



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

AGENDA ITEM 5

Question of Namibia (*continued*)

1. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): In 1966, the General Assembly took the important decision [*resolution 2145 (XXI)*] of terminating the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia. It was in 1967 that the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia [*resolution 2248 (S-V)*], of which Turkey is one of the founding members, as the sole legal Administering Authority for the Territory until Namibia attains its genuine independence.
2. Since then, the question of Namibia has continuously engaged the concern of the international community, within and outside the United Nations, through the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and, during the last three years, through the activities of the five members of the Western contact group. The Security Council, in the discharge of its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, has on several occasions considered the prevailing situation in Namibia and the future of this Territory.
3. The annals of the United Nations—both General Assembly and Security Council resolutions concerning Namibia—clearly record the determined and dedicated efforts of the international community to terminate South Africa's illegal occupation of the international Territory of Namibia and to prevent South Africa's attempts to install a puppet régime there and, above all, to ensure that the people of Namibia achieve their inalienable right to self-determination, freedom and genuine independence.
4. During that period, however, South Africa has always managed to flout those resolutions and challenge the will of the international community through its defiant and intransigent attitude. The attitude of South Africa has certainly violated the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and has, therefore, constituted a serious threat to international peace and security.
5. Ever since early 1978, we have had before us the United Nations plan for an internationally acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia, which provides for free and democratic elections to be held in Namibia

under the supervision of the United Nations. In spite of all efforts, the plan, which was endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), has, unfortunately, not been implemented to this day because of the numerous questions raised by South Africa at each and every phase of this peace initiative. The international community is well aware of the duplicity and lack of responsibility which have characterized the South African attitude since the very beginning.

6. We have seen the efforts for a negotiated settlement frequently undermined by the unilateral measures resorted to by South Africa and by its manoeuvres. These measures culminated in the elections held unilaterally by South Africa and in the legislative powers later conferred upon the National Assembly with a view to installing an illegal régime in Namibia, in full defiance of the Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which declared the elections and its results null and void. Later, during the course of 1980, South Africa established a so-called Council of Ministers in Namibia, thus attempting to enlarge the scope of competence of the illegal régime installed in Namibia. Furthermore, during that period, South Africa resorted to conscripting and training additional tribal troops in the Territory.
7. In spite of all these developments, which certainly raised serious doubts about the true intentions of South Africa, the pre-implementation meeting was held in Geneva from 7 to 14 January 1981, at which all of the parties concerned participated around a negotiating table, with a view to solving the remaining questions and determining the modalities for immediate implementation of the United Nations plan under the leadership of the Secretary-General and his high-ranking aides. Unfortunately, the pre-implementation meeting fell short of fulfilling the expectations for the establishment of clear-cut dates for a cease-fire and for the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group to move into the Territory in preparation for the United Nations-supervised elections because of the intransigent attitude of South Africa.
8. At that meeting, the South African delegation put forth, at that late stage of the peace initiative, some demands for further guarantees of the impartiality of the United Nations during the transitional period as well as during the elections to be held in Namibia, whereas the President of the South West Africa People's Organization [*SWAPO*] declared that he was ready to sign a cease-fire agreement there.
9. Thus, contrary to the aspirations of the international community, the Geneva negotiations ended in total failure, with the delegation of South Africa declaring that it was premature for the United Nations plan to be implemented, in spite of the goodwill shown by all other participants. This has, no doubt, been interpreted as a deliberate attempt on the part of the

South African régime, which is the sole party responsible for the failure of the Geneva meetings, to obstruct the peace process and to gain more time to enhance its position vis-à-vis the internal régime installed in Namibia. In fact, the deliberate measures resorted to by South Africa since then, in terms of increased arrests and detentions of SWAPO members and an escalation of attacks against the front-line States—the last of which being the recent massive attack on Angola in late August 1981—are ample evidence of the true intentions of South Africa.

10. The failure of the Geneva meeting is, no doubt, a major setback to the settlement efforts and peace process for Namibia. Later on, the Security Council, which met in April 1981 to adopt mandatory sanctions against South Africa because of its intransigence concerning the solution of the question of Namibia, did not conclude with any result. The frustration thus created in the international community led to the convening, at the request of an overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, of this emergency special session on Namibia. This emergency special session is also taking place in the immediate aftermath of the recent military intervention by South Africa in Angola, which still continues at this moment and indeed entails the danger of escalating an already explosive situation. This event in itself is further evidence of the urgent need for finding a just, balanced and lasting solution to the question of Namibia and clearly demonstrates the destabilizing effects of the Namibian question in southern Africa as a whole.

11. In this connection, I should like to point out again, as was done in a statement issued by the Turkish Government immediately after the attack, that Turkey condemns this act of aggression and finds it likely to aggravate further the instable situation already existing in that part of the world.

12. As we have declared on several previous occasions from this rostrum, we should like to associate our delegation with the urgent appeal that the Secretary-General made to South Africa in his report of 19 January 1981¹ to reconsider its position with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan. We would also urge all other concerned parties not to lose hope and to continue their constructive efforts with a view to saving the peace process and preventing all their previous endeavours from going to waste at this late stage. We believe that there is no difficulty that cannot be overcome, especially when the alternative is more bloodshed and more human suffering.

13. My delegation is convinced that every effort should be made and that necessary pressure should be exerted on South Africa during this phase of the peace initiative, including action taken on the Security Council in the form of mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, to ensure its co-operation with all the other parties concerned in the prompt implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) from this point on. We feel that this is indispensable, not only because of the nature of the critical situation prevailing in Namibia, but also because of the credibility of the Organization, which could be at stake if that resolution should be doomed to failure at this late stage.

14. This emergency special session has to meet this challenge and should be able to adopt such measures as are necessary against South Africa politically, economically, militarily and culturally in order to compel it to implement the decisions of the United Nations, particularly Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Such measures will have a decisive impact on South Africa by demonstrating once again the resolute and determined will of the international community in this regard.

15. Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. President, let me begin by saying that it is a privilege for the delegation of Finland to continue to work in the General Assembly under your leadership.

16. This emergency special session takes place under the shadow of South Africa's attack against Angola. The attack continues. It continues despite the condemnation of the international community, including the condemnation of the overwhelming majority of the Security Council, the supreme organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. In their meeting a few days ago, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Nordic countries condemned the South African military attacks on Angola. They insisted that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola must be respected by everyone and that South Africa's military intervention must be brought to an immediate end.

17. The attack against Angola by South Africa is yet another proof of the arrogance of the Pretoria Government. By resorting to acts of aggression against its neighbours, South Africa violates the basic principles of international behaviour. South Africa's actions against Angola show that its policies of internal repression breed external aggression. It is a direct result of the structural tension caused by the absence of a peaceful solution to the question of Namibia. South Africa's refusal to accept a peaceful solution makes violence endemic both in and around Namibia.

18. This year marks the tenth anniversary of the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on the question of Namibia.² In that opinion, initiated by Finland, the Court determined that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal. This historic decision of the Court has never been disputed.

19. Since that opinion, 10 laborious years have gone by. And yet, the international community continues to be faced with South Africa's refusal to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia and to accept its independence. The anger and frustration of the African nations, shared by my country, are fully justified. Against this background, their request to have this emergency special session of the General Assembly is understandable.

