

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTH EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION



**7th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 9 September 1981,
at 3.20 p.m.

Official Records

NEW YORK

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

In the absence of the President, Mr. Katapodis
(Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (continued)

1. Mr. DA LUZ (Cape Verde) (*interpretation from French*): Setting up a moral equation for the question of Namibia would seem an easy task: on the one hand, we have South Africa illegally occupying the Territory of Namibia by force, in flagrant and abusive violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, and on the other hand, we have the Namibian people, which, under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], is struggling to regain its inalienable rights to freedom and independence.

2. So far as rhetoric is concerned, the question has become both easy and difficult at the same time. It is easy because, ever since the General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) ended South Africa's Mandate in Namibia, the problem has been taken up in all international meetings, and all politicians have had long experience with it. Furthermore, since its establishment in May 1967, as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia, the United Nations Council for Namibia has carried out a great number of very well-documented studies which have greatly facilitated the work of all those desiring to study the question.

3. However, when it comes to realities, the problem is very complex: first, the enormous natural wealth existing in the Territory, the uncontrolled exploitation of which has been consistently denounced by the competent bodies, is what is primarily responsible for the complexity of the problem. Secondly, the multi-national corporations associated with South African companies, in their avidity to produce the greatest possible profits, collaborate unconditionally with the *apartheid* régime, not only in exploiting that wealth but also in exploiting slave labour. Thirdly, there is the political myopia of certain Western countries, which, out of fear of displeasing their Pretoria partners, naively accept and peddle the most reactionary and elementary yarns spun by the masters of *apartheid*. The latter, in their desire to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia, and to continue to commit persistent acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, spin the most implausible yarns, ranging

from the need to defend Western civilization and the white race in the area to the need to maintain a bastion against Communist subversion in Africa, and so on. Last, but certainly not least, there is the firm determination of the Namibian people, under the far-sighted leadership of SWAPO, to banish from its homeland all forms of exploitation, whatever shape they may take—colonialist, neo-colonialist or imperialist.

4. Those are some of the facts of the problem which encourage South Africa in its persistent defiance of Security Council and General Assembly decisions. Those are some of the real elements supporting South Africa in its arrogant decision to reject the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That is what is behind Pretoria's racist policy in the daily massacres of the Namibian people. That is what covers up South Africa's warlike policy in its constant aggression against neighbouring countries Members of the Organization.

5. Some of the aspects of an analysis of all the elements of the question of Namibia are enough to drive one to the brink of paranoia.

6. To mention only the most flagrant cases, we have, for example, the following. On 27 October 1966, the General Assembly, by resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Here we are now in September 1981, and South Africa still holds a *de facto* mandate, with the tacit or declared approval of some States Members of the United Nations. In December 1976, in resolution 31/146, the General Assembly recognized SWAPO as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people and, in resolution 31/152, granted it observer status. South Africa does not respect those decisions. It calls the combatants of SWAPO a "band of terrorists" and creates its own puppet groups; some Members of the United Nations believe that, in any solution to the problem of Namibia, those groups should be considered as legitimate parties.

7. In 1978 the five Western countries represented in the Security Council drew up a plan which was accepted by the group of African States and by SWAPO, after lengthy negotiations, it being clearly understood that South Africa would accept it as containing all elements necessary for a peaceful settlement of the problem. Now, last January, the Secretary-General, following several contacts with the parties directly involved in the conflict, promoted a meeting at Geneva to consider ways of implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Supported by Africa, SWAPO attended the meeting, sincerely prepared to contribute to a peaceful solution of the conflict. On the part of South Africa we witnessed the most

fallacious manoeuvres and stonewalling aimed at preventing discussion, and all hopes turned into frustration, to say the least.

8. Recently, under the mandate of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], a mission headed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, Mr. Ouko, in an attempt to break the deadlock created by South Africa's behaviour, met with the authors of the plan to discuss implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Among the five authors there were those who recommended that the plan, which they had drawn up and which SWAPO had accepted as a compromise, should be strengthened with elements designed to satisfy South African sensibilities—in particular, the prior drafting of a constitution that would grant some privileges to the white minority of the Territory.

9. But that is enough, I think; I will stop there. Actually, if those events had not been witnessed by the majority of those present, one might say that they had been taken from the world of Kafka.

10. The purpose of this emergency special session, advocated in the Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, which met in New Delhi in February and reconfirmed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held last June in Nairobi, is not to proceed to an inventory of the facts of the Namibian problem or to produce yet another resolution. These facts are all too well known, and the resolutions on this subject can no longer even be counted. The question of Namibia is not merely a matter of rhetoric; it is not a question solely of the interests at stake; nor is it merely a question of negotiations. It is a challenge to our dignity as Africans because of the human values it encompasses; and it is also a challenge to the conscience of the international community because of the moral and legal values it involves. It is basically the determination of a people which has been the victim of the greatest barbarity of our times and which is taking up arms to fight to regain its dignity. It is basically the epic struggle of a people which has proved with the blood of its heroes that it is prepared to make every sacrifice to liberate its country from the Fascist colonial yoke and to regain its independence in a unified homeland, which would include Walvis Bay. It is those facts, and no others, which are the fundamental and determining factors of the problem. To disregard them is tantamount to ignoring one of the most striking aspects of universal history and of national liberation struggles. As a matter of fact, in all of human history no people prepared to make every sacrifice to liberate itself has ever been deterred from its goal.

11. Throughout history all empires have fallen, however powerful they were. Throughout history all colonial Powers, however powerful they were, have fallen also. That is the truth of the historical process, and in the not-too-distant future it will be the truth for the people of Namibia as well.

12. While we have not come here merely to call for approval of a new resolution neither have we come to ask for anything extraordinary, nothing which is not contained in the Charter of the United Nations. We have come solely to call on South Africa's friends to use their influence to put an end to the criminal

actions of the racists against the Namibian people. We have come only to ask South Africa's friends to use their good offices to halt the escalation of aggression and attacks by the Pretoria régime against neighbouring countries. We have come solely to call on South Africa's friends not to encourage it by their complacency in its warlike activities, which constitute a serious breach of international peace and security. We ask only that, given the seriousness of the situation and if South Africa persists in its arrogance, its privileged partners refrain from blocking operation of Chapter VII of the Charter. A negative reply to those appeals would mean there was no other alternative for African countries and progressive forces throughout the world but to close ranks around SWAPO and provide it with all necessary means to bring about the liberation of its people from the yoke of racist oppression. These are the only possible choices for a solution to the problem: either in the Assembly we will commit ourselves, each and every one of us, unambiguously to the implementation of the United Nations plan, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and have an honourable and peaceful solution of the problem, or the solution will require the Namibian patriots to wage a long armed struggle, in which the sacrifices on both sides are at present unforeseeable. Future generations of southern Africa, both black and white, will all judge us if we are not able to create the social and psychological conditions conducive to their survival and future relations.

13. Before concluding, we should like to express our deep gratitude to the front-line countries which, in carrying out the decisions of OAU and the United Nations, do not shrink from making any sacrifices at the side of their Namibian brothers in their struggle for national liberation. The People's Republic of Angola, given its firmness and determination in its unconditional support of SWAPO, has been a victim of constant acts of aggression by the Pretoria racists. The most recent of those brutal attacks, launched on 24 August, in terms of the manpower and equipment involved—about 45,000 men, 135 tanks, 140 military vehicles, 38 helicopters and 3 artillery units—constitutes a declaration of war.

14. The United Nations should act accordingly through its appropriate organs. The Organization, established to preserve peace in the world and embodying humanity's hopes for survival, has not adopted a single measure or even expressed condemnation. The Security Council, which met for that purpose, was prevented from carrying out its duty owing to the veto of a great Power. All that remains for the People's Republic of Angola is the exercise of its lawful right to request assistance from friendly countries in order to drive out the enemy from its territory. The Republic of Cape Verde, which maintains with the People's Republic of Angola long-standing ties of brotherhood going back to the time of our glorious national liberation struggles, is unconditionally on the side of the Angolan people, which, under the leadership of the MPLA¹—Workers Party, is responding with heroism to the criminal acts of the South African racist régime.

15. Finally, we would like to reiterate to the Namibian people and its sole legitimate representative,

SWAPO, the total militant solidarity of the people and Government of the Republic of Cape Verde and its Party, the PAICV.²

16. The struggle continues and victory is certain.

17. Mr. SHEARER (Jamaica): I wish to join other representatives in expressing confidence in the leadership of Mr. von Wechmar as he presides over this historic emergency special session of the General Assembly on Namibia. His election is a fitting tribute to his outstanding diplomatic abilities and to the high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues in the United Nations.

18. This session is convened against the background of extremely disturbing international developments which are jeopardizing international peace and security and directly threatening the stability of the entire southern African region. It is convened against the background of South Africa's persistent and callous defiance of the will of the international community, in the context of that racist regime's continued occupation of Namibia, notwithstanding the decisions calling upon it to withdraw by the Security Council, by the General Assembly and by the International Court of Justice. Equally, this session is convened against the background of the brutal aggression perpetrated by South Africa through Namibian territory against neighbouring States, in complete disregard of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the Organization.

19. Earlier this year the Security Council held extensive discussions on Namibia. During the course of that debate I reiterated Jamaica's unwavering support for the right of the people of Namibia to sovereign independence with full territorial integrity consistent with the carefully worked out United Nations plan for Namibia approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).³

20. The overwhelming majority of statements made in the Security Council and the predominance of affirmative votes cast in support of the draft resolutions in the Council left no doubt that the judgement of the world community was resolutely in favour of the enforcement measures advocated. Only recourse to the veto by three States permanent members of the Security Council prevented the Security Council from taking concrete, effective steps to put an end to Pretoria's persistent defiance of the world body.

21. It may be instructive here to recall that, in my address to the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, I said that

"... it is of vital importance that the whole United Nations should never be rendered impotent and incapable of dealing with... threats to the peace or acts of aggression. If its main peace-keeping organ, the Security Council, should at any time be paralysed by the veto... residual means of enabling the United Nations to take such action should be found within the Charter, or written into it".
[1293rd meeting, para. 89.]

I continued:

"Jamaica is concerned to see the Security Council remain strong. We wish to see it employing to the fullest extent the wide and effective powers with which the Charter has endowed it." [Ibid., para. 91.]

Today, 17 years after that statement was made, I wish to re-emphasize that Jamaica remains fully committed to that position.

22. The situation in Namibia is of special concern to the United Nations and to this body, its most representative organ, because the United Nations itself has assumed a direct, special and continuing responsibility for the Territory.

23. We recall that, over 15 years ago, at its twenty-second session, the General Assembly acted to terminate the Mandate of South Africa and declared that henceforth it was to be the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

24. Subsequently, the United Nations Council for Namibia was established and entrusted with the responsibility for the administration of the Territory until independence.

25. South Africa's disregard of these and subsequent decisions and resolutions, proximity and pre-implementation conferences constitutes an intolerable and blatant defiance of the authority of the United Nations. South Africa has, with foreign economic interests, continued its rapacious exploitation of the natural resources of the Territory. By the repression of the authentic representative will of the people, in favour of hand-picked puppets, by the unilateral division of the Territory into mutually exclusive administrative entities based on ethnic groupings, by a systematic disregard for the universal values of human dignity and human rights and by its increasing militarization, leading to aggression against its neighbours, the Government of South Africa has sought to consolidate and strengthen its illegal hold on the Territory.

26. The sustained escalation of terror and repression against Angola, resulting in extensive destruction to lives and property, must necessarily be viewed as another facet of the régime's design to perpetuate its hold and influence on the Territory of Namibia.

27. The position of Jamaica on this deplorable action was contained in a statement made on 27 August, in which I stated:

"The Government of Jamaica is outraged by the current invasion of Angolan territory by the military forces of the racist régime in South Africa and strongly condemns this latest act of aggression, which is a flagrant breach of the territorial integrity of Angola. South Africa has once again demonstrated its utter disregard for international opinion and its open defiance of the United Nations and the principles enshrined in its Charter. It is this regard and defiance which have led to the complete blockage of the arrangements to secure the independence of Namibia—an objective on which the United Nations has long reached agreement. The use of Namibian territory as the channel for this latest aggression against Angola compounds the South African defiance and the illegality of their action."

