



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

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: I wish to draw attention to two basic documents before the Assembly at the present session: the first [A/ES-8/3] contains the memorandum approved by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the second [A/ES-8/4] the consensus adopted by the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

2. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): Sixty-one years ago the League of Nations took its fateful decision to place Namibia, then South West Africa, under the Mandate of South Africa, charging that country with promoting to the utmost the national and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory. In those 61 years the question of Namibia has continuously taken a prominent place on the international agenda, and still today the inherent right of the Namibian people to self-determination, to independence, to a free and unrestricted exercise of their political will and to an uninfluenced decision about their own political future has not been fulfilled.

3. There is no need to go into the causes and into the history of the situation. The history is well documented, and the causes are all too apparent to everyone familiar with the problem. Austria has consistently associated itself with the United Nations plan for Namibia's peaceful and negotiated transition to independence. In the view of the Austrian Government, any political settlement which aims at stability and durability has to rest on the broadest possible basis, comprising all the parties engaged in the problem. The plan, originally put forward by the five Western Powers and subsequently endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), meets these basic requirements, as it provides for true self-determination on the basis of democratic and internationally supervised elections. Even in view of all the setbacks in the negotiation process, Austria continues to regard the United Nations transition plan as the most promising, and probably the only, way to discharge the special responsibilities of the United Nations for that Territory and to arrive at a genuine and peaceful transfer of power to the Namibian people. There already exists a wide area of agreement on the transition plan itself and on the establishment of a

demilitarized zone, an agreement which has been achieved in three years of intensive and difficult negotiations. The international community cannot permit these efforts to have been undertaken in vain or the agreement on so many important aspects of the plan to be of no avail.

4. Most recently, the South African Government has urged the need for constitutional guarantees of adequate minority protection in a future independent Namibia. One cannot but take a rather cynical view of that request, coming as it does from a Government which has disenfranchised the majority of its people and is based on a system of institutionalized oppression and racial discrimination. For the majority of the population of that torn country, "one man, one vote" and constitutionally guaranteed human rights are a far distant dream and, of all the countries involved in the Namibian problems, South Africa has the least right to promote that request.

5. Apart from that, what are the best guarantees for internal stability and a secure and stable future for everybody who lives in a country? Do not these guarantees arise from a climate of trust and confidence, of co-operation and togetherness and of a genuine and democratic exercise of political will rather than from a piece of paper argued over at the conference table?

6. The longer the situation in Namibia and the internal and external pressures on that country continue, the more difficult it will become to establish such a climate and to enable the people to have trust and confidence in anybody or in any group that will be granted political leadership.

7. But instead of appreciating fully the long-term advantages of a peaceful and internationally recognized transition of Namibia to independence based on democratic principles, South Africa has continued its policy of obstructing the final implementation of the United Nations plan. It has furthermore intensified its unilateral course of action, which started with the elections in Namibia and which creates a fictitious political reality in the Territory unacceptable to the international community.

8. The military presence of South Africa has increased, accompanied by new waves of detention and imprisonment of personnel of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO] and military strikes against SWAPO camps. South Africa's policy towards the front-line States has become even more aggressive and overbearing. The recent military invasion by South Africa into Angola, which still continues at the moment and, indeed, entails the danger of escalation of an already explosive situation, is further proof of the urgent need for implementation of the settlement plan and clearly demonstrates the desta-

bilizing effects of the Namibian question on the southern African region as a whole.

9. Austria deeply regrets that the Security Council has not been able to present to South Africa a decisive, swift and unanimous response to this latest act of aggression. Austria is firmly convinced that aggression or invasion, as well as every other breach of international law, has to be rejected, wherever and under whatever pretext it occurs.

10. We have repeatedly stated in previous debates that in our view the steps taken by the South African Government reflect a wrong assessment of the political situation, which could have grave and far-reaching consequences. That course can lead neither to a stabilization of the area nor to the establishment of an atmosphere of peaceful and mutually fruitful coexistence in southern Africa. On the contrary, it will inevitably lead to further violence and further bloodshed in the military struggle and will rightly increase the impatience of those who for so long have been deprived of the right to self-determination and independence.

11. Chief Gatsha Buthelezi once said, "You must do more than cry for us. We can drown in your tears". So let us recall briefly what is at stake.

12. At stake are the freedom and independence of a people. At stake is the chance of a whole region of the African continent achieving peaceful development, prosperity and stability. At stake are fundamental values and principles of pluralistic and democratic societies, values and principles on which the Organization has been built and which inspire the confidence that the States of the world place in it. And, last but not least, also at stake is the chance for South Africa to arrive at a solution of its problems and to achieve a transformation into a viable, democratic, multiracial and open society.

13. A permanent and valid solution will not be found through increased armed struggle, much as we might understand the motives of those who, in frustration and anger, have taken up arms as a last resort. A permanent and valid solution will have to be built in negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which contains all the elements for the transition of Namibia to independence.

14. On this basis we appeal to SWAPO and to the Governments of the front-line States not to give way to frustration and despair, but to uphold their commitment to the negotiating process and to continue the responsible role they have shouldered. We also add our voice to those who have urged the members of the Western contact group to persist in the negotiations and to continue the efforts to solve the problem within a United Nations framework. The continuation of the negotiations will, however, have to be supported by a commitment of securing respect for international justice and the rule of law and, should the powers of persuasion and argument really fail, to resorting to a set of carefully devised coercive measures, as provided for in articles of the Charter of the United Nations.

15. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 States Members of the European Community.

16. Namibia is a particular responsibility and concern of the United Nations. Indeed, for a great number of years it has been one of the most serious and intractable problems which the Organization has faced. The international community has consistently reiterated the view that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa must be brought to an end in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Regrettably, that aim has yet to be achieved. The 10 States members of the European Community adhere firmly to their conviction that the people of Namibia must be permitted urgently to exercise their right to self-determination and independence without further delay by means of free and fair elections on the basis of universal suffrage.

17. The plan for implementation approved by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which now commands overwhelming support, provides the basis for the achievement of internationally accepted independence for Namibia. That plan was accepted both by SWAPO and by the Government of South Africa. The past years have seen strenuous efforts made by the Secretary-General and by his Special Representative, by the front-line States, Nigeria and the Organization of African Unity [OAU], and by the five Western States that were the authors of the plan. The 10 members of the European Community consistently supported them. In January of this year, however, those efforts to implement resolution 435 (1978) suffered a most serious reverse at the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva.

18. At the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in March this year [105th meeting], my colleague, the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the members of the European Community, expressed our deep disappointment that the pre-implementation meeting had failed to set an early date for a cease-fire as a first step in implementing the settlement plan. The Geneva meeting, which for the first time brought together all the parties concerned, presented a unique opportunity to achieve Namibia's independence through an internationally acceptable solution. That opportunity was lost through South Africa's prevarication, for which we see no justification.

19. Moreover, inside Namibia itself, South Africa and its representative, the Administrator General, have taken steps which the Community regards as retrogressive, such as conscription, the most recent extension of the powers of the so-called Council of Ministers, and the second-tier elections. In the view of the community these actions are divisive. They exacerbate tensions inside the Territory. They are not consonant with an internationally acceptable solution. We reject any attempt to impose an internal settlement on Namibia.

20. The 10 members of the Community have repeatedly made clear that we regard it as of the utmost importance that South Africa should abide by its declared willingness to let Namibia gain independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We wish to underline the grave consequences of delay in the implementation of the settlement plan.

21. The recent large-scale incursions by South African forces into southern Angola demonstrate

again most vividly the urgent need for a peaceful solution. Our Governments have repeatedly condemned the resort to force as a means of resolving the problems of the area. The latest South African action has been widely condemned and our Governments have called for the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. Violence can only increase the suffering and bitterness of the local population.