20. Early this year the international community had high hopes. The Geneva pre-implementation talks, however, did not succeed. The wishes of the African nations were not unreasonable. On the contrary, SWAPO and the African nations showed statesmanship and restraint. The Geneva talks failed because of South Africa. Before Geneva, South Africa had publicly and repeatedly committed itself to the United Nations plan endorsed by Security Council resolution 435 (1978), particularly to the holding of

free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations. But then, in Geneva, South Africa, after the long years of negotiations, suddenly rejected the implementation as "premature". That is the situation today.

21. As far as the Finnish Government is concerned, free and fair elections are the essential component of the United Nations plan. But South Africa has, in effect, implied that free and fair elections, in its view, are fair only if SWAPO does not win. For us, free and fair elections signify an unfettered, democratic expression of the will of the people. In our view, the rights of minorities are in no way incompatible with the rule of a democratically elected majority. Free elections, then, are at the core of an internationally acceptable solution. This obviously excludes any internal solution, whatever form it may take.

22. For the Finnish Government, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the basis for an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia. All parties to the conflict are on record in their acceptance of this. Yet the solution continues to elude us. The patience of the international community is running out. Even so, Finland does not wish to believe that all possibilities for a negotiated settlement have been exhausted. South Africa should be made to realize that it is in its own best interest to concur with the international community. We see no alternative but to persist in pushing the plan through to full implementation. This requires the continuation of negotiations towards a peaceful settlement combined with increased pressure on South Africa.

23. Namibia remains the supreme test of the viability of the very ideals for which the United Nations was established. Our collective efforts on behalf of early independence for Namibia cannot be allowed to fail. That is the essential task of this emergency special session.

24. Mr. RÁCZ (Hungary): Sir, it is a great honour for me to salute you as the President of this eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly. Allow me to express my hope and confidence that your guidance, based on your widely acknowledged diplomatic skill and sense of responsibility, will contribute to the successful conclusion of our deliberations here at a time when this body has met once again to consider one of the most burning issues that has confronted it for many years.

25. Yes, the question of Namibia, which is on our agenda, is a long-standing and pressing problem of our time, whose urgent solution is of paramount importance for the future of southern Africa, the whole continent, and actually for the entire world.

26. Being aware of the real nature and complexity of this issue, the vast majority of the international community has approached this question of Namibia with profound concern and great political responsibility on the basis of the principles of fundamental human rights and dignity, those of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and, taking into consideration the unalterable and irreversible course of historical development. It has been widely recognized that the fate of a nation is at stake. The overwhelming majority of States Mem-

bers of the United Nations have therefore sided with the people of Namibia, fighting for the elimination of the legacy of their colonial past, for the termination of the illegal occupation by South Africa, for their fundamental human rights and for their national independence, and have pledged their solidarity with this heroic struggle. That was the only possible choice for those who have not forgotten their sufferings and grievances and who respect the most generally accepted principles of moral and human dignity.

27. But the Pretoria régime, enjoying the overt or covert support of some imperialist, neo-colonialist circles, is doing everything it can to defend its selfish interests and to suppress the justified aspirations of the Namibian people. This policy of the racist régime is anything but a surprise. The unacceptable position it holds in regard to Namibia is a direct continuation of its *apartheid* policy and an integral part of its aggressive foreign policy, endangering the sovereignty of independent neighbouring countries and threatening the security of the southern African region. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is nothing but a brutal act of colonization, a manifestation of the global imperialist and neo-colonialist policy of our days.

28. The various organs of the United Nations have on several occasions dealt with the question of Namibia. A great number of resolutions have been adopted but the situation in Namibia has not improved; so far it has even deteriorated. The racist régime of South Africa has kept on questioning the competence of the United Nations, challenging world public opinion, defying the resolutions of the Organization and openly ignoring the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and national independence. It is continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia: its armed forces are engaged in a savage war against the Namibian people which is fighting under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, as is recognized by the United Nations as well.

29. This brutal oppression is supplemented by a series of unprovoked acts of armed aggression against the front-line States, using the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia as a springboard for those incursions. The most recent example of such actions is the attack launched by the racist régime against Angolan territories, which truly demonstrates the real nature and ambitions of Pretoria. Sovereign States Members of the United Nations are thus under constant military threat simply because they are in solidarity with their brothers and sisters in Namibia.

30. This emergency special session has been convened because the obstacles created by the Pretoria régime have meant that there has been no progress in solving the problem of Namibia by implementing the United Nations plan of action. The details of the actual events—the failure of the pre-implementation talks in Geneva early this year, the inconclusive meetings of the Security Council—are too well known to all of us here and, therefore, there is no need for me to recall them. But the aim must now be to find what measures are to be taken to force South Africa to accept and implement the relevant resolutions of the United Nations in order to achieve Namibia's independence.

31. The Hungarian delegation is of the view that resolute and effective steps should be taken now. Nobody can be misled by the manœuvres of the racist régime and its accomplices which are aimed at disguising the real motives of Pretoria and at gaining international recognition for the puppet régime that it is trying to install in Namibia. The illegal occupation and the whole system of *apartheid* cannot be improved in any way. They must be completely eliminated and destroyed forever.

32. Everybody should come to the conclusion that the period of fine words and arguments must be over. Everybody should realize that the vetoes cast in the Security Council to prevent the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa and even to bar condemnation of that régime's acts of aggression directly encourage the racist régime to defy the appeals made by world public opinion. Effective measures should be taken in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations to promote the achievement of Namibia's independence by the strict application of all the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

33. That resolution in itself was a compromise: its acceptance aptly demonstrated the goodwill of SWAPO and its determination to solve the problem as soon as possible; it did not refer to any weakness of that organization. Therefore, no one can expect further concessions from the genuine representative of the Namibian people; any further demand, any modification of or prevarication on that resolution is unacceptable. It is high time now to give clear priority to the immediate solution of the question of Namibia over the selfish interests of those well-known monopolist circles that reap huge profits from plundering Namibia's natural resources in close co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa.

34. The events we are witnessing in southern Africa clearly reconfirm our long-standing view that it is the aggressive policy of Pretoria that endangers the security and stability of that region. Its illegal occupation of Namibia creates a hotbed of tension in the international situation.

35. It has always been with great sympathy and active solidarity that the Hungarian people has followed the just struggle for national independence of the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, its sole, legitimate representative. My Government will, as in the past, continue to support all efforts that really further the cause of Namibia's genuine independence. We share the view expressed here by a lot of speakers before me that the Namibian people may lawfully resort to armed struggle if the efforts at a peaceful settlement of the problem fail. It is our hope and firm conviction that the just struggle of this heroic people will soon be crowned by final victory.

36. Mr. D'ESCOTO (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Revolutionary Government of Nicaragua decided to be present at the highest ministerial level at this emergency special session because we consider that the situation in Namibia and in southern Africa constitutes one of the most serious crises in the history of the Organization—a crisis on whose solution will depend the possibility of reviving the waning faith of our peoples in the United

Nations as an entity that is seriously and effectively able to face the grave problems endangering world peace.