28. The Government and the people of Jamaica continue to hold to the view that South Africa's occupation of the Territory is illegal, that its continued presence there constitutes defiance of the authority of the United Nations, that its continued use of Namibia for acts of aggression against its neighbours poses a grave threat to international peace and

security and that the independence of the Territory can and will be achieved only by the strict observance of the principles enunciated in the relevant resolutions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

29. Here I must register our disquiet and growing concern at the proposal to seek a modification of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In our view, a modification of that resolution can only, on the one hand, encourage the illegal occupation régime to delay further implementation of the resolution and, on the other hand, aid and abet South Africa in reckless and irresponsible actions detrimental to international peace and security. It is the hope of my Government that the Governments of the Western contact group will use their influence to exert the requisite pressure on South Africa, which is the single entity standing in the way of Namibia's independence.

30. The Foreign Ministers and other representatives of Africa and the non-aligned countries who have preceded me in this debate have eloquently and forcefully expressed the demand by the international community for an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. The General Assembly should reflect that demand in a resolution which calls for the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In addition, the General Assembly should demand the total, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African forces from Angola and reassert most emphatically the necessity of respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter.

31. Jamaica, for its part, will support any effective measure advocated by the Assembly at this emergency special session designed to advance the liberation of Namibia in keeping with the gravity and seriousness of the threat posed to international peace and security.

32. To the people of Namibia I express the continued solidarity of my country in the hope that the combined efforts of the Member States attending this emergency special session will help to ensure the historical inevitability of their freedom from domination and the assumption of their rightful place among the community of nations as a proud and independent nation.

33. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka supported the request of the group of African States for the convening of this emergency special session, a session which draws its mandate from the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in February and the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held at Nairobi in June.

34. This is not the first major gathering to deal with the situation in Namibia, though one would wish it could be the last. There is therefore less need to recount the history of the struggle for freedom in Namibia or to debate whether or how Namibia should be free. Everyone is agreed that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal and that its actions in the Territory against the people of Namibia are to be strongly condemned because they violate all the norms of civilized behaviour.

35. The President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Lusaka, has already told this special

session [*3rd meeting*] of an insidious programme of bantustanization being carried out in Namibia through repressive legislation and executive measures to fragment Namibia and to stem the growing tide of support for SWAPO. We have only just completed a series of meetings of the Security Council, which met to deal, though inconclusively, with a massive armed aggression by South Africa against Angola from the bridgehead of Namibia that was not accidentally timed for the eve of this emergency special session.

36. We could not agree more with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kenya, the Current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of OAU, who stated that we have come to this emergency special session because we believe the situation in Namibia has reached a critical stage in which we have been called upon to act with speed. Namibia is, after all, the responsibility of the United Nations.

37. Following exhortations that it use peaceful means and eschew violence, the people of Namibia, through their sole authentic representative, SWAPO, embarked on the road of negotiations. At the price of numerous concessions and compromises on the part of SWAPO, those negotiations resulted in the United Nations plan of action, which in essence provides for a cease-fire, the establishment of a demilitarized zone, the deployment of a United Nations Transitional Assistance Group and the holding of fair and free elections under United Nations supervision and control.

38. It is now a few days short of three years since that plan was unanimously endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978). The exhortation to be pacific and prudent is still being directed only at the people of Namibia and at SWAPO. On the other hand, South Africa's use of military might and police brutality and its violations of all human rights are being acquiesced in or overlooked with appeals to moderation and fairness.

39. South Africa is beyond appeal. As the Foreign Minister of Kenya has said, we cannot ask South Africa to grant independence to Namibia, as freedom is the birthright of all Namibians. The Assembly should at this session direct its energies to those countries that wield considerable influence with South Africa and are in a position to bring firm and decisive pressure to bear on that recalcitrant régime. The five Western countries, whose entreaties SWAPO and the people of Namibia accepted in good faith, have more than a mere moral responsibility to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) unmodified, unqualified and without further prevarication. If the plan needs strengthening, such strengthening should be aimed at expediting the process towards independence, not at hampering it by negotiating residual constitutional and other powers and concessions for South Africa. How the Namibian people should structure their political, economic and social life after independence is their own business.

40. Again, as the President of Kenya has said, the struggle for Namibia's independence will continue until Namibia is free, by peaceful means if that is possible, or by continued and intensified armed struggle should the peace options fail. He said that Africa's patience is running out but faith in the option of peace has not died. While that precious commodity

of patience must not run out, the Security Council must heed the solemn call to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

41. Mr. ALI BABA (Nigeria): Fifteen years ago, on 27 October 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory. The logical development of that historic decision by the General Assembly should have been self-determination and national independence for Namibia. Up to now that goal has remained a tantalizing dream in spite of several resolutions of the General Assembly and decisions of the Security Council, culminating in Council resolutions 389 (1976) and 435 (1978), which were universally accepted as providing a just and equitable basis for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Namibia. But, as has too frequently been the case in Namibia's long march towards independence, justice and fairness have not proved sufficient to regain for that Territory its birth-right to national autonomy. Extraneous considerations and criminal illogicalities have been woven into the tapestry of South Africa's conspiracy to deny the people of Namibia what the rest of the world already enjoys—national independence. It is time to put a stop to all prevarication over Namibia's independence.

42. We have therefore come to New York to attend this session of the General Assembly with the single objective of advancing the achievement of that goal, especially in view of the continued failure of the Security Council to discharge its responsibility in the wake of continued South African intransigence and aggression against Namibia and neighbouring independent African States, the most glaring example of which is the ongoing naked aggression against Angola which commenced two weeks ago.

43. The Security Council debate on the situation in Namibia, from 21 April to 30 April 1981, was both momentous and memorable, not only because it resulted in unmasking Western duplicity in regard to Namibia's future, but also because it called into question as never before the wisdom of surrendering the important question of world peace and security to those who continue to encourage breaches of peace and security for narrow national interests, regardless of the consequences.

44. As it turned out, it was not only the future of Namibia that was at stake during that memorable debate, but also that of the Security Council itself. This special session of the General Assembly, acting as an international jury, will pronounce its verdict on the conduct of the Security Council over Namibia, especially for having acted in defiance of the established global consensus in favour of the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the racist South African régime for its crime of *apartheid*, its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States, in violation of various United Nations resolutions.

45. The request for the Security Council debate on the situation in Namibia by the group of African States at the United Nations last April was based on a resolution of the OAU Co-ordinating Committee

for the Liberation of Africa, adopted at its January 1981 meeting at Arusha, the New Delhi Declaration adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries at its New Delhi meeting in February 1981, the resolution of the OAU Council of Ministers adopted during its thirty-sixth ordinary session at Addis Ababa in February and March 1981, the Programme of Action of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries adopted at its Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting at Algiers from 16 to 18 April 1981 and by an earlier resolution of the General Assembly adopted at its thirty-fifth session [*resolution 35/227*]. All of those called on the Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. There was therefore *ab initio* and prior to the Security Council debate a global consensus in favour of the application of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. In spite of that overwhelming global consensus, the guardians of world peace and security, those entrusted with the power of the veto for the preservation of humanity, chose to exercise their power arbitrarily to negate the process of peaceful settlement in Namibia. Africa refused to be bound by that deliberate and premeditated affront and has continued to pursue the course of peaceful settlement in Namibia. This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been convened pursuant to a resolution of the Council of Ministers of OAU and endorsed by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its eighteenth ordinary session, held in June at Nairobi, to continue the search for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue.

46. We are not here to rehash the catalogue of South Africa's transgressions, which are manifold, nor are we here in a spirit of confrontation. Nevertheless, we wish to stress that South Africa's act of illegality continues to give rise to consequences of the gravest magnitude, characterized by a serious threat to international peace and security and by constant acts of aggression. The specific elements of the breaching of international peace and security created by South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia are as follows: first, South Africa's massive military presence in Namibia, which ensures its continued repression of the population and forcible occupation of the Territory; secondly, the continued use by South Africa of Namibia as a springboard for armed aggression and terrorizing neighbouring African States, especially Angola, Mozambique and Zambia; thirdly, the acts of torture, repression, execution, detention and forced labour perpetrated against Namibian citizens by South Africa; and fourthly, South Africa's relentless exploitation of Namibia's mineral wealth and its persistent designs to dismember the Territory of Namibia through the purported annexation of Walvis Bay, in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and various resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly.

47. All of the above give rise to consequences that derive from all three categories referred to in Article 39, namely, threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Therefore the Security Council was under a clear obligation to apply Article 41 of the Charter and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. That it

failed to do so, my delegation submits, was a grave dereliction of its responsibility, and the General Assembly, the highest tribunal of the international community is well placed to reverse the verdict of the Security Council in the interest of the greatest good of the greatest number.

48. My delegation appeals to this high tribunal for justice to be done to the people of Namibia because those Western nations which frustrated the will of the entire world by casting vetoes against measures designed to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation were motivated neither by justice nor the concerns of world peace and security.

49. No amount of polemics or legalistic quibbles should be allowed to obscure the historical and momentous nature of this emergency special session of the General Assembly on the situation in Namibia. Just as the pen is mightier than the sword, so is the moral armour of the General Assembly mightier than the nuclear arsenals at the command of the permanent members of the Security Council. A highly sceptical world awaits the outcome of this emergency special session of the General Assembly. The question before it is not whether Namibia has a right to be free and independent. That decision was taken by the Assembly 15 years ago when it terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory. The question which the Assembly must decide is whether, on the basis of the mass of documents it had before it, the Security Council acted in consonance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter when it failed to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter and apply Article 41 when it was called upon to do so. If the Assembly decides that the Security Council erred in failing to discharge its responsibility towards the people of Namibia, it must act to rectify that failure. And we say to those friends of South Africa who claim friendship for black Africa that they cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. It is certainly not in their interest to continue to aid and abet South Africa's intransigence in Namibia.

50. Namibia is the child of the General Assembly. The question before the Assembly is whether this child, long held by South Africa against its will and that of the international community, will be left to languish under the yoke of the tyrannical and diabolical racist régime. Africa says "no"—as does the rest of the civilized world. In the stillness of these halls, and above the tumult and cacophony of this debate, the anguish of a martyred Namibia cries out, not for vengeance, but for the rectification of the historical wrongs of the past 15 years. We cannot, we must not we dare not fail to act; for, should we let the dream of a free and independent Namibia die should we, while the United Nations yet lives, abandon Namibia as a hostage to South Africa in a gesture of surrender and appeasement, and should we fail to rise to the challenge with which this body has been so constantly and insolently affronted by South Africa, it is certain that the fate which overtook the defunct League of Nations also awaits the United Nations. In the face of the aggravated threat which South Africa's continued defiance concerning Namibia poses to the continuing viability of the United Nations, the clear obligation and responsibility of this body is to adopt overwhelmingly a resolution which should help preserve

and restore faith in the United Nations as well as secure the accelerated independence of Namibia.

51. The hour is late in terms of Namibia's independence calendar. Time is of the essence. Every hour, every day and every month that the independence of Namibia is delayed means yet more deaths among an already depleted Namibian population, owing to South Africa's genocidal policies. It also means a needless perpetuation of the unspeakable cruelty and human degradation to which Namibians have for too long been subjected. It amounts to acquiescence in South Africa's terrorism and aggressive practices against Namibia and the neighbouring African States. It means the further depletion of Namibia's mineral resources through criminal exploitation. In a word, delay in freeing Namibia from the clutches of *apartheid* South Africa is a crime against Namibia and its citizens. To all that—and much more—Africa says "no".

52. When we advocate measures to secure Namibia's independence through peaceful means, those who have dealings with and influence over South Africa tell us nothing can be done because South Africa is too powerful and also that such measures will induce further South African obstinacy. How much more obstinate can South Africa be? In the April Security Council debate they told us that sanctions would not work. We must ask why, then, the three Western permanent members of the Security Council bothered to cast negative votes against measures they claimed would not work anyway. They claimed that they voted the way they did because they wished to keep open the prospects for a negotiated settlement. It is now five months since their ill-motivated vetoes were cast to destroy the buds of freedom in Namibia, and we have a right to ask: who is keeping the gate to a negotiated settlement locked? They even had the nerve to speak of guaranteed rights for minorities in Namibia. We must ask: what about the trampled rights and the usurped freedom of the majority in Namibia?

53. In the name of Africa, my delegation calls upon the General Assembly, mankind's highest tribunal of justice, meeting in an emergency special session on the situation in Namibia, to take effective, urgent and affirmative action to resolve once and for all obstacles to Namibia's freedom and independence.

