nations will continue to prevent the international community from taking the concerted action which is needed to obtain its compliance.

52. This meeting of the emergency special session here today clearly demonstrates the serious concern shared by us as members of the international community at the inability of the Security Council to take positive action with regard to the withdrawal of South Africa from the international Territory of Namibia and with regard to the repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against Angola. It underscores our determination to see that all effective measures open to the Organization are taken to eliminate a situation which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

53. We cannot ignore the fact that the situation has reached a critical stage. In Namibia there is open conflict and repression. South Africa's illegal occupation is maintained only with the aid of tens of thousands of South African troops. There have been far too many acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring sovereign States in which brutal attacks have been perpetrated, often against unarmed civilians. We cannot ignore this serious threat to international peace and security in the region, nor can we—except at our own peril—continue to remain inactive in the face of so much injustice and human suffering. We must be equally mindful of the fact that the open defiance by South Africa of the will of the international community is a damaging affront to the Organization, since it calls in question the very principles on which the United Nations was founded. More than that, however, the aggressive and irresponsible actions of the South African régime constitute a serious menace to international peace and security.

54. In a consensus unanimously adopted on 14 August [A/ES-8/4, *annex*], the Special Committee, among other things, noted with great concern that the situation in and relating to Namibia had further worsened as a consequence of the sabotage by South Africa of the pre-implementation talks held at Geneva and the tactics and manoeuvres employed by South Africa to perpetuate its illegal occupation of that Territory and to impose an "internal settlement" on the Namibian people.

55. The Special Committee condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of the Territory, its persistent refusal to comply with the related decisions of the United Nations, as well as the repeated acts of aggression perpetrated by South African armed forces against neighbouring sovereign States. Further, the Committee reiterated that Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations until self-determination and independence are achieved in the Territory and reaffirmed the need to hold free elections under the supervision and

control of the United Nations in the whole of Namibia as one political entity in accordance with the relevant decisions of the United Nations. In that regard the Committee regretted any attempt to revise or weaken Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitutes the only acceptable basis for a peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. Furthermore, the Committee deplored the recent failure of the Security Council, owing to the negative votes of the Western permanent members, to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa and endorsed the call for this special session to review the question of Namibia and to take appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

56. That is the principled position of the Special Committee. The validity of that position, which is based on its conviction that the United Nations is duty-bound to do everything possible to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation has, I trust, been more than amply demonstrated. Indeed, all that has happened during the three years since the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978), culminating in South Africa's refusal to proceed with its implementation at the talks in Geneva, reveals a consistent and calculated policy of dissembling and delay. All of those manoeuvres have clearly unmasked the true intent of the Government of South Africa. This has been to earn time, under the guise of negotiations, to consolidate its dominion over the Territory through the proxy of a puppet régime and to deny the Namibian people their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

57. There is indeed absolutely nothing new in South Africa's defiant attitude towards the United Nations or in its contemptuous disregard of world public opinion. Not once in the history of the dispute over the Territory has South Africa shown any respect for the authority of the Organization; not once has its attitude been one of co-operation or conciliation. Rather, South Africa's attitude throughout has been characterized by inflexibility and confrontation, broken promises, false assurances and outright duplicity.

58. The developments which have taken place since the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) are ample proof that South Africa will never willingly accord the Namibian people their right to genuine freedom and independence. Its record throughout three years of intensive negotiations has been one of duplicity and evasion, culminating, in January last in Geneva, in a flagrant refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in implementing the resolution.

59. Meanwhile, in Namibia, as the negotiations were going on, the illegal South African régime made not the slightest pretence of moderating its *apartheid* policies or its exploitation of Namibia's resources. On the contrary, throughout that period South Africa increased its ruthless repression of the Namibian people and, in its efforts to consolidate its hold on the Territory, imposed there a puppet régime which would be subservient to it. Instead of creating an atmosphere which would be conducive to the holding of free elections in accordance with resolution 435 (1978), South Africa created an atmosphere of tension and confrontation and increased its militarization of the Territory, using it as a springboard for repeated attacks against neighbouring States.

60. At this very moment, when we are meeting here to consider the question of Namibia in order to pave the way for the taking of firm action to secure the full and speedy compliance of the Government of South Africa with the principles and objectives consistently upheld by the Organization, South Africa's military forces are still in Angolan territory. Not only does this represent a serious aggression and violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a Member of the United Nations, but it poses a serious threat to the whole region and, by heightening tensions, further impedes the process leading to the independence of Namibia.

61. The negative votes cast by the Western permanent members of the Security Council against the imposition of sanctions, and the more recent vote by one permanent member which prevented the Council from condemning South Africa's recent aggression against Angola, are being seen by South Africa as indications of support for its actions and an open invitation to continue its reprehensible conduct towards the people of Namibia, towards neighbouring independent States and towards the international community. There has never been any doubt that comprehensive and effective sanctions against South Africa are the most effective measures by which the United Nations can obtain South Africa's compliance with the decisions of the Security Council and are, doubtless, the key to the restoration of peace and security in the region.

62. During the long-drawn-out negotiations for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) we witnessed, on the part of the leadership of SWAPO, a sincere willingness to do everything possible to effect without delay the full implementation of the United Nations plan. The spirit of accommodation, patience and statesmanship demonstrated by the leaders of SWAPO has been widely noted and commended. In the same context the leaders of the frontline States have been justly praised for the crucial role they have played throughout in support of the cause of the people of Namibia.

63. That attitude of SWAPO stands in sharp contrast to the intransigence and arrogance demonstrated by South Africa. The increasing violence in and around the international Territory of Namibia and also the inability of the Security Council to take affirmative action constitute the background against which we in the United Nations must view the present crisis. Namibia is a Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and it is therefore our unavoidable duty to ensure that the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council are strictly implemented without further delay. The only course of action commensurate with the present situation is for the Assembly to take appropriate action under the Charter of the United Nations which will signify to South Africa that its stalling tactics, its manoeuvres and its aggression against independent neighbouring States will no longer be tolerated. Accordingly, it is essential that the international community adopt necessary measures not only to enforce the effective implementation of the existing arms embargo against South Africa but also to bring about South Africa's total isolation through the imposition of a comprehensive boycott of all dealings with South Africa,

whether of a political, economic or cultural nature, and including most particularly an effective embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products and, of course, the complete cessation of all military co-operation.

64. Such decisions taken by the Assembly at this emergency special session would be a positive demonstration that the United Nations is resolved to fulfil its obligations towards the people of Namibia as well as its responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the region.

65. Before concluding, I should like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to acknowledge with appreciation the important work carried out by the United Nations Council for Namibia under the outstanding leadership of Mr. Lusaka of Zambia in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it. The role of the Council as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia until independence cannot be overemphasized. At the present stage of the struggle of the Namibian people it is essential that the Council be given utmost co-operation by all the Member States so that it can continue to discharge its responsibilities with even greater effectiveness.

66. Mr. President, I am confident that under your acknowledged leadership and guidance and with your skill, wisdom and diplomacy the work of the Assembly at this emergency special session will make a further positive contribution towards ending the situation in Namibia.

67. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/152 of 20 December 1976, I now call on the Secretary for Foreign Relations of SWAPO, Mr. Peter Mueshihange.

68. Mr. MUESHIHANGE (South West Africa People's Organization): I wish to begin by extending, on behalf of the oppressed people of Namibia and the Central Committee of SWAPO, warm greetings and best wishes to the Assembly and to the eminent personalities present here on this occasion of the opening of the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of Namibia.

69. Mr. President, we wish to extend congratulations and best wishes to you on your presiding over this important and historic debate. I hope that the outcome of the debate will hasten the independence of Namibia. In that regard we recall your important statement on Namibia Day, 26 August, at the United Nations.

70. The SWAPO delegation is most gratified to see so many ministers and other high-ranking officials from the States Members of the United Nations, whose presence here confirms once again their solidarity with and support for our sacred cause and the yearning of our struggling people for freedom, justice and genuine independence. We should like to thank them for responding promptly and positively to the request for the convening of this particular session, initiated by the States members of OAU at Nairobi last June.

71. Of course, broadly speaking, the decision to hold an emergency special session on Namibia, in the event of failure by the Security Council to impose total economic sanctions against racist South Africa, was made as a result of successive meetings at the highest

level of the Non-Aligned Movement and OAU. The need to proceed on that basis was felt in the aftermath of the United Nations-sponsored pre-implementation talks at Geneva, where the colonial delegation of the occupationist régime displayed a complete lack of diplomacy, sincerity and statesmanship and eventually succeeded in deliberately sabotaging the meeting.

72. In other words, we are gathered here because such is the expressed desire, based on a clear global consensus to insist on the need to launch a world-wide campaign, both within and outside the framework of the United Nations, in order to ensure the continued isolation of the illegal régime of Pretoria and, at the same time, to mobilize support and assistance for the struggle of the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, the vanguard of the Namibian revolution and the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. However, we have taken full cognizance of the fact that certain Western Powers, the usual trading partners and collaborators with the *apartheid* régime, have tried every conceivable method of intrigue and blackmail to prevent the emergency special session from taking place. Now, in spite of the fact that they have been rebuffed in that the session has been convened notwithstanding their tricks, they will still deploy new tactics to undermine the debate, professing hypocritically to be acting only in the best interests of the Namibian victims, who continue to be killed, maimed and terrorized by the Fascist Boers with the weapons and other war material supplied them by the major Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO].

73. This then is the sketchy background to the present debate. Obviously we are happy that the debate is taking place and, at the same time, we welcome the opportunity to make a contribution.

74. SWAPO regrets that so much time has been wasted as a result of racist South Africa's usual tactics. The delegation of the minority white settler régime of racist South Africa has once again tried, with the support and encouragement of the usual States, the trading partners of South Africa, to undermine the work of the General Assembly. Nobody is interested in the empty diatribes of the Pretoria racist clique trying to defend the evil system of *apartheid*. The system has been condemned as a crime against humanity. By the same token, the Pretoria régime has no legal, political or moral right whatsoever to purport to speak for Namibia. It is a régime responsible for arrogantly maintaining an illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia, a country over which the United Nations has direct legal authority.

75. SWAPO has taken note of the important statements delivered by the previous speakers, in particular the statement of the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and that of the spokesman for OAU, as well as the memorandum contained in document A/ES-8/3 from the United Nations Council for Namibia to the emergency special session of the General Assembly.

76. There are some deliberate distortions concerning the patriotic struggle of the Namibian people to liberate their beloved fatherland by any means necessary, including armed struggle, and concerning SWAPO, the vanguard of that struggle and the sole and authentic

representative of the struggling masses of our country at home and abroad.

77. To begin with, racist propaganda and calculated imperialist connivance would have the world believe that the struggle of our people since 1915 against the genocidal policies and practices of the previous colonial occupation by imperial Germany and now against the Boer colonial régime is a creation of outside Powers. Do we really need outsiders to tell us about the wholesale massacre of our people, about the extermination orders which have resulted in the decimation of our population and the exile of generations of Namibians and about the violent conquest of our land and the seizure of livestock and mineral wealth? Do we really need to be told by foreigners, whoever they may be, about our sufferings and deprivation at the hands of the oppressors, who are at present visibly inflicting an unmitigated reign of terror, intimidation and oppression? Have our detractors not read the colonial records or heard about the tragic losses we suffered when we were colonized and alienated from our land?