22. We remain gravely concerned at the consequences for the whole region that result from continuing delay to reach agreement on implementation of the settlement plan. In our view, it makes it all the more necessary urgently to pursue the effort to bring about the independence of Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We welcome and support the continued readiness of the front-line States to work for a settlement on this basis and the determination of the five Western States to continue their effort. The right to self-determination and independence should not continue to be denied to the people of Namibia by South Africa. We urge everyone concerned—and above all South Africa—not to throw away the progress which was achieved and to examine all the possibilities that may help to bring about agreement on the implementation of the United Nations plan without further delay.

23. Mr. SAKA (Ghana): Sir, allow me, first of all, to express my delegation's pleasure at having you preside over this emergency special session, barely a fortnight before you relinquish the office which you have occupied with distinction. It is no accident of history that twice during your presidency you have been called upon to preside over the deliberations on the Namibia question. The well-deserved acclaim and respect you have won for yourself through the commendable manner in which you conducted the Assembly's thirty-fifth session and its resumption in March on the question of Namibia strengthen our hopes for success as we again discuss this problem. You can count, in the performance of this task, on the full co-operation and support of the Ghana delegation.

24. Among the issues that have confounded and frustrated statesmen repeatedly over a long period of time, one should surely mention the problem of Namibia. It is, indeed, most disturbing to think that, 25 years after the General Assembly adopted a policy on decolonization in resolution 1514 (XV), the people of Namibia should continue to be held in bondage.

25. South Africa still occupies Namibia despite the numerous decisions of the United Nations and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that its presence in the Territory is illegal.¹ Encouraged by a recent turn of events, South Africa has become even more defiant; the suspension in the negotiations has provided a welcome opportunity for a heavy military build-up in Namibia.

26. In apparent contempt for the Organization, Pretoria has even chosen the occasion of the current debate to launch a major military offensive against Angola. Since its independence in 1975, Angola has been subjected to a series of attacks by South Africa. About a week and a half ago, the international community received heart-rending reports about the subjection of innocent Angolan women and children

to abuse and indignity, the wanton destruction of property and, worst of all, an indescribable human carnage resulting from aerial attacks and bombardment by the South African soldiers who invaded Angola.

27. The latest incursion into Angola recalls vividly to mind a similar armed invasion of that country from the Territory of Namibia in the summer of 1980. The armed invasion of Angola by South Africa on 23 August is surely a very serious challenge to the Organization and is therefore deserving of unreserved condemnation. It is a matter of deep regret for the Ghana delegation that some Members of the Organization not only have failed to show the necessary courage to condemn such deliberate acts of aggression against a Member State but have sought to give the impression that Angola might not be entirely unblamable.

28. Considering the scope, duration and scale of destruction resulting from the invasion of 23 August, we most certainly do not need any further evidence that the Namibian problem is fraught with serious threats to international peace and security.

29. Yet the Security Council, which has the ultimate responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, has been rendered powerless; it is unable to fulfil its solemn obligations because of the exercise of the veto by certain permanent members of the Council. The series of meetings last April on the Namibia question² clearly demonstrated divisions and the lack of unanimity in the Council on the issue.

30. This emergency special session, therefore, is essentially a universal response to two concerns: first, the apparent inability of the Security Council to take resolute action in the face of the continuing defiance of the will of the world community by a racist colonial Power and, secondly, the recent turn of events, including the reported moves to revise Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and, presumably, to frustrate important initiatives of the United Nations to bring an end to the colonial era in Namibia.

31. A framework exists for Namibia's independence. It was approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), adopted with the concurrence of the Council's permanent members. On the basis of that resolution, pre-implementation talks were held at Geneva in January of this year. The failure of the Geneva talks, in consequence of South Africa's intransigence and insulting behaviour, demonstrated that Pretoria was not interested in negotiations; it had gone to Geneva to buy time with a view to perpetuating its illegal presence in Namibia.

32. After the Geneva experience, one would have thought that the logical next step would be for the international community to apply effective pressure on Pretoria to accept the opinion of the majority; indeed, one would even have expected that our Western partners would be the first to demonstrate such a commitment, since they were the originators of the idea of a negotiated settlement.

33. It is therefore distressing that, in spite of the clear pattern of South African deceit and evasiveness, the Security Council meetings in April failed to respond with appropriate measures to the serious challenges posed by South Africa. It is even more distressing to think that, after all the opportunities for a negotiated

settlement given the South African authorities, certain initiatives have been taken suggesting that further concessions need to be made to placate the racist Pretoria régime.

34. As of now, the Ghana delegation is not aware of the details of the reported changes which certain Western countries would like to see made in resolution 435 (1978). It is hoped that we shall soon have the opportunity of hearing the reasons behind the sudden shift of position on a document which our Western partners had authored and sponsored in the Security Council.

35. But, even at the risk of being accused of passing judgement before listening to the other side, let me state that the sudden about-turn on the part of the five members of the Western contact group is a serious betrayal of trust. The timing has gravely undermined the strength and confidence in which negotiations have proceeded thus far and the reported move has caused divisions among the ranks of the partners, exposing the entire approach to accusations of inconsistency and lack of seriousness. Indeed, it is an open secret that the sudden change of positions of our Western partners has encouraged the current upsurge of extremist feelings in South Africa and the increased waves of aggression against Angola.

36. The international community cannot view with indifference South Africa's repudiation of the Security Council decision; it cannot permit South Africa to continue its exploitation of Namibia and to frustrate the aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence. Nor can it permit the racist Pretoria régime to continue exploiting the natural resources of Namibia and pursue its unprovoked attacks against neighbouring independent African countries merely because those countries support the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people.

37. Despite the triple veto and reported moves by our Western partners, the universally acclaimed resolution 435 (1978), in our view, has by no means lost its relevance and validity. That resolution cannot be abandoned. For the same reason, the call by the majority of the international community last April for mandatory economic sanctions against the South African régime also remains valid.

38. The Security Council has an inescapable responsibility to compel South Africa to implement resolution 435 (1978) within a given time-frame. International meetings of the non-aligned countries and OAU, held at New Delhi and Algiers and lately at Nairobi, have been clear and unambiguous on the effective action that the international community should take in the light of the present impasse. There was a unanimous opinion at those meetings that negotiations with South Africa had gone on for too long; the overwhelming view was that the time had come to isolate the racist régime politically and economically.

39. The Ghana delegation fully supports that view. Unless the United Nations imposes coercive measures, Pretoria will continue to defy the will of the majority. It is our view, therefore, that the conclusions of this emergency special session should focus on three basic elements.

40. First, it must renew the call of last April to the Security Council to impose mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. It is not too late even for those countries which opposed mandatory economic sanctions against the racist régime to reappraise their policies. We are aware that it is difficult to reverse a policy to which one has been attached for a long time, but policies must change with new political realities. We would therefore urge those countries, particularly those which have special leverage on South Africa, to show the necessary political will and political courage and support the call by the majority of the Organization. If they refuse to avail themselves of this opportunity, posterity will blame them for failing to counteract racist terror, to stop bloodshed in southern Africa, and to promote international peace and security.

41. Secondly, the international community should renew its support of SWAPO, which, more than ever before, needs our moral and material support at this crucial stage of its struggle. It is our view that SWAPO should also be encouraged, as preparation for taking on greater responsibilities of management that lie ahead, to draw up a comprehensive programme for training Namibians who could take over the administration and management of their country at the appropriate time. The inexorable march to independence of Namibia has started; it is therefore important that SWAPO should be adequately equipped to provide sufficiently large cadres of trained administrative and technical personnel who can fill any vacuum that may be created on independence day.

42. Thirdly, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the interim Administering Authority for Namibia, should be encouraged to continue its present programme of publicizing facts about the problem of Namibia. The Council's visiting missions to various capitals, its seminars and hearings, including the recent hearings on uranium, are commendable efforts which could go a long way towards not only educating the international community about Namibia but also effectively counteracting powerful South African lobbies and propaganda.

43. In conclusion, I should like to place on record the deep appreciation of the Government of Ghana for the commendable role which the United Nations Council for Namibia has been playing in the face of these frustrations.