37. The indignation of the Assembly—in particular, that of the Non-Aligned Movement—dates back many years because of the persistent illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, and its shameless and cruel exploitation of the human and material wealth of that fraternal country.

38. There are also many resolutions that bear witness to the full and broad support enjoyed by SWAPO, the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, in its leadership of that people's armed struggle to achieve self determination, freedom and national independence for a united Namibia.

39. We might also recall the already long list of the Assembly's vigorous condemnations of the South African régime because of its stubborn challenge to international law, its repeated acts of aggression against the front-line States, and because of the growing intensification of its military might in Namibia; together with manœuvres designed to set up political puppets so as to perpetuate its colonialist and terrorist domination of Namibia.

40. While the present level of repression, torture and assassination of Namibian patriots was sufficient justification for the decision of our brothers in the Organization of African Unity [OAU] to request the convening of this emergency special session, Nicaragua considers, furthermore, that at this time we should also consider the grave international implications of the continuing flagrant violations of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people.

41. As is rightly stated in the Panama Declaration on Namibia, which was adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 5 June last, the situation in Namibia:

“has confronted the United Nations with one of the most severe crises in its history, and represents the gravest and most enduring challenge to the authority and the purposes and principles of the Organization”.³

42. Thirty-six years ago, the founders of the Organization stipulated, in the Charter of the United Nations, measures such as those provided for in Chapter VII to be applied whenever there was a breach of international legality, making the Security Council responsible for safeguarding the sovereignty of States, decolonization and independence. It is a sad, grave and condemnable fact that the Security Council has not imposed mandatory sanctions, which are justified not only by the obduracy of Pretoria in not fully decolonizing Namibia, but also by the use of the Territory of Namibia to launch acts of aggression and invasions against the front-line States—in particular, against the sister Republic of Angola. In April, as well as in August, vetoes were cast which were incompatible with the principles of the Charter and, in particular, with the legitimate accession to independence and the defence of territorial integrity. Not only was that a blow for our brothers in Angola and Namibia, but it was also a dangerous precedent, making it possible for the Security Council to disregard

the legitimate claims of peoples who are victims of aggression when they come to the Organization in the future seeking effective measures for the peaceful solution of their problems.

43. Yet it is praiseworthy how SWAPO, in spite of everything, continues to keep faith with the United Nations by displaying a constructive attitude in the search for a solution to the Namibian problem. Thus in September 1978 an international consensus was arrived at, reflected in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which endorsed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. We emphasized at that time the need for the plan to be implemented without delay or alteration, with the members of the Western contact group, as advocates of the plan, assuming special responsibility. The response of South Africa could not have been more defiant of the will of the international community, since it has sought to mock it by endeavouring to transfer power to illegitimate groups so as to maintain its domination.

44. The failure of the pre-implementation talks in Geneva was yet further proof that the racist Pretoria régime was determined to perpetrate its illegal occupation of Namibia. Thereafter, the aggressions against neighbouring countries—and, in particular, the invasion of Angola last month—have meant that the racist challenge constitutes no longer a threat but a manifest violation of international peace and security.

45. Nicaragua, when speaking on this question, more recently at the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, which met at Algiers in April, has pointed out that the persistent and illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, as well as the campaign of aggression against the front-line States, was not occurring in a vacuum but with the indirect support of certain Western Powers. I am referring not only to the participation in the illegal exploitation of Namibian resources of some members of the Western contact group, but also to the manoeuvres to delay the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and to help in the imposition on Namibia of a neo-colonialist solution and to exclude SWAPO, the only authentic representative of the Namibian people.

46. At the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, in February, the Ministers paid special attention to the role of the Western contact group and regretted, in particular, the apparent refusal of those countries to use their enormous and growing influence over South Africa in order to win its co-operation with the Secretary-General in the efforts to carry out the independence plan.

47. Recently the United States, forgetting the celebrated words of Abraham Lincoln, who said that what was morally wrong can never be politically right, affirmed that it is politically desirable for us to be more patient with South Africa, that there is progress in the deliberations and that a change in attitude is discernible. To those who are insensitive to the sufferings of peoples, it is easy to preach patience when it is the other who are suffering the consequences of crimes and exploitation. If patience is a virtue—as it is—resignation to injustice is complicity.

48. In the particular case of southern Africa, the only reality is the blatant invasion and massacre perpetrated by the racist régime of Pretoria against the People's Republic of Angola, the overt destabilization campaign against the front-line States, the intensification of repression in Namibia and in South Africa itself against patriots who are fighting institutionalized racism. No, the international community must be neither patient nor neutral in the struggle against the scourge of the *apartheid* régime and the new version of this diabolical system which it is intended to establish in Namibia. As for the so-called change in attitude, the only one we have been able to notice is the one shown by the Reagan Administration in irresponsibly vetoing the draft resolution condemning aggression against Angola. The United States alleges that what is important is not how one votes, but specific results. For our part, we consider that this attitude is the main reason why so far the aims that justice demands of us have not been met.

49. The heroic and spirited people of Sandino know from their own experience how those who oppose the self-determination of peoples always try, by means of delaying tactics, to gain time and find room on the political scene for genocidal and anti-popular régimes; just as they usually insist on giving a false colouring of East-West confrontation to the struggle of peoples for their true independence and always deny the representativeness and political legitimacy of liberation movements, calling them names, such as "terrorists". We know, too, that they take reprisals against countries that are already liberated when they follow a genuinely independent policy and demand total respect for the right of self-determination of struggling peoples.

50. The growing threats to the sovereignty of peoples create a need for a greater unity in the international community, and in the case of Namibia that solidarity must take the form of a categorical condemnation and the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against South Africa because of its continued illegal occupation and increased repression.

51. The Revolutionary Government of Nicaragua reaffirms Security Council resolution 435 (1978) as the only basis for a negotiated settlement. We reject and condemn any manoeuvres designed to undermine that resolution or to deprive the fraternal people of Namibia of their victories so arduously won. We maintain our absolute and total solidarity with our brothers in SWAPO, as well as with the front-line States, and with all peoples struggling for their true and definitive independence.

52. We reiterate our desire to see the United Nations prove to the peoples who sincerely aspire to world peace that it is able to take measures that will assist in the attainment of this noble and just objective. Accordingly, the resolution that we shall adopt in this Assembly will have a significance going even beyond the interests of southern Africa, since it will enable us to anticipate the manner in which we shall respond to other crises of no lesser gravity.

53. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Mr. President, my delegation has already had an opportunity to pay a tribute to you for the skilful, efficient and serene manner in which you have been discharging the onerous and seemingly unending duties of the presi-

dency of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. If I do so again, it is to reaffirm and to underscore my delegation's appreciation of the important contribution that you have been making to the work of our Assembly, a contribution that gives us confidence that the proceedings of this emergency special session will be successfully conducted.

54. My delegation regrets that the progress in relation to the liberation of Namibia, or, rather, the lack of progress, has made necessary the convening of this emergency special session of the Assembly. Yet we consider it our solemn duty to use this opportunity to speak out in defence of the people of Namibia, whose Territory continues to be illegally occupied by South Africa and who continue to be denied by the Pretoria régime the exercise of their right to be an independent nation.