78. We know from long experience as victims of foreign occupation that colonialism and racism have always sought to legitimize their domination by confronting the oppressed at every turn with a caricature of their historical identity. First the German colonialists and then the *apartheid* chieftains, who today continue arrogantly to maintain their illegal rule in Namibia, have based their abhorrent policies on a master-servant relationship in order to justify their atrocities and barbarism. In order to massacre human beings like wild animals, they had first to negate our history and dispossess our people of everything.

79. The struggle of the Namibian patriots, which SWAPO is spearheading today, is a struggle resulting from the colonial conquest itself and is a reaction to the unjust decisions of the Conference of Berlin of 1884-1885, at which the major imperialist Powers divided Africa into spheres of control, domination and influence. It was then that our forefathers launched the first liberation war, the great patriotic resistance, on a national scale involving all the African people in Namibia.

80. The occupying army of racist South Africa has never left Namibia since its invasion in 1915, during the first major imperialist war—the First World War. The army and the police have ever since been the permanent instruments of colonial policy; they are responsible for the daily killings, torture, arbitrary mass arrests, imprisonment, generalized terror and intimidation of our people.

81. The very existence of the *apartheid* State in southern Africa and its evil system of *apartheid* are the source of the colonial conflict, racial polarization and tension, which could easily engulf the entire region and the world at large in a global war involving major Powers. Throughout the long period of about 66 years during which our country and its people have been treated as mere spoils of war, mere chattels, we have known only violence, repression and exploitation by the Afrikaner mafia and its imperialist collaborators.

82. In collusion with the imperialist interests to which it is allied the South African occupation régime

has created a system of extreme economic exploitation in Namibia which is buttressed by a repressive colonial administrative machinery and a racist legal system. In Namibia there are white-settler oppressors who live in splendid wealth and enjoy unlimited privileges entrenched in law, while the masses of our people have little chance to escape the poverty, degradation and misery to which they are institutionally bound.

83. Disregarding the interests and well-being of the African majority, the huge transnational corporations exploit to the fullest the safe haven of super-profit-making, which is facilitated by the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and military intimidation. Despite repeated United Nations resolutions on Namibia and the rulings of the International Court of Justice, in particular the advisory opinion of the Court dated 21 June 1971,¹ South African and other foreign economic interests represented by the giant transnational corporations have continued and, indeed, expanded their ruthless and illegal exploitation of human resources and of mineral resources under the soil and on the sea-bed within the territorial waters and the continental shelf of Namibia. These giant corporations have for years monopolized the commercial and mining sectors of the Namibian economy for their own exclusive benefit and to the detriment of our people now and in future generations.

84. Outstanding among the transnational corporations of Western nations are those originating from the States members of the so-called contact group—Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States. In this connection we have taken due notice of the positive pronouncements and encouraging overtures from the leaders of the new Government of the parties of the left, led by the Socialist Party, in France. SWAPO and the embattled people of Namibia welcomed wholeheartedly the positive vote of France in the Security Council on 31 August 1981. We can only express here our sincere hope that this new France will in due time loosen this economic stranglehold which impedes the progress of our heroic struggle.

85. Further, I should like to mention that, according to the latest available information, there are as many as 88 transnational corporations carrying out plunder and destruction in Namibia. Of that number, 35 are based in South Africa itself, 25 in the United Kingdom, 15 in the United States, 8 in the Federal Republic of Germany, 3 in France and 2 in Canada. All these firms, including those registered in South Africa, are conducting their illegal operations by means of licences issued by the Pretoria régime or its illegal colonial administration in Namibia.

86. I have cited these data in order to stress the point that, in addition to the historical wrongs done to us by the successive colonial Powers, the economic and strategic interests of the major capitalist Powers, the trading partners and the ones providing the military safety net of NATO for the Boer régime have aggravated the conditions of conflict, violence and political and military confrontation between the revolutionary forces of change and the defenders of the *status quo*.

87. Like our forefathers we, too, are struggling and sacrificing, not in the name of some abstract ideology or as agents of a foreign Power. Rather, we have endured all this as a people to reconquer our land, to re-establish ownership and control over our natural resources, to liberate human manpower and to create the necessary conditions for our people for the full enjoyment of their basic rights of freedom, self-determination and genuine and unfettered independence.

88. On this basis we resolutely reject and condemn all those who, through massive propaganda and vicious disinformation, try to depict the heroic struggle of our people as an extension of East-West tension or SWAPO as an agent or creature of non-African Powers.

89. Can anybody really doubt the fact that today Namibia is a police State, a terrorist State, an occupied Territory whose people daily languish at the mercy of a colonial army of nearly 80,000 soldiers, police and civilian commandos? In addition to this massive militarization, the racist occupiers are Namibianizing the colonial conflict by arming and training Namibian youth at gunpoint, thereby creating a situation in which brother will kill brother.

90. I have already spoken of the plunder of our wealth and the exploitation of the labour of workers and peasants by foreigners who care nothing about the Namibians' survival or welfare. There are also illegal and unilateral political impositions which are intended as preparations for a unilateral declaration of independence in Namibia. In this regard, all the preliminary administrative, legislative and political steps have been completed in favour of the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance puppet group. Are we supposed to ignore such things, to roll over and play dead? We say "No." We are patriots; we are freedom fighters. Indeed, we are revolutionaries, no less than were George Washington or the partisans of the European revolutions. It is our historical responsibility and patriotic duty to resist the settler colonialists and their local puppet traitors. It is our fatherland we are fighting for and it is our people whose yearning for emancipation inspires us to go forward.

91. At this point, I should like to refer to another distortion, namely, of why SWAPO is recognized now, before elections have been held, as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. The issue is actually uncomplicated and self-explanatory. SWAPO is the only indigenous liberation movement with the necessary organizational sophistication, military capability, human resources, political programme and international standing to resist effectively the colonial domination and illegal conduct of South Africa in Namibia.

92. At the time of the birth of SWAPO more than 20 years ago, there were certain other Namibian political organizations and groupings carrying out limited patriotic and anti-colonial actions inside Namibia through the efforts of the sons and daughters of the soil. With the ever-increasing repression and intimidation by the Boers, those organizations and groupings succumbed, until by the beginning of the 1970s virtually all of them had disappeared. At that time those that existed in name only as moribund entities

had ceased to enjoy the recognition of the international community. Some representatives will perhaps recall that throughout the mid-1960s several Namibian representatives of various organizations used to appear jointly before United Nations bodies as petitioners. By 1971, however, all the genuine anti-colonial and patriotic organizations had died political deaths.

93. Following the decision taken by OAU in 1972, the General Assembly recognized SWAPO in 1973 as the authentic representative of the Namibian people. In 1976, that status was changed to "sole and authentic," and in 1978, SWAPO was accorded permanent observer status at the United Nations. Yet it is worth pointing out that SWAPO was not created by either OAU or by the United Nations. It was created by the people of Namibia themselves to spearhead the struggle for freedom and independence. What OAU and the United Nations did was merely to recognize the existing reality and to make the one and only correct decision to strengthen the efforts of the Namibians by choosing to support their liberation movement, which was and is the only one capable of delivering the goods.

94. The fact that SWAPO has survived for 20 years, fighting singlehandedly the most powerful military Power on the African continent, is a clear vindication of the trust and confidence reposed in the movement by OAU, the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement, of which we are a proud member. Actually, the Boers themselves have been our best promoters through their unending complaints about our effective operations against their forces and their military installations. Each time they carry out their military actions against us, they publicize worldwide the fact that they have destroyed the SWAPO military organization, that they have killed hundreds, if not thousands, of our guerrillas, that each action was the biggest combined military operation—each with a peculiar code name—or that our forces are deserting in large numbers. Merely by adding up such alleged facts and figures, we can see that SWAPO should have been wiped out tens of times over the past years. Yet scarcely two weeks pass without the Boers writing to the Secretary-General to complain about SWAPO actions. So it goes on and on and on. It is a matter of record that the Boer régime agreed to sign a cease-fire agreement with SWAPO under the terms of the United Nations plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO, thus, is alive and well.

95. I should like now to deal with what ought to be a matter of common sense, but which the racist propaganda and imperialist and malicious disinformation campaign have been trying to distort, especially in recent months. To a Martian visiting our planet as a guest of the Boers and the Reaganites, the SWAPO freedom fighters would be nothing but a contingent of foreign invaders from yet another planetary outpost, obsessed with an impulse to kill, maim and otherwise victimize Namibian men, women and children in the service of some wicked demon. Enemy propaganda is so pervasive and vicious that some people unwittingly fall victim to it.

96. The truth of the matter is that SWAPO has been able to survive through 20 long and difficult years only because we are a people's movement created,

organized and led by the sons and daughters of the soil. How can anyone in his right mind believe that the members of SWAPO, who are themselves all Namibians, could adopt as their policy and objectives the wanton killing of their own mothers, fathers and siblings, our kith and kin? This is absurd. If that were so, we would long ago have alienated ourselves from the masses. They would have exposed us by withdrawing their protective cover. The whole world would have long known about such things—for example, through churches and other social institutions—in the same way as the atrocities of the occupationist régime against both the masses and SWAPO members are reported now. I am stressing this point because when one listens only to the spokesmen of the new unholy alliance of racist South Africa and the United States, one is baffled by their distortions and falsifications. The Pretoria régime of illegal occupation and its gang of local puppet traitors and settler chieftains are made to appear as the liberators and defenders of our people whom they are brutalizing and exploiting, forcing them by means of neo-Nazi tactics to support the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance and its neo-colonial entity in Windhoek. The fact of the matter is that the South African racists are able to maintain themselves only through the force of arms and intimidation.

97. The puppets will fall, as did their brethren in Southern Rhodesia, as soon as coercion and military threats are removed. They will be rejected. However, the reason we have been able to survive in the face of sustained and massive military attacks and repression is that we in SWAPO are the heroes, the liberators, the embodiment of the aspirations of the masses for liberation and independence. SWAPO is extremely popular; it will win any democratically organized free and fair elections in Namibia. The Boers know this very well. The choice before the people will be between freedom or colonial slavery. And their votes will be overwhelmingly in favour of freedom, for which our forefathers sacrificed and for which the combatants of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia continue to endure hardships. Those who would like to falsify the facts in favour of their selfish economic and strategic interests are the racists who seek to maintain and expand their dominance and control in southern Africa.

98. The other distortion being propagated by the new unholy alliance of Pretoria and Washington characterizes SWAPO freedom fighters as terrorists. Well, we have been called many things over the years. But that name-calling has not changed and will never change the content of our struggle, nor will it transform us into what our detractors would wish us to be. What is, however, dangerous about the latest vilifications and subterfuges of the unholy alliance is that, not only are we called terrorists, but it is alleged that we are the creatures and agents of certain foreign forces. That is outrageous. That is an attempt to prepare the citizens of the countries concerned and their allies to accept shallow racist diatribes and ideological warfare, in order to pave the way for military intervention and the destabilization of SWAPO and the front-line States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola. The fact of the matter is that our national resistance against foreign domination started in the mid-1880s,

long before the victory of the Great October Revolution. Ever since, we have been struggling constantly against foreign, colonial domination and doctrines of white supremacy, such as *apartheid*. Our own generation, led by SWAPO, has been struggling for the last 20 years to end South Africa's colonial and illegal presence in Namibia. When we launched this phase of our struggle, Angola was still occupied by the Fascist régime of Portugal.