44. We in Ghana throughout the liberation struggle have stood firmly and continue to stand strongly behind SWAPO. We do so because we believe the cause of SWAPO and of the people of Namibia is right. We should like to use this opportunity to renew the expression of Ghana's unflinching support to SWAPO and its leadership in this final stage of their struggle to achieve freedom and independence for their people.

45. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the honour to convey to the members of the General Assembly the great appreciation of our Government and people for the OAU resolution, which led to the convening of this historic session of the General Assembly to step up the efforts by the international community as well as by regional and national organizations to put an end to

the occupation of Namibia, which is the question we are considering today.

46. We are quite sure that this question, as it has developed since the beginning of the year, can be dealt with only on an exceptional and urgent basis. Our Government reiterates in words and deeds, but above all in deeds, its support for the liberation struggle conducted by oppressed African peoples.

47. As regards the struggle of the people of southern Africa, Syria is in the vanguard of States which have adopted a clear position vis-à-vis the racist régime of South Africa. It decided to boycott that country and to break off all relations with it. Indeed, our country stands side by side with the people of Namibia and Azania against racism and to achieve freedom and independence.

48. We should like to emphasize the special nature of the common struggle being waged by our Arab nation and the African people. Our struggle is against racism, a racism that has two repulsive faces: one is that of racist zionism, now represented by Tel Aviv, and the other is the racist occupation by Pretoria of Namibia.

49. The explosive situation in South Africa, and in particular in Namibia, as a result of the occupation of that Territory by foreign forces and the acts perpetrated with deadly weapons against Angola lead us to turn to the origin of this question of the occupation of Namibia. The effects of this occupation are clear to everybody. There is no dispute about that.

50. In recent days we have seen that the only difference is between the world at large and the United States, which is attempting to crush the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa to obtain independence and to recover sovereignty over their territories.

51. Fifteen years ago now, despite the efforts of the imperialists and colonialists who then controlled the Organization, the General Assembly put an end to the Mandate imposed on the Territory of South West Africa after the First World War. That Mandate had been imposed at the height of the rivalry among Western imperialist Powers to despoil the peoples of their rights, their territory and their natural resources, which took place in the name of the imperialist slogan, ingeniously invented by General Smuts, the faithful friend of Weizmann and Cecil Rhodes in an attempt to make imperialism a legitimate system for the imposition of domination on other countries. The philosophy of this "juridical crime" and its catastrophic results have seriously affected large parts of Africa as well as Palestine with a view to its Judaization, as well as huge areas of the Arab homeland, which was broken up, making it impossible for it to achieve its aspiration to unity, freedom and independence.

52. Today the world is affected by two great crises which date back to the time of this Mandate and which threaten international peace and security. Thus, the origin of these two crises may be found in the Mandate and its consequences, which are, today, the coercion and the deprivation of their national rights of millions of human beings.

53. Fifteen years have passed since the General Assembly adopted its historic resolution putting an end

to the racist régime of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assuming direct responsibility for the despoiled region and people of Namibia. We have seen on a daily basis efforts made to consolidate *apartheid* in South Africa and to perpetuate it and its consequences in Namibia, which is suffering from foreign racist occupation. That occupation is accompanied by intensified plundering of the wealth of those regions by multinational corporations supported by interests which have made of the pillaging of peoples' wealth an economic and social asset, but this is contrary to the values we all individually and collectively respect in conformity with the Charter of the Organization with a view to preserving human dignity and the freedom of peoples. At the same time, South Africa's supporters, who repeat their slogans of democracy and humanitarianism in their respective countries, clearly see that the rights of the Namibian people are being trampled underfoot by South Africa thanks to the weaponry and wealth that it receives from those who claim to defend democracy in their own countries, whether this is true democracy or not.

54. Since the adoption of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) a great many things have been made clear, such as the scandal of the tripartite veto, and that has strengthened our conviction, as the children of those who have suffered and continue to suffer from imperialist practices, especially those of the United States, that there are people who regard the desire to bring about a peaceful solution to the problem in accordance with the United Nations programme for Namibia as a surrender or the endorsement of a bogus independence. This thesis is rejected by SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people, which is determined to pursue its armed struggle so that the people of Namibia are not left in a state of slavery at the mercy of illegal racist structures and entities. It is quite clear that the delaying tactics are intended solely to conjure up a false armistice in order to disrupt the great demonstration of international solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia to achieve its full independence.

55. These delaying tactics have failed and the true picture has become clear. We can now see the objectives being pursued by those bearing false witness, those who were attempting to stop SWAPO and to disrupt the world's solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed peoples. It should come as no surprise that the conspiracy against the people of Namibia has been unmasked. Similarly, the Arab people have seen through the false autonomy for Palestine fabricated at Camp David, which is being imitated by South Africa—an internal settlement that has been rejected by the entire world.

56. Our meeting today is evidence of the commitment of the whole world to the struggle of SWAPO, even armed struggle, in order to achieve final victory.

57. The Syrian Arab Republic, thanks to its clear grasp of the nature of imperialism and its practices, and since it is aware of the nature of the continuing conspiracy against peoples striving to achieve their independence and to retrieve their rights, is taking part in this session not just to express its full solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia against racist foreign occupation but also to condemn the

barbarous acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria régime for the purpose of putting an end to the struggle of Namibia against South African military and economic aggression. Moreover, the Syrian Arab Republic has also come here to state that our patience is now exhausted. Our full potential must now be mobilized, on all levels, in support of SWAPO and to help it to bring about the defeat of the aggressor. It is not enough to have awakened world public opinion to the justice of our cause in Africa. The régimes supporting South Africa have deceived their peoples and we even see those régimes shedding crocodile tears about the victims of *apartheid*. We can see that those régimes are giving the South African régime all possible support to enable it not only to strengthen its domination of the black majority in South Africa but also to defy the Security Council resolutions concerning the solution of the question of Namibia.

58. Given the tripartite veto, we believe that there is a conspiracy against putting an end to the occupation and against the recovery by Namibia of its sovereign control over its territory and its natural resources, which are being plundered by certain Western interests and profit-hungry companies. We do not hesitate to say that the United States Administration is responsible for the worsening of the situation in southern Africa. The last United States veto, on the draft resolution condemning South Africa's military act of aggression against Angola, is but further evidence of its aggressive aims against the African continent and primarily against the front-line States. That aggression is to a large extent, in terms of its nature, objectives and execution, comparable to the Israeli aggression against southern Lebanon. One is also struck by the fact that South Africa and Israel, given their racist and imperialist background, have co-ordinated and even synchronized their acts of aggression against Angola, Lebanon and the people of Palestine in order to terrorize those who have sworn that they will not lay down their arms until they have fully recovered their despoiled rights.

59. The last United States veto, preceded by the tripartite veto in the Security Council, confirms our belief that all available means to put an end to the occupation of Namibia have now been exhausted. It is therefore essential to formulate and implement a comprehensive strategy for mobilizing all men of good will in order to liberate Namibia and to remove all threats to the security of Angola. We must spare no effort to support the struggle of SWAPO and its noble objectives, and to strengthen the resistance of the front-line States.

60. We are convinced that a thoroughly worked-out strategy, agreed upon by us all, can put an end once and for all to the occupation of Namibia and can eliminate the systems and methods practised by the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria in Namibia. Like other speakers, we appeal for a common strategy to liberate Namibia. We have seen that possible measures by the Security Council will merely be aborted. Among those measures is the imposition of comprehensive, binding sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. The United States bears the primary responsibility for paralysing and immobilizing the Security Council and preventing it from discharging its essential responsibilities for taking steps to put a

halt to acts of aggression. It has done that by exercising its veto on the one hand and by using all means to encourage South Africa to continue with its present tactics on the other hand. We must rely upon ourselves, our friends and the struggle waged by SWAPO. That is now the only way to emerge from the shadows into the light of day.