55. As has been made manifest by the wide participation in the current debate, the independence of the people of Namibia is not merely the concern of the States of southern Africa, nor is it a concern of African States alone. The suppression and oppression of the majority population of Namibia, the violation of their democratic right to majority rule, the continuing occupation of Namibia and the repeated acts of armed aggression against neighbouring independent African States all create conditions in our human society that must be and are of concern to all States and all men.

56. My delegation considers it a solemn duty to speak out in support of the prestige and authority of our international Organization whose decisions on Namibia are being consciously set aside in favour of support for South Africa's designs on the Territory of Namibia. This is all the more essential in view of the fact that Namibia is a Territory for which this Assembly has assumed direct responsibility.

57. It is not my purpose to trace the history of the involvement of the General Assembly or of the Security Council in the question of Namibia, nor that of South Africa's resistance to that involvement. That has been sufficiently well established by delegations which have preceded me and, in any case, is well known to us all. On the basis of those accounts, with which my delegation fully agrees, it is clear that the present situation in southern Africa is one which summons the international community to prompt action for the peaceful and orderly transition of Namibia to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

58. Recent events have served to dramatize the urgency of the need for an early settlement of the question of Namibia. It was just two weeks ago that the Security Council considered Angola's complaint against South Africa, occasioned by an armed South African invasion more than 200 kilometres inside the southern part of Angola. We recall that, while the world seethed in outrage against South Africa, one member of the Council took its stand squarely on South Africa's side against the people of Angola, against the people of Namibia and against the people of Africa in general. While the world longed for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, for one member of the Council South African aggression and

lawlessness were not thought to deserve the condemnation of the Council.

59. Throughout the past decade in particular, Angola has occupied Western and South African attention in a sustained manner. That does not require elaboration. We are all familiar with the publication *In Search of Enemies*, which tells the story in complete detail. The Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola could not be prevented from coming to power in Angola, but the strategic objective in respect of Angola still remains.

60. The Pretoria régime's present invasion and occupation of southern Angola only represents its most recent attempt not only to deprive SWAPO for an important source of external support, but also at the same time to revive its UNITA⁴ quislings to serve the dual purpose of harassing and destabilizing the Government of Angola and providing a buffer for Namibia. Such a naked and cynical abuse of power by a State, disrespecting the independence and territorial integrity of another State, flies in the face of the Charter of our Organization and the principles governing peaceful relations among States. It places in jeopardy the peace and security of southern Africa and was rightly condemned by States the world over. Unfortunately the Security Council was prevented from making the firm, unequivocal response that such lawlessness deserves. Preponderance of military power must not be allowed to become the determinant of relations among States, in whatever part of the world, including southern Africa. Change in southern Africa cannot be brought about through the use of power to destabilize and weaken neighbouring States, but only on the basis of mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs. A framework for such change already exists in Security Council resolution 435 (1978), implementation of which continues to be frustrated by South Africa.

61. While that Council resolution seeks a simple transition from minority to majority rule in Namibia, its implementation is now being further complicated by the introduction of elements unrelated to the nature of the struggle taking place in Namibia. We need to be on guard against the introduction of such red herrings and against all attempts at obscuring the true nature of the struggle for Namibia. Such attempts are nothing but a pretext and an excuse for delaying and placing limitations upon Namibia's independence and for interfering in Angola's internal affairs and subverting and destabilizing the Government of that country. The struggle of the people of Namibia is a struggle for freedom; a struggle against illegal occupation. It is South Africa that is standing in the way of Namibia's freedom. Likewise it is South Africa which has invaded and continues to occupy Angolan territory. South Africa is the enemy in southern Africa and its promotion and defence of *apartheid* lie at the heart of the crisis that are plaguing that corner of Africa: No amount of sophistry can alter that fact.

62. It must surely be a sign, at best of arrogance, at worst of the contempt in which the black people of southern Africa are being held by some, that the nationalist sentiment of Namibians can only be seen as an element in an East-West power play, or that Angola can only be seen as a hapless pawn in what is called the struggle for southern Africa. No part of Africa is

a trophy to be competed for. The people of Namibia have their own legitimate Namibian interests which are completely independent of and unrelated to the fortunes of any ideology in southern Africa. The people of Angola, no less, have their own legitimate Angolan interests, one of which is to live in peace and security, free from interference in their internal affairs, including attacks by South African marauders such as they have suffered recently. Africa, and the international community in general, must categorically reject all attempts aimed at introducing an ideological dimension into the struggle of the people of Namibia. Equating the pursuit of the interests of the people of Namibia and of Angola with the prosecution of a so-called ideological war unnecessarily seeks to complicate the situation in southern Africa, mocks the nationalist sentiment of the peoples of the region, encourages and emboldens the Pretoria régime in its brutalization of the people of Namibia and of Angola and leads to more suffering and bloodshed.

63. The Pretoria régime is systematically dehumanizing the people of Namibia and frustrating their aspirations to national independence and it expects them to suffer in silence and resignation. Like oppressed peoples everywhere in every era, the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, will not be passive while attempts are made to rob them of their birth-right. Since they have been left with no opportunity for enjoyment of their rights through peaceful means, they have chosen the path of armed struggle. Those who walk away from the people of Namibia cannot, at the same time, expect them to reject those who decide to heed their pleas for help. We cannot walk with the enemies of the Namibian people and, at the same time, profess to be concerned about whom they choose for their friends. Any realistic concern about who the friends of the Namibian people might be must be accompanied by an overt demonstration of support for them in overcoming their enemies. The issues involved in Namibia are so clear-cut that it is not possible to be a friend of South Africa and a friend of Namibia at the same time. There is no room for confusion over South Africa's intentions with regard to Namibia and Angola, any more than there is room for confusion between darkness and light. To befriend South Africa against Namibia, to make any accommodation with South Africa and with *apartheid* is to make a concession to the forces of oppression and racial intolerance and, correspondingly, to weaken collective international action for change in southern Africa.

64. My delegation is well aware of the sinister designs of the Pretoria régime in retaining its hold on Namibia and in ensuring that, while enjoying nominal independence, the Territory will be ruled by persons who will be completely subject to South Africa's bidding. My delegation is also aware of the enormous investments of transnationals in Namibia and of the interests that they represent. We recognize that the pursuit of these interests will lead to even greater inflexibility by South Africa, to more temporizing and to the devising of new schemes intended to deceive or to placate. We recognize that the battle between vested economic interests, on the one hand, and the rights of the people of Namibia, on the other, is going to be protracted and costly. But in the end we are

confident of the victory of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO. We are sustained by the victories of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe and, most recently, Zimbabwe. By their sacrifices over many years and by their prolonged struggle against ruthless tyranny, they have demonstrated that people who are united and resolute will always triumph over the forces of oppression and imperialism.

65. The so-called "internal settlement" in Zimbabwe failed because it lacked legitimacy based on the wishes of the majority of the people of the Territory. Any attempted settlement in Namibia similarly conceived is also bound to fail.