99. In a word, the question of Namibia is a question of colonialism and illegality. That is the universal consensus. SWAPO is the national liberation movement founded upon the aspirations and interests of the oppressed and colonized Namibians, who desire freedom and liberation. We therefore strongly protest against, and reject, any suggestion to depict our struggle as something other than a patriotic struggle to reconquer Namibia for all our people.

100. Furthermore, it is an irrefutable fact of history that in 1966 the United Nations took a bold and historic step in terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assuming direct legal responsibility over Namibia. The United States of America was one of the countries which voted in favour of that decision. Likewise, the United States supported the historic opinion of the International Court of Justice in June 1971,¹ namely, that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal; consequently, all Member States were enjoined not to have any dealings, directly or indirectly, with South Africa in respect of Namibia.

101. That means that the Namibian masses demand that South Africa get out of Namibia forthwith. The African continent regards South Africa as its public enemy No. 1. By proclaiming several years later that it would militarily attack any African country south of the equator, the Pretoria régime virtually declared war on all the States members of OAU. The evil *apartheid* system, which is the foundation of racist white settlerism, has been declared a crime against humanity. The racist Boer junta has adopted a belligerent policy of expansionism, military attacks and other acts of aggression against all the front-line States. The racist authorities of South Africa have internationalized the colonial conflict in Namibia and the *apartheid* menace by introducing mercenaries, those filthy dogs of war, to murder our people in South Africa and Namibia. Theirs is a régime that is infamous for the massacres at Sharpeville, Langa, Soweto, to name but a few in South Africa itself, and for similar massacres at Windhoek in Namibia in 1959—and who will forget Kassinga? There were many other such genocidal acts at other places in Namibia. It is that same militarist régime which is training and arming counter-revolutionary puppet agents from almost all the front-line States, in order to carry out destabilization and organized violence against those States. Most seriously, it is Fascist South Africa that has brought a nuclear-weapons system into Africa, thanks to the gang of five, thus threatening peace and security on the continent, with serious global repercussions.

102. South Africa is a country of international outlaws, a terrorist State which is responsible for daily judicial murders of African men, women, and children in Namibia and South Africa; it is a country of neo-Hitlers, about which nothing good has ever been said

at any time, at the United Nations or elsewhere in the world.

103. But now we are told that the United States of America regards that country as a friendly country which must be dealt with on the basis of the so-called constructive engagement approach. What conclusions are we to draw from that alarming revelation? What is it that the United States is telling the Africans and the rest of peace-loving and justice-upholding mankind?

104. Only a few days ago, Mr. Chester Crocker, United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, delivered a bombshell. He let the cat out of the bag. If ever proof was needed, he provided it in a policy statement, dated 29 August 1981, which was strategically timed to convey the message with the fullest possible impact. It was done at a time when the Security Council was actively seized of the latest acts of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola and at a time when a high-level OAU ministerial mission was visiting Washington, and during the period of preparation for this emergency special session.

105. What more is there to say, except to wonder aloud why a super-Power which professes fair play and peaceful solutions to burning issues in the world should behave in this manner? Mr. Crocker stated, in a nutshell, that the United States would not allow itself "to be forced to align [itself] with one side or another". This means, in our view, that the United States has clearly decided to align itself openly with *apartheid* South Africa.

106. I have given a descriptive analysis of the true nature of the Pretoria régime and concluded that its continued existence in itself, together with its Fascist policies, poses a serious threat to the peace and security of the world. Thus, United States neutrality in the face of what South Africa represents—a hostile and destructive racist entity—to the world means support for *apartheid* and embracing the perpetrators of repression, violence and state terrorism. But let me state without any fear or favour that the United States is neutral only as regards those that are fighting for freedom, justice and equality, not in respect of those—the racists—that are in control, albeit temporarily, of raw materials and so-called strategic interests in southern Africa, that is, in Namibia and South Africa. For Mr. Crocker declared: "It does not serve our interests to walk away from South Africa". He argued further:

"The potential damage to Western interests is enhanced by southern Africa's geopolitical importance along the strategic sea routes around Africa and by its growing importance as a source of critical minerals."

107. I will cite just one more passage from that policy statement on southern Africa to amplify my arguments. Mr. Crocker made another point, saying:

"It is essential that military force not become established as the arbiter of relations between States or the means of effecting needed political change."

108. Well, now, who is responsible for the military force that Fascist South Africa is today, and is it not South Africa that has proclaimed the policy I referred

to earlier of being ready to attack militarily any African State south of the equator, and is it not the Pretoria régime which, through military force, perpetuates its illegal occupation of Namibia? The massacres and genocidal policies that I have mentioned are being carried out by means of military force. How, then, is the needed political change possible without counter military force in favour of the oppressed majority?

109. It is absolutely necessary that due attention be given to that policy exposition because it has serious implications for Africa, the United Nations and the world at large.

110. Let me now say a word about the most recent military invasion of the People's Republic of Angola by the Fascist armed forces of South Africa. Throughout the past six years Angola and its great people have been victims of naked acts of aggression of this kind committed by the Pretoria régime and other agents of imperialism. It all started with the massive military invasion of Angola in 1975. While the Boer forces and CIA/UNITA/FNLA⁴ elements were defeated, the campaign of terror and subversion continued over a period of six years.

111. The Security Council met on 28 August 1981 to consider the complaint by Angola against South Africa.⁵ The latest acts of aggression by the racists, like all the previous ones, constituted a clear violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. The Boers or their new-found apologists could not, in any way whatsoever, justify such actions against an independent and sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations. At the end of the debate, the overwhelming majority—13 countries—of the members of the Council voted to censure the invaders, but because of the United States veto the resolution was killed. To add insult to injury, the representative of the United States in the Security Council went out on a limb with his cold-war polemics trying to justify South Africa's armed military invasion of Angola. His language was as undiplomatic as his reasoning was erroneous. He was quite insensitive to the sufferings of the African people of Angola. Yet his support for the racists was generous and no doubt comforting to them. Now we know that what Mr. Lichenstein said in the Security Council was a pointer to what we would hear from Mr. Crocker the next day.

112. Let me take this opportunity to thank all the countries and international, regional and national organizations, as well as solidarity groups, for their persistent support and material assistance to SWAPO in the name of the struggling people of Namibia. I also wish to thank the United Nations as a whole, and the Secretary-General in particular, for their tireless efforts to defend the interests of the Namibian people against the sinister machinations of the occupationist régime and its imperialist supporters, which are all bent on undermining and usurping the United Nations authority over Namibia.

113. In this context, I can only reiterate the readiness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement with racist South Africa, once it agrees to follow our good example, in order to open the way for the early commencement of the implementation of the United Nations plan in its final and definitive form.

I should like further to reiterate that SWAPO, like OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement, has no interest whatsoever in reopening negotiations regarding Security Council resolution 435 (1978); it is a compromise formula already accepted by the two principal protagonists in the Namibian conflict, SWAPO and South Africa, and should be implemented without any further delay, amendment, modification, qualification or dilution.

114. In conclusion, SWAPO is a proud member of the Non-Aligned Movement. This great, dynamic and representative movement celebrated the twentieth anniversary of its founding at a solemn meeting yesterday and rededicated itself to increasing support and concrete assistance for SWAPO, in order to intensify the war of national liberation. We are most grateful for this and pledge right here that we shall leave no stone unturned until we reach Windhoek. Victory is ours, whether through the bullet or the ballot.

115. One of Namibia's greatest national leaders and an indomitable guerrilla commander against the German colonial forces told his arch-enemy, the German colonial Governor Leutwein, in 1893—and I quote his words with much heartfelt pride and the confidence of a revolutionary:

“If you kill me for my country and my independence without transgression on my part, that is no disgrace nor loss to me because then I die honourably in the cause of that which is mine”.

Then he issued the clarion call to his soldiers, saying, “Let us die fighting”.

116. SWAPO represents that legacy and heritage today, and we say to Hendrik Witbooi, who spoke those words, that we shall not fail him.

117. The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

118. Mr. MALMIERCA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly is holding an emergency special session in order to consider the question of the independence of Namibia, the territory of which continues to be illegally occupied by South Africa despite the repeated decisions that have been adopted by the main organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council, and despite the unanimous condemnation of all the peoples of the world which, without exception, have advocated the elimination of colonialism in southern Africa and the definitive eradication of the monstrous system of *apartheid* from the face of the earth.

119. Quite rightly the group of African States has considered that the question of Namibia requires our most urgent attention. However, the press media of several Western Powers, especially that in the host country of the United Nations, namely, the United States, are trying to depict this urgency as uncalled-for. With ill intent, they are concealing the importance which the international community attaches to the independence of the Namibian people and attempting to spread the idea that we will hold a pointless and unnecessary debate, trying to conceal from public opinion in their countries the real causes which lead the United Nations time and again to discuss this question, until a just solution of the problem is found.

120. The Non-Aligned Movement and OAU took the initiative of calling for the convening of this emergency special session and renewed on this occasion their unflinching support for and solidarity with the struggle for the self-determination, freedom, independence and territorial integrity of Namibia and with its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO.

121. From 16 to 18 April of this year, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries met at Algiers at the ministerial level for the sole purpose of taking up the question of Namibia and appealed to the Security Council urgently to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Ever since then the failure of this appeal had been expected, given the certain veto of the three Western countries permanent members of the Security Council, and especially of the United States, which is the chief supporter of the *apartheid* régime. For that reason, the Bureau at Algiers contemplated the convening of this emergency special session for the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations so that the Organization could fulfil its responsibilities, and especially pointed out the importance of strengthening solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO to attain the independence of Namibia.

122. At Algiers the Ministers reiterated:

“By its struggle,... SWAPO has won its rightful place in the comity of nations as the embodiment of the Namibian people's sovereignty. The Bureau welcomes the victories won by the valiant fighters of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia, the military branch of SWAPO, whose just struggle enjoys the full support of the international community against the racist occupation forces and their puppets of the Turnhalle group, thus dealing the racist régime of illegal occupation a severe blow.

“While hailing these victories of the heroic people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, the Bureau reaffirms its full and unconditional support of the armed struggle of the Namibian people for their national liberation and reiterates the solemn commitment of the non-aligned countries to intensifying their moral, political, military, diplomatic and material assistance with a view to enabling the people of Namibia to achieve their national, political, economic and social liberation”.⁶

123. The failure of the Geneva negotiations showed those who had any remaining doubts that the Pretoria racist régime had decided to continue its illegal occupation of Namibia and that, with the benevolent attitude of some members of the contact group and the outspoken support of the Reagan Administration, it had no intention whatsoever of complying with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

124. The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries at its meeting at Algiers also warned of the consequences of aggression by South African forces against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States.

125. It could have been foreseen that the Security Council would not be able to fulfil its mandate. It was also clear that the course followed by the new Administration in Washington would encourage the

aggressive and gangster-like actions of the Pretoria authorities and that in the immediate future it was only to be expected that there would be a marked deterioration in the situation in southern Africa.