54. It is now 15 years since the Assembly assumed responsibility for Namibia with the aim of preparing it for national independence. It is past time that Namibia assumed its full nationhood and its rightful place among the council of nations in the Assembly. It should be enabled to do so without further delay.

55. It is now a decade since the International Court of Justice handed down a categorical judgement that South Africa's Mandate had been validly terminated by the General Assembly and that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia was therefore illegal.⁴ It is time Members of the United Nations brought that situation of illegality to an end.

56. It is now 10 years since the Security Council, in resolution 301 (1971), upheld the decision of the International Court of Justice. It is time that the Security Council lived up to its Charter obligation by applying Article 41 and imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

57. Justice delayed is justice denied. Before this highest tribunal, we plead only that justice be done. It was the American Thomas Jefferson who once wrote that "the sword of the law should never fall but on those whose guilt is so apparent as to be pronounced by their friends as well as foes". The friends of South Africa have made that pronouncement several times and over many years from this very rostrum of the General Assembly. That verdict has been repeated a dozen times over by friends and foes alike in the course of this present debate. If there are any here who still harbour any doubts about the guilt of South Africa, let them speak now or forever hold their peace, and let justice be done.

58. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): As I am speaking for the first time in this important forum as the Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the President of the General Assembly on his skilful guidance of the work of this important session which has been convened at a time when the situation in southern Africa has become extremely acute, threatening international peace and security. This explosive situation has been further exacerbated as a result of the large-scale armed aggression by the racist Republic of South Africa against the independent, sovereign and progressive People's Republic of Angola. This new and arrogant adventure on the part of Pretoria once again confirms that, despite all the generally recognized norms of international law and despite stern moral condemnation by world public opinion, the racist régime of Pretoria, protected by its overseas allies, intends to continue its aggressive and predatory policy. However, we may rest assured that Angola, this proud, unsubdued 600-year-old country supported by all the progressive forces of the world, will prove able to defend its sovereignty and independence.

59. The people of my country, as a result of their own experience in a long struggle for independence and freedom, know full well the price of freedom. Therefore we are deeply convinced that the just struggle of the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, its sole legitimate and authentic representative recognized by the United Nations and OAU, will remove this last shameful stigma of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* on the African continent from the face of the earth.

60. This year the leaders in Pretoria have been rejecting with particular ferocity all decisions of the United Nations, flagrantly flouting all norms of international law and rejecting the fundamental principles for a settlement of the Namibian problem which were worked out as the result of many years of negotiation in various bodies of the United Nations, including the Security Council. Furthermore, the Pretoria authorities have been doing their utmost to prolong their illegal occupation of Namibia and to prevent the victory of the national liberation movement of the Namibian people. It is crystal clear that the situation existing at the present time in Namibia is a direct result of the policy pursued by leading countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], primarily the United States, a major world Power, a permanent member of the Security Council and a country bearing

special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. For that country South Africa, unfortunately, has been and remains a valuable ally, in the political as well as in the military and economic spheres—in the sphere of venal exploitation by transnational corporations—and that is why these countries have never really given serious thought to the scrupulous implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and why they have no intention of using the opportunities available to them to bring their influence to bear on the Republic of South Africa. Since the failure of the Geneva meeting last January, these countries, taking refuge behind the slogan of "moderation", are in actual fact supporting the policy of the Pretoria régime in its delaying tactics, thereby trying to ensure a neo-colonialist solution for the problem of Namibia. This was borne out by the triple veto in the Security Council last April, when those countries blocked the imposition of sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. In the spirit of the so-called "new regional strategy of the United States" with respect to southern Africa, that country voted against the draft resolution submitted by African and other non-aligned countries, thereby pronouncing itself quite clearly in favour of a continuation of armed aggression by the Republic of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. It is also clear that the "new regional strategy" accommodates all the basic goals of Pretoria, that is, the preservation in Namibia of a privileged position for the white minority, the isolation of SWAPO and the granting of power to puppets. It is also clear that the authors of that doctrine are trying to impose on Namibia's neighbours a "certain line of conduct" as a necessary condition for a solution of the Namibian problem. In its essence this is hypocrisy, as such conditions constitute flagrant and unjustifiable intervention in the affairs of sovereign African States with which the racist régime has long been waging an undeclared war.

61. The heroic people of Namibia and its vanguard, SWAPO, are continuing their just struggle in exceptionally difficult conditions. The inhuman régime of Pretoria is making use of sophisticated methods whose ultimate aim is the liquidation of SWAPO. However, neither massive assaults nor the tracking down of SWAPO fighters nor torture nor murder can halt the heroic national liberation struggle of the Namibian people led by its vanguard. The Namibian people has on its side also the world community and historical justice.

62. Therefore my country strongly supports an effective and comprehensive settlement of the question of Namibia. A settlement of this question—and we repeat this, as many others have before us—can be ensured only on the basis of the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which provide for the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of all armed forces and police forces and the entire Administration of South Africa from Namibia, including Walvis Bay, further ensuring the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, and the immediate realization of the inalienable rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

63. At the same time we support the proposals to apply effective measures against the Pretoria régime, measures that would force it to heed the will of the international community. There can be no doubt that such measures would include the imposition by the Security Council of comprehensive economic and other mandatory sanctions against the Republic of South Africa, in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

64. Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique):* The Assembly is meeting at a particularly grave moment, when a Member of the Organization is being subjected to a barbarous and heinous invasion of its national territory. Angola is at present the target of a flagrant and unprovoked aggression. The people of Angola are being massacred indiscriminately by the forces of the illegal racist régime of Pretoria. This situation, of a gravity without precedent in contemporary history, surpasses our imagination and demands from the Assembly the recognition of the clear and unequivocal intentions of the Botha régime so that appropriate measures can be taken to put an end to such irresponsible actions.

65. The South African invasion of Angola is not just a threat to peace and security in southern Africa. The invasion of the territory of a sovereign and independent State is a direct violation of all the principles which led to the creation of the Organization. It represents a serious threat to world peace. We cannot and should not remain indifferent to a situation of this nature, a situation that offends our feelings and violates our collective consciousness. We cannot allow the crimes perpetrated by the Pretoria racist régime to continue unpunished. It is, in fact, not an isolated act carried out on the pretext of exercising the right of hot pursuing of those whom South Africa refers to as "terrorists". Let us see why the criminal acts of Pretoria are not isolated acts.

66. Angola, as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations, has always complied with the obligations laid down by the Organization for the elimination of colonialism, *apartheid* and racism, which constitute a threat to international peace and security. South Africa, the main bastion of those backward ideas and of the maintenance of the *status quo* in southern Africa, invaded Angola precisely with the aim of preventing that country from expressing in concrete form its solidarity with the people of Namibia in their struggle for self-determination and independence. South Africa invaded Angola with the aim of preventing that country from complying with the relevant resolutions of the OAU, the United Nations and the non-aligned countries, which rightly reaffirm the justice of the struggle of the Namibian people, who, under the leadership of SWAPO, are fighting with their weapons to conquer their right to live as a free people.

67. This macabre act of the Pretoria régime is part of the global imperialist strategy to destabilize the countries of southern Africa that seek an independent development of the region. It is designed to create in the south of Angola a buffer zone to prevent the advance and development of the activities of SWAPO fighters.

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

68. On the other hand, it should also be borne in mind that the present situation could pave the way for the secession of part of Angolan territory, which would be handed over to the so-called UNITA⁵, a puppet movement created by Portuguese colonial fascism which continues to be maintained and encouraged by South Africa. We should be alert to this possibility and spare no effort to prevent the partition of Angola by the imperialists. We cannot allow part of the territory of a State Member of the United Nations to be handed over to bands of murderers.

69. By aggression and by promoting puppet groups for the destabilization of neighbouring countries, South Africa seeks to extend the contradictions of the *apartheid* régime beyond its borders. It seeks to export the heinous and repugnant policy of racial discrimination.

70. It is the moral duty of all countries to help Angola to defend its seriously threatened sovereignty. The immediate withdrawal of the racist forces is an urgent demand.

71. Given the repercussions and implications of all those actions, we wonder who is encouraging South Africa to embark on such adventures? How is it possible for South Africa to be increasingly intransigent in regard to the application of the decisions of the international community concerning the decolonization of the Territory of Namibia unless it is the firm support of the Western Powers, which inspire and encourage the criminal attitude of Pretoria and unless it is the passivity, silence, acquiescence and concurrence of those Powers, which pursue similar aims and should have persuaded the Pretoria régime not to commit such heinous crimes. Since the Geneva talks, all attempts to solve the problem of Namibia have been unsuccessful because of the arrogance of South Africa, supported by the Western Powers and, in particular, by the United States. The arrogance and irresponsibility of the minority racist régime of South Africa are the reasons for the failure of the Geneva meeting and of all the subsequent actions intended to settle the problem of Namibia.

72. The United States systematically blocks all initiatives conducive to the solution of the problem of Namibia. The United States, in proposing the revision of the United Nations plan approved in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), violates a decision of the highest organ of the United Nations. It is disrupting a universally accepted consensus, thus supporting racism and *apartheid* as well as defending the occupationist aggressors who massacre defenceless populations.

73. During the last series of meetings of the Security Council, when the United States admitted that the intransigence of South Africa was the source of tension, it was simply soliciting the sympathy of the African States, in particular, and of the international community in general. The multilateral support accorded to the *apartheid* régime by the United States in the economic, financial and military fields is a well-known fact.

74. In seeking to equate the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with the invasion of that country by South Africa as sources of tension, the United States is trying to confuse public opinion on the issue of who is

the aggressor and who is the victim of aggression. This is an absolute side-tracking of the issue and clear interference in the internal affairs of Angola. What right has the United States to impose such conditions when its troops are stationed all over the world and are even now occupying a part of Cuba?

75. The Cuban troops are in Angola because the people of Angola has so requested. They are there at the request of the people of Angola in order to defend it from an act of racist aggression which has been condemned by the international community as a hideous crime. After all, it is South African and United States interference that brought about the Cuban presence in Angola. The peace-loving peoples of the world are grateful for the sacrifices of the Cuban people in supporting and upholding human dignity. Namibia should not be used as a commodity in exchange for the presence of imperialist interests in our region, particularly when such interests mean the loss of our freedom, independence and sovereignty.

76. After the failure of the Geneva meeting, the Namibian question was considered in various forums—in the Security Council, in OAU, and by the Non-Aligned Movement. OAU, which met at Arusha in January, adopted a plan of action that envisaged certain concrete steps. Among those steps were an increase in military, financial, material and diplomatic support for SWAPO and the convening of a series of Security Council meetings for the sole purpose of imposing economic sanctions against South Africa. The same plan also envisaged assistance to the front-line States to enable them to withstand the acts of armed aggression by South Africa of which they are the victims.

77. At the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in February, the fundamental guidelines of the Arusha plan were endorsed. It was in response to the mandate of the OAU Council of Ministers that the group of African States at the United Nations called for a Security Council meeting last April to study this problem resulting from the deterioration of the situation and urged the adoption of measures adequate to the seriousness of the moment. In the Security Council, the Western Powers, in an obstructionist stance, used their veto to block the imposition of sanctions against South Africa, claiming that the measure would not contribute to a solution of the problem. Very recently, the United States once more used its veto, thus preventing the condemnation of South Africa for its acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Thus the United States veto further strengthened and encouraged the aggressor.

78. The People's Republic of Mozambique considers that the policies and acts of the new United States Administration, in its close collaboration with the Pretoria régime, are contrary to aspirations of peoples and the decisions of the United Nations. It is therefore the duty of the international community severely to condemn these policies of the United States in order to ensure the promotion of peace in the world and the defence of the freedom of peoples and the independence of nations. It is also to be regretted that the United Kingdom abstained in the vote and was thus inconsistent with its earlier stated position of condemnation.

79. To refrain from condemning *apartheid* is ultimately to encourage Pretoria to carry out its horrible policies and practices. When members of the Security Council tell us that they cannot condemn an act of armed aggression committed by the racist régime resulting in the murder of hundreds of people and the destruction of infrastructures involving the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars merely because the draft resolution contains strong expressions against the aggressor, this makes us wonder whether it is worth while to seek peaceful solutions through the Security Council. The Council has been rendered ineffective for so many years that it finds itself unable to implement unanimously adopted resolutions and specifically resolution 435 (1978).