66. It is not difficult, though it is horrible, to contemplate what could and would certainly be the outcome of the course on which South Africa is currently embarked in southern Africa. That very prospect should move all members of the international community, in particular those possessing undisputed leverage with South Africa, to exploit to the maximum all opportunities for peaceful change which now exist. This brings us back to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). That resolution, in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the membership of this Assembly, continues to be valid and to offer the only hope of peaceful change in Namibia. South Africa must be compelled to co-operate in its implementation. This is also the consensus of the Non-Aligned Movement, OAU and, indeed, all progressive forces that love peace and freedom. So to compel South Africa is more than a moral duty and one which takes account of more than narrow national economic interests.

67. The charade has been played for too long; for too long has injustice been allowed to continue in Namibia. This emergency special session must move to bring the unrelieved weight of international pressure upon South Africa in the form of a comprehensive régime of mandatory sanctions. My delegation repeats its conviction that, if South Africa's Western friends were to commit themselves unequivocally to such a course of action, the liberation of Namibia would be hastened.

68. This session must reaffirm support for SWAPO as the sole authentic representative of the people of Namibia and for the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory until independence. For its part, my Government will continue to give its support to SWAPO and to the Council and to seek to identify ways of increasing pressure on and completely isolating the racist Pretoria régime. This we shall do as a matter of principle. As my President, Mr. Forbes Burnham, declared when opening the International Forum on Southern Africa, held at Georgetown last April and May:

"For us in Guyana freedom and liberty in the world today are whole and indivisible. The presence in any corner of the universe of colonialism and exploitation rampant anywhere diminish our freedom and limit our independence".

69. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): How many times has the attention of the international community been directed towards the African continent! The

General Assembly has met in an emergency special session to consider the extremely dangerous situation in Namibia, which constitutes a serious threat to international peace. Our delegation considers it necessary to emphasize from the very outset that the responsibility for the situation that has been created in southern Africa is directly related to the policies of certain Western permanent members of the Security Council, which were unable to transcend their selfish interests and join the "global consensus" in evaluating the illegal actions of the *apartheid* régime.

70. With an insistence worthy of a better cause, and displaying various kinds of hypocrisy and cynicism, the United States and its partners in the so-called contact group have been trying to convince the international community that they are continuing their efforts directed towards the unremitting search for a solution leading to a "genuine, truly independent and stable democratic Namibia."

71. The true value of these "efforts" and of the "unremitting search" was made clear by the South African racists themselves, whose troops carried out at the end of last month from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia a completely unprovoked massive incursion into the territory of Angola, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, which caused the death of hundreds of absolutely innocent people. It appeared that this time the racists would not be able to avoid just retribution. Demands to adopt the strongest measures against the Botha régime were made by the overwhelming majority of States which took part in the Security Council when it considered the complaint by Angola against the Republic of South Africa. But once again the world was witness to obstruction by the United States, which this time too was reluctant to support the just unanimous demands of the international community.

72. The entire discussion at this emergency special session has shown graphically that tension in that region has reached an extreme. Insolently flouting the numerous relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council, the racist régime of Pretoria is continuing its policies of repression and terror against the indigenous population of Namibia in its endeavour to keep that Territory under its control. The main target of its persecution are members and supporters of SWAPO, the vanguard of the Namibian people, recognized by the United Nations and OAU as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. The purpose of these barbaric activities is absolutely clear: it is to try to deprive the Namibian people of its leader, to eliminate SWAPO physically as the leading political force in the country and to bring about a neo-colonialist solution of the problem of Namibia by implanting a puppet régime there.

73. Increasing ruthlessness in the colonial system has recently been complemented by a number of measures within the context of a so-called internal settlement. The international community is well aware of these "cosmetic" measures, which cannot conceal the gaping sore of the *apartheid* system, let alone change it.

74. The General Assembly and the Security Council have repeatedly and unequivocally stated their attitude to the farce concerning the elections to the so-called

National Assembly and "Council of Ministers", as well as to the idea of the so-called constellation of States, emphasizing in their resolutions that the genuine and just settlement of the problem of Namibia is possible only with the participation of SWAPO, in strict accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The true nature of South Africa's manoeuvres was again demonstrated at the Geneva meeting held in January this year, when the Botha régime provocatively wrecked the meeting and refused to agree to the cease-fire and other provisions of the United Nations plan.

75. The reasons for this defiant behaviour by the South African rulers and their refusal to implement the many resolutions of the Security Council and other United Nations bodies are not hard to see. They are to be found not in the strength of the régime itself, but in the broad support it receives from outside, and that support is not at all beneficial in nature. The maintenance of the hotbed of colonialism and racism in southern Africa is in the long-term strategic, political and economic interests of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in particular the United States. The United States does not conceal the fact that that region, like a number of other regions in the world chosen by the United States as it deems fit, is a "sphere of its vital interests", and the Republic of South Africa is, for the United States, a "friendly country". The close economic and military co-operation between the transnational corporations of the United States and its Atlantic partners is fully in consonance with that doctrine. The United Nations Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, in particular, has concluded:

"South African and other foreign interests based in Canada, France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have for years monopolized the commercial sectors of the Namibian economy, to their own benefit and to the detriment of the African population. 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*."⁵

76. The militarization of Namibia by South Africa is aimed at maintaining the *status quo*. South Africa's troop strength in the Territory is more than 100,000 men. Namibia is actively used by the South African racists as a springboard for acts of aggression not only against Angola but also against other neighbouring African countries in order to intimidate the front-line States and to deprive the Namibian patriots of assistance and support. Feverish military preparations are going on in the Republic of South Africa itself—naturally, not without the assistance of States "friendly" to it. According to information furnished by the United Nations Centre against *Apartheid*, almost 10 times as much will be spent on the South African army this year as in 1974. During the past five years, the Republic of South Africa has procured

weapons costing 4 billion rands. The danger of stepping up the military potential of the Republic of South Africa is obvious, and the main responsibility for this state of affairs must be borne by the imperialist Powers, which are striving to prevent changes there and to maintain their control over that very rich region. Particular alarm in the international community has been created by the nuclear ambitions of the Pretoria régime, which, as we may see from many documents of the United Nations, are being actively encouraged by a number of Western States. It is patently clear that the possibility that the South African racists may produce nuclear weapons constitutes an enormous threat to international peace and security.

77. Recently the international community has noted with alarm that co-operation between certain Western States and the Republic of South Africa has been raised to a new level. Reports relating to the military aspects of a United States—South African alliance, particularly the plans to create a military bloc in the south Atlantic with the participation of the Republic of South Africa, give a particularly sinister character to this conspiracy.

78. These plans were strongly condemned in the resolution on South Africa adopted by the Council of Ministers of OAU in June this year.⁶ My delegation considers that the United Nations must respond to the appeal by OAU contained in that resolution. It must adopt all measures to prevent the creation of a new aggressive bloc.

79. This session has been convened because of special circumstances, and the long-suffering people of Namibia and the entire international community are expecting effective measures from it, in order to put an end to South Africa's tyranny and cause it to heed the numerous resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies.

80. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that the question of the exercise by the people of Namibia of the right to self-determination and independent development on the basis of the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the off-shore islands, must be resolved without further ado. The South African régime occupies Namibia illegally and, therefore, is obliged without any further delay and without any conditions to withdraw its troops, as well as its police force and administration, from the entire Territory and to disband the military and paramilitary units of its puppets.