126. Indeed, the Western Powers vetoed the draft resolution which provided for sanctions against South Africa, as well as three other draft resolutions which completed those sanctions by providing for the severance of all diplomatic and trade relations and an embargo on oil and the sale of arms to South Africa.

127. The outcome of the debates in the Security Council could have been foreseen, but it is necessary to stress here that an embargo on the sale of arms to the South African racists was vetoed, which is tantamount to recognizing that the United States and some of its allies stand ready to continue supplying arms to that genocidal régime, and that there was an attempt, in open collusion with Pretoria, to have the Security Council hear a representative of the so-called Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, in violation of the terms of a resolution of that very organ, its resolution 439 (1978).

128. If the outcome of the discussions in the Security Council in April of this year showed anything it was the deep commitment that binds Washington and Pretoria together. Shamefully disguised during the Carter Administration, the alliance, under the banner of the so-called free world, between the United States and the South African racists is being proclaimed today with unprecedented cynicism as a brutal challenge by imperialism to the African Governments, to the Non-Aligned Movement and to the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

129. It is important to emphasize here the duplicity and disrespect to be seen in the behaviour of the Government of the United States towards the international community. While Mr. Chester Crocker was travelling throughout 12 African countries, trying to hoodwink their leaders by affirming that the present Administration did not yet have a policy on southern Africa, firm steps were being taken to implement Washington's “new” policy of close alliance with the South African racists and of full support for the régime of *apartheid* and its desire for hegemony. The contacts between South African intelligence officials and the representative of the United States to the United Nations, the visits by South African officials to Washington and, finally, the presence of the racist Botha, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pretoria, in the North American capital are examples of that.

130. Secretary of State Alexander Haig did not conceal his satisfaction or his deeply felt reactionary joy when he toasted Roelof Botha, the known pro-Nazi, and proclaimed:

“South Africa can rely on our determination and support as the leader of the free world... May this mark a new beginning of the mutual trust between the United States and South Africa, old friends, like Minister Botha, which have come together again... Let us now drink to the friendship and co-operation between the United States and South Africa.”

131. Casting themselves in the role of representatives and leaders of the Western Powers, the representa-

tives of the Government of the United States encourage Pretoria to continue denying Namibia its independence and to keep millions of Africans deprived of their most basic rights.

132. In the period which followed the April series of meetings of the Security Council, the Pretoria authorities stepped up their attacks against Angola, their destabilizing actions in Zambia and Mozambique and hostile economic measures against Zimbabwe, while at the same time the United States was turning subversion into its main political weapon against the front-line States. Zambia and Mozambique, in strict defence of their sovereignty, felt forced to expel several officials of the CIA who, sheltered by the United States embassies in both countries, were taking part in conspiratorial activities against the legitimate Governments of Presidents Kaunda and Samora Machel, at the same time that the United States Government was announcing its readiness to renew assistance in weapons and money to the counter-revolutionary gangs of UNITA in Angola.

133. Who can doubt but that the actions of the CIA against Angola, Zambia and Mozambique are the fruit of agreement between the authorities of Pretoria and Washington?

134. At the same time and in view of the failure of attempts to create a new military bloc in the South Atlantic, the Reagan Administration brought some of its allies into the naval exercises called "Ocean Drive 81", which covered the area from the south to the north Atlantic, including the Caribbean, on the pretext of protecting the shipping lanes.

135. What need is there to undertake such visible naval exercises along the coasts of Africa unless it be to try—albeit uselessly—to intimidate the African countries?

136. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU has given a firm and decisive reply to the blackmail and the threats of the Government of the United States and the Pretoria régime and, at the same time, it has maintained its strong support for the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, as endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

137. The negative results of United States policy towards the independent States of Africa, especially towards the front-line States, could be clearly seen in the recent armed aggression by the South African racists against the People's Republic of Angola.

138. That act of banditry, which violates the Charter of the United Nations, has been condemned most strongly by international public opinion and by the States Members of the Organization, with the sole and not at all surprising exception of the strongest ally of the *apartheid* régime and the prime instigator of its misdeeds, the Government of the United States.

139. The United States Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Chester Crocker, stated in Honolulu that the United States would not align itself with any of the parties to the conflict—a cynical statement which is tantamount to claiming to maintain neutrality between slave-owners and the enslaved. Furthermore, we all know that it is not neutral, that the United States has aligned itself with the South African racists, that it supports the maintenance of the *apar-*

theid régime, that it prevents the independence of Namibia and that it encourages aggression against the front-line States.

140. The entire world was at one in admiring the heroic resistance of the Angolan people and its Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola under the firm leadership of President José Eduardo dos Santos and the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA)-workers party.

141. The Revolutionary Government of Cuba, in its statement of 27 August 1981, clearly set forth its position as follows:

"The racist invaders must halt their aggression and withdraw from Angolan territory. Their cowardly actions are already reaching an extreme. If the invading South African columns come close to the lines being defended by the Cuban internationalist fighters, our troops, in fulfilment of the duty of solidarity between our country and the sister Republic of Angola, will go into action with all their means.

"The Government and people of Cuba will unhesitatingly stand once again at the side of the heroic people of Angola in the face of racist and Fascist aggression to defend its independence and national integrity."

142. Never before today has there been a stronger will to independence on the part of all peoples. Colonialism, dependency, the exploitation of some peoples by others have been condemned by history. The prolongation of colonial domination in Namibia creates a constant focus of insecurity and tension. It is a threat to international peace and security.

143. Through its heroic struggle under the leadership of SWAPO the Namibian people has given proof of its will and its ability to accede to independence. In the process of that lengthy struggle SWAPO has become the authentic expression of the aspirations of the Namibian people to national economic and social liberation, to national unity and to the territorial integrity of the country, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and others along its coast.

144. SWAPO has given proof of political maturity and a constructive attitude. If, on the one hand, the fighters of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia are firmly waging an armed struggle against the racist oppressor, on the other, SWAPO is adhering to and strictly abiding by the United Nations plan for Namibia approved by Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).

145. It is not SWAPO that is preventing a peaceful and negotiated settlement leading to Namibian independence. It is Pretoria and its allies that are responsible before history for the continued killing and the holocaust that may ensue if the imperialists continue to insist on denying the Namibian people and African countries that support in the full realization of their inalienable national rights.

146. The non-aligned countries support the position of the front-line States and demand the implementation without delay, qualification or modification of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence. Pursuant of the decisions taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, the principles

embodied in statements made at the main conferences of the non-aligned countries, and particularly at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979, the Non-Aligned Movement has affirmed and reiterated its total and unqualified support for the armed struggle of the Namibian people and has pledged itself to strengthen its moral, political, military, diplomatic and material support to contribute to the victory of that struggle.

147. It is up to the Government of the United States and its allies to choose what path to follow, whether to continue on a path of confrontation with the Namibian people and world public opinion or to co-operate in order to achieve a solution that will guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of Namibia.

148. The current session of the Assembly is meeting at a time when there is a heightening of international tension, when there is an attempt to impose a cold war in international relations, and when some are speeding up the arms race by deciding to begin production of the neutron bomb. The uncertain future of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and the stagnant global negotiations on international economic relations are further proof of the absence of political will on the part of the United States to resolve the basic problems of our times through co-operation and negotiation. In the Near East, in southern Africa and in Central America the imperialists make possible and provoke armed confrontation.

149. Against this background the Yankee imperialists attempt to distort the essence of the Namibian problem, which for the entire international community is a case of decolonization and illegal occupation of a Territory and try to place it in the context of the so-called East-West confrontation and defence of its so-called strategic interests in southern Africa, casting the Pretoria racists in the role of principal ally and regional policeman.

150. The Assembly is faced with one course only, if we truly wish to achieve a just solution for the case of Namibia, and that is progress in the implementation of the comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, including the oil embargo, in keeping with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations; it must call on all States Members of the United Nations to halt any type of economic, political or military co-operation with the *apartheid* régime and bring pressure to bear on it to bring about the speedy decolonization of Namibia in keeping with the plan adopted by the United Nations in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We must reiterate our support for the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO in application of the basic principles of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Charter of the United Nations and General assembly resolution 1514 (XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

151. The choice is clear. Either we resort to the machinery that has been created by the United Nations to guarantee the inalienable rights of peoples through peaceful means or the international community will have to bear the unforeseeable consequences that may

result if once again the decisions of the Organization are frustrated.

152. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The question of Namibia cannot be taken as anything other than one of colonial domination. It is a matter related to decolonization that must be resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV).

153. That conclusion, contained in the Panama Declaration on Namibia⁷ adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia at its extraordinary plenary session held in the capital of my country on 5 June 1981, is the most authoritative guide to our work.

154. Thus the United Nations Council for Namibia, faced with the inability of the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, quite justifiably adopted the Panama Programme of Action on Namibia,⁷ which, among other things, called for the speedy convening of this emergency special session with the participation of Ministers for Foreign Affairs in order to consider the question of Namibia and to adopt appropriate measures pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations.

155. That appeal was echoed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981.

156. With regard to the item now under consideration the Assembly should take into account the valuable contribution made by the final communiqué of the front-line States issued at Luanda on 15 April 1981; the final communiqué of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries on the Question of Namibia, held at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981; the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa and the Special Declaration on Namibia adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981; the relevant decisions adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981; the consensus adopted by the Special Committee at its 1195th meeting, held in New York on 14 August 1981; and the statement dated 26 August 1981 issued by the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

157. At the ministerial meeting at Algiers my country maintained, as it does now, that it is fundamental to implement the settlement plan for Namibia approved by Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), which has been universally recognized as the only valid framework within which to effect a peaceful transition and which must be implemented without further delay in order to achieve the speedy independence of Namibia.

158. The memorandum of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been issued as an official document of the Assembly [*see A/ES-8/3*], thanks

to the commendable diligence of its President, Mr. Lusaka, makes it unnecessary for me to refer to the historical background of the issues, as that document is a concise and accurate synthesis and assessment of the serious situation which prevails in Namibia as a result of the continued illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa.

159. As the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only legitimate authority for the Territory until its independence, maintains, the question of Namibia should not be linked with other unrelated questions in order to try to justify the continuance of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime.

160. No one fails to see that the basic problem lies in the illegitimate military occupation of Namibia by South Africa. That illicit international situation continues to prevail 10 years after the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, dated 21 June 1971,¹ and that alone is full justification for the armed struggle against South Africa.

161. The legitimacy of Namibia's war of independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, has the support expressed in many resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. SWAPO holds a legitimate position. South Africa holds an illegitimate position. That conclusion is based on the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which declared that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa had immediately to withdraw from Namibia and that the States Members of the United Nations were obligated to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and to refrain from any act or dealings with South Africa with respect to Namibia.

162. For its part, the General Assembly recognized SWAPO as the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people and supported the legitimacy of the armed struggle under the leadership of SWAPO. The General Assembly has repeatedly recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people in all its forms, including armed struggle, in order to assume power and establish a democratic State. Within its field of competence the Security Council, in its resolution 473 (1980), also recognized the legitimacy of that struggle aimed at the establishment of a democratic State.

163. Such recognition is unimpeachable since any attempt to put down the struggle against colonial and alien domination and against racist régimes is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*], the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and is therefore a threat to international peace and security.