61. As a member of the international community and as a delegation taking part in this decisive session urgently convened to consider the problem of Namibia which is a threat to international peace and security both in Africa and throughout the world, we consider that we must study the aims of Pretoria's terrorism against the African peoples as well as the terrorism practised by Israel against the Lebanese and Palestinian Peoples and against the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories. All of that comes within a broader American strategy, a world-wide plan to re-establish American domination and to deprive our peoples of their freedom and to destroy the achievements they have made since we put an end to occupation and imperialism. There is a fallacious concept called the "strategic entente" or the "rapid deployment force". We consider that that concept and the American manoeuvres are a threat to world peace and security and a challenge to the objectives and principles of non-alignment. The alliance between the United States, Israel and Egypt following the Camp David meetings and the events in South Africa are moves by United States imperialism to impose hegemony in southern Africa and West Asia.

62. The Camp David system set up in order to create a "greater Israel", in terms of population and geographic and military might, is nothing other than a mirror-image of the Baghdad Pact, which was denounced by Arab peoples everywhere. Whether they occur in Asia or in Africa, whether they are committed by Pretoria or by Tel Aviv to infringe the interests of our peoples and put an end to our fighting spirit and to wipe out our militants, we find ourselves between the hammer and the anvil. We oppose such manoeuvres, and the convening of this emergency special session represents a recognition of the dangers stemming from such new United States machinations.

63. Let us recall here that Washington's benediction of certain bloodthirsty, erroneous theories that are contrary to the letter and the spirit of Article 51 of the Charter only encourages the two racist entities—Israel and South Africa—to oppress our peoples. Clearly the United States accepts what are called the "right of hot pursuit", "pre-emptive strikes" and "deterrent strikes", and let us not forget that such irresponsible theories threaten the peace and security of us all. Similarly, American acts of aggression in the airspace of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and provocative action by United States fleets against independent countries in Latin America and elsewhere are only an expression of the true objectives of the American military, industrial and financial establishment, which is to extend the life of imperialism.

64. It is therefore our duty to sound the alarm without further delay. We must all work together to face up to the global danger which threatens all our peoples and all our countries, namely the Zionist threat and the threat posed by the leaders of the white minority in Pretoria to all of Africa and West Asia.

65. The Syrian Arab Republic, which has always resisted and which continues to resist by all possible means the common enemy in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, reiterates its determination to strengthen support for the people of Namibia in their struggle under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative, and the struggle of all of the peoples of southern Africa against imperialism and colonialism in order to achieve freedom, independence and equal rights. We firmly denounce the acts of aggression against Angola and consider ourselves to be in the front line, since the enemy is a single one, whether in Tel Aviv or in Pretoria; the decisive battle is also a single one. We should not make a distinction between our struggle and that of the African continent against racism, occupation and aggression.

66. Mr. KOH (Singapore): Mr. President, two of the qualities for which you are much admired by your colleagues are your precision and brevity. I shall attempt to emulate those qualities in my statement on the question of Namibia. I can summarize the position of my delegation in the form of six propositions.

67. First, South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia is illegal.

68. Secondly, South Africa's imposition of the policy of *apartheid* on Namibia is morally repugnant and contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

69. Thirdly, the struggle of the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, to liberate themselves from South African colonialism and racism is a legitimate struggle. It deserves the moral and material support of all who are opposed to colonialism and racism.

70. Fourthly, the African front-line States are morally and legally justified in assisting the struggle of the Namibian people against South Africa. South Africa's repeated attacks on Angola and Zambia are morally reprehensible and legally unjustifiable. We wish to express our solidarity with the front-line States, especially Angola and Zambia, which have borne the brunt of South Africa's aggression and intimidation.

71. Fifthly, the five Western Powers—Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States—have a special responsibility towards Namibia because they are the authors of the United Nations plan of action approved by Security Council resolution 435 (1978). SWAPO and the Government of South Africa have accepted that plan. South Africa's acceptance of the plan is, however, open to question because it has over the past three years put forward one excuse after another for not agreeing to the implementation of the plan. We appeal to the five Western Powers to demonstrate a sense of fidelity to their own plan of action. We appeal to them to put political and economic pressure on the Government of South Africa in order to persuade that Government to accept the implementation of the plan. The current attitude of one of the five Western Powers is unhelpful and is likely to strengthen the intransigence and duplicity of the régime in Pretoria.

72. Sixthly and finally, it is in the interest of the five Western countries to ensure the prompt and faithful implementation of Security Council resolu-

tion 435 (1978). I say this because those Western countries are the advocates of the process of peaceful change in southern Africa. They have told us time and again that peaceful change is preferable to change through armed struggle. It is therefore in the interest of the West to ensure that the process of peaceful change in Namibia succeeds. If the West is not prepared to put pressure on South Africa in order to overcome its intransigence, then the process of peaceful change must surely fail. If the process of peaceful change fails, the people of Namibia will have no alternative but to intensify their armed struggle in order to achieve their liberation from South African colonialism and racism. The West must remember that the alternative to peaceful change is not acquiescence in the *status quo*. The alternative is change by violent means.

73. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to express the Bulgarian delegation's satisfaction at seeing you once again guiding our debates, this time as President of the eighth emergency special session. Aware as we are of your outstanding qualities as a skilled and competent diplomat and of your tact and wisdom that are recognized by all, I have no doubt that under your guidance this session will be crowned with success.

74. For many years now the oppressed people of Namibia, under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, has been pursuing a heroic struggle for its national liberation, independence and self-determination. For its part the United Nations, motivated by the principles and purposes of the Charter, has been attempting to give full assistance and moral, political and material support to the cause of the Namibian people.

75. The just and dauntless struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, as well as the consistent efforts made within the Organization to eliminate one of the last bastions of the dark age of colonialism, which has long been condemned by the peoples and by history, enjoys the unswerving support of the people and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the other countries of the socialist community, the front-line African States and OAU, as well as the militant solidarity of the Non-Aligned Movement, the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community and world public opinion.

76. Backed by the virtually unanimous desire of the international community of States, the United Nations has handed down its historic verdict on the barbaric régime of *apartheid*, roundly stigmatizing its repressive, terrorist and aggressive policies. Through their decisions and resolutions the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as many other organs of the Organization, have laid down a clear-cut political and juridical basis for a just and lasting solution to the Namibian problem.

77. However, heedless of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, and especially those of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as of the opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on 21 June 1971,¹ the Pretoria régime continues its illegal occupation

of Namibia. In insolent defiance of the international community and the sovereign will of the Namibian people, the racist authorities, basing their policies on the benighted philosophy of *apartheid*, are endeavouring to perpetuate their domination of that Territory. What is more, Pretoria has progressively resorted to open acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, directly jeopardizing their independence and territorial integrity.

78. Events have finally confirmed the warranted misgivings of the majority of States Members of the United Nations that the Western Powers would not only not use their close links with Pretoria in order to exercise moderating pressure or influence on the South African Government but would, on the contrary, support the racists in their manoeuvres aimed at gaining time, imposing recognition of their puppet intermediaries and jeopardizing the unanimity of the peoples in favour of a just and lasting solution to the Namibian problem. The failure of the Geneva meeting in January this year once again brought out clearly the fact that the Western countries were motivated in this matter above all by their desire at all costs to impose a neo-colonialist settlement as a result of which they would have free rein to continue plundering the natural wealth of Namibia and exploit its people.

79. Today, as in the past, the insolence of the racists, without a shadow of doubt, derives directly from the assistance given them by those forces and circles in the contemporary world which, in international relations base all their schemes on the policies of force, neo-colonialism and imperial diktat. These same forces are striving to modify the content and the real purpose of the just struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, seeking to portray it as so-called "international terrorism". Furthermore, absurd attempts are made to present the very elementary defensive steps taken by the newly independent and progressive African States, which they have been forced to take to preserve their sovereignty and territorial integrity, against the cupidity of imperialism and colonialism, as an alleged argument for acquitting the aggressor.