81. This session must result in the taking of effective measures to facilitate the transfer of all power in that country to SWAPO, the genuine representative of the Namibian people. For many years SWAPO has repeatedly demonstrated its political maturity. That organization has the necessary leaders and sufficient experience; it enjoys the full trust of the Namibian people and it is capable of shouldering responsibility for governing the country.

82. We consider that it is extremely important, even essential, to abide strictly and unswervingly by the arms embargo imposed on the Republic of South Africa. In our opinion, cutting off loans, investments, and economic and other links to the Republic of South Africa, thus achieving the complete interna-

tional isolation and boycott of the racist régime of Pretoria might be the means of ensuring the elimination of one of the last bastions of colonialism. We therefore support the demand of the majority of countries that the racists of South Africa must be decisively rebuffed and that the Charter of the United Nations be used against the Republic of South Africa in the form of mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII.

83. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like to state that, in the just struggle for its liberation, the people of Namibia can always count on our full solidarity and support.

84. Mr. SALLAH (Gambia): Mr. President, allow me first of all to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this emergency special session. My delegation is confident that your proved qualities of statesmanship and the important role that your country continues to play in the search for a just settlement of the problem of Namibia will guide the deliberations of this critical session to a successful conclusion.

85. The situation in Namibia has now reached a point of crisis, at which the independence of Namibia, international peace and security and, finally, the authority and credibility of the United Nations are all at stake.

86. Convened at the request of the group of African States, following the inability of the Security Council to agree in April on the measures necessary to ensure South Africa's compliance with the relevant United Nations resolutions, this emergency special session offers the Organization the singular opportunity to demonstrate to the people of Namibia that their confidence has not been betrayed.

87. The African continent in general and the people of Namibia in particular have displayed singular patience and restraint throughout the tortuous negotiations which have surrounded the question of Namibia's independence since 1966. Repeatedly, however, the spirit of tolerance and compromise displayed by SWAPO, the authentic representative of the Namibian people, has been met with treachery and subterfuge on the part of the racist régime in Pretoria. It was against the background of that constant duplicity that the Security Council convened in April to consider the situation in Namibia.

88. During this meeting it was demonstrated conclusively, if indeed there was need for further proof, that South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia was illegal, that it constituted a breach of international peace and that it remained a threat to international security. There was, however, an almost surrealistic quality about the debate in which the original sponsors of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—who had, in fact, been betrayed by South Africa—sat with benign indifference while the African and non-aligned countries expressed vicarious indignation at Pretoria's duplicity. This, coupled with the negative votes cast by three of the Council's permanent members which effectively blocked the imposition of the sanctions provided for under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, has gravely undermined the credibility of the five members of the Western contact group.

89. Africa has not been reassured by the recent references in certain capitals to the need for reinforcing

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) with such "confidence-building measures" as constitutional guarantees for the white minority. Can it have been forgotten so soon that the very acceptance of the Western plan, which makes no reference to Walvis Bay, represents in itself a major compromise by SWAPO and is a living testament to the genuine desire of the Namibian people for a peaceful settlement? To expect any further concessions is surely to add insult to injury.

90. The position of Africa on this issue is unequivocal: Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the sole and immutable basis for the transition to independence in Namibia.

91. As was inevitable, such references to constitutional guarantees, coming in the wake of the Security Council vetoes, have been interpreted in Pretoria as official Western endorsement of South Africa's position on Namibia. Thus, while Pretoria's permanent campaign of destabilization against the front-line States has long represented a threat to international peace and security, the unprovoked invasion of Angola launched last month from Namibia was unprecedented in both its scale and timing. This time there was no pretence of having crossed the border in "hot pursuit of terrorists". Indeed, how could there be, given the size of the invading force? Armoured columns escorted by jet bombers are not entirely consistent with the argument of hot pursuit. Instead, the uncharacteristic candour of the Pretoria régime about that massive incursion suggests a radical new development in South Africa's campaign of destabilization abroad, which can only have been encouraged by the apparent indulgence of its allies. Those allies now shoulder a moral responsibility for the death, destruction and untold human suffering inflicted last month on the people of Angola.

92. The timing of the invasion itself is significant. Launched from Namibian territory barely a week before the opening of the present emergency special session on Namibia, the invasion underlines South Africa's total disregard for the United Nations.

93. The situation in southern Africa is now fraught with danger. Namibia, a Territory under the administrative and legal jurisdiction of the United Nations, has been transformed by South Africa into a spring-board for armed aggression against neighbouring African States. In view of the inability of the Security Council even to condemn the invasion of Angola, it is impossible to predict what new destructive adventure the outlaws in Pretoria may now embark upon. For how long will South Africa continue to violate the Charter of the Organization with impunity? For how much longer can its wilful defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council be tolerated?

94. Recent events have demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the continued illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. Under the circumstances, the consequences of any further delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia do not bear contemplation.

95. On this issue, the United Nations faces two major responsibilities which it must not hesitate to

shoulder: first, as the Administering Authority of the Territory of Namibia and, secondly, as the custodian of international peace and security. It is therefore imperative for the very credibility of our Organization that whatever measures are necessary to ensure South Africa's early compliance with the United Nations plan for Namibia be applied without further delay.

96. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): It is our good fortune today that you, Sir, are presiding over the eighth emergency special session of the Assembly devoted to the question of Namibia. My delegation is confident that, with your wisdom and diplomatic skill at our disposal, these deliberations will be most fruitful.

97. The question of Namibia has a special place in the life of the United Nations, which has a special place in the hopes and aspirations of the Namibian people. The question of Namibia, in evidence since the League of Nations, has confronted this international body since its early years. The Organization's treatment of this subject over the years has been punctuated by high-level consultations, meetings and missions, by important resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and other bodies, and by advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice.

98. In 1966 the Assembly, by its resolution 2145 (XXI), terminated the Mandate over South West Africa, assumed direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence, and shortly after established the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority. Later, in June 1971, the International Court of Justice reaffirmed that, as the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal, South Africa was under an obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of that Territory.²

99. In subsequent years great efforts have been exerted to arrive at an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia. Indeed, during the last 10 months Namibia has been the subject of intensive consideration in numerous conferences and agencies, including the Security Council and the General Assembly. But a political solution of the question of Namibia has not been found. This emergency special session has been made necessary because of the lack of progress towards implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The pre-implementation meeting held in Geneva from 7 to 14 January of this year failed because South Africa refused to sign a cease-fire agreement and to proceed with the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)—and that sign of defiance seems to have set the trend thus far for this year. South Africa has persisted on a dangerous course, marked by the entrenchment of the system of *apartheid*, the conscription of Namibians, increased militarization of Namibia, the introduction of new governmental structures and other forms of exploitation of Namibia's human and natural resources.

100. It is for the international community to reserve that trend and to put the question of Namibia on the track towards a peaceful settlement. At this session, the Assembly should call once again in the most urgent terms for the prompt and full implementation

of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, in accordance with Council resolution 435 (1978).