164. In that connection I should add that the General Assembly, in resolution 3103 (XXVIII) of 12 December 1973, formally proclaimed the basic principles of the legal status of the combatants struggling against colonial and alien domination and racist régimes. That resolution established that those anti-colonialist con-

flicts are to be regarded as international armed conflicts in the sense of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and the legal status envisaged to apply to the combatants in the 1949 Geneva Conventions and other international instruments is to apply to the persons engaged in armed struggle against colonial and alien domination and racist régimes.

165. The holding of the current emergency special session in our view will have an eminently positive effect, since the moral force of mankind is mobilized in this forum. We know full well that there are many sceptics who believe that no resolution adopted by the Assembly could force South Africa to abide by the agreements contained therein. Such persons of little faith also say that resolutions of the Assembly only have a recommendatory effect and that those addressed to the Security Council would encounter insurmountable obstacles there.

166. Panama does not share that view. While it is true that resolutions of the Assembly are not mandatory as are those of the Security Council, no one will venture to deny that, whenever a proposal is put to the vote in the Assembly, we are virtually conducting a plebiscite at the international level, which carries specific weight as regards taking decisions to resolve contemporary problems.

167. Whenever the 154 States that make up the Assembly adopt a given decision by an overwhelming majority, a decision that is not subject to veto, that is in itself of undeniable moral force. That was the idea which prevailed when on 3 November 1950 resolution 377 A (V), was adopted, giving rise to rules 6, 8, 9 and 63 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly on the convening of emergency special sessions. It is therefore logical and sensible for the United Nations Council for Namibia, OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement to have agreed upon the advisability of considering the serious situation which prevails today in Namibia in the plenary Assembly. Naturally the aggrieved party, which is none other than the people of Namibia and the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the Organization which support Namibian independence, have no option as regards the choice of forum within the United Nations system where they wish their cases to be discussed and resolved through resolutions which, in addition to being effective, would be enforceable. It might well be asked why a choice of forum is not available within the United Nations system. There is an obvious answer. A serious crisis exists within the United Nations. On the question of Namibia practically all peaceful means have been exhausted. The International Court of Justice decreed the withdrawal of South Africa from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia. Ten years have elapsed without that decision being implemented.

168. The Security Council has adopted many resolutions to the same effect without their being implemented. That is happening despite the fact that the Council bears the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. To say that the system of international security currently in force is based on the tenets set forth in articles 4, 25 and 103 of the Charter is not just an idle remark.

169. If, despite the binding force of these clear provisions of the Charter, resolutions of the Security Council and the judgement of the International Court of Justice are not being implemented, it is obvious that the international community is faced with a crisis of great magnitude which is daily worsening owing to the erosion of the spirit of détente and the serious increase in international tension brought about by super-Power rivalries.

170. As a member of the Security Council and a member of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, the Government of Panama has proclaimed a policy of unqualified support in all international forums for the independence of a united Namibia within the United Nations system and for the struggle of African peoples for their final liberation. To this end Panama is striving to contribute to the full implementation of resolution 1514 (XV), so that colonialism, racism, *apartheid*, arbitrary repression and political persecution may disappear once and for all from southern Africa.

171. Furthermore, the Panamanian Government has deemed it advisable, through President Arístides Royo, to express special gratitude to the Governments of the front-line States for their noble and costly contribution to the struggle for the freedom and independence of Namibia. The attacks frequently launched by South Africa against these countries deserve the condemnation and the repudiation of the international community and call for concerted action by the United Nations, as in the case of the unjust and reprehensible aggression at present inflicted on the People's Republic of Angola, which must be stopped as a matter of urgency by bringing into play the machinery established in the Charter.

172. We emphasize that the Assembly is a formidable body of tremendous political value and extraordinary moral force for promoting the independence of Namibia. Furthermore, it is a psychological factor in discouraging South Africa in its attempt to intensify the war against the people of Namibia and against the African States and for putting an end to the exploitation, plundering and pillaging of the natural resources of Namibia.

173. South Africa identifies itself with the hateful régime of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, which thwarts human progress, peace and justice. We urge the Assembly once more to condemn it and to recommend the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter, because of its lawlessness. In the harshest and frankest terms we must reopen here the discussion of the Nazi-Fascist methods which led to the Second World War and which are today being fiercely applied in southern Africa.

174. The Assembly has already expressed its conviction that the doctrine of segregation being practised in South Africa is based on racial discrimination and ethnic superiority, which is scientifically false, morally reprehensible and socially unjust. We must therefore intensify national and international efforts to ensure the speedy independence of Namibia, with due respect for its national unity and its territorial integrity. We believe that our actions should not only be aimed at stepping up the political struggle but also at increasing

the struggle against *apartheid* and racial discrimination as crimes against human dignity and the human conscience.

175. South Africa in our times represents the rebirth of nazism, racial intolerance and an ideology based on terror. In South Africa, with understandable repercussions on the Territory of Namibia, racial prejudice and discrimination combine with official terrorism to make racism a State policy. It is therefore understandable that the representative of the African National Congress [ANC], Mr. Johnstone Makatini, on Thursday last week in the Security Council⁸ stated that the Council could not encourage by default a further deterioration of a situation in South Africa which was already explosive and whose explosion could poison racial relations not only in Africa but throughout the world for decades to come.

176. The far-reaching scope of that statement, delivered dispassionately, should not pass unnoticed. Bitterness and resentment have been superseded by the sensible description of a terrifying reality, which the statesmen of our times should avoid if they wish to act in keeping with the spirit of our times.

177. I should like to recall that the Freedom Charter, the political platform of ANC, proclaims in its preamble with a well-balanced sense of coexistence that:

“We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:

“That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white...

“... ”

“That only a democratic State, based on the will of all the people, can secure to all their birth-right without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief”.⁹

178. There is no doubt that South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the use of force to attack other front-line States is more than a hostile act against the people of Namibia; it is an act of aggression against the United Nations, the authority which bears the legal responsibility for that Territory until independence.

179. In the circumstances Panama advocates that the States members of the Assembly should take concerted action to bring about the conditions necessary for a viable agreement on the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. In the recent debates in the Security Council on the complaint by Angola against South Africa's aggression, we should welcome the highly positive stand taken by France and the United Kingdom, which could serve as a bridge in the case of Namibia leading to greater achievements by the Western Powers constituting the contact group.

180. In our view, international pressure must be intensified so that South Africa will not only consent to the speedy independence of Namibia but will also put a stop to the political persecution of the opponents of *apartheid* which takes the form of the detention and torture of members of SWAPO and the Namibian people.

181. The United Nations must mobilize international public opinion so that South Africa will cease its militarization of Namibia and its acts of aggression

against African States, especially Angola—which is unjustifiably invaded today—Botswana, Mozambique and Zambia and, furthermore, its destabilization of the neighbouring States, most particularly Angola.

182. We also believe that, in the context of establishing a new international economic order, a halt must be called to the accelerated plundering by South Africa of the natural resources of Namibia.

183. I must conclude by requesting, on behalf of the Panamanian delegation, the Assembly to adopt whatever measures are within its competence and to recommend agreement on those measures falling under the authority of the Security Council, in order to give more effectiveness to the Programme of Action on Namibia adopted in Panama on 5 June 1981 by the United Nations Council for Namibia. The Panama Programme of Action encompasses political measures, an arms embargo, an oil embargo, economic sanctions and other undeniably important measures.

184. As proclaimed in the Panama Declaration on Namibia, all members of the international community have pledged themselves to redouble their efforts to achieve the independence of Namibia, in order to contribute to developing stable and harmonious relations and to hasten the dawn of an era of peace and harmony, as envisaged by the founders of the United Nations. It is clear that an international consensus exists that Namibia must be free without territorial dismemberment, without strings attached and without violating its national unity, which is as sacred for Namibians as for those from other parts of the world who support the heroic struggle which the freedom fighters are waging for their final independence.

185. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): We are meeting in this emergency special session to consider once again the question of Namibia because all the other efforts we have patiently exerted in various forums have not resulted in the liberation of Namibia.

186. Fifteen years ago, the United Nations assumed responsibility over what was then called South West Africa by terminating the Mandate exercised by South Africa. Since then, South Africa has contemptuously rejected all United Nations decisions and has arrogantly refused to bring its policies into conformity with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the international community. The United Nations has therefore repeatedly called for South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia and the restoration of the Territory to its people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative.

187. In the United Nations and in other forums we have for years been talking about South Africa as a racist, Fascist and oppressive régime, sometimes perhaps without full cognizance or a deep understanding of the true nature of that régime. First of all, we must recognize that South Africa is a Government of none but a meagre minority. Secondly, it practises a system of racism of the worst order known in the world today. Thirdly, it simply imprisons people whose only crime is to clamour for their right to freedom and to live freely in their own country, or workers who are merely seeking better pay and better working conditions. Fourthly, it ruthlessly colonizes Namibia and by coercion and oppression attempts to

impose a bogus government on the people of Namibia. Fifthly, it thoroughly exploits the natural resources of the Territory in co-operation with transnational corporations. Finally, it uses Namibia as a launching pad from which to attack neighbouring countries for no reason other than their support for the independence of Namibia. That is the nature of the régime with which we in the United Nations have long been confronted.

188. How is it possible for such an odious régime, which has been despised for so long by the international community, to survive? The answer to this is that, quite apart from the reign of repression which it enforces in that country, it is the recipient of the support that is extended to it by a number of States which maintain expedient ties and trading relations with the Pretoria régime. In the United Nations, it depends on vetoes in the Security Council in order to survive. It can remain a Member of the Organization only through the indulgence of its Members, in their hope that it will change, mend its ways and regain acceptance.

189. It was the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) that raised our hopes for the early withdrawal of South Africa and the proclamation of a free and independent Namibia. Only last January, we were very hopeful that the Geneva pre-implementation talks would finally pave the way for the achievement of independence. Resolution 435 (1978), as we all know, was adopted on the initiative of the five Western Powers as a viable formula for a peaceful solution that SWAPO accepted and that Members supported in good faith. After initially accepting that resolution, South Africa lost no time in spurning the plan by imaginary allegations of partiality on the part of the United Nations, and it began to concoct an internal settlement for Namibia. It has raised more and more demands and has introduced other elements unrelated to the issue.

190. It was against this backdrop that the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at New Delhi early this year, held the Pretoria régime responsible for undermining the pre-implementation meeting and sought comprehensive economic sanctions to end the Territory's illegal occupation. The meeting of the Council of Ministers of OAU held last February at Addis Ababa endorsed that position. At the Algiers Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries last April, an appeal was made to the Security Council to impose sanctions. Much to our regret and disappointment, and despite the strong urging by no less than 19 Foreign Ministers, including the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, the Council failed to adopt reasonably formulated resolutions that would impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions. This failure of the Council, which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, was caused by the negative votes of the permanent members, who were members of the contact group that initiated resolution 435 (1978). We deplore their attitude and their action, which have once again dashed our hopes. It is because of this failure that we are meeting here today in this emergency special session.

191. The question remains: how long will the international community continue to tolerate South Africa's

defiance, or are we going to take concrete action to end Pretoria's intolerable tactics?

192. The increasingly repressive action of South Africa against the people of Namibia, its continued illegal occupation of the Territory and its renewed acts of aggression against African States constitute a threat to the peace and security, not only of its neighbouring States, but of the whole continent and even the world. In this context, the Government of Indonesia has issued a statement expressing its strong condemnation of South Africa's premeditated attack and occupation of parts of Angola and has called upon the Pretoria régime to withdraw immediately.