80. Several times the Security Council has been called upon to take measures that would put an end, once and for all, to the constant violations of sovereignty and to the acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria soldiery. However, the Western countries permanent members of the Security Council—particularly the United States—refused to ensure the implementation of the Charter, thus giving the racists and the Zionists a free hand to kill indiscriminately, merely because the victims are Africans or Arabs. It is Western armaments and technology that cause and spread the destruction, and our peoples and countries are the preferred areas for the war experiments of the Western Powers.

81. The people who have been bombed and massacred have no alternative but to call in the forces of friendly nations, in accordance with article 51 of the Charter. Hence we urge all States to respond positively and promptly to the appeal of the people and Government of Angola. The legitimacy of Angola's appeal needs no argument or justification whatsoever. Here we should like to give credit for the commendable attitude shown by France, one of the five members of the Western contact group, during the last series of meetings of the Security Council. France voted with a complete sense of responsibility. We welcome and salute this attitude of France towards Africa. We hope that France will take further steps in support of the struggle for the liberation of southern Africa.

82. The seriousness of the times we live in requires that this Assembly adopt appropriate measures capable of securing the maintenance of international peace and security. We must eradicate the factors that contribute to the climate of war which we are witnessing today. In practical terms we base our stand on the following points.

83. First, the problem of Namibia must be solved pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

84. Secondly, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the plan endorsed by it constitute the political and juridical framework for a proper transition of the Territory of Namibia to self-determination and independence.

85. Thirdly, the entire international community must shoulder its responsibilities towards the Namibian people, for Namibia is an international Territory.

86. Fourthly, South Africa must be politically, economically and diplomatically isolated. The People's Republic of Mozambique supports the imposition of

comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The People's Republic of Mozambique considers irrelevant the argument that the imposition of sanctions would not bring about any positive results. It is important that all countries which directly or indirectly collaborate with South Africa adopt unilateral measures for the isolation of that racist régime, as some countries have already done. For the sanctions to be effective, a fundamental prerequisite is that the Western countries which are economic partners and allies of South Africa apply the sanctions effectively.

87. Fifthly, the international community must give its material and diplomatic support to SWAPO in its armed struggle for national liberation, which at the moment is the only way of securing final victory for the Namibian people.

88. The People's Republic of Mozambique pursues a policy of peace, for we believe that only through the preservation of a peaceful climate can there be free development and progress for the people of southern Africa. Freedom for the people of Namibia is the *sine qua non* for the establishment of peace in southern Africa.

89. The People's Republic of Mozambique, guided by the spirit of solidarity, reiterates its support for the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and authentic representative.

90. The people of Namibia will triumph. *A luta continua.*

91. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): The convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly is fully justified by the situation created in and around Namibia. That situation threatens peace and affects the basic human rights of the people living there.

92. Nearly 15 years have already elapsed since the General Assembly took the historic decision to put an end to South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and to place the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations until independence. It is our political obligation and moral duty to implement that decision.

93. For a number of years now we have been witnessing a discernible sequence of manœuvres on the part of the racist régime of South Africa. The United Nations remains confronted by the illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by South Africa and the people of Namibia are subjected to the brutal practices of *apartheid*, the racist doctrine condemned by the United Nations and the whole civilized world. This situation represents a serious challenge to the authority, purposes and principles of the United Nations. At the same time it endangers peace and security not only of that particular region but also of the whole world.

94. The situation in southern Africa became more critical following the escalation of the policy of *apartheid*, repeated acts of military aggression and acts of terrorism committed by the forces of the Pretoria régime against the front-line States, in particular the People's Republic of Angola. The Territory of Namibia was recently illegally used by South Africa to commit an open aggression against Angola. The Polish Government condemned that act as an attempt to destabilize

the situation in Angola, to aggravate further the situation in the region and seriously to endanger world peace. The United Nations, representing the whole international community, cannot remain idle in the face of those facts.

95. Events have shown that no half-measures, whatever their origin, will ever suffice to persuade South Africa to leave Namibia on its own or to stop its aggression against independent African States.

96. The question of Namibia is one of decolonization and must be resolved in accordance with the provisions of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. The Government and people of Poland have always actively supported that Declaration, as well as the struggle of peoples against all forms of colonial and imperialist oppression. It is in that spirit that Poland is lending its full support to the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for genuine self-determination, independence, freedom and the total liberation of its territory, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands.

97. We reaffirm our resolute support of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

98. We are deeply concerned about the continued occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria and its blatant refusal to implement United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia. For that reason the responsibility of the United Nations towards the colonial people has never before been as great as it is now in the case of Namibia.

99. A just solution of the Namibian problem lies in a speedy, full and unhesitating implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), the latter of which endorses the United Nations plan for Namibia.

100. At the same time the Polish delegation strongly deplores the negative stand taken by some countries on measures demanded by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of our Organization on the complete economic and political isolation of South Africa. In that connection, my delegation would like to stress once again that the United Nations should impose, without further delay, mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

101. Moreover, Poland as a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia is strongly against any attempt or manœuvre to impose an external settlement, in other words a solution of the Namibian question outside the framework of the United Nations, which bears legal responsibility for that Territory.

102. Also, we intend to support the speedy implementation and strengthening of the legal basis of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia,⁶ enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia, in order to stop the illegal, colonial exploitation of Namibia's natural resources. We also comply fully with Security Council resolution 418 (1977), which calls for an arms embargo against South Africa.

103. Poland will play its part in the Organization's valuable efforts to defend and promote the cause of the Namibian people. There is no place in today's world for a disgraceful, colonial system and *apartheid*, and we should do our utmost to remove all vestiges of colonialism from the African continent.

104. The Polish delegation intends to give full support to any resolute proposal submitted at this session which will constitute an important step in the international mobilization of all progressive forces for the final and urgent liberation of the people of Namibia from racist domination.

105. Mr. MOGWE (Botswana): Three years have gone by since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), endorsing the United Nations plan for Namibia. Three years have gone by since SWAPO and, ostensibly, South Africa declared their acceptance of the said plan. Africa and the international community as a whole welcomed the plan as a blueprint for peaceful change in Namibia. Yet the plan, three years later, remains a pious declaration of intent.

106. All are agreed, both inside and outside Namibia, that independence must inevitably come to Namibia—and soon. The stumbling-blocks, the impediments, the obstacles—however the Assembly might choose to characterize them—to the implementation of the said plan are various: some genuine, others spurious if not obstructively contrived. They include the search for supplementary measures designed to assure South Africa and the parties in Namibia of fair and equitable treatment.

107. The Assembly will recall that the Geneva talks on Namibia in January this year stalled on the question of mutual trust and confidence. South Africa and the internal parties craved the termination of United Nations diplomatic, political and material support for SWAPO and the substitution of equality of treatment for all as the norm.

108. To the international community SWAPO is the sole and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia in its struggle for the decolonization and the independence of its territory. SWAPO acceptance of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) was contingent upon the cessation of hostilities and the creation of conditions conducive to free and fair elections. Consequently, SWAPO has zealously pressed for an agreed date for the cease-fire.

109. By its acceptance of pre-independence elections SWAPO unconditionally concedes and recognizes the reality of the existence of parties representing other interests in Namibia. To its magnanimous credit is the acceptance by SWAPO of the fact that, in a situation of peace, it will cease to be the sole party campaigning for elections. It accepts the fact that its socialist orientation may come up against challenges, internal political challenges externally inspired and orchestrated. SWAPO is none the less ready to go to the hustings and do battle.

110. With SWAPO so poised and ready to co-operate, there are questions to be asked such as: whence the lack of trust? why the lack of confidence? Is this not a tactic to buy time, to consolidate the position of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance or to exclude SWAPO from the elections? Is it not a manoeuvre by the racist

régime to facilitate its regular murderous sorties into the People's Republic of Angola to massacre and maim innocent civilians and destroy property?

111. By its acts of aggression against neighbouring States South Africa destroys the credibility of its vaunted request for mutual trust and confidence. In the interest of peace in the region, rather than test its military might by attacking weak neighbouring States in the area, South Africa should agree to the setting of a date for the cease-fire and thus open the door for all other processes leading to the independence of Namibia.

112. Another obstacle to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is what, in Western circles, has come to be regarded as basic constitutional principles to which the Namibian parties must commit themselves before elections can be held. Botswana is not privy to what those principles are or what they entail. Those who know play their cards very close to their vests. It is surmised, however, that one of the principles might be the protection and entrenchment of the rights of minorities.

113. Botswana has nothing against the acceptance beforehand by all the Namibian parties concerned, including SWAPO, of any principles designed to amplify—but not to modify—Security Council resolution 435 (1978). We shall none the less raise our voices in protest if the tragedy of Namibia should continue to provide material for East-West rivalry.

114. Botswana is a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We unequivocally and without reservation support the African Charter of Human and People's Rights in the formulation of which we fully participated. Our State Constitution enshrined fundamental human rights for all, without exception. Our record in the field of human rights is impeccable. Botswana supports the assurance of such rights for all people.

115. The concept of the entrenchment of minority rights therefore sounds, to our ears, discriminatory and like an unwitting invitation to future national discord and strife. The Zimbabwean experience need not be replicated in Namibia. The major task for independent Namibia will be to decolonize people's attitudes, particularly those of the white minority, to unify the nation, and to build up one loyalty and one allegiance. To be fair, just and equitable, the constitution of Namibia should apply equally to all. Having said that, we are, however, deeply conscious of the fact that, in the final analysis, it will be the people of Namibia themselves who will decide on the form of constitution suited to the historical, ethnic and other conditions prevailing in that country. It could therefore be pretentious of us to be categorical or to assume some enlightened insight into what might not be advantageous for them.

116. Fundamental to the impasse in the Namibia drama and overriding many other considerations is South Africa's place in the strategic, political, economic, commercial and security interests of the West, particularly, of the United States. The Reagan Administration has, at various levels, displayed morbid concern about the Soviet and Cuban presence in Angola.

117. In his speech to the American Legion in Honolulu recently, Chester Crocker, the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, told his audience that America sought to deny opportunities to all those who sought objectives contrary to those sought by the United States. The Study Commission of United States Policy Toward Southern Africa lists among American foreign-policy objectives in Africa the protection of United States military and strategic interests and the minimization of Soviet influence.

118. A fortnight ago the international community watched helplessly as the South African troops, using the United Nations Territory of Namibia as a launching pad, penetrated deep into the territory of Angola, there to spend a week of carnage and destruction. South Africa continues to gloat over the killing of many SWAPO fighters. The international community, in the Security Council, condemned that act of aggression. Only the United States vetoed the draft resolution—on the grounds that the incursion was the result of some terrorism and bloodshed caused by the so-called insurgents operating from Angola. We cannot claim that we fully comprehend the justification of or the rationalization behind that stance. We can only guess that this might be a case of the People's Republic of Angola's seeking objectives contrary to those sought by the United States, or a case where United States military and strategic interests are being protected or Soviet influence minimized.

119. No doubt its new-found friendship and the reported killing and capturing of Russian military officers in southern Angola will not only embolden South Africa to engage in more terrorist acts such as the strafing of a convoy near Cahama in Angola but also delay even further the accession of Namibia to independence. It is worthy of note that in the context of southern Africa one cannot condemn the Soviet Union's support for the liberation of oppressed peoples without conversely being seen to sympathize with, give encouragement to, and approve the institutionalized debasement of those who are struggling for their freedom.

120. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the independence of Namibia have erroneously but perhaps by design—to confuse issues—been associated with the issue of the Cubans in Angola and the rebel UNITA² forces in the south of that country. Angola is a sovereign independent State with a right, unfettered except where proscribed by the will of its people, to enter into treaties, alliances and pacts with any country whatever. Although my country, Botswana, recognizes the danger to peace and security in Africa inherent in the involvement of extra-continental Powers in African political conflicts and maintains that Africa did not regain its freedom and independence only to subject itself to other foreign Powers for recolonization, and although we deprecate and resent the growing danger of foreign countries arrogating to themselves the role of policeman in Africa, we recognize and support the sovereign right of any State to identify its enemies and to choose its friends, particularly in situations of armed conflict.