101. By concerted action by the world community, the right to self-determination and national independence of the Namibian people within a united Namibia must be reaffirmed; but any "internal settlement" arrived at in contravention of the United Nations plan must be rejected.

102. There should be widespread support for appropriate measures to push this matter to a solution. In this regard, recent meetings have assessed the implications of the collapse of the pre-implementation talks, and the declarations which they have produced—such as the Paris Declaration on Sanctions against South Africa, the Special Declaration on Namibia⁷ adopted by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, as well as the Panama Declaration and Programme of Action on Namibia³ adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia—contain a number of proposals, including a programme of unilateral sanctions against South Africa. We are also aware of the meetings of the five members of the Western contact group. The activities of that group should be vigorously pursued, with the co-operation of all parties and with a view to the early independence of Namibia.

103. The Organization has a special place in Namibia's past and present, but particularly in its future. While the liberation of Namibia is primarily the responsibility of the people of Namibia, it is the duty of all States to seek all possible means to bring that liberation about in a peaceful manner. International pressure for the liberation of southern Africa must be renewed and intensified. We must redouble our efforts, in the light of the current circumstances, to eradicate *apartheid* and to establish a free and democratic society in Namibia.

104. Finally, I wish to express our high appreciation for the dedication with which several bodies, in particular the United Nations Council for Namibia, have performed their work of mobilizing international support for the Namibian struggle and preparing Namibia for a smooth transition to independence.

105. Mr. MARTINI-URDANETA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a pleasure for my delegation to see you, Sir, presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly. We are certain that your talents and diplomatic experience will ensure the effective conduct of this session.

106. This session, convened to consider the question of Namibia, is being held at a particularly critical time for the international community. We have observed with growing concern and feelings of frustration the increased repression against the people of Namibia, as well as the continued acts of aggression by the racist South African régime against the front-line States. Recently, Angola was once again the victim of aggression by the racist régime in which hundreds of men, women and children lost their lives, and there was substantial material loss. We have also witnessed South Africa's rejection of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia and the ineffectiveness of the Security Council in assuming its responsibility vis-à-vis the defiant racist régime in a situation

which no doubt threatens international peace and security. Those are the inescapable facts which caused the international community to convene this emergency special session.

107. Venezuela, as an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, has closely followed with grave concern the events which have affected the Namibian people during the last months as a result of the failure of the Geneva meeting which the racist South African régime only attended so as to frustrate a cease-fire agreement and the implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia provided for in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

108. Thereafter, in the course of this same year, we considered the question of Namibia at the resumed thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, in the Security Council, at the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia held in Panama in June and in other international forums, particularly within the Non-Aligned Movement and at the meetings of OAU. Yet, to date, no progress has been possible in the effective fulfilment of the collective commitment of the international community to the rights of freedom, independence and self-determination for the Namibian people.

109. This lack of progress is not exclusively the responsibility of the racist South African régime, because it could not persist in its scorn towards the United Nations without the support of a few countries which profit from the illegal exploitation of the human and natural resources of Namibia. Some of those countries resist compliance with the mandatory arms embargo imposed by the Security Council against South Africa and continue to supply weapons and military equipment which are used to deny the Namibian people its rights as well as to launch military attacks and other acts of aggression against independent African countries.

110. Venezuela, as a democratic country which respects fundamental human rights, comes to this emergency special session to reiterate its support for the noble cause of the Namibian people. We maintain the full applicability of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia. We are convinced that the plan for the independence of Namibia, which of necessity provides for free and democratic elections under United Nations supervision, constitutes the appropriate framework to guarantee the rights of the Namibian people to freedom, independence and self-determination.

111. Venezuela supports the adoption of effective comprehensive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to ensure the total isolation of the racist South African régime. We are convinced that it is only by the application of effective and comprehensive measures that we shall be able to implement the plan for the independence of Namibia and put an end to the situation of growing instability in southern Africa arising from the illegal occupation of Namibia and the policies of provocation and aggression systematically practised by the South African racist régime.

112. In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm the confidence of the Venezuelan people, as expressed in San Francisco, that the international community will

shoulder its historic responsibility towards the noble people of Namibia. We trust that the decisions to be adopted at this emergency special session will be an expression of solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people to attain the place to which it is by right entitled in the concert of free nations.

113. The PRESIDENT: May I now, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, call on the last speaker this morning, the observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations.

114. Mr. MAKSOUUD (League of Arab States) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, on behalf of the League of Arab States, I congratulate you on presiding over this emergency special session of the General Assembly. I should like to thank you for having invited us to participate in this important session and to express our appreciation for your wisdom as you guide our work.

115. The emergency special session on the question of Namibia has been convened at a critical juncture in the struggle against lingering racist entities. It is true that the issue of racism has been debated at length. It is equally true that racist theories and objectives have been refuted on sound scientific and judicial grounds and rejected world-wide through a rising awareness of the evil that racism represents. Yet it is just as obvious that racist régimes and entities, among them South Africa, are not about to acknowledge the bankruptcy of those theories, despite the international acceptance of humanitarian principles and of the right of all peoples to self-determination and national independence. Those racist régimes and entities continue brazenly and openly to reject the inalienable prerogative of nations to determine their own destiny, a right that has become the rule rather than the exception in this last quarter of the twentieth century, in the wake of the utter defeat of the old colonialism. It is a right approved by the international will within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations and according to United Nations resolutions, so much so that self-determination has become a major pillar of the political edifice of our age.

116. A close examination of the record on the question under discussion in this session leaves no doubt that the suffering of Namibia is, first and foremost, the result of the insistence of South Africa's racist entity on following policies clearly inimical to the Namibian people and to their legal rights in their own land. Nor has South Africa limited those hostile policies to Namibia alone. As we can see from the latest act of aggression against the sovereign Republic of Angola, South Africa now habitually directs its hostile actions against the African countries that have declared their solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people.

117. The racist authorities of South Africa have resorted to every excuse and deception to deny the Namibians their aspirations to freedom and their right to national independence. Namibians today are under direct foreign occupation, suffering from every form of oppression. In addition, South Africa remains contemptuous of international legalities and principles, defiant of world public opinion, and totally unconcerned about the numerous United Nations resolutions condemning the South African occupation of Namibia.

118. We are all well aware of the numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on this subject and there is no need to enumerate them here. But what is of grave concern is South Africa's continuing disregard of those resolutions. The more resolutions we have adopted, the more South Africa has shown its utter scorn for them, which, in turn, has prompted the United Nations to reaffirm its position with new resolutions every time the Namibian question has come up for discussion.

119. This undermines the credibility of the United Nations itself. The dignity of the world Organization, which embodies the highest aspirations of all nations to peace, would be severely harmed if it were to content itself with resolutions and recommendations in international disputes. It should be noted that the ability of the United Nations to operate as a dependable and respected guarantor of regional and international security depends to a large degree on its determination and capacity to follow through on its resolutions.

120. That is why it has become imperative for the international community to move beyond simple prompting in the case of Namibia. The time for action is now. The United Nations has often enough urged all concerned parties, and particularly racist South Africa, to expedite the process of Namibian independence and has even more frequently condemned South Africa's role and its occupation of Namibia. The racist South African régime has responded by widening its aggression, an example of which was its latest military assault on Angola, launched from Namibia on the pretext of pursuing the freedom fighters of SWAPO.