193. At this stage, when after more than 30 years of continuous efforts Namibia is no closer to freedom, it is imperative for this session to chart new and stronger measures, including comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa; otherwise we may well face a situation that will be too terrifying even to imagine. While discussing the explosive situation in Namibia, my Foreign Minister, in his statement in the Security Council on 22 April 1981, said the following:

"In view of the failure of all United Nations peaceful efforts to achieve Namibian independence and overcome South Africa's defiance, we seem now to have arrived at a dead end situation in which diplomatic approaches have become increasingly unproductive. This state of affairs will if it remains unchecked, bring us to the brink of a really uncontrollable situation, further endangering international peace and security."¹⁰

194. Despite the gloomy picture and the evident difficulties faced by the Security Council in securing a clear-cut resolution, we must persist in our efforts to have the Council adopt appropriate measures. At the same time, this session must also consider what collective measures we can voluntarily take with a view to forcing South Africa to respect the right of the Namibian people to freedom and independence. In my delegation's view this session should decide on measures, including those recommended at the extraordinary plenary meeting of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in Panama last June, that will drive South Africa to the point of isolation and force it to liberate Namibia.

195. One of the most important measures in that regard is the flow of arms to South Africa. Despite the existence of the Security Council's arms embargo, it is well known that weapons continue to reach that country. South Africa has even acquired a nuclear capability, which it uses to blackmail African States. The flow of arms will undoubtedly continue unless we scrupulously observe the provisions of the Security Council's mandatory sanctions banning the sale of arms to South Africa.

196. The General Assembly's recommendation of an oil embargo has proved to be less than effective. As South Africa's survival depends upon its oil supply, the oil-producing countries should enhance their vigilance to prevent oil from reaching South Africa by tightening their laws and regulations and by improving their monitoring systems.

197. South Africa's trade and economic relations with its partners, despite the many resolutions of the General Assembly, have increased, while the natural resources of Namibia continue to be ruthlessly exploited. Other sectors deserving our attention include the banning of communications to, and sports relations with, South Africa.

198. To make those measures effective, we need the world-wide co-operation of the private sector as well, of trade unions, of student bodies, and of other socio-economic and religious groupings; such organizations should undertake actions parallel to those of the national Governments in order to isolate South Africa still further. To that end, we call upon the United Nations Council for Namibia to intensify its efforts and to contact those bodies in order to seek their co-operation and further to enlighten world opinion. To enable the Council to function effectively, we are confident that the United Nations will provide it with the necessary funds and manpower.

199. Indonesia, for its part, has enacted laws and regulations banning trade and other relations with South Africa and has not only imposed sanctions but has also remained vigilant with regard to possible violations.

200. In conclusion, my delegation should like to assure the session of our firm support for Namibia's liberation and statehood. We are confident that the solidarity demonstrated here will usher in a new stage of mobilization of support, which will enable an independent Namibia to take its rightful place in Africa and the world.

201. Mr. RODRIGUES (Angola):* Mr. President, on behalf of the Government and delegation of the People's Republic of Angola, I extend to you our best wishes on your assuming the presidency of this emergency special session, after having so ably conducted the proceedings of the thirty-fifth regular session of the General Assembly. This session is surely one of the most important in the history of the African continent, and hence of importance to the United Nations.

202. On this occasion, I should also like to convey our appreciation to the Secretary-General, to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to the Council, and to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Namibia, for the way in which they have been discharging their duties at this difficult time.

203. With revolutionary pride, we also greet our comrades from Namibia and the SWAPO delegation. We are fellow travellers of the revolution. Their cause is our cause, their struggle is our struggle, and their potential liberation is an extension of our own.

204. For a long time, Africa was treated as the forgotten continent—forgotten for all other purposes except the exploitation and plundering of its human and other valuable resources and the pillaging of its lands. Africa's ancient civilizations and institutions were deliberately destroyed and replaced by the worst excesses of racist, imperialist and colonial rule.

205. It appears that there are some who still think of our continent in those terms. The international com-

* Mr. Rodrigues spoke in Portuguese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

munity has been dealing with the issue of Namibian independence for a long time but has not yet succeeded in ending the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist South African régime.

206. Namibia is a unique case in the history of the United Nations. It is the first time that the United Nations assumed direct responsibility for a Territory. However, the enslavement of Namibia by the racist régime has withstood the 1966 termination of the League of Nations Mandate, the creation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the judgement of the International Court of Justice, the holding of two previous special sessions on Namibia, and innumerable Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and other international declarations.

207. And yet, today, Namibia is still under military occupation and racist rule, while South Africa flouts the Charter of the United Nations, violates United Nations resolutions and insults the international community.

208. War cannot for a single minute be separated from politics. That is why, throughout, the people of Namibia and the friends of Namibia have sought and participated in constructive negotiation. On a few occasions in the past few years, after the five Western countries undertook a series of consultations and negotiations, it seemed that a way out of the impasse was in sight. But time and time again, the racist régime in Pretoria succeeded in deceiving the international community. Since late 1977, the racist régime's strategy has been to buy time. It has hedged, obfuscated, and stalled to give the illusion that it was as serious as the rest of us in the search for an internationally acceptable solution on the issue of Namibian independence. All the while, however, the Pretoria régime strengthened its military, political, economic and administrative grip on the Territory. It held sham elections, it created an illegal "government" structure, it created artificial parties designed to foster civil war among the people of Namibia; it imported thousands of racist troops and paramilitary and police personnel into Namibia, it launched attacks on the People's Republic of Angola and the refugee camps located in Angolan territory, it created "tribal" armies, it divided Namibia into zones and concentration camps, it quickened its pace in the exploitation of Namibia's vast natural resources, it tried to quell the total support given by the people of Namibia to their liberation movement, SWAPO, through murder, harassment, and intimidation, and it tried to break the resistance of the Namibian people.

209. Simultaneously, the racist régime, within its own borders, has created a *laager* mentality, it has built up its military and nuclear capability to the extent that it can now threaten Africa, and it has enacted a law allowing it to attack any African country south of the equator. The Kalahari desert in Namibia has been illegally used by the racist régime for nuclear testing.

210. The revolutionary independence of Angola and Mozambique was considered a direct threat by the racist régime to its system of government and its way of life for the minority; the glorious independence of Zimbabwe under the leadership of the Patriotic Front, after a fair and free election, was another traumatic blow. It was confirmed for the racists that

a genuine liberation movement that has worked for its people and has the support of the people will win against the most overwhelming odds, and that the people reject puppets and protégés foisted on them by colonial and imperial masters.

211. Ultimately, the persecutor is terrified of his victim. That is why he must silence him for ever; and that is why the racist, terrorist régime cannot allow a genuinely free and independent Namibia, cannot think of a SWAPO government in power in Namibia.

212. The racist régime is not interested in an internationally acceptable settlement. It is interested only in a settlement acceptable to itself and compatible with its *apartheid* system, a settlement that would allow Pretoria to maintain and extend its hegemony and terrorism over southern Africa.

213. The prestige of the authors of the plan for independence gave us the hope that Namibia would soon be free, but recent statements from certain quarters give us more qualms than confidence. We are being asked to tolerate racism and terrorism, colonialism and imperialism in the heart of southern Africa, because South Africa is of strategic importance to some countries. Yes, we know that South Africa has 64 per cent of the world's vanadium, 49 per cent of the world's gold reserves, 86 per cent of the world's platinum and allied minerals and 83 per cent of the chromium reserves. These are used to build up South Africa's economic and military strength, but the advantages of this are denied to the people who are the true owners of these resources—the majority inhabitants of South Africa. We also know that the United States alone imports from South Africa more than 98 per cent of the cobalt it uses, 99 per cent of its manganese and 91 per cent of its chromium.

214. South Africa's commercial links with its Western imperialist allies allow it to insult the United Nations. With its nuclear capability, South Africa has acquired a nuclear shield for *apartheid*; Namibia's resources, illegally plundered by the racist régime, contribute heavily to underwriting Pretoria's state terrorism in southern Africa. In effect, the Namibian people are being forced to underwrite their own oppression.

215. I should like briefly to discuss a few issues connected with South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the connected denial to the Namibian people of their inalienable right to independence.

216. The Secretary-General's plan for the independence of Namibia is one in which the racist régime has been involved, and on which it has been consulted, from the first moment. All of us, especially SWAPO and the front-line States, have accepted a number of compromises in the interest of early and genuine independence for the Namibian people. In fact the People's Republic of Angola has been instrumental in resolving a number of issues that were deadlocked, first by some constructive suggestions by our late beloved leader, Mr. Agostinho Neto, and then by Comrade José Eduardo dos Santos, President of the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA)-Workers Party and President of the People's Republic of Angola. Our flexibility and co-operation earned us violent attacks and armed invasions by the racist armed forces of South Africa. One such invasion was

the subject of a Security Council debate a few days ago.

217. I would like to inform the international community that today the racist South African troops are in illegal occupation not only of Namibia but also of areas in southern Angola. They continue to meet with resistance from the Angolan patriots, especially the Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola, and they continue to bomb Angolan cities and massacre Angolan civilians.

218. Action by the Security Council on the armed invasion of my country by the racist troops was stopped by a veto, a veto by South Africa's biggest and closest political, economic and commercial partner. If present attitudes are any indication, the international community may just have to look for other avenues of support and pressure on South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia and allow implementation of the Secretary-General's plan.

219. Another issue I wish to discuss is the central role played by the vanguard party of the Namibian revolution—SWAPO. SWAPO was not merely awarded recognition by OAU and the United Nations as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia; it won that status by hard work, perseverance and sacrifices and by virtue of the role it plays in the lives of the Namibian people and their struggle for independence. SWAPO freedom fighters spearhead their nation's demand for independence. They represent the people of Namibia inside and outside the country. They face the bullets of the racist troops. They run schools, hospitals and refugee camps. SWAPO has an armed wing, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia. SWAPO freedom fighters give their lives in defence of their fatherland. SWAPO has been recognized by the majority of the international community. Since political means have not yet yielded victory in the form of independence for Namibia, no one has the right to ask SWAPO to renounce its armed liberation struggle; and no one has the right to criticize those countries that assist SWAPO—in fact this assistance has been legitimized, indeed requested, in OAU and United Nations resolutions.

220. The continued and increasing involvement of the United Nations in the issue of Namibian independence is the only guarantee we have of impartiality and fairness in all the procedures leading to independence. Is the United Nations biased and partial? Yes, it is, as it is enjoined to be by the Charter of the United Nations and by countless Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and declarations. It is enjoined to be biased and partial on the side of peace, security, freedom, independence, liberation, decolonization and justice. No one has the right to ask the United Nations to go against the principles on which and for which it was founded.

221. There is the matter of Walvis Bay and South Africa's illegal and invalid incorporation of Walvis Bay into the racist Republic of South Africa. Is the international community going to give to the people of Namibia a truncated, amputated Namibia, cutting out a piece of its body, with South Africa for ever poised with a dagger to plunge into Namibia's heart? The 434-square-mile area is Namibia's only deep-water

port and handles 90 per cent of its export trade. South Africa has recently turned Walvis Bay into a fortress housing the headquarters of the newly formed counter-insurgency unit of the navy, a rapidly expanding air force base and South Africa's only motorized infantry regiment. Walvis Bay also houses very sophisticated radar and communications installations.