121. The Angolan saga must therefore be viewed against that background. Angola is a socialist State, and so are many other countries in Africa and the world. So what? Angola has since its independence

sought nothing less than to live in peace with its neighbours and other countries of the region, including South Africa, despite the barbarous acts of aggression South Africa has persistently committed against that country. Angola, a front-line State, has contributed in no small measure to the search for peaceful solutions to the problems of southern Africa, particularly those of Namibia. It was Angola that recommended the formula of a demilitarized zone in its territory in the interest of peace in Namibia. The irony of the situation is that a country so involved in the search for peace should itself be granted none.

122. Botswana condemns in the strongest terms acts of aggression against that sister State. My country does not condone any open or tacit support for UNITA rebels. Their existence or otherwise should in no way influence the political process leading to Namibia's independence. To sympathize with UNITA is to be a party to the destabilization of Angola.

123. SWAPO is a liberation movement which has drawn inspiration from liberation wars in Africa and elsewhere, but more recently from the heroic and determined struggle of the peoples of Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe for freedom and independence. Like other liberation movements in those countries, SWAPO resorted to an armed liberation struggle as an act of desperation. It sought assistance from socialist countries because the Western countries were insensitive to the human misery and suffering caused by unconscionable racism and *apartheid*. Their colonialist experience had numbed their conscience and their sense of political justice. Yet the West and South Africa disparage SWAPO's socialist connections and, if it lay within the power of South Africa to do so, it would precipitate their severance or even the eclipse of SWAPO itself.

124. Edward Heath, a former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, addressing the South African Institute of International Affairs at Johannesburg recently, warned that "to isolate SWAPO because it has links with Moscow is only to give it no alternative but to strengthen that relationship". SWAPO, as the embodiment of the spirit of the people's struggle for freedom, cannot and will not be exterminated.

125. The concept of elections is by its very nature a recognition of the existence of varying political points of view, some capitalist, some socialist and others Communist, with varying degrees of commitment within each, yet each without exception claiming to be more democratic than the others. Namibian political parties will be no exception to the rule. The measure of democracy required of us all is that all should be provided with equal opportunities in the election process to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their inalienable right to elect a government of their choice without external interference or internal intimidation.

126. This emergency special session has been convened in the belief that international ranting and raving interspersed with grim reminders of the imminent invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations might move the problem of Namibia closer to solution and to the restoration of peace in the region. The facts we adduce to support our case are historical and well known to the point

of being trite. But we continue to intone them in the hope that some day we may penetrate South Africa's intransigence.

127. The General Assembly, in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 1966, declared that South Africa had "failed... to ensure the moral and material well-being and security" of the inhabitants of the Territory. In 1970 the Security Council, in resolution 276 (1970) declared that "the continued presence of the South African authorities in Namibia is illegal." In 1971 the International Court of Justice ruled that

"South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory;"⁴

128. The 1971 Court injunction, for all its immediacy, has not, 10 years later, been put into effect and South Africa continues to occupy Namibia and to claim responsibility for the protection of the people of that Territory against SWAPO attacks. South Africa's response to the resolutions relating to Namibia has been one of open defiance. The United Nations reaction to that defiance has been one of overt impotence and powerlessness.

129. South Africa derives solace and encouragement from the expression of sentiments about its alliance and participation in world wars, from the spectre of some red peril, from the importance of the Cape route and sea lanes, from strategic minerals and vital economic interests and from vetoes and abstentions in its defence.

130. Nature may not have been sufficiently bounteous as to endow Namibia with matching attributes, yet circumstance has provided Namibia with life—human and sacred.

131. The central issue is Namibia's independence and freedom and, by extension, southern Africa's peace and stability. Neither the East nor the West is being invited to align itself with independent Africa against South Africa. Our call in Africa is for the East and the West to align themselves with right against wrong, with freedom against oppression and tyranny and with justice against injustice. The United Nations plan for Namibia remains our only hope—the only alternative to the wanton destruction of human life in that country.

132. Mr. HODOUL (Seychelles) (*interpretation from French*): I have already had the opportunity in other circumstances of congratulating the President on his election to the presidency of sessions of the General Assembly. Today I shall confine myself to extending my thanks to all those who have helped in the convening and the smooth organization of this emergency special session of the General Assembly on the question of Namibia. I should like to extend my particular thanks to the Secretary-General and his Secretariat.

133. The history of the countries and peoples of Africa over the last quarter of a century has essentially been marked by a series of victories gained as a result of liberation and independence struggles against foreign domination, oppression, exploitation and even plundering.

134. The Namibian people, whose struggle has been going on for years, will also have their day of victory;

we are convinced of that. This emergency special session has no other purpose but to hasten the coming of that day.

135. Unfortunately, the Namibian people are still struggling today, for the simple reason that the Pretoria régime and its allies are seeking by all possible means to continue the pillage of that Territory for the benefit of imperialism and the multinational corporations and are using it both as a rampart and a base in their policy of aggression and expansionism.

136. That insane, cruel and inhuman régime has been condemned by all the members of the international community, with the exception of a few States, as is shown by the history of the resolutions of the Organization dealing with the decolonization of southern Africa.

137. It is precisely those few States, accomplices of *apartheid*, that allow the Pretoria régime to continue with impunity its illegal occupation of Namibia. Their alliance with Pretoria is no longer a secret. They even dare sometimes to proclaim it openly and to justify it on the fallacious pretext of a crusade against communism. That complicity only undermines the moral authority of our Organization and paralyzes it in its quest for a just solution of the Namibian question. Furthermore, as I have had the opportunity to stress on many occasions, the Organization is partially responsible for the present situation in Namibia. Because of the shilly-shallying of some of its Members it supports the occupation of Namibia and the atrocious crimes committed against the Namibian people.

138. Today, having taken note of the refusal of those few States unconditionally to rally to the just cause of the Namibian people, we find ourselves once again meeting in an emergency-special session to ensure that peace, justice and freedom can be finally established in Namibia and in the area despite their vetoes.

139. The path adopted to that end since 1966, when the General Assembly put an end, in resolution 2145 (XXI) to South Africa's administrative Mandate over the Territory of Namibia and established in 1967 the United Nations Council for Namibia, has been the path of reason and justice. In 1978 when the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia and also this year when SWAPO agreed to participate in the Geneva talks and when the majority of the members of the Security Council called for the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, it was in order to try to bring the Pretoria régime to reason as well.

140. Unfortunately, that régime, because it is intrinsically oppressive, barbarous and bellicose, has proved itself incapable of reasonable and peaceful conduct. The recent acts of aggression not only against the Namibian people but also against the Angolans are additional proof of this.

141. My delegation calls on the Assembly to take note once again of this reality and to act accordingly.

142. While reaffirming its total agreement with the United Nations resolutions on independence for Namibia, especially Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which constitutes a minimal plan for a valid settlement without any need of strengthening, my delegation nevertheless would like the Assembly to

readjust its strategy in order to take into consideration both the intransigence of the Pretoria régime and the support it enjoys from certain Member States, which, through the abuse of their right of veto, have rendered the Security Council incapable of carrying out its duty.

Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Vice-President, took the Chair.

143. Thus my delegation feels that this eighth emergency special session has no choice but to have recourse to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950, which provides that:

“ if the Security Council... fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security... the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

144. Faced with the existence of a breach of the peace, which the Security Council itself has recognized, on the one hand, and the incapacity of that Council to act, on the other, my delegation is duty bound to reaffirm the preponderant role of the armed struggle being waged by SWAPO in order to wrest all of its territory from the domination of the Pretoria régime and put an end to acts of aggression by South African forces in the area.

145. Thus it is imperative, as provided for by the same resolution 377 A (V), that States Members of the United Nations as quickly as possible offer material, military and humanitarian assistance to SWAPO, thereby allowing it to intensify this armed struggle.

146. Furthermore, my delegation continues to be in favour of the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa by way of support for the struggle of SWAPO against the occupier.

147. That, is the position of my country, the Republic of the Seychelles, on the question before us.

148. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the United Arab Emirates, I am pleased to congratulate Mr. von Wechmar most warmly on the fact that he is presiding over this emergency special session. His presidency of this most important session, coming after his presiding over the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, is a sure guarantee of the happy outcome of the deliberations, and we reaffirm our confidence in his wisdom and competence and our respect for his person and for the State he represents.

149. We wish also to avail ourselves of this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, our appreciation for his efforts and endeavours to promote the United Nations and the achievement of the Organization's objectives.

150. The General Assembly has been convened to consider the question of Namibia and South Africa's refusal to implement United Nations resolutions aimed at enabling the Namibian people to exercise their inalienable rights. It is meeting also because of the abuse of the right of veto by some permanent members of the Security Council in disregard of legality

and in support of the aggressor: It is being held under resolution 377 (V), entitled “Uniting for peace”, which gives the Assembly at this emergency special session the power to adopt practical recommendations to safeguard international peace and security in the event of the Security Council's failure to carry out its duty as a result of the use of the veto by some great Powers.

151. The actions of the racist régime of South Africa are a barrier preventing the Namibian people from exercising the right to self-determination and independence. That régime has escalated its acts of aggression against neighbouring African States, acts which are a threat to peace and security not only in southern Africa but also throughout the world.

152. In this respect this session should adopt a resolution going beyond the framework of recommendations, appeals and mere condemnations. We consider that the resolution should contain mandatory and comprehensive sanctions to be applied, in accordance with the mandate conferred upon the General Assembly by the “Uniting for peace” resolution.

153. We are certain that such a resolution would represent the bare minimum expected of this session. The adoption of an appropriate resolution in accord with the international will would reflect the scope of the commitment of the United Nations to its Charter and its ability to achieve the objectives which led to its establishment: the creation of a world where justice, the law and peace will prevail.

154. In Article 77 the Charter defined the United Nations responsibility in the case of a Territory under colonial domination such as Namibia. Since South Africa has refused to recognize this responsibility, the International Court of Justice, at the request of the Security Council, handed down an advisory opinion on 21 June 1971,⁴ which reaffirmed this United Nations responsibility.

155. In the light of this opinion, various United Nations organs have considered the question of Namibia and have adopted several relevant resolutions designed to enable the people of Namibia at last to exercise their right to self-determination and to form an independent State. Despite all this, the racist Pretoria régime continues to defy the United Nations by refusing to implement the resolutions and persisting in the consolidation of its racist and imperialist régime in the area, while carrying out repression against that people and exploiting its resources and its goods. That régime would not have been able to adopt such a defiant attitude towards the international community unless it had the support of industrialized countries in the political, economic and military fields, countries that are only governed by material greed and disregard principles, human ideals and the rules of international law, although from time to time they claim they are encouraging the observance of such ideals and rules.

156. The attitude of those countries to the situation has assisted South Africa and Israel to consolidate their domination and to continue the escalation of their aggression in every field, including that of nuclear armament, and to exchange their experience in the field of coercion and repression. South Africa and Israel have each adopted a similar attitude towards the

neighbouring countries in order to hamper their economic and social development, the most recent example being the aggression committed by South Africa against Angola.

157. As a result of the victories of SWAPO on the battlefield and because of the increased political and moral support given to SWAPO by the international community, resolution 435 (1978) was adopted by the Security Council with the assent of the very Western Powers that support the Pretoria régime. That resolution provided a practical and reasonable foundation for a peaceful settlement, under United Nations supervision, based on the withdrawal of South Africa's forces and the holding of free elections with the participation of all parties in the Territory.

158. Despite the fact that that resolution did not fulfil all the hopes of the Namibian people, SWAPO, together with other countries in Africa and particularly the front-line States, accepted that resolution as proof of its good intentions and its will to arrive at an early and peaceful settlement of this question.

159. Despite the imperfections of resolution 435 (1978), my Government has given SWAPO and the African States its support. My country considers that that resolution is one step forward towards the settlement of this question. Of course we should have wished that the good will of the other parties concerned had created the atmosphere necessary for the implementation of that resolution but, unfortunately, we have been disappointed by the policies and conduct of the parties, collectively and individually, which have hampered its implementation.

160. The fact that we are meeting in an emergency special session is proof of the importance of the cause of Namibia and the explosive situation prevailing in the African countries and therefore throughout the world.

161. We must face up to our responsibilities with regard to this question by adopting coercive measures, including a complete boycott against the Government of South Africa. There is no other course; otherwise history will judge us most severely, as it did the League of Nations in the past.

162. Mr. NIASSE (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Our debate on the question of Namibia comes at a time when the situation in southern Africa is becoming even more threatening to international peace and security.

163. The illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the racist South African régime, which has already been denounced by the International Court of Justice, as well as its repeated attacks on independent African States such as Mozambique, Angola, Botswana and Zambia, contributes to the maintenance of an atmosphere of tension in that region.