80. Thus, only a few days ago, the southern part of the sorely tried African continent once again claimed the attention of the international community. Through the armed invasion by the racists, an overt and massive act of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola was committed, constituting a flagrant violation of peace and security and representing a further step in the escalation of the barbaric armed attacks carried out by South Africa. Once again the abhorrent creation of imperialism and colonialism that is the Pretoria régime confronted the Organization and the international community as a whole.

81. Once again also the determination of the vast majority of Member States to contain that aggressor, to take energetic and effective measures to safeguard international peace and security, encountered the fierce opposition of those who, without any scruples, overtly protect the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria. For that reason that régime has received clear encouragement to persist in its aggressive policies. Indeed, every day that passes adds to the number of new victims, new acts of destruction on the interminable list of crimes committed by the racists against the

people of Namibia—against free and independent Africa. The Western patrons of South Africa and primarily the policies of the United States share a major part of the responsibility for the repressions and the bloody terror which have been intensified in the occupied territory and also for the hegemonistic military actions of Pretoria, which have gradually passed from systematic acts of terrorism to brutal and overt aggression against independent neighbouring States.

82. The political aspects of these developments are tragically clear. An attempt is being made to thwart and reverse the process of decolonization and to undermine the independence and sovereignty of Africa. The policy of destabilization, of fostering tension and insecurity, is aimed at nullifying the victory won by African States in their struggle for freedom, independence and social progress and at restoring the absolute domination of the forces of imperialism in that part of the world and their control of the natural wealth of independent Africa. Obviously imperialism and neo-colonialism are concerned by the fact that for some time the African countries, as well as other developing countries, have been more and more consistent and persistent in their struggle to bring about a just and democratic order in their international economic relations.

83. The ongoing illegal occupation of Namibia occupies a key position in the plans of world imperialism.

84. The policy of confrontation and open defiance with regard to the African peoples, as well as the "new regional strategy" adopted by the United States, simply give the lie to its pretended "desire", given such wide and clamorous publicity recently, to seek a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question. It is evident that, here again, the ruling circles of the United States have opted for an irresponsible demonstration of force. By adopting an obstructionist position with respect to almost all matters which are the subjects of international negotiation, the United States has obviously chosen the policy of the "cold war", thus intending to impose its imperial diktat and to proceed to world domination. The United States has openly declared that its attitude towards Africa would be in keeping with the global aspirations of its great-Power policy and with its geopolitical purposes and plans. In other words, it places its own selfish economic and strategic interests in that part of the world above the fundamental principles of the United Nations, to the detriment of the interests of the African peoples. Such a political line is fraught with extremely serious dangers, for every individual member of the international community as well as for the United States itself, for modern civilization and for the existence of mankind.

85. Mankind's past experience and the undeniable achievements of peoples in their struggle for decolonization, for national liberation and for social progress provide irrefutable proof that it is impossible to prevent a people from achieving self-determination and independence. The manoeuvres by Pretoria and its protectors are not capable of halting the struggle of the people of Namibia and the course of history.

86. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that, in view of the arrogant refusal by South Africa to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia, the international community and the Organization must redouble their efforts to isolate the racist régime. In our opinion, the most effective way to isolate Pretoria would be to adopt multilateral and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, it is essential that all States Members of the United Nations step up their comprehensive assistance to SWAPO and to the front-line States, which, at the cost of enormous losses in human lives and material damage, are supporting the liberation struggle being waged by the people of Namibia. In this connection, it is particularly urgent to give immediate assistance to the people of Angola so that they may be enabled to repulse the military aggression of the racists of Pretoria, which threatens the national independence and territorial integrity of that country. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that at present in the matter of decolonization there is no task more urgent than that of securing the independence of the Namibian people. An important role in that regard must be played by the United Nations Council for Namibia, whose activities we highly appreciate and to which we shall continue to give our complete assistance. We fully support the efforts of the United Nations along these lines to ensure the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

87. In keeping with its position of principle, the Government of Bulgaria is in favour of guaranteeing the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, on the basis of the inviolability, unity and territorial integrity of that country, including Walvis Bay and the coastal islands, of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops and administration, including their withdrawal from Walvis Bay and the coastal islands, and also of the transfer of full power to the people of Namibia represented by SWAPO as its sole, legitimate representative recognized by OAU and the United Nations. In accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations, my country unreservedly supports the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom and independence under the leadership of SWAPO and is giving and will continue to give comprehensive assistance in that struggle.

88. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The solution of the problem of Namibia remains one of the most urgent and pressing of the issues that have long faced the United Nations and indeed, the whole international community.

89. The General Assembly has had to meet again, this time at an emergency special session, to consider a situation which seriously affects peace and stability in southern Africa and constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

90. Since the last time that the General Assembly took up the question of Namibia in March 1981, not only has no progress been made towards solving this problem, but the situation has worsened because of South Africa's persistent refusal to put an end to its illegal occupation of Namibia and to implement the United Nations resolutions concerning Namibia, and

because of its repeated and ever more widespread acts of aggression against neighbouring independent States and its increasingly hard-line racist and colonialist policy of *apartheid* and aggression.

91. That policy is expressed with ever greater brutality and irresponsibility in defiance of the most fundamental norms of international law. In the context of the acts of aggression constantly committed by the racist régime of South Africa against its neighbours, it has just entered a new phase of extreme seriousness, taking the form of a large-scale military operation carried out against the People's Republic of Angola on the very eve of this session.

92. Committing sizable armed forces and using techniques of mass destruction, with the participation of regular forces and mercenaries, in a murderous large-scale invasion of Angolan territory, South Africa has by these aggressive acts seriously worsened the situation in southern Africa and increased the state of tension and conflict in the area, threatening peace and security throughout the world.

93. It is particularly deplorable that the Security Council, despite the position adopted by a large number of countries, including the majority of its members, was unable to take a decision at least to condemn the blatant and premeditated acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola which constitute a true breach of the peace.

94. Since the outset, the Government and people of Romania have firmly condemned the irresponsible aggression of South Africa and have called for the withdrawal, without delay, of South African troops from Angolan territory. They have called for an immediate and unconditional halt to all military action against the independence and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola and the cessation of all displays of force against African States. The Government and people of Romania have reaffirmed their full solidarity with the friendly people of Angola in their just struggle against the aggression perpetrated by the racist authorities in Pretoria and have supported the efforts of the Angolan Government to repel the South African invasion.

95. We fully share the general view that what occurred recently in Angola makes clear the seriousness of the situation, the growing dangers stemming from the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia, the absence of a settlement of the Namibian problem and the retrograde and aggressive policy of South Africa.

96. We cannot sufficiently stress the danger flowing out of the unbridled increase in expenditures and military preparations of the South African military directed against its neighbours, an increase which has been noted by many recently.

97. South Africa's aggressive military actions, which prompted the firmest and most explicit condemnation by the international community, were directed against both Angola and the Namibian people and against the just struggle which that people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic and legitimate representative, is waging in order to put a halt to the illegal

occupation of Namibia and to achieve its inalienable right to a life of freedom and independence.

98. It cannot be denied that the essential problem facing southern Africa today is that of the exercise by the Namibian people of its sacred right to self-determination and that the underlying cause of the situation in that part of the world—which is having an extremely serious impact on international relations as a whole—is the brutal rejection by South Africa of that right of the Namibian people, as well as the acts of aggression perpetrated against the front-line States. As a result of those acts the United Nations has before it one of the most serious crises that it has had to deal with in its existence.

99. More than ever, peace in southern Africa and the interests of peace and security throughout the world require action by the United Nations and all Member States urgently and resolutely to deal with the problem of Namibia in accordance with the decisions adopted here in the United Nations.

100. There are few other cases, where responsibility for respect for the goals and principles of the Charter, indeed, the very prestige of the Organization, is involved to a greater degree and nobody can shirk his obligations here.