Mr. von Wechmar (Federal Republic of Germany) resumed the Chair.

222. Even under the Secretary-General's plan, no reduction is envisaged of South African forces in Walvis Bay, and South Africa is no doubt dangling the South Atlantic's biggest natural harbour as a very tempting carrot in front of the North Atlantic alliance, on whose behalf the racist régime would continue to terrorize the South Atlantic. Walvis Bay is an integral part of this scheme. Racist control over Walvis Bay would also threaten Angola and other African countries on the Atlantic's eastern shores. Are we to legitimize and accept the break-up of the historical Namibian fatherland? Are we to agree to the Balkanization of Namibia?

223. My Government has supported and continues to support Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only internationally acceptable political solution to the question of Namibian independence. We have invested many years in it and have banked on it to bring peace to Namibia. The United Nations must not abdicate its responsibility vis-à-vis Namibia, or allow its mandate to be weakened in any way. The United Nations must demonstrate its capability to act at a time when the future peaceful development of southern Africa is at stake and we, the States Members of the United Nations, must do everything in our power to keep the role of the United Nations in Namibia as strong, as effective and as prominent as we can.

224. The situation is at the danger-point. War could engulf the whole of southern Africa at any time. It is already raging in southern Angola with the military occupation by the racist troops. Now, what many countries feared has actually come to pass: there are nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists, the racist terrorists of South Africa, and the region's fragile stability could be disturbed at any moment.

225. Revolutions are not made; they come out of the past. We need revolutions to obtain freedom, as well as to preserve it. We pledge our full support and solidarity to SWAPO and to the people of Namibia. Their victory shall be Africa's victory. Now is the time for Governments and peoples to re-examine their commitment to Namibian independence and to the Charter of the United Nations, to strengthen that commitment and to abide by it.

226. In support of Namibian independence, we declare, as Churchill did:

“Victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival”.

227. *A luta continua.*

228. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, I wish to pay a tribute to you for the admirable manner in which you have been guiding the work of the General Assembly. Your experience, wisdom and leadership have been a most valuable asset to the Assembly in

its deliberations on issues of great significance to the international community. We are confident that you will be able to guide the proceedings of this emergency special session with equal success.

229. The current emergency special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia is taking place at a time when the arduous struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination and national independence has entered a final phase. It is our earnest hope that Members of the United Nations will summon all the resources at their command to bring to an early close the dark era of colonial and racist repression in Namibia.

230. The prospect for the liberation of the Namibian people had brightened when three years ago the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), charting out a programme for Namibia's transition to independence. The administrative arrangements for the holding of United Nations supervised elections in the Territory envisaged in this resolution were based on a "proposal for a settlement of the Namibian situation",¹¹ drawn up by the Western contact group consisting of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. That proposal, which was the result of difficult and protracted negotiations undertaken by the group, was accepted by all parties concerned, including SWAPO and South Africa.

231. To the shock and dismay of the world community, South Africa, by design and deliberate manoeuvre, aborted the Geneva negotiations aimed at setting a date for the commencement of the independence plan for Namibia by questioning the competence of the United Nations to organize free and fair elections in Namibia. The failure of the Geneva talks exposed once again the ulterior motives of the racist régime in Pretoria directed towards the establishment of a subservient government in Namibia which would continue to enable South Africa to exploit the natural resources of that Territory.

232. In the pursuance of that design, South Africa has armed itself to the teeth and has acquired nuclear-weapon capability. It has resorted to increased use of force in an attempt to intimidate the neighbouring States and break their resolve to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism and racism in the continent of Africa. The latest instance is its massive armed attack against Angola, which has outraged the international community. Pakistan has joined in the universal condemnation of South Africa for that act of aggression against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola. Such a pattern of behaviour cannot be condoned under any circumstances.

233. The authors of the independence plan for Namibia have a solemn responsibility to thwart South Africa's sinister designs against the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to independence, and full sovereignty over their natural resources. They must fulfil their obligations towards the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Evasion of that commitment would inevitably lead to even greater violence and conflict in the area with incalculable consequences for their own security and for world peace.

234. We hope that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is upheld in all its integrity. Failure to uphold it will undermine the ability of the Security Council to fulfil its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It is therefore imperative that the international consensus as outlined in resolution 435 (1978) should be respected. The United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia adopted at an extraordinary Plenary meeting held last June in Panama, has also emphasized the importance of implementing the independence plan for Namibia as contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) "without any modification, qualification, dilution, prevarication or delay".⁷

235. In this context I should like to commend the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which has been mandated by the General Assembly as the legal Administering Authority, for the Territory until genuine independence is achieved. I also wish to pay a warm tribute to Mr. Lusaka, whose dynamic leadership of the Council has made a significant contribution towards promoting the cause of Namibia's independence.

236. The time has come to set a deadline for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and to fulfil the solemn obligation of the international community to lead the people of Namibia to full independence. Should South Africa continue to persist in its lawless behaviour, the international community must proceed to impose mandatory sanctions against it without further hesitation. It is only such a measure that will bring home to Pretoria that it stands isolated, condemned and discredited in the international community on account of its inhuman policies of *apartheid*, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its continuing aggression against the neighbouring States.

237. This emergency special session is a reaffirmation of the solidarity of the international community with the struggle of the indomitable Namibian people for freedom and national independence. It must therefore endorse the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and should unequivocally declare the commitment of the international community to seek its early implementation. The session must reaffirm its support to SWAPO, which is leading the liberation struggle of the Namibian people, and it must reiterate the universal condemnation of the abhorrent policies of racism and *apartheid* imposed by the minority Pretoria régime on the people of South Africa. It is also imperative that the General Assembly reaffirm the commitment of peace-loving peoples all over the world to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the front-line States which have become the victims of South Africa's increasingly relentless aggression.

238. The people of Pakistan share the deep indignation of the international community at South Africa's persistent defiance of the rules of international law and morality. As a non-aligned Islamic country, Pakistan has always extended full support to the just struggles of peoples against colonialism, imperialism and racism in all their manifestations and to the efforts of the United Nations to promote decolonization and the exercise by peoples of their right to self-deter-

mination. Our steadfast support of the courageous people of Namibia is based on our commitment to that principle and to the universal values of human dignity, equality and justice. We greet our brothers in Namibia and assure them that the day of their deliverance from colonial and racist oppression is not far away.

239. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): May I express our delegation's and my own pleasure at seeing you, Mr. President, presiding over this important session which has been convened in very difficult circumstances for the present and future of southern Africa in particular and for the African continent in general and for the support of peoples who love peace, independence and freedom in general, as well as all that concerns international peace and security. We are fully confident that, under your wise presidency, this important emergency special session will prove an important landmark on the road to Namibia's independence and the freedom of its people. That is an objective accepted by the great majority, albeit ignored by a minority, of the international community, the achievement of which is bound to become a reality.

240. The problem of Namibia seriously threatens international peace and security and is one that we consider to represent a continuation of the era of political and economic repression and the exploitation and colonization of Africa, which has struggled and sacrificed everything to eradicate these evils. Africa still stands ready to sacrifice and struggle until Namibia has been liberated from the last effects of South Africa's racist exploitative colonialism.

241. We had all hoped for a quick, peaceful settlement of the problem, but our hopes were disappointed by South Africa's manœuvres during the negotiations, manœuvres that were aimed at obstructing the implementation of the peaceful settlement plan. Notwithstanding the moderate and fair attitude of the African States and SWAPO, South Africa resorted to sabotaging the Geneva meeting by alleging that the time was not ripe for signing a cease-fire agreement and by casting doubts on the impartiality of the United Nations. Full responsibility for the failure of the Geneva talks must be borne by the South African Government and its partners, because South Africa used every means to wreck those deliberations so as to win time and to continue its illegal manœuvres against the people of Namibia.

242. As a result of those developments, last April the African States called on the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities for the implementation of the peaceful settlement plan in accordance with its resolution 435 (1978) and requested the Council to impose sanctions on South Africa for its failure to implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. Regrettably, the Security Council could not take advantage of that opportunity to discharge its responsibilities because some Western States objected to the imposition of sanctions against South Africa for many reasons, including the maintenance of their economic interests, despite the obligations they had undertaken to implement the peaceful settlement plan.

243. As a result of the failure of the Security Council to act, it was imperative for the African States to come to the General Assembly and call on it to discharge

its responsibility for the solution of this problem whose continuation is considered a violation of international peace and security and an explosive threat the consequences of which could extend beyond southern Africa. There is no greater proof of this than what happened during the past few weeks: the invasion of Angola by barbaric South African forces, which we unreservedly condemn. We declare Egypt's full solidarity with the spirit and letter of the draft resolution submitted in the Security Council which, regrettably, the Council was unable to adopt.

244. The President of Egypt reiterated our firm position on the question of Namibia in his statement to the Council on Foreign Relations during his visit to New York City on 7 August. He said:

"The case in point here is Namibia. The Security Council has unanimously adopted a resolution that reflects the legitimate aspirations of the people of that African nation. The racist régime in South Africa has decided to defy the entire world and maintain its control of the Territory. We in Africa believe that the United States together with its key Western European allies can bring more pressure to bear on South Africa to comply with the Security Council resolution".*

245. In the light of these developments the Egyptian delegation believes the following.

246. First, the peaceful settlement plan endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978) is the only legal plan for a peaceful settlement of the problem and must be implemented in full, without any amendment or modification, within a specific time-frame.

247. Secondly, our discussions at this emergency special session must lead to a strong condemnation of South Africa, which will not return to the negotiating table unless the maximum economic and political pressure is exerted on it by the Western contact group, as we see from the conclusions of the ministerial mission of OAU and its contacts with that group.

248. Thirdly, the international community is requested now more than ever to intensify its political, diplomatic and material support for the Namibian people in its just struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, its only legal representative.

249. Fourthly, it is necessary to exert full pressure on the States that have strong influence on South Africa to make them urge it to stop its co-operation with the racist régime, since their policies vis-à-vis South Africa encourage that country to take the resolutions of the United Nations lightly. In this connection we should like to pay a tribute to the French Government for its position on the draft resolution that was submitted to the Security Council during its consideration of the aggression by South Africa against Angola. We sincerely regret the positions taken by some of the permanent members of the Security Council during the vote on that draft resolution.

250. Fifthly, the resolutions of the United Nations have clearly shown the actions that must be taken by Member States. All Member States, whether individually or collectively, must implement those resolu-

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

tions and more particularly the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia, adopted on 5 June 1981 by the United Nations Council for Namibia⁷ and guarantee their execution.

251. In conclusion our delegation would like to reiterate Egypt's pledge to continue its support for the Namibian people in its just struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, its only legal representative, until it reaches real independence.

252. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Although we are convinced that time works in favour of those who defend just causes and that history moves forward and not backward, we must say that the latest meetings of the Security Council on the aggression of South Africa against Angola call into question the victory of good over evil and of justice for all, in view of the rules that at present govern the effective action of the Organization. Those rules still permit one of the five permanent members of the Security Council to stand alone in opposition to the will of the international community and to obstruct United Nations resolutions and the norms of international law governing the need to respect the sovereignty of independent States over their land and the right of peoples to self-determination.