121. Those and other instances of aggressive action prove that South Africa is neither ready nor willing to heed any warnings. It is clearly defiant of the international consensus. That is why we now ask whether the United Nations has any alternative but to adopt tangible measures to put an end to this racist behaviour which contradicts all international laws and principles.

122. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council have no other choice but to face the issue squarely and to attempt to retrieve their credibility through serious action. The issue is simple: if the racist South African régime fails to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, then the world Organization must impose military and economic sanctions under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

123. Forcing South Africa to heed the will of the international community and to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations on the question of Namibia will in the short and long terms reinforce international peace and strengthen the role of the world Organization by affirming, on the one hand, the right of a nation to determine its own destiny and deterring, on the other, an aggressive racist policy condemned by all countries.

124. The historical, political and legal dimensions of the Namibian question are well known and openly on record. The United Nations has worked diligently over the years to affirm the inalienable right of the Namibian people to freedom, self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia. The great majority of nations have in principle endorsed that

legitimate right of Namibia. And yet South Africa persists in its rejection of United Nations resolutions and in its defiance of the General Assembly by its continued occupation of Namibia and its pursuit policies of expansion and segregation.

125. One wonders: could South Africa disregard the international consensus if it were not supported by forces having significant influence in the international arena? Certainly not.

126. The truth is that South Africa can continue to antagonize world public opinion and to persist in its occupation and racial oppression of Namibia with the permissive support of the United States, whether in the international domain or in the United Nations. United States officials have repeatedly declared their reluctance to take sides in this strife. Yet they have also declared that American policy in that part of the world is aimed at countering the so-called "Soviet influence". One wonders how the United States proposes to counter the racist influence—with silence?

127. Those American signals are just as clear to the racist rulers of Pretoria as they are to the rest of the world. Those rules depend heavily on the United States position to continue their imperialist policy towards Namibia and its people, as well as against the African neighbouring States and their peoples. Most recently, the permissive attitude of the United States was transformed into a shield for South Africa when the United States used its veto in the Security Council against a draft resolution that would have condemned the racist entity for its aggression against Angola.

128. Is there any doubt that the permissive attitude of the United States encourages South Africa to persist in its racist aggressive attitude towards Namibia?

129. The international community has given the five members of the Western contact group ample time and opportunity to achieve Namibian independence. The Western contact group did produce a plan that was accepted by SWAPO, but what followed could hardly be called encouraging. The hoped-for objectives fell victim to dissimulation on the part of the contact group and to aggression on the part of South Africa.

130. While the Western Powers had reached the conclusion that complete independence for Namibia should be achieved in stages, South Africa was preparing to undermine those international efforts on the pretext of the same step-by-step arrangement. South Africa ignored the United Nations resolutions on Namibia because it viewed the international efforts as giving it licence to proceed in the opposite direction.

131. The failure to condemn the Pretoria authorities, although they lack any kind of legitimacy, gives South Africa time to entrench its policies in Namibia and to create situations that not only serve South African interests but will be difficult to overcome in subsequent negotiations on Namibia. The consequences are certain to be even more serious if sanctions are not imposed on a country that trifles with the resolutions of the United Nations, as South Africa so often does.

132. It is this danger that makes it critical for the General Assembly to abandon the policy of appealing to and placating racism, which only strengthens its venom, and move on to the stage of executing its resolutions on South Africa. This fact has been amply proved throughout contemporary history by the actions of racist entities like South Africa and Israel. Numerous United Nations resolutions against both of these countries have had little or no effect on their racist attitudes because the resolutions did not include any significant sanctions.

133. In fact, it was the reluctance to impose sanctions against Israel and its aggressive policies that encouraged South Africa to follow suit, especially since the two are twins with similar racist, aggressive and expansionist creeds.

134. A simple review of the history of the United Nations and of its resolutions will clearly show that those two racist entities are a heavy burden on the international community. No countries have so violated the norms of international law and persisted in flagrantly defying the international will as South Africa and Israel have done. Israel was planted in the very heart of our vast homeland and was nurtured on aggression, which it practises to this very day. Expansion, occupation and oppression are characteristics of its history and constituents of its being. No condemnation by the United Nations has ever deterred Israel, not even once. We all clearly remember the events of this summer, when in the space of just one month Israel launched criminal attacks against two Arab capitals. Even before the ink was dry on the Security Council resolution condemning its attack on Iraq's peaceful nuclear installation, Israel committed its barbaric assault on the civilian quarters of Beirut, killing hundreds and wounding many more. In every instance the excuse was the same. Israel violates the skies of a State Member of the United Nations, occupies its southern regions and murders its citizens on the pretext of pursuing what it calls "terrorists". When Israel struck at the nuclear facilities of another Arab State, it claimed that its action was dictated by "self-defence".

135. That is exactly what South Africa does when it occupies the Territory of Namibia, curbs the rights of its people and denies them the opportunity to determine their own future, despite the international consensus so clearly embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations. When South Africa launched its aggression against Angola two weeks ago it claimed, as its twin Israel usually does, that its forces were going in pursuit of SWAPO units. That is hardly surprising, because racism has its own special rules and concepts which are totally at variance with accepted international norms.

136. It is truly painful to see how racist régimes, and specifically Israel and South Africa, continue to diminish the dignity of the United Nations and its resolutions without the world Organization being able to curb those dangerous racist trends which threaten to undermine it in its appointed role, just as they threaten international peace.

137. It is equally regrettable that those racist régimes have drawn strength from the leniency they have found in the international community, typified

by the fact that the United Nations has deemed it sufficient to issue only resolutions and recommendations against aggressive, racist policies. The coordination between the reactions of South Africa and Israel to international resolutions is clear. The timidity of those resolutions has encouraged both those régimes to continue in their policies of racism, occupation and aggression, which are the result of the nature of their system. Moreover, international leniency towards one régime actually became an incentive for the other to practice its aggressive, racist and expansionist policies.

138. Dependence on the United States and on its influence in reducing the role of the United Nations in deterring aggression constitutes one of the major factors in the international and regional policies of the rulers of Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

139. We in the League of Arab States declare our total solidarity with Namibia and its people and completely support the right to self-determination and national independence, the aims for which SWAPO, the only legitimate representative of the Namibian people, is fighting so valiantly. We also look forward, today more than at any other time and especially during this emergency special session of the General Assembly, to the role we all expect the United Nations to play in the case of Namibia. It is no longer possible to ignore acts of racist piracy committed at

the expense of the destiny of an entire nation and the credibility of an international Organization that is the final guarantee for peace and justice in the world.

140. The policy of racism practised by Israel and South Africa is a defeat for human culture and values. The international community has no alternative but to erase the effects of that defeat before launching an all-out final attack against racism which goes against history and the belief in the inalienable rights of peoples according to existing international laws.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

1. *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1981*, document S/14333.
2. *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.
3. See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 222.
4. União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.
5. A/AC.109/656, para. 2.
6. A/36/534, annex I, resolution CM/Res.854 (XXXVII).
7. A/CONF.107/8, sect. X.