101. Romania and the Romanian people are particularly disturbed at the tense situation in southern Africa as a result of the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist South African régime and its attempts to prevent the affirmation of the right of the Namibian people to free and sovereign existence with the achievement of independence in Namibia.

102. We are gratified to note that the struggle of the Namibian people to exercise its fundamental and inalienable rights is increasingly viewed with sympathy and supported by solidarity and, indeed, international assistance. The United Nations and its Member States have expanded and diversified the scope of their moral, political and material assistance to the struggling people of Namibia and to its liberation movement. The United Nations Council for Namibia, the body responsible for administering the Territory of Namibia until independence, has maintained a wide range of activities which deserve our appreciation.

103. It is worth recalling in this respect the Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia³ adopted by the Council for Namibia in Panama on 5 June this year, which contained a firm expression of the will of the international community to act decisively to resolve the problem of Namibia in accordance with the United Nations plan.

104. I should like, in particular, to underscore the efforts of SWAPO, the front-line States, other African States and OAU, as well as the great majority of United Nations Member States, to contribute to promoting developments likely to lead to the speediest possible liberation of Namibia and to the granting of independence to the Namibian people.

105. At this emergency special session the Romanian delegation fully reaffirms Romania's militant solidarity with the just struggle of the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, to put an end to the régime occupying Namibia. We would underscore the firm

support of the Romanian Government for the achievement of the Namibian people's aspirations for freedom and progress, as well as for its right to choose for itself the path of its economic and social development and to live in an independent country.

106. The continued development of multifaceted relations of friendship and solidarity between the Romanian and Namibian peoples found its highest expression in the recent meetings between the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceasescu, and the leaders of the Namibian liberation movement.

107. As the President of Romania declared in his recent message to the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, on the fifteenth anniversary of Namibia Day, it is vitally necessary, in conjunction with a stepping up of the struggle by the Namibian people, to accelerate the efforts of all democratic and anti-imperialist forces and of international public opinion to put an urgent halt to South Africa's domination and to ensure Namibia's access to national independence.

108. As it has stated on several occasions recently, the Romanian Government feels that in the present circumstances all States must increase their political and diplomatic efforts in order to achieve Namibian independence on the basis of the United Nations plan, and all progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces must redouble their efforts in order to ensure the success of the just struggle of the Namibian people.

109. While encouraging a political solution to the Namibian problem, we have always considered that, given the rigid policy and the delaying tactics of the Pretoria Government and its persistent illegal activities, the oppressed Namibian people is quite clearly entitled, under the leadership of its legitimate and authentic representative, SWAPO, to resort to all means of struggle—political, diplomatic or other, including armed struggle—in order to eliminate foreign domination and to achieve its aspirations for freedom, independence and progress.

110. Romania is firmly determined to contribute in sustained fashion, together with African countries, other non-aligned and developing countries and all nations that love peace and justice, to the international efforts urgently to solve the problem of Namibia, in conditions of strict respect for the rights of the Namibian people.

111. From the rostrum of this emergency special session, the Romanian delegation feels it necessary to reiterate the vital need for the United Nations and its Member States to take all necessary measures and to make every effort to ensure without delay a beginning of the process of implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

112. Nearly three years ago now, following extensive, difficult negotiations, with the active participation of a large number of countries and agreement among the parties concerned, the international community adopted, by the terms of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the United Nations plan for Namibia, which set forth the principal stages towards a peaceful, just and democratic solution to the problem.

113. However, despite the prolonged and varied efforts, the appeals, the protests by international public opinion, the severest of condemnations and, indeed, the negotiations which it had formally accepted, the Pretoria racist régime, resorting to various pretexts and excuses, has constantly raised new obstacles in the path of the plan, striving desperately, by the most deplorable means, to maintain and perpetuate in that part of the African continent the most retrograde form of colonial domination, racial discrimination and *apartheid*.

114. Given the fact that the Geneva meeting devoted to implementation of the United Nations plan to ensure the independence of Namibia failed because of the obstructionist attitude of the Pretoria régime, all States Members of the Organization, as well as the General Assembly and Security Council, have the responsibility to consider the situation which has arisen and to adopt the necessary measures in order to eliminate the opposition and the obstacles raised by the South African régime in the path of the Namibian people's exercise of the right to a free and sovereign existence.

115. In our view, there is broad agreement that there can be no postponement of a solution to the Namibian problem. It is increasingly necessary to call a halt to a shameful and outdated system of domination and exploitation.

116. The debate during the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in March, as well as debates in other international forums—particularly the high-level meeting of African States at Nairobi and the present debate—have made strikingly clear the general concern of the countries of the world to find the most effective ways and means of settling the problem of Namibia and thus removing a serious source of conflict in southern Africa, which poses a danger to international peace and security.

117. More than ever, the United Nations must respond to the legitimate concerns of Member States by adopting decisions likely to strengthen and make effective international action to bring about the speedy attainment of Namibian independence.

118. At this emergency special session the Assembly is called upon to act decisively, pursuant to the direct responsibilities which the United Nations has assumed towards Namibia, so that the Namibian people can finally exercise freely its inalienable right to self-determination, in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Charter and international law. Its decisions should speed up progress towards a peaceful solution to this problem, pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, primarily those calling for implementation of the United Nations plan.

119. In the view of the Romanian delegation, it is absolutely essential that the General Assembly reaffirm the United Nations' direct and sole responsibility for the fate of the Namibian people, as well as the overall validity of the United Nations plan for Namibia and the will of all Member States to act firmly on it. The Assembly must also take all necessary measures, including comprehensive, binding sanctions, and define new ways and means of overcoming the obstacles created by South Africa to thwart the implementation of the plan. It must do all this to restore

international legality and to enable the Namibian people to become master of its own destiny and to build its own independent future.

120. The Security Council, which has on many occasions been called upon to consider the Namibia problem, must in its turn act decisively, fully discharging the functions and responsibilities incumbent upon it under the Charter, and adopt the necessary measures to compel South Africa urgently to implement the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations regarding Namibia.

121. In this respect, the problem which is increasingly before all Member States, and particularly before the five Western members of the "contact group", is to act unequivocally, decisively and without delay not only within the framework of the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council but in their international relations in general, in order to compel the South African authorities to implement, without further delay, the United Nations plan for Namibia.

122. As far as Romania is concerned, it supports the just cause of the Namibian people, is aware of the direct responsibility of the United Nations for Namibia and is ready to make an active contribution in order to promote the adoption and implementation of such measures.

123. It appears quite clear to us that the solution of the problem of Namibia will have a positive effect on the international political climate and will encourage efforts, by political means and negotiations, to find settlements to other problems which now face the United Nations and the international community.

124. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): May I first, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, express to you, Sir, our great pleasure at seeing you presiding over this very important session of the General Assembly and our conviction that, under your presidency, the General Assembly will take appropriate decisions on the question of Namibia, thus responding to the demands of the international community.

125. My salutations go equally to Mr. Peter Mueshihange, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, which is recognized and respected by the international community for its heroic and dauntless 20-year struggle against the illegal occupation of its territory by the racist régime of South Africa.

126. Given the explosive situation in southern Africa which has been deliberately caused by the colonialist and warlike policies of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, this emergency special session of the General Assembly takes on particular importance.