253. Although this regrettable state of affairs is a source of disappointment to us, it cannot shake our faith in the role of the United Nations, whose responsibility is to restore justice; for, indeed, if we were to lose that confidence, that would mean that we accepted the *status quo* and the imposition of solutions by force in contempt of international agreements and law.

254. That is why we believe that the convening of the present emergency special session, immediately after the meetings of the Security Council which proved unable to take a decision against the racist Pretoria régime, will perhaps encourage the Namibian people to step up its struggle for national independence under the direction of SWAPO. For, in spite of everything, the result of the vote in the Security Council showed that the Namibian people was not alone in its struggle for independence and freedom and for the liberation of its country from the oppression of the South African minority régime.

255. As a result, despite the failure of the Security Council even to condemn a barbarous act of aggression committed without the least justification against an independent State, a Member of the United Nations, despite the fact that the Security Council was unable to impose economic and military sanctions against the Pretoria régime, and despite the inability of the United Nations itself to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council—and there are more than 20 of them—we must not allow the aggressors, the usurpers, to believe, even for an instant, that they can escape justice and enjoy impunity.

256. Perhaps this emergency special session is a reaffirmation of the following truth: it is natural and it is human, however heroic one may be, to hesitate and even feel despair in individual struggles, but the struggle of a people supported by the international community must be pursued to the end. I should pause for a moment after that sentence.

257. By "support" here we do not mean that we support the people with enthusiastic words, because words do not protect women, old men and children against bullets and words do not give back to its own masters a country that has been usurped. Regrettably the resolutions that have been and are being adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council, from Assembly resolution 65 (I) of 14 December 1946 to the resolution adopted during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, when the Assembly reaffirmed its past resolutions concerning Namibia [*resolution 35/227*], unless implemented and translated into action, will always remain just ineffective words. So the international community should not content itself with endorsing those resolutions concerning this important and unique issue.

258. The League of Nations entrusted to South Africa the administration of South West Africa, but the United Nations ended that Mandate in 1966, according to General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and resolved that South Africa should comply with the provisions of those resolutions in regard to its responsibilities in that region. But South Africa tried to interpret those resolutions differently, including during the negotiations between the South African Government and the representatives of Western countries under the auspices of the United Nations.

259. None of those negotiations led to any material result with regard to the achievement of that objective. South Africa claimed, at the Geneva meeting last January, that it was not yet ready to sign a cease-fire agreement and implement Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). That led the Secretary-General to comment in his message to the United Nations Council for Namibia on the occasion of the last Namibia Day, that we had missed the opportunity to achieve an acceptable solution to that chronic problem. The Secretary-General reaffirmed that this dead end we have reached in the negotiations on Namibia would not only have an effect on Namibia, but also on the prospects for peace and prosperity in the whole area.

260. Although we accept the legal responsibility of the United Nations to stand up to and face the attempt to usurp Namibia, to dismember it and to absorb its parts one by one, as in the annexation of Walvis Bay and the plundering of the natural resources and wealth of the Territory, we must also state that, as is shown by experience, the United Nations cannot implement its resolutions alone, unless it is supported by those States that have the power to influence the other parties concerned. Here it is the Western industrialized States which are giving the South African Government the necessary weapons, despite Security Council resolution 418 (1977), and which are helping it to achieve its objectives through the multinational corporations which are plundering the mineral resources of Namibia, including uranium.

261. Despite the fact that those countries have tried collectively to convince the racist régime in Pretoria that it is standing against the tide of history, those efforts have so far failed because of the intransigence of South Africa and also because the Western States do not apply the necessary pressure to make the Pretoria Government accept the logic of justice and law and not the law of the jungle. Despite all that, the

latest developments are not a cause for optimism; quite the contrary, they threaten us with more tensions because of the latest split in the Western States over Namibia. That split first appeared in the speech by Mr. Chester Crocker, the United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, delivered in Honolulu on 29 August, when he outlined the new policy of his Government concerning South Africa. That policy could honestly be summarized by saying that the United States Government is keen to develop its relations with the Pretoria régime in order to safeguard American interests and investments in South Africa and that it will not support "those dedicated to seizing... power through violence". That is a direct reference to SWAPO, which has the support of the United Nations and all countries in the world.

262. Lastly, this situation is encapsulated in Mr. Crocker's statement: "We are convinced that a satisfactory outcome can only be based on parallel movement toward Cuban withdrawal and vice versa". That means tying up the fate and future of Namibia with an issue that is concerned mainly with American strategy in the area and the rivalry among the great Powers for the control of that part of Africa.

263. This is not the place to discuss such issues; what is important to us is that the latest development, reflected in the result of the voting in the Security Council, could encourage the racist régime in Pretoria to persist in its intransigence and its contempt for the efforts to solve that issue on a fair and just basis.

264. I do not have to provide proof, because this situation is just the same as that being created by Israel in the Middle East. There Israel is making light of the rights of the Palestinians and the sovereign rights of the neighbouring Arab countries and is defying all international laws and agreements and United Nations and Security Council resolutions. Israel is also encouraged by the growing military, economic and political support provided by a super-Power.

265. Qatar, which denounces the colonization of Namibia by the racist régime and its continuing acts of aggression against the neighbouring African countries, reiterates that its constant position on this issue is on the following basis.

266. First, we reaffirm that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) are the basis for granting independence to Namibia in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the recent summit meeting of OAU at Nairobi.

267. Secondly, all illegal actions taken by South Africa with regard to the annexation of certain parts of Namibia, such as Walvis Bay, the Penguin and other off-shore islands, are null and void;

268. Thirdly, we reaffirm non-recognition of any internal settlement and acknowledgement that SWAPO is the sole legal representative of the people of Namibia.

269. Fourthly, we request the Security Council to shoulder its historical responsibility towards the Namibian people by applying pressure against the Government of South Africa to comply with the will of the international community through the imposition of mandatory sanctions, whether political, military or economic, under Chapter VII of the Charter;

270. Fifthly, we denounce *apartheid* and the policy of bantustanization practised by South Africa against the people of Namibia and we support the people of Namibia in its just struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, to achieve independence and freedom.

271. Mr. NISIBORI (Japan): The Territory of Namibia has had a difficult history and has long been a matter of international concern. Indeed, the United Nations has been dealing with the question of Namibia in good faith ever since the Organization was established 36 years ago. During this period many countries on the African continent have achieved independence. Namibia, however, has regrettably not yet gained that status in spite of all the efforts which States Members of the United Nations have made over many years.

272. The adoption of resolution 435 (1978) by the Security Council on 29 September 1978 was a source of hope to the international community that an independent Namibia would at long last be born. But, unfortunately, developments since then have turned the promise into a sour betrayal. That Namibia at this late date has still not gained its independence is a profound disappointment not only to the Namibian people but also to the international community as a whole. The feelings of frustration and justifiable anger which the Namibian people are experiencing are shared by people throughout the world. This truly lamentable situation is the direct result of South Africa's intransigence, and that country alone must bear the responsibility for it.

273. Following the tragic failure of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva early this year, the question of Namibia has been discussed on numerous occasions—in the Security Council in January, at the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in March and again in the Security Council in April.

274. On 3 March, during the deliberations of the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly and again on 4 April in the Security Council debate, my delegation expressed its deep regret over South Africa's uncompromising attitude which led to the failure of the pre-implementation meeting. We also expressed the hope that the South African Government would correctly understand the present situation and the growing indignation of the world community and that it would not obstruct efforts for a peaceful solution of this problem. My delegation expressed the hope that the South African Government would urgently consider the matter so that Namibia's independence could be achieved on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) at an early date. This hope was expressed by many other countries as well. That South Africa did not respond to such hopes was a great disappointment to all of us.

275. My delegation deeply deplores the reported establishment by South Africa of the SWA/Namibia Territory Force and the introduction of a conscription system in Namibia. Furthermore, we strongly condemn South Africa's recent use of Namibian territory in order to launch once again an invasion into Angola. These acts run directly counter to the efforts of the international community for the early achievement of Namibian independence through peaceful means. The Government of South Africa has already

accepted Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and now it must co-operate in its implementation. The international community will be sorely vexed if this is further delayed by South African intransigence.

276. Japan has consistently supported and highly evaluated the efforts of the five Western countries in seeking an early and peaceful solution of this problem. Such efforts include their settlement proposal, the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and their initiatives for conciliation and mediation.

277. After the failure of the Geneva meeting, the five Governments affirmed their commitment to vigorous action in the efforts to bring Namibia to independence at an early date. However, no concrete results have as yet been achieved. We take note of the communiqué, issued on 22 June in Ottawa, in which the Foreign Ministers of the five countries agreed upon the urgent need to continue the efforts to bring about the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in a manner that will command international approval. It is our earnest hope that the contact group will make further efforts, with resolution 435 (1978) as a solid basis, towards a solution of the question and that these efforts will reap positive results in the near future.

278. At this time I should like to reconfirm Japan's readiness to consider seriously all constructive proposals which may be presented for an early and internationally acceptable solution of the Namibian question.

279. For its part my Government has taken various concrete measures in connection with the question of Namibia which have gained the co-operation and understanding of the Japanese people. For example, my Government prohibits direct investment in Namibia and South Africa by Japanese nationals or corporate bodies under Japanese jurisdiction. As a result of this prohibition, no Japanese national participates in the management of any enterprise in Namibia.

280. Furthermore, the Japanese Government brought to the attention of the general public Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,¹² and the response has been positive. Other examples are my Government's annual voluntary contributions to various United Nations funds and programmes related to Namibia and its commitment to participate in the United Nations Transition Assistance Group that will be established as part of the process towards Namibia's independence. Thus the Government and people of Japan are clearly committed to co-operating with United Nations efforts to bring about an early independence of Namibia through peaceful means. I hope that these sincere efforts will be justly acknowledged by the United Nations Council for Namibia and by the international community at large.

281. On the occasion of Namibia Day, which was observed about a week ago, our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Sunao Sonoda, sent a message expressing

"the firm support and profound sympathy which the Government of Japan has for the Namibian people as they strive to attain basic human rights and national self-independence."

He also reconfirmed the Government's position that

"the settlement of the Namibia question is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, and that Japan remains committed to finding a solution to the problem on the basis of the provisions of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978)."

282. My delegation reiterates its intention to continue to co-operate with the United Nations in pursuing our common goal—the early and peaceful realization of Namibia's independence. Japan will make every possible effort to extend, through the United Nations, its co-operation to the people of Namibia. And when Namibia does gain its independence, my country will continue to extend co-operation throughout the ensuing period of nation-building.

283. In concluding, I should like to express the hope of my delegation that the current emergency special session of the General Assembly will prove to be constructive in hastening the day when the Namibians can start the process of building their independent nation.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

NOTES

1. See *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.

2. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-third Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1978*, document S/12827.

3. *Ibid.*, Thirty-sixth Year, 2267th to 2277th meetings.

4. Central Intelligence Agency/União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola/Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola.

5. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2296th meeting*.

6. *Ibid.*, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1981, document S/14458, annex, para. 12.

7. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 222.

8. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2295th meeting*.

9. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Session, Supplement No. 14*, para. 295.

10. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2268th meeting*.

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

12. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. 1, annex II.