164. These attacks, the most recent of which was perpetrated against Angola in flagrant violation of the Charter and of international law, and the impossibility of the Security Council to react as it should to such acts of aggression have gravely affected the credibility of the Organization. Resignation on the part of the international community is likely to jeopardize the survival of States with limited means of defence.

165. OAU called unanimously for the convening of this emergency special session to discuss the important

question of Namibia because it continues to have faith in the Organization and also because it agrees with the opinion of the Secretary-General, namely:

“The problem now consists in deciding on the best way to arrive at our objective, namely, the achievement of independence for Namibia at the earliest possible date by the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).”

166. In view of the Security Council's inability, under the relevant provisions of the Charter, to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa and in the absence of any possibility of implementing resolution 435 (1978), it was legitimate, because of that faith in the United Nations, to seize the General Assembly of this matter, since Article 14 of the Charter states that the Assembly:

“may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations”.

167. It cannot be too often repeated that the United Nations has a direct responsibility for the Territory of Namibia, which since 1967 has been placed under the authority of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is vested with administrative power over the Territory.

168. The settlement plan of the Western countries, endorsed by the Security Council in resolution 435 (1978), was an honourable compromise. Its adoption aroused great hopes and opened the way to a just settlement of this problem, which greatly concerns the international community. The reopening of the issue by South Africa at the Geneva meeting clearly proved, if proof were needed, that South Africa seeks to free itself of the constraints of United Nations decisions. Quite rightly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, stated:

“It became clear in the course of the [Geneva] meeting, that the South African Government was not yet prepared to sign a cease-fire agreement and proceed to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).”

169. It is quite clear that we can no longer allow South Africa to deny the people of Namibia the exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

170. SWAPO most responsibly agreed, for its part, to seize the opportunity provided by the initiative of the Western Powers whose action unexpectedly improved the prospects for an internationally acceptable settlement. Now that it has been established that the Government of South Africa has spoilt a unique opportunity, what can one expect of the United Nations but a strict application of the principles set out in the Charter against States which obstinately violate international law.

171. At present, it would be dangerous, to say the least, to promote any “comprehensive attitude” that would further compromise the credibility of the United Nations. There can be no doubt that if South Africa still takes the liberty of defying the international community, it is because it is assured within the United Nations of impunity, which is a barrier to the very spirit of the Charter.

172. In rallying to the Western initiative, we intend to acknowledge the fact that the most implacable attitudes could be won over, so as to put an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African Government. Above all, we were aware that the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council was to mark the culmination of efforts backed by a clear political will to put an end to a situation which was condemned in the past, as it is condemned today, by the entire international community.

173. The new demands of the racist South African régime at the Geneva meeting show its consummate skill in postponing by every means the accession of Namibia to independence. They are unacceptable and therefore must be rejected by the Security Council. Indeed, since the plan was endorsed by the highest body of our Organization, it cannot be left to the Government of South Africa alone to judge of its implementation.

174. It is an irony of fate that the settlement plan has led South Africa today to further intransigence. South Africa continues, by arsenals of laws and acts accompanied by aggression against neighbouring States, to try to perpetuate its racist and illegal domination of Namibia.

175. My country, Senegal, once again condemns the South African Government for its intransigence and at the same time deplors any comprehensiveness that might be expressed towards it. We are even warranted in thinking that it is from such ambivalent attitudes that South Africa draws the courage it needs to pursue its constant and systematic acts of aggression against independent neighbouring African States, thus aggravating existing international tensions, and to defy our Organization. Proof of this is the recent aggression of which the sovereign people of Angola was a victim at a time when the OAU mission that was constituted by the Council of Ministers of OAU at its thirty-seventh ordinary session, held at Nairobi in June, was in Europe to discuss ways and means of implementing the relevant provisions of resolution 435 (1978).

176. These new events provide additional reasons for the conviction that it is the duty of our Assembly, on the one hand, to consider all possible measures to compel South Africa to accept, under the provisions of the Charter, the decisions adopted by the Security Council and, on the other hand, to take initiatives to impose on that country the mandatory sanctions that the participants in this special session will certainly not fail to recommend against it.

177. In this spirit and given the repeated refusal of South Africa to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), as is borne out in the report of the Secretary-General,⁸ it is now more urgent than ever for the international community—in the opinion of my delegation—first, to put an end to all military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, in accordance with resolution 418 (1977); secondly, to impose on South Africa a sufficiently effective embargo, in particular on petroleum; thirdly, to allow neither investments nor loans; fourthly, to put an end to purchases and trading in gold and other precious metals from South Africa, as well as to co-operation with South African organizations for the marketing of those

precious minerals; fifthly, to refuse to South Africa all essential supplies, in particular electronic and telecommunications material, machines and chemical products, as well as the transfer of technology from whatever source.

178. Members will recall that these measures were advocated by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris from 20 to 27 May, over which my country, Senegal, had the honour of presiding, because South Africa had created a dangerous and explosive situation in southern Africa.

179. In the opinion of my delegation, the constant violations of the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations committed by the South African racist régime legally justify the adoption of enforcement measures against that régime. Furthermore, since it depends largely on foreign aid for technology, capital, durable goods and oil, the South African economy would feel severely the effects of specific mandatory international sanctions.

180. Need I repeat that the political, economic and military collaboration that certain States and transnational corporations continue to provide South Africa encourages it in its attitude of intransigence and defiance of the international community, and in particular of the United Nations, in spite of the praiseworthy efforts of Mr. Kurt Waldheim and his assistants throughout the world.

181. This is an opportunity for my delegation to congratulate the Secretary-General, as well as the United Nations Council for Namibia, on their steadfast efforts on behalf of the accession of Namibia to independence. My country, Senegal, wishes also to give SWAPO, the sole authentic liberation movement of the Namibian people, and our brother, Sam Nujoma, its President, every kind of assistance to enable them effectively to fulfil the aspirations of the Namibian people to genuine independence in a united Namibia.

182. Here I must salute the spirit of initiative, openness, co-operation, conciliation and political maturity which SWAPO displayed throughout the lengthy exercise that led to the settlement plan adopted by the Security Council and, more recently, at Geneva where it agreed to sign a cease-fire and to promote the establishment of a United Nations demilitarization force in Namibia.

183. Are these not sufficient proofs of the good will and sincerity of SWAPO and of our brother, Sam Nujoma?

184. In conclusion I wish to reaffirm, on behalf of my country, that it is high time for the Organization fully to discharge its responsibilities by scrupulously applying the relevant provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which alone can lead to a settlement. In this context, the delegation of Senegal considers that the Western group that initiated this plan should exert greater pressure on South Africa to bring it to comply with this resolution. The peace, security and stability of every State in the region are at stake and no one should count on any hoped-for lassitude on the part of Africa that could enable them to impose a solution that is not in accord with the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people, the

African people throughout the continent and all nations which love peace and prize justice.

185. Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The present emergency special session, which has been convened on the initiative of the African countries to take up the question of Namibia is proceeding against the background of the extremely complex and explosive situation created in southern Africa by the racist Republic of South Africa.

186. Despite numerous decisions of the United Nations, OAU and the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, the South African colonizers and racists, with the connivance and support of the major Western countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], constantly and provocatively ignore the just demands that independence be granted to Namibia, cynically refuse to implement United Nations decisions on Namibia, and do everything to continue their illegal occupation of that Territory and to create there a puppet neo-colonialist régime. To this end the Pretoria authorities are trying by military means and by massive repression to put down, first and foremost, the national liberation movement of the Namibian people, led by its vanguard, SWAPO, which has stood the test of battle.

187. The Pretoria régime is constantly strengthening its military potential and military presence in Namibia. According to available data, the total number of troops belonging to South Africa in Namibia is at present approximately 100,000 men—that is, a ratio of more than one occupier, armed to the teeth, per 10 peaceful inhabitants in Namibia. The armed forces of the Republic of South Africa in Namibia include infantry, tank, mechanized and airborne battalions, punitive police forces and other subdivisions, which are deployed among approximately 80 bases along the boundary with Angola and in the so-called “police zone”. Active use is being made in Namibia of former members of the Southern Rhodesian armed forces and thousands of paid mercenaries from some Western Countries.

188. The on-going cruel acts of repression and terror against the Namibians, the annexation of individual parts of Namibia, the predatory exploitation of its human and natural resources, the fact that the Territory of Namibia has been turned into a springboard for the carrying out of systematic acts of aggression against independent African States, and the challenging attitude adopted by the Pretoria régime towards the decisions and efforts of the United Nations on Namibia—all this is possible only because South Africa continues to rely on the constant and comprehensive support it receives from the Western Powers and their imperialist monopolies.

189. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, in the words of congratulation addressed in May of this year to the States and peoples of Africa on the occasion of Africa Liberation Day:

“By issuing a challenge to all peace-loving Africa, by demonstrating their utter contempt for the rights and aspirations of African peoples, the imperialists

are more and more openly pursuing a policy aimed at rapprochement with the South African régime and have become virtual accomplices in protecting that bulwark of racism and colonialism in Africa. They openly ignore the United Nations demand that independence be granted to Namibia and unabashedly equate the national liberation struggle with ‘terrorism’, while they themselves openly support State terrorism as practised by Pretoria and give overt encouragement to its direct aggression against neighbouring sovereign African countries.”

190. The most recent and most blatant fact attesting to this aggression, the grossest flouting of the Charter of the United Nations, was the armed invasion into the territory of a sovereign African State, the People’s Republic of Angola, by regular troops of racist South Africa from the Territory of Namibia, which it illegally occupies—an armed invasion that was perpetrated immediately before this session convened. The scope of this invasion and the number of regular Republic of South Africa army personnel involved in it, as well as the use of a large number of tanks and armoured troops carriers, aviation and other military technology, leave no doubt about the true goals being pursued by the Pretoria régime.

191. The Republic of South Africa has once again issued a challenge to independent Africa and to world public opinion by going even further in its heedless policy of further complicating the situation in the southern part of the African continent.

192. The acts of brigandage of the Republic of South Africa can only be regarded as further demonstrations of the efforts by the racist régime and the imperialist forces that support it to prevent young African States which have embarked on the course of social reform from building a new life.

193. We cannot fail to see the link between such things as the intention of the present United States Administration to give direct support to the counter-revolutionary forces in Angola, and steps taken in Washington to strengthen “friendly relations” with the *apartheid* régime and the recent use by the United States of its veto in the Security Council on a draft resolution which contained a condemnation of South Africa’s act of military aggression against Angola and a demand for the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from the territory of the People’s Republic of Angola, and the growing aggressiveness of the Pretoria régime towards neighbouring African States.

194. After the United States had prevented the Security Council from adopting that draft resolution, as we read in the *Washington Post* of 2 September of this year senior officials in the United States Administration reaffirmed their position regarding southern Africa and stated that the Administration had established “a useful dialogue with South Africa”.

195. In this connection, I wish to draw attention to the recent statement made by the representative of SWAPO in the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in which, *inter alia*, he emphasized that:

“We have charged before, and I charge today, that South Africa persists in those policies and is able to carry out those acts of aggression and military attacks against the African peoples thanks to the encouragement and collusion of the major Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and thanks to the involvement of their monstrous transnational corporations in southern Africa, and particularly in South Africa.”⁹

196. The size and nature of the co-operation, including military and nuclear co-operation, between South Africa and those States, is well known. The vast stream of assistance to Pretoria from the major Western countries has never been stemmed. United Nations documents, in particular a document,¹⁰ submitted under agenda item 8 of the seventh session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations, entitled “Studies on the effects of the operations and practices of transnational corporations” attest to the fact that in 1979-1980 alone South Africa received 28 loans amounting to the sum of \$US 1,092 million.

197. We cannot but be seriously concerned at the fact that Security Council resolution 418 (1977) is not being properly implemented because of resistance on the part of certain Western Powers.

198. As a result of the continuing military and nuclear co-operation—primarily with the United States and certain other Western countries, as well as Israel—South Africa’s programme of military and nuclear development has been carried even further, a fact that was reflected in the International Seminar on the Implementation and Reinforcement of the Arms Embargo against South Africa, which was held in London in April of this year.