127. The year 1981 should have been the first year in the process of decolonizing the last Territory which still remains under United Nations Trusteeship in southern Africa. Rather, it has been marked by an intensification of the colonial and aggressive policies of the minority régime in Pretoria together with manoeuvres designed to impede the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The seriousness of this situation was accurately evaluated by the

United Nations Council for Namibia during an extraordinary plenary meeting held in Panama in June last as follows:

“The Council renews its conviction that the critical situation in Namibia, as a result of South Africa’s continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its defiance of United Nations resolutions, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its intransigence, as demonstrated most recently in its refusal at the Geneva pre-implementation meeting to agree to commence the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the enhancement of its military strength, including the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability, its repeated acts of armed aggression against the people of Namibia, its use of the Territory of Namibia to launch armed attacks against States and its attempts at destabilizing sovereign independent African States, particularly Angola, constitutes no longer a threat to but a manifest breach of international peace and security.”³

128. The resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in March 1981 adopted a number of resolutions, including one which called upon the Security Council to impose sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 35/227 J*]. The concern and indignation of the peoples of the world were clearly expressed at a series of international conferences held during the first half of this year after the breakdown of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva: the meetings of heads of State and Ministers of OAU, meetings held by the Non-Aligned Movement, by heads of State of the front-line States, the International Forum on the Liberation of Southern Africa, and the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa. An international consensus has emerged from all those meetings, namely, on the fact that the colonialist and racist régime of South Africa and its allies deserve severe condemnation; a request that mandatory sanctions be adopted against South Africa, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations; implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978); and, finally, continued support and assistance for the struggle on all fronts, including the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO and supported by the front-line countries.

129. It is clear that no international political question has been the subject of so many international conferences and forums in such a short period of time in an effort to find a settlement as the question of Namibia. This confirms the particular importance of solving this vital issue the repercussions of which on the Namibian people, the national liberation movement in southern Africa and international peace and security will be incalculable, if the international community does not take energetic, effective and timely steps to bring about a radical settlement of this matter.

130. The United Nations Council for Namibia adopted in Panama a Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia³ which called for the intensification of international political opinion and requested Member States to take both unilateral and collective action to impose comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, including an arms embargo, an oil embargo, economic sanctions and other measures.

131. But a few scant days before the convening of this emergency special session the South African colonialists unleashed, from Namibian territory which they continue to occupy illegally, a massive armed aggression that penetrated several hundred kilometres into Angolan territory. Until now the South African aggressors continue to occupy a part in the south of the territory of the People’s Republic of Angola, which is an independent and sovereign State Member of the United Nations. This act of aggression and military occupation by the Pretoria racists is evidence of their most insolent disregard of the Charter of the United Nations and world public opinion. The crimes perpetrated by South African troops during that invasion—which have been denounced by the Angolan delegation and partially reported on in the *Washington Post* of 5 September 1981—cannot fail to remind us of the atrocities committed by United States troops in South Viet Nam for years and those perpetrated by Chinese troops in North Viet Nam in the recent past.

132. Regardless of whether it is United States or Chinese expeditionary forces or South African racist troops that are involved, we see the same methods of barbaric butchering and massacre of the civilian population which originate in the policy of terrorism and repression practised against peoples which fall victim to their aggression.

133. By preventing the Security Council from adopting a resolution condemning South Africa and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its aggressive troops from Angolan territory during the last series of Council meetings, and by its attempts to destabilize the legitimate Government of Angola, the United States Administration must bear the direct responsibility for all the consequences that flow from that act of aggression by South Africa against the People’s Republic of Angola—which has gone unpunished so far—and its persistent and insolent defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions on the question of Namibia.

134. Besides brutally resorting to force, the Pretoria racists have executed manoeuvres designed not only to prevent the implementation of United Nations resolutions but aimed virtually at voiding them, specifically Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the basis for any negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. The machinations which have surrounded the implementation of the plan put forward by the five contact group countries have quite rightly given rise to serious doubts in world public opinion about the good intentions of the authors of that plan.

135. It is a matter of public knowledge that the manoeuvres carried out by the South African racists are due largely to the attitude of certain Western Powers, primarily the United States of America. The latter has encouraged a so-called new settlement, so as to cancel Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and to impose on the Namibian people a more sophisticated neo-colonial régime. All that quite obviously serves the interests of the capitalist monopolies, which are seeking by all possible means to hang on to Namibia, as well as the purposes of the global strategy of the United States in that part of the world.

136. The minority régime in South Africa, supported by its traditional ally, international imperialism, is exerting its best efforts to maintain its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia, first in order to pillage the natural and human resources of the Namibian people and then to create tension and instability in southern Africa in order to stem the flourishing national liberation movement in that part of the world. Allegations such as those about "international terrorism" or "East-West confrontation", which have been used to slander the heroic people of Namibia and the other militant peoples in southern Africa, as well as the socialist countries which support them, are aimed solely at misleading public opinion, at masking the dark designs to maintain a bloodthirsty colonial bastion in Namibia and thus to protect strategic and economic interests in southern Africa.

137. In the joint communiqué issued at Hanoi by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which recently visited Viet Nam, it was stated:

"It is the expectation, therefore, of both the Government of Viet Nam and the Council that the emergency special session will devise a new strategy to compel South Africa to comply with United Nations decisions on Namibia in order to enable Namibia to secure full independence."⁴

138. In the opinion of my delegation, the imposition of global economic sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as recommended by the General Assembly, the Non-Aligned Movement and OAU, and, moreover, unreservedly supported by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, would constitute one of the most effective ways of forcing South Africa to heed the resolutions of the United Nations on Namibia. But for reasons well known to everyone, those sanctions were not imposed. Therefore this emergency special session is in duty bound to survey the situation and to take effective steps, which States Members of the United Nations could individually or collectively decide to implement, in view of the fact that the Security Council has not yet been equal to a full discharge of the solemn responsibilities incumbent upon it in this connection because of the opposition voiced by Western permanent members of the Council.

139. We believe that the elements of this new strategy have been fully explored in the international conferences on Namibia I have referred to and more specifically in the Panama Programme of Action which was adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia this past June. We should like to recall a few of those principles at this point.

140. First, our delegation believes that the key element in this strategy is the ongoing and unquenchable struggle of the Namibian people for its right to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence. That struggle has been waged on various fronts, including that of armed struggle, the legality of which has been recognized by the resolutions of the General Assembly, under the guidance of the fair and far-sighted policies of SWAPO, the vanguard of the Namibian people and the sole authentic representa-

tive of that people, a fully-fledged member of the Non-Aligned Movement and an observer to the United Nations.

141. Secondly, it is imperative that all progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces should redouble their efforts to ensure the success of the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people, both by stepping up available aid and assistance, including military assistance, to SWAPO and to the front-line States, as well as undertaking various activities to bring about the complete political, diplomatic and economic isolation of South Africa.

142. Thirdly, the programme of sanctions and related measures against South Africa, adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in Panama in June must be implemented as a matter of urgency. Its first stage is the mandatory arms embargo unanimously endorsed by the Security Council. It is also important to impose an oil embargo, a necessary corollary to the embargo on arms and nuclear co-operation, as well as other economic sanctions against the *apartheid* régime in South Africa.

143. Fourthly, the international community must exert every effort to parry the manoeuvres of the Pretoria racist régime, supported by its Western protectors, to revise or modify in any way the United Nations plan as described in the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council, specifically Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which is the only possible basis for a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. South Africa's attempt to impose a neo-colonialist régime by means of a so-called internal settlement should be vigorously condemned and decisively thwarted.

144. The people and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, hand in hand with all forces that value peace and justice in the world faithful to their consistent policy of militant solidarity with the national liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin America, forthrightly condemn the racist régime of South Africa and its imperialist allies. We continue to lend our resolute support to the heroic struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, seeking its right to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence, in a united Namibia, which would include Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. We also give full support to the tireless and praiseworthy efforts of the United Nations Council for Namibia, presided over by Mr. Paul Lusaka, the representative of Zambia, as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia. We are deeply convinced that, given the persevering and resolute efforts of the Namibian people and its revolutionary leadership, accompanied by a further increase in aid and effective assistance by the international community, the Namibian people will recover its fundamental and sacred national rights in a free, independent and united Namibia which will take its place in the concert of nations in the nearest possible future.