199. As the declaration adopted by that Seminar indicates:

“Assistance to the South African racist régime in the military and nuclear fields constitutes collusion in the crime of *apartheid*, in the illegal occupation of Namibia and in aggression against the front-line States, as well as a breach of the fundamental obligations of Member States under the Charter of the United Nations.”¹¹

200. Numerous United Nations documents indicate the continuance of the practice of the inhuman policy of exploitation and repression of the indigenous population of Namibia and the imperialist plundering of its resources. In a document of the Special Committee on the question of the activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples there is indication that South Africa and other foreign interests which are operating out of the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western countries have monopolized Namibia’s economy in their own interests and to the detriment of the African population. That document states, *inter alia*:

“In exchange for the opportunity to earn great profits for themselves and their shareholders, principally through the exploitation of the Territory’s vast mineral reserves, these foreign interests have supported South Africa’s illegal occupation of the Territory both politically and financially and have

participated in and benefited from the practice of *apartheid*.”¹²

201. The overwhelming majority of the profits go to foreign shareholders and are exported from Namibia. About 90 foreign companies are involved in the depredation of Namibian minerals and dozens of Western monopolies are now prospecting for new mineral deposits. The Rio Tinto Zinc uranium-mining corporation, the Tsumeb Corporation, which deals in all base metals, and many other South African and Western transnational corporations dominate the main branch of the Namibian economy—the mining industry.

202. A particular danger can be seen in Pretoria’s ability to exercise control over rich uranium deposits in Namibia. This enables South Africa to carry out its nuclear programme, which, in view of the well-known nuclear ambitions of the Republic of South Africa, is fraught with a genuine threat to peace and security not only in the south of the African continent but also beyond its boundaries.

203. Namibian uranium is also of considerable economic and strategic importance to the imperialist Powers.

204. It is precisely such specific material concerns for profit and the military, strategic and political interests of the West that explain the heightened activity of imperialist circles of the chief Western members of NATO in Namibia and their position on Namibia in the United Nations. Several years have passed since the adoption by the Security Council of its resolution 435 (1978), which was submitted by the Western “five”. But we are still in the same spot. All those years have been used by the Pretoria racists, under the pretense of a willingness to find a peaceful solution to the problem of Namibia and with the connivance of the so-called “five”, to undermine the United Nations plan for Namibia and to set up in Namibia a puppet neo-colonialist régime which would be to the liking of the Republic of South Africa and the West.

205. The leaders of South Africa have gone even further in their political machinations and delays. In particular, they were entirely responsible for the breakdown of the Geneva talks, but the United States and certain other Western Powers continue to call for restraint on the question of a Namibian settlement. In the Security Council attempts to adopt effective steps against these incurably presumptuous racists have been thwarted. Washington has completely dropped all camouflage. Quite recently this year in the United States officials from the Republic of South Africa and even puppets from Namibia were received at various high levels.

206. In other words, the policy of the imperialist Powers to drag out a solution to the problem on various pretexts is aimed at undermining the very basis for a political settlement as contained in United Nations decisions and to legalize the puppet groups in Namibia and exclude SWAPO from any participation in determining the future of its country.

207. In the light of the dangerous political manoeuvres of the Republic of South Africa and its Western protectors, it is the duty of the United Nations

specifically to ensure that effective measures are taken against the Pretoria régime that would prompt it to implement the decisions of the United Nations on Namibia. Such absolutely essential steps, as was once again stressed in the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa,¹³ adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May of this year, undoubtedly must include the Security Council's adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. It is also essential that all States strictly observe the sanctions that have already been enacted by the Security Council against the Pretoria régime.

208. In the light of the position it holds as a matter of principle, the Byelorussian SSR has consistently favoured and continues to favour the Namibian people's being guaranteed its inalienable right to self-determination and independence, the preservation of the unity and territorial integrity of that country, including Walvis Bay, the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal of all the troops and administrative apparatus of the Republic of South Africa from Namibia, and the transfer of all power to the people of Namibia in the person of SWAPO, which has been recognized by the United Nations and OAU as the sole legitimate and genuine representative of the Namibian people.

209. This year has witnessed a new powerful upsurge of the African peoples against the last bastions of colonialism and racism in the southern part of Africa. The people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, have been selflessly struggling to become the genuine masters of their own country. The barbaric domination of the colonizers and racists is quite naturally drawing to an inglorious close. The struggle of the Namibian people has reached a decisive stage.

210. The Byelorussian SSR once again declares its solidarity with the valiant Namibian people, headed by its true and well-tried vanguard SWAPO, in its just struggle to achieve the self-determination and independence of Namibia.

211. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): From its very inception the United Nations has been seized of the question of the independence of Namibia and in those 36 years both the strength and the weakness of the Organization have been revealed in the evolution of the question within the United Nations. That the question of Namibia's independence has remained up to now a priority item on the agenda of the international community and that the banner of the just struggle of the oppressed masses of Namibia has been held high for so long is a credit to the United Nations. The failure to evict South Africa from the international Territory of Namibia will, however, remain a dark spot in the history of the United Nations.

212. In the long and arduous struggle for Namibia's independence, two clearly distinct protagonists have emerged: the racist régime of South Africa, buttressed by the political, economic and military support of the States members of NATO, maintaining the *status quo* of racial injustice, political oppression and economic exploitation in Namibia, on the one hand; and the Namibian people, with SWAPO in the vanguard of its revolution, and with the full backing and solidarity of

the overwhelming majority of the international community, fighting for national liberation and social emancipation in their motherland, on the other hand. That alignment of forces has been manifest both on the battlefield and in the diplomatic arena.

213. The arms and the mercenaries Pretoria utilizes in its incessant acts of terrorism and war of aggression against the struggling people of Namibia and the front-line countries originate almost exclusively from well-known NATO sources. In consistency with its broad base of support among peoples that love peace and freedom all over the globe, SWAPO, on the contrary, derives its support from a variety of sources. While this wide support for SWAPO has enabled the United Nations to take positive, albeit limited, action in support of the just cause of the Namibian revolution, there is no gainsaying the fact that a number of NATO Powers have hitherto torpedoed all comprehensive enforcement measures by the Security Council. This regrettable abuse of the veto power by the Western States cannot but be a source of concern to all of us, since it is effectively frustrating all hopes for a peaceful solution of the Namibian question. Indeed, the policies pursued by those Western States pose a serious threat to the long-term viability and credibility of this world Organization.

214. All those who have closely followed the evolution of the Namibian question in the United Nations cannot help but observe the persistence with which Pretoria has been pursuing its goal of maintaining the illegal occupation of Namibia. While the tactics and strategy of racist Pretoria have varied from time to time, depending on external pressures and circumstances, the goal of indefinitely subjugating the Namibian people has remained constant for the last 36 years. Those external factors have sometimes forced Pretoria to temper its defiance of the international community with a limited and short-lived semblance of co-operation with the United Nations.

215. When the General Assembly refused to oblige South Africa in its declared desire to annex Namibia in 1946, for instance, Pretoria agreed to report on the Territory to the United Nations. Nevertheless, it declined to propose a Trusteeship Agreement for the Territory, as was required of all the Mandatory Powers. In 1949 it went so far as to refuse to furnish any information on the Territory, claiming that the Mandate over Namibia had lapsed with the demise of the League of Nations. Even after 1950, when the International Court of Justice handed down its advisory opinion affirming the international status of Namibia and South Africa's obligations in that regard,¹⁴ Pretoria refused to submit annual reports on the Territory. Even though the South African régime again showed a semblance of flexibility by accepting a United Nations mission in 1962, its defiance remained unchanged for more than a decade thereafter.

216. In fact it took 15 more years for the United Nations to counter that defiance by terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and placing it under its own direct responsibility [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*]. That decision by the General Assembly, as well as the 1971 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice⁴ confirming the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia, were, however, disregarded with impunity by Pretoria.

217. When the Security Council, meeting in 1972 at Addis Ababa for its first session away from Headquarters, invited the Secretary-General to initiate contacts with all the parties concerned in the Namibian issue, the South African régime again showed a semblance of reasonableness by receiving the Secretary-General and, subsequently, his representatives and allowing them to visit Namibia. But in characteristic fashion, Pretoria refused to make public its understanding of the right to self-determination and independence as it affected Namibia, thus blocking the path to further dialogue. Furthermore, while professing apparent acceptance of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), racist South Africa again revealed its total intransigence by blocking the implementation of the provisions of both resolutions. It must be noted, however, that, while maintaining intermittent contact with the United Nations, Pretoria had all along been pursuing its real objective of establishing *apartheid* in Namibia and promoting puppet groups and unrepresentative organs.

218. Total intransigence hidden behind a semblance of co-operation has thus characterized Pretoria's relations with the United Nations. No doubt the craft of deception and treachery has been perfected by the South African régime. Pretoria has never negotiated in good faith with the United Nations. Nor has it ever considered the transfer of power to duly elected representatives of Namibia as a desirable and just option. Unfortunately, its Western supporters have attempted to make us believe that Pretoria is a credible partner in international negotiations. That this is not the case needs no further proof now.

219. For negotiations to succeed, the parties to them have to negotiate in good faith. They must also have an interest—indeed, a vital interest—in the success of the negotiations. In the case of Namibia, good faith has been lacking on the part of Pretoria. As far as Pretoria is concerned, and this goes equally for some of its supporters, Namibian independence would mean a loss of economic benefits derived from the unbridled exploitation of the human and natural resources of the Territory. It would also mean, for Pretoria at least, the disappearance of a buffer zone between the citadel of racism that is South Africa and the oncoming wave of national liberation and social emancipation.

220. We ask ourselves why the racists of Pretoria should be interested in a negotiated settlement now, when overt political and economic collaboration, as well as covert military collaboration, between it and the West is not only being maintained but strengthened. Were the United Nations able to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against Pretoria, then we could have seen a rationale for South Africa's interest in the speedy transition of Namibia to independence. But that option has been foreclosed by the triple veto of the Western permanent members of the Security Council in April last.

221. To the extent that Namibia is a unique responsibility of the United Nations, South Africa has remained a unique stumbling-block to the discharge of that responsibility, and, to the extent that Namibia is still under the yoke of colonial subjugation, the United Nations has yet to meet the challenge posed to its authority by racist South Africa. We therefore dare to say that the key to the genuine independence of

Namibia does not lie in New York. Nor, for that matter, does it lie in the Western capitals, which have everything to gain from the perpetuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia in order to enable their transnational corporations to continue the plunder of the riches of the Territory.

222. The West, and more particularly the contact group of the five members, has refused to implement its own plan as embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978). What is more, ironically, it is the West that is now attempting to subvert that same plan. As though that were not enough, the Western Powers, and more particularly the United States, have, in total defiance of world public opinion and in clear breach of their solemn commitment, openly acknowledged that they attach greater importance to their imperialist interests in southern Africa than to the emancipation of Namibia. Such a public acknowledgement will most certainly encourage Pretoria to persevere on its dangerous path of illegality. The recent unprovoked aggression against Angola and the continued suppression of patriotic forces within Namibia must be viewed in that light. Fortunately, however, that arrogance on the part of South Africa and its principal supporter could also have a salutary effect by forcing us to open our eyes to the hard and bitter reality that surrounds the question of Namibia, a reality that has so far been hidden behind false promises and ritualistic pronouncements of lofty ideals.

223. That a negotiated settlement in present circumstances is virtually impossible and that the West cannot possibly be an honest broker is also part of that reality. That the key to Namibia's independence lies in the bushes and deserts of Namibia, where the gallant sons and daughters of Namibia are writing history with their blood, is also part of the same reality. What happens there will be the decisive factor in the struggle for the freedom and independence of Namibia.

224. Africa's independence will remain incomplete and its dignity will be trampled underfoot until racism and colonialism in Namibia and South Africa are finally eliminated. Indeed, the international community cannot let the challenge posed by Pretoria go unanswered. Despite the obstacles posed by the powerful supporters of the South African régime, the United Nations should therefore redouble its efforts and effectively discharge its legal and moral responsibilities vis-à-vis the people of Namibia.

225. Ethiopia, for its part, is ready to contribute its share to speeding the inevitable independence of Namibia. On behalf of the people and Government of Ethiopia I therefore extend our solidarity and unflinching support to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, as well as to the courageous peoples and Governments of the front-line States, particularly the people and Government of Angola.

226. Ethiopia's assistance to, and solidarity with, the oppressed masses in southern Africa will be extended as long as the struggle continues and until final victory is achieved.

227. Mr. CASSANDRA (Sao Tome and Principe): Mr. President, since this is the first time that I have had the honour of addressing the Assembly in the

course of this session, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate Mr. von Wechmar on his presiding over the General Assembly at this eighth emergency special session.

228. My delegation would also like to convey to the many ministers from African and other non-aligned countries the fraternal greetings of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Sao Tome and Principe, Mrs. Maria de Amorim, who, for reasons beyond her control, is not able to be here to address the Assembly in person.

229. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is well known, and it has been discussed many times—indeed annually—at the United Nations, and my delegation has no intention of boring this Assembly with background details. However, the consideration of the situation in Namibia at the present emergency special session is taking place at a decisive stage in the struggle of the Namibian people for their liberation from South African colonial oppression.

230. This session has been necessitated by South Africa's increasingly repressive action against the people of Namibia, its repeated and systematic acts of aggression against independent African States and the blatant manner in which it deliberately caused the collapse of the pre-implementation meeting held in Geneva early this year. The meeting in Geneva was proposed as a means of facilitating agreement and of creating the necessary climate of confidence and understanding. However, the acceptance on the part of South Africa was, I am afraid, intended to allow it both to use the meeting as an excuse for further delay and to give the Namibian so-called internal parties as much credibility as possible.

231. In the interest of peace and to facilitate a fair election free from any form of armed intimidation, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola and the Republic of Zambia graciously accepted the United Nations plan. SWAPO has accepted the holding of free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control, and it has repeatedly stated its readiness to sign a cease-fire. Therefore the blame for the non-implementation of the United Nations plan should be put upon South African intransigence.

232. South Africa has been encouraged by the increasing political, economic, diplomatic and military support it receives from certain Western countries, as was manifested not long ago in the exercise of the triple veto by three permanent members of the Security Council during the Council's debate on the question of Namibia in April 1981. Again, South Africa has been further encouraged by the recent veto cast at the Security Council meetings on the question of South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. That act of aggression against Angola not only constitutes a threat to peace and security in the area but is intended to prevent the African countries from supporting the just struggle of the Namibian people and to obstruct the process of Namibian independence.

233. Furthermore, the triple veto in April and the recent single veto by a certain permanent member of the Security Council did not serve the purpose of peace and security in the region or indeed in the world.

On the contrary, it only strengthened the forces of oppression and exploitation in Namibia and in South Africa itself.

234. During the general debate at the thirty-fifth session last year, my Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation stated:

“This constant postponement of adequate solutions might, if senselessly prolonged, make peoples lose faith in the strength of dialogue, which would lead to growing feelings of despair in the context of the expectations of nations and peoples yearning for redress.” [17th meeting.]

235. But the *apartheid* régime has spurned all demands for peaceful solutions and its resorting to every desperate and ruthless measure in order to preserve the *apartheid* system in South Africa, to perpetuate the illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia and to establish a so-called “constellation of States” in order to acquire hegemony in the region.

236. The existence of South African military bases in Namibia, besides challenging the national security of Namibia, constitutes a constant threat to all neighbouring countries. Pretoria, with its aggressive policies and despite condemnation, is determined to leave nothing but scorched, blackened earth as it continues its brutal invasion of Angola in a bid to force that country to give up its stand of principle in support of the Namibian people. This new crime committed by South Africa cannot remain unpunished.

237. What explanation can be found for the obstinacy of South Africa? Only the irresponsible blindness of the *apartheid* régime to the progress of history, and the shameful interests of a group of Member States can explain the systematic rejection of a solution put forward by the Organization.

238. South Africa's action has demonstrated that mere condemnation is not enough and that measures under Chapter VII of the Charter are needed to secure peace and freedom in southern Africa. Therefore, in view of the failure by the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa, this emergency special session should take the appropriate measures provided for under the Charter to ensure the complete economic and political isolation of South Africa.

239. My Government believes that all those who assist the Pretoria régime to maintain its evil practices are entirely responsible for the present situation. We deplore efforts to revise or modify Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides the accepted basis for a settlement of the Namibian problem. It should be implemented unconditionally and without any prevarication, qualification or modification.

240. In conclusion permit me, Sir, to avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm without reservation the support of the Government of Sao Tome and Principe for SWAPO in its legitimate struggle by all the means of its choice. On behalf of the people of my country I want to declare our support for the endeavours of the Secretary-General and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia to find an urgent solution to this problem in order to enable

Namibia to join the great family of the United Nations soon. *A luta continua!*

241. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): This session is meeting at a time of grave concern over the future of Namibia. The growing frustration of the international community over the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the obstacles created by the racist régime of South Africa to the implementation of United Nations decisions are evident everywhere. South Africa, having once accepted the painstakingly negotiated United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has now refused to abide by its commitments. Its attitude at the Geneva pre-implementation talks revealed beyond any doubt that its only true intention was to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia. Faced by such intransigence on the part of the racist régime, the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in February this year, called upon the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

242. Namibia is the special responsibility of the United Nations. The international community has consistently reiterated that South Africa must be forced to end its illegal occupation in accordance with Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

243. The only effective answer to the continued South African defiance of the United Nations is recourse to the ways and means provided in the Charter. It is therefore disappointing that the Security Council has failed to act in accordance with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Organization. Indeed, the Council's failure has put to a crucial test the commitment of the United Nations to genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

244. Nepal shares the indignation of the international community at South Africa's defiance of international law and justice. That defiance is an open challenge to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. South Africa's persistent oppression of the Namibian people through large-scale conscription, arrest, torture and massacre is an affront to civilized norms of behaviour. Its policy of *apartheid* has aptly been declared by this Organization to be a crime against humanity. Its overwhelming military strength is an instrument of terror in Namibia and a persistent threat to the peace and security of southern Africa and of the whole African continent.

245. Nepal condemns the repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the front-line States. South Africa's premeditated and unprovoked aggression against the People's Republic of Angola only a few days ago is a grave reminder of the threat the Pretoria régime poses to international peace and security. We deeply regret the failure of the Security Council even to condemn South Africa for its naked act of aggression against Angola.

246. To compound its arrogant defiance of the United Nations, South Africa continues to create an administrative apparatus that will allow it to impose the so-called internal settlement and thus perpetuate its illegal hold over Namibia. To that end South Africa has started a process of fragmentation and bantustanization of the Territory, which is under the sole

legal administration of the United Nations. Faced by such arrogance, the people of Namibia have no choice but to intensify their struggle for national self-determination. This session symbolizes the reaffirmation of the solidarity of the international community with the people of Namibia struggling for national independence under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of that people.

247. Nepal reiterates its support for Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in its entirety. That resolution embodies the only accepted basis for the achievement of internationally acceptable independence for Namibia. The United Nations Council for Namibia at an extraordinary meeting held in Panama has also called for implementation of Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) without modification, qualification, dilution or delay.

248. I should like to take this opportunity to commend the role of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which is the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence. The efforts of the Council have made a significant contribution to furthering the cause of the Namibian people. My delegation would also like to express its appreciation for the strenuous efforts made by the Secretary-General and his Special Representative for the implementation of the independence plan.

249. Nepal fully shares the grave concern voiced by Africa over the deteriorating situation in Namibia. The contact group of five Western countries, which drafted the plan for implementation, have undertaken a solemn responsibility to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence by means of free and fair elections. They must fulfil their obligations without further delay; otherwise the situation will only deteriorate, with all the incalculable consequences that will ensue. We also appeal to all those States having influence over South Africa to exert the necessary pressure so that the long-delayed independence plan for Namibia can be implemented. We hope that this session will generate the necessary momentum for the achievement of that goal.

250. Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The question of Namibia is one of the most important questions on the agenda of the United Nations, with which it has been concerned for a long time without having been able to arrive at a final solution, because of the intransigence of the racist South African régime, its obstinacy in rejecting the resolutions of the international Organization and its continued illegal occupation of Namibia that is aimed at preventing its people from acceding to independence.

251. Not satisfied with that, the white minority régime of Pretoria has also resorted to a policy of invasion and occupation, thus threatening the peace and security of sovereign African nations in an attempt to conceal its plans for the perpetration of its occupation of Namibia and for ensuring the supremacy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

252. The latest act of aggression committed against Angola a few days ago is one more link in a chain of acts of aggression which have been constantly perpetrated by the racist régime against the African front-

line States with the encouragement and support of its Western allies, which are preparing that racist régime to serve their aims of restoring colonialism and subjugation in that region. Those Western allies are protecting South Africa by their use of the veto to prevent the Council's collective condemnation of that régime. A few months ago the use of the triple veto prevented the adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. A few days ago the United States also took the initiative of voting against the Council's draft resolution condemning South Africa for its act of aggression and its violation of the sovereignty and independence of the People's Republic of Angola, thus showing its true face and its support for the racist and aggressive policies of South Africa. International imperialism has by the positions it has taken expressed its alignment with the racist régime of South Africa.

253. In the light of all these facts, world public opinion does not attach any interest or importance to the possible outcome of the efforts of the so-called contact group, whose actions have been limited to the consolidation and protection of the racist régime in South Africa. That group has confined itself to promises about the chances of convincing the racists to accept and recognize the independence of Namibia without exerting pressure on South Africa.

254. Thus the debates of this session are of crucial importance because the session is taking place following important events and a further increase of tension as a result of actions of South Africa whose consequences are not limited only to southern Africa but also threaten world peace and security.

255. There has been a unanimous rejection here of South Africa's perpetuation of its illegal occupation of Namibia; its repressive acts have been condemned and the immediate release of all political prisoners, the return of the exiled patriots and the transfer of power to the Namibian people through SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, have been demanded. The adoption of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa has also been called for, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The world community has also asked for condemnation of those countries which continue to have relations with the racist régime of South Africa as well as of those corporations which aid and abet the plunder of the national resources of Namibia.

256. International public opinion also supports the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to independence and sovereignty and the legitimacy of its heroic struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO, against the illegal occupation by South Africa.

257. This session will reaffirm the Assembly's condemnation of the Pretoria régime and its aggressive and racist policies in southern Africa. But the Western allies will be in duty bound to bring pressure to bear on that régime if it is to comply with international resolutions and to renounce the crimes it commits with Western support.

258. That support being received by the white minority in South Africa to serve and protect imperialist interests in Africa is similar to the support being given to the Zionist entity enabling it to carry

out a similar function in the Middle East, where Arab territories continue to be occupied, where the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people are still being trampled underfoot, and where Arab countries continue to be the victims of aggression. The latest example of such aggression was the brutal attack on the camps of Palestinian refugees and the inhabitants of Lebanon.

259. The common dangers to which Africa and the Middle East are exposed as a result of the imperialist-racist alliance and its actions call for renewed concerted efforts if we are to prevent attempts to re-establish the colonialist hegemony which has been rejected by the peoples of that region.

260. The policy which is being sponsored by the new United States Administration and whose implementation rests with the racist régimes in Palestine and South Africa has been revealed recently in the aggressive acts of the United States in its attempts to create new zones of influence and to show off its strength. That was what it did in the case of the unjust act of aggression committed against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and that is what it is doing when it consolidates its military presence by establishing military bases, by intervening flagrantly in the internal affairs of other countries and by trying to bring down progressive national régimes. The United States has found support for the realization of those objectives in the region.

261. Democratic Yemen supports the just and equitable struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, on the basis of our conviction of the legitimacy of the struggle of the Namibian people against the policy of occupation and colonialism practised by South Africa. We also condemn the racist practices of South Africa and its acts of barbarous aggression committed against Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States in Africa. We appeal for a redoubling of international support for that struggle and for the provision of material and moral support to the Namibian people so that that people may attain independence and establish an independent and unified national State. We also appeal for drastic sanctions against South Africa so that it will withdraw completely from Namibia and for compliance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), so as to put an end to the racist and aggressive policy of that country.

262. We remain convinced of the final triumph of the Namibian people and of the patriots of southern Africa, thanks to their sacrifices and to the growing international support for their just cause.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.

NOTES

1. Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola.
2. Partido Africano da Independência de Cabo Verde.
3. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, 2267th meeting.*
4. *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.*

5. União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.
6. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.
7. See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981*, document S/14333, para. 19.
8. *Ibid.*, document S/14333.
9. See A/AC.109/PV.1189.
10. E/C.10/83.
11. See A/36/190-S/14442, annex.
12. See A/AC.109/656, para. 2.
13. See A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.
14. *International Status of South West Africa, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 128.