145. Mr. KODJOVI (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): The massive invasion of Angola by assorted South African armed forces launched from Namibia only a few days before this special emergency session of the General Assembly did not come as a total surprise. In fact there are many previous examples of

South Africa's choosing, on the eve of an important meeting of the General Assembly or the Security Council to consider the question of Namibia, to present a new challenge to the Organization by an intensification of repression in Namibia or armed intervention in one of the countries bordering on the Territory, Angola and Zambia. My delegation would recall just the bloody massacre in Kassinga committed by South African armed forces on the eve of a Security Council debate on the question of Namibia in May 1978. As in previous cases, my delegation must state that the Government and people of Togo, under the leadership of General Gnassingbé Eyadéma, the founder and Chairman of the Rassemblement du peuple togolais and the President of the Republic, energetically condemn such military operations, which reflect the blatant bad faith of South Africa and are intended solely to set us even further back from a peaceful solution to the Namibian question.

146. Mr. President, before I go any further allow me to extend to you the warmest congratulations of the Togolese delegation on your assumption of the presidency of this special emergency session of the General Assembly on Namibia. I do so with pleasure particularly since you are the representative of a State, the Federal Republic of Germany, with which my country, Togo, enjoys fruitful relations of co-operation and friendship. We are particularly pleased to be working under your leadership. Your qualities as an experienced diplomat and your competence ensure that our work will be concluded successfully.

147. Convened at the request of African countries following the inability of the Security Council in April last to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa, pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, this emergency special session of the General Assembly provides an extremely useful opportunity to bring about Namibian self-determination and independence and thus to avert a generalized conflict and the unforeseeable consequences it would entail.

148. The United Nations has now been considering the question of Namibia for 35 years—35 years, during which the question has regularly been included on the agenda of regular sessions of the General Assembly, which has on each occasion adopted a great many resolutions. The Security Council also has adopted a great many resolutions on this question. I say this in order to remind the Assembly that the question of Namibia is well known to the international community and particularly to the delegations present in this chamber. The question is too well known for it to be necessary for me now to go into its background. This year alone, two important gatherings have enabled a great many delegations to recount the background to the problem of Namibia. There was the thirty-fifth regular session of the General Assembly and the resumed session in March, and in April the Security Council met to consider the question. Suffice it to say that the present session was made necessary by the persistence of South Africa in its illegal occupation of Namibia despite General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, in which the Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate for Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations, despite the great many Security

Council resolutions that enjoin it to withdraw from the Territory, and despite the advisory opinion of 1971 of the International Court of Justice,¹ which found South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal and stated that South Africa should withdraw from it. We are here because the United Nations plan for Namibian independence contained in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978) has not been applied in any respect.

149. We have heard a great deal of talk about Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Namibian people, the African countries and the international community placed great hopes in that resolution, which provides for the signature of a cease-fire agreement, the establishment of a demilitarized zone, the establishment of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group and the holding of free and fair elections under the control and supervision of the United Nations. South Africa accepted the Security Council resolution. However, since resolution 435 (1978) was adopted the Pretoria Government's actions make it clear that its agreement was only a device to save time so that it could prolong its domination over Namibia and its exploitation of the principal natural and other resources of the Territory. While stating that it accepted the United Nations plan for Namibian independence, and without drawing the lessons to be learned from the Zimbabwe experience, the Pretoria Government has continued to seek an "internal" settlement to the Namibian question through sham elections and the establishment of a so-called "Windhoek Council of Ministers". Any doubts that might remain as to the Pretoria Government's bad faith were dispelled by the failure of the pre-implementation meeting held at Geneva in January of this year. At that meeting, whereas SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people, stated its willingness to sign a cease-fire agreement and to set a date for the holding of free elections under United Nations control and supervision, the Pretoria Government stepped up its delaying tactics, trailing red herrings and stating that it was premature to talk about implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibian independence.

150. The Geneva meeting had at least one redeeming quality: it made clear the real intentions of the Pretoria Government. After that meeting, nobody can deny that South Africa is not prepared to accept a negotiated settlement in Namibia and give up its domination over the Territory.

151. It was on the strength of that evidence that the front-line countries meeting at Lusaka, the African countries meeting at Addis Ababa and the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries meeting at Algiers decided, after the resumption of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly to consider the question of Namibia, to return to the Security Council to ask it to adopt binding measures to bring South Africa genuinely to accept without delay the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. That decision to ask the Security Council to adopt comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa was based on resolutions already adopted by the Council, particularly resolutions 385 (1976) and 439 (1978). Resolution 385 (1976) set 31 August 1976 as the deadline for implementation. After that date the Security Council

reserved the right to consider appropriate steps to be taken against South Africa under the Charter of the United Nations. Resolution 439 (1978) was even more precise. After having declared that the so-called elections which the Pretoria Government had just organized in Namibia were null and void, the Security Council demanded that South Africa co-operate with it and the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978). In the case of failure by the Pretoria Government to do so, that resolution envisaged a new meeting of the Security Council to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions.

152. That was why the African countries, with their trust in the Security Council, came and called on it last April to apply its own resolutions by adopting comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the recalcitrant Pretoria Government with the aim of compelling it to abandon its arrogant and intransigent position and to accept in good faith the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

153. Everyone knows what happened last April. Making use of their right of veto, three permanent members of the Security Council prevented the Council from discharging its mission and complying with the will of the overwhelming majority of the international community.

154. The African countries and the international community are well aware of why Security Council resolution 435 (1978) has remained a dead letter. They know that it has not been implemented yet because some of the five Western countries of the contact group which sponsored it have not brought to bear on the Pretoria Government all the pressure which they are capable of, in view of the enormous influence which they enjoy vis-à-vis that Government and their weight within the international community.

155. If those countries are refusing to bring to bear upon South Africa the pressure which the international community is entitled to expect them to exert it is because the question of Namibia has been skilfully distorted. The problem of Namibia, which is a simple problem of decolonization, has been turned into a complex ideological issue of the security of the Western world and of East-West rivalry. On the pretext that South Africa is a guarantor of the interests of the Western world in southern Africa, no effort is being spared to offer it financial, economic, political and military support in order to enable it to continue with impunity its illegal occupation of Namibia and its unbridled exploitation of the main mineral and other resources of the Territory.

156. My delegation is convinced that in order to solve the Namibian problem it is first of all necessary to re-establish the real nature of the issue. The question of Namibia is one of decolonization and nothing else. We are dealing with the inalienable rights of a people

to self-determination, freedom and national independence. If we look at the problem in those terms, then we are obliged to recognize that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) provides an irreplaceable basis for its solution. My delegation once again offers its total support to resolution 435 (1978). In the view of my delegation it is urgent to implement that resolution as a whole without delay, amendment or modification. In that connection the five countries of the contact group have a decisive role to play and a historic responsibility to fulfil with regard to the international community and the people of Namibia.

157. Those countries must finally agree to bring to bear upon the Pretoria Government all the pressure which the international community and the people of Namibia are entitled to expect them to exert. In that connection Togo has been following with great interest and admiration the wholly novel and constructive approach which the Government of one of those member countries of the contact group has adopted in connection with the question of Namibia and co-operation with South Africa since the April meeting of the Security Council. My delegation hopes that that constructive attitude will be maintained and built upon and, especially, that it will be followed by the Governments of the other member countries of the contact group and in particular by those which have a right of veto in the Security Council.

158. My delegation would like to reiterate here the total support of the Government and the people of Togo for the heroic struggle being waged by the Namibian people for their independence, under the wise and responsible leadership of SWAPO, their sole and authentic representative. My delegation would also like to renew its congratulations to the United Nations Council for Namibia for its tireless efforts to bring about an independent Namibia. For our part, during this session, we shall support all draft resolutions put forward and all initiatives recommended in order to speed up the self-determination and independence of Namibia and to spare mankind a generalized armed conflict which the South African racists wish at all costs to provoke and of which the tragic events currently occurring in the area may be a portent.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

1. *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-sixth Year, 2267th to 2277th meetings*.
3. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 222.
4. *Ibid.*, para. 705, sect. 5 (